



**INTERNATIONAL PERSPECTIVES ON
EDUCATION AND SOCIETY
VOLUME 8**

**EDUCATION FOR ALL: GLOBAL
PROMISES, NATIONAL CHALLENGES**

**DAVID P. BAKER
ALEXANDER W. WISEMAN**

Editors

EDUCATION FOR ALL: GLOBAL
PROMISES, NATIONAL
CHALLENGES

INTERNATIONAL PERSPECTIVES ON EDUCATION AND SOCIETY

Series Editor: Abraham Yogev

- Volume 1: International Perspectives on Education and Society
- Volume 2: Schooling and Status Attainment: Social Origins and Institutional Determinants
- Volume 3: Education and Social Change
- Volume 4: Educational Reform in International Perspective

Series Editor from Volume 5: David P. Baker

- Volume 5: New Paradigms and Recurring Paradoxes in Education for Citizenship: An International Comparison
- Volume 6: Global Trends in Educational Policy
- Volume 7: The Impact of Comparative Education Research on Institutional Theory

INTERNATIONAL PERSPECTIVES ON EDUCATION AND
SOCIETY VOLUME 8

EDUCATION FOR ALL: GLOBAL PROMISES, NATIONAL CHALLENGES

EDITED BY

DAVID P. BAKER

Pennsylvania State University, USA

ALEXANDER W. WISEMAN

The University of Tulsa, USA



ELSEVIER

JAI

Amsterdam – Boston – Heidelberg – London – New York – Oxford
Paris – San Diego – San Francisco – Singapore – Sydney – Tokyo

JAI Press is an imprint of Elsevier

JAI Press is an imprint of Elsevier
Linacre House, Jordan Hill, Oxford OX2 8DP, UK
Radarweg 29, PO Box 211, 1000 AE Amsterdam, The Netherlands
525 B Street, Suite 1900, San Diego, CA 92101-4495, USA

First edition 2007

Copyright © 2007 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form or by any means electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise without the prior written permission of the publisher

Permissions may be sought directly from Elsevier's Science & Technology Rights Department in Oxford, UK: phone (+44) (0) 1865 843830; fax (+44) (0) 1865 853333; email: permissions@elsevier.com. Alternatively you can submit your request online by visiting the Elsevier web site at <http://elsevier.com/locate/permissions>, and selecting *Obtaining permission to use Elsevier material*

Notice

No responsibility is assumed by the publisher for any injury and/or damage to persons or property as a matter of products liability, negligence or otherwise, or from any use or operation of any methods, products, instructions or ideas contained in the material herein. Because of rapid advances in the medical sciences, in particular, independent verification of diagnoses and drug dosages should be made

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

ISBN: 978-0-7623-1441-6

ISSN: 1479-3679 (Series)

For information on all JAI Press publications visit our website at books.elsevier.com
--

Printed and bound in the United Kingdom

07 08 09 10 11 10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

Working together to grow
libraries in developing countries

www.elsevier.com | www.bookaid.org | www.sabre.org

ELSEVIER

BOOK AID
International

Sabre Foundation

CONTENTS

LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS	<i>ix</i>
----------------------	-----------

PREFACE	<i>xiii</i>
---------	-------------

EDUCATION FOR ALL: PARADOXES AND PROSPECTS OF A GLOBAL PROMISE <i>Karen Mundy</i>	<i>1</i>
--	----------

THE POLITICAL DIMENSIONS OF INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION IN EDUCATION: MECHANISMS OF GLOBAL GOVERNANCE TO PROMOTE EDUCATION FOR ALL <i>Yuto Kitamura</i>	<i>31</i>
--	-----------

THE MARKET, THE NATION AND THE SCHOOL: EFA IN TIMES OF GLOBALIZATION AND NATIONALISM <i>Muhammad A. Naseem and Adeela Arshad-Ayaz</i>	<i>73</i>
--	-----------

GROUND FOR PRIORITIZING EDUCATION FOR GIRLS: THE TELLING CASE OF LEFT-BEHIND RURAL CHINA <i>Vilma Seeberg, Heidi Ross, Jinghuan Liu and Guangyu Tan</i>	<i>109</i>
--	------------

INCLUSIVE EDUCATION AS A STRATEGY FOR ACHIEVING EDUCATION FOR ALL: PERSPECTIVES FROM THREE ASIAN SOCIETIES <i>Vivian Heung and David Grossman</i>	<i>155</i>
--	------------

IN PURSUIT OF EFA: EXPANDING AND
ENHANCING MULTIGRADE SCHOOLING IN
BHUTAN

*Peter Ninnes, T. W. Maxwell, Wangchuck Rabten and
Karchung Karchung* 181

EVERY CHILD IN SCHOOL: THE CHALLENGES OF
ATTAINING AND FINANCING EDUCATION FOR
ALL IN INDIA

P. Geetha Rani 201

STATE AND CIVIL SOCIETY RESPONSE TO
EDUCATION FOR ALL: LINKING GLOBAL DREAMS
TO NATIONAL REALITIES IN PERU

Nelly P. Stromquist 257

THE EDUCATION OF YOUTH AND ADULTS IN
MEXICO MORE THAN 15 YEARS AFTER JOMTIEN:
GLOBAL PROMISES, NATIONAL CHALLENGES

Teresa Bracho and Arcelia Martínez 279

THE REFORM FOR EFA IN MEXICO:
DISAPPOINTING PROGRESS, COULD DO BETTER

Christopher Martin 305

EDUCATION FOR ALL AND ITS INFLUENCE ON
AT-RISK STUDENT POLICY IN CURACAO,
NETHERLANDS ANTILLES

Rosita C. Tormala-Nita 325

EDUCATION FOR ALL IN SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA:
PROSPECTS AND CHALLENGES

C. C. Wolhuter 337

TEACHER QUALITY AND EDUCATION FOR ALL IN SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA <i>Thomas M. Smith and Albert Motivans</i>	363
CHALLENGES OF REBUILDING EDUCATION IN CRISIS: ACCESS TO UNIVERSAL PRIMARY EDUCATION IN AFRICA <i>Ladislaus M. Semali</i>	395
HOW “BASIC” IS BASIC EDUCATION?: RESTRUCTURING BASIC EDUCATION IN POST-APARTHEID SOUTH AFRICA WITHIN THE CONTEXT OF EFA <i>Chijioke J. Evoh and Noxolo Mafu</i>	427
MAKING SENSE OF THE EFA FROM A NATIONAL CONTEXT: ITS IMPLEMENTATION, AND IMPACT ON HOUSEHOLDS IN ETHIOPIA <i>Shoko Yamada</i>	453
EDUCATION FOR ALL: A MYTH OR REALITY? LIMITATIONS OF IMPLEMENTING EDUCATION FOR ALL: THE SIERRA LEONE CONTEXT <i>Jasmine Renner</i>	493
WCEFA: A MOMENT IN THE HISTORY OF MULTILATERAL EDUCATION <i>Phillip W. Jones</i>	521
AUTHOR INDEX	539
SUBJECT INDEX	547

This page intentionally left blank

LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS

CO-EDITORS

<i>Alexander W. Wiseman</i>	School of Education, The University of Tulsa, Tulsa, OK, USA
<i>David P. Baker</i>	Educational Theory and Policy Department, The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA, USA

CHAPTER AUTHORS

<i>Adeela Arshad-Ayaz</i>	Department of Integrated Studies in Education, McGill University, Montreal, QC, Canada
<i>Teresa Bracho</i>	Public Administration Department, Centro de Investigación y Docencia Económicas, México, D.F. Mexico
<i>Chijioke J. Evoh</i>	The Milano School for Public and Urban Policy, New School for Social Research, New York, NY, USA
<i>David Grossman</i>	Faculty of Languages, Arts, and Sciences, The Hong Kong Institute of Education, Hong Kong SAR, China
<i>Vivian Heung</i>	Center for Special Needs and Studies in Inclusive Education, The Hong Kong Institute of Education, Hong Kong SAR, China

<i>Phillip W. Jones</i>	Research Institute for Humanities and Social Sciences, The University of Sydney, NSW, Australia
<i>Karchung Karchung</i>	Ministry of Education, Bhutan
<i>Yuto Kitamura</i>	Graduate School of International Development, Nagoya University, Nagoya, Japan
<i>Jinghuan Liu</i>	Kent State University, Kent, OH, USA
<i>Noxolo Mafu</i>	The Milano School for Public and Urban Policy, New School for Social Research, New York, NY, USA
<i>Arcelia Martínez</i>	Public Administration Department, Centro de Investigación y Docencia Económicas, México, D.F. Mexico
<i>T.W. Maxwell</i>	School of Education, University of New England, Armidale, Australia
<i>Christopher Martin</i>	Ford Foundation, Mexico, D.F. Mexico
<i>Albert Motivans</i>	UNESCO Institute for Statistics, Montreal, Quebec, Canada
<i>Karen Mundy</i>	Department of Adult Education and Counselling Psychology, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, Canada
<i>Muhammad A. Naseem</i>	Department of Education LB-553-8, Concordia University, Montreal, Quebec, Canada
<i>Peter Ninnes</i>	UNICEF Education Officer, Dili, East Timor
<i>Wangchuck Rabten</i>	Ministry of Education, Bhutan
<i>P. Geetha Rani</i>	Educational Finance Unit, National Institute of Educational Planning and Administration, New Delhi, India

<i>Jasmine Renner</i>	Department of Education Leadership and Policy Analysis, East Tennessee State University, Johnson City, TN, USA
<i>Heidi Ross</i>	School of Education, Indiana University, Bloomington, IN, USA
<i>Vilma Seeberg</i>	Cultural Foundations of Education, Kent State University, Kent, OH, USA
<i>Ladislaus M. Semali</i>	Curriculum and Instruction Department, The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA, USA
<i>Thomas M. Smith</i>	Department of Leadership, Policy, and Organizations, Peabody College, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, TN, USA
<i>Nelly P. Stromquist</i>	Rossier School of Education, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA, USA
<i>Guangyu Tan</i>	Kent State University, Kent, OH, USA
<i>Rosita C. Tormala-Nita</i>	Department of Educational Policy & Community Studies, School of Education, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, Milwaukee, WI, USA
<i>C.C. Wolhuter</i>	Faculty of Educational Sciences, North West University, Potchefstroom, South Africa
<i>Shoko Yamada</i>	National Graduate Institute for Policy Studies, Tokyo, Japan

This page intentionally left blank

PREFACE

Comparative education researchers have been studying both the promises and the challenges surrounding the Education for All (EFA) movement for decades, but in comparative education research literature there is still neither consensus on the impact that EFA has nor clearly identified global trends in either EFA policymaking or policy implementation. It seems that for every promise that EFA brings, there is an accompanying challenge. This volume of *International Perspectives on Education and Society* highlights the struggle between the global promises and the national challenges of EFA.

The World Conference on EFA in Jomtien, Thailand in 1990 reinvigorated the push for modern mass schooling – making it a primary focus of national education policymakers and researchers around the world. The EFA declaration that grew out of this conference served as a culmination of a century-long movement to transform existing national educational systems from elite or otherwise limited organizations into the most comprehensive mass system of schooling ever devised. This commitment to the global expansion of basic education to all children, youth, and adults was reconfirmed at the Dakar World Education Forum ten years after Jomtien.

Taking a close look at the promises and challenges of EFA has many benefits. For one thing, it highlights the ways in which the worldwide expansion of mass schooling has become institutionalized at the global level. Scholars have been examining cross-national data for trends in schooling growth and expansion since the 1970s, but with the advent of EFA as both a formal and informal global movement the formerly isomorphic institutional process has rapidly expanded. Institutional educational change has been accelerated and legitimized in the form of basic formal state-sponsored schooling for the masses.

The chapters in this volume also ask (and answer in part) why EFA has gained such popularity and adherence from so many countries around the world. One answer might be that people everywhere really care about the education of their citizens, and this may be true. But, scholars and policymakers might also point out that most social agendas are maintained

because they serve a need. What do countries need that participating in the EFA movement and meeting the EFA goals provides? At this point it is important to remember that schooling is not only a tool that is believed to be crucial in educating individual students, but also for community and national development. The last century of schooling around the world is intimately linked to the fulfillment of national development goals. As such, schooling has become a national project to enhance the civic welfare, political status, and economy of a nation through the development of economically productive, socially and technically literate, and politically active citizens.

By taking a close look at the ways that EFA is either discussed or implemented in various nations around the world, it is perhaps easier to see how schooling uncovers the nation-state presence in people's lives. During the twentieth century, schooling became a function of the state. Regardless of the amount of years students are schooled in any particular country around the world, schooling for the most part is a mass and often compulsory process and, as such, it is sponsored and organized in some way by the state through funding, curriculum guidelines, mandated textbooks, teacher certification or training, and high stakes examinations. Consequently, schooling is a product of state mandates and actions or inactions and the immediate environment in which schools operate.

Even given the impact of national context and state agendas, this push for universal access to basic education reaches beyond national borders. It is indeed a global issue and as such is part of a global culture, governance structure, and a market. These overarching ideas have made EFA more of a human right than just a national strategy to economic success, and this is reflected in the scholarship about EFA and the greater institutionalization of formal education in society. The first three chapters in this volume by Karen Mundy, Yuto Kitamura, and the team of Muhammad A. Naseem and Adeela Arshad-Ayaz address the global context and influence of EFA.

Providing basic education for all children, youth, and adults is an ambitious goal. And, the challenges of reaching this goal are nowhere more evident than in the historically disenfranchised and uneducated groups of people. Several chapters in this volume address this concern. In particular, the chapters by Vilma Seeberg, Heidi Ross, and others address the promises and challenges of educating girls in rural China. The chapter by Vivian Heung and David Grossman tackles the challenges of inclusive education for special needs of students in selected Asian nations. And Rosita C.

Tormala-Nita's chapter discusses the challenges of educating all students in the Netherlands Antilles given its large at-risk student population. Specifically, these authors ask whether or not all children, youth, and adults really can benefit from the EFA movement. This volume on EFA also includes several chapters that emphasize the particular promises and challenges of implementing basic education in Sub-Saharan nations. Chapters by C. C. Wollhuter, Thomas M. Smith and Albert Motivans, Ladislaus M. Semali, and Chijioke J. Evoh and Noxolo Mafu address political, capacity, access, and socio-cultural promises and challenges of EFA, respectively.

Other chapters in this volume are detailed and thoughtful accounts of the progress and challenges of implementing EFA-driven educational reform in specific nations as remote as Bhutan (see the chapter by Peter Ninnes, T. W. Maxwell, Wangchuck Rabten, and Karchung Karchung) and Peru (see the chapter by Nelly P. Stromquist), as large as India (see the chapter by P. Geetha Rani) and Mexico (see the chapters by Christopher Martin and the team of Teresa Bracho and Arcelia Martínez), as aid-dependent as Ethiopia (see the chapter by Shoko Yamada), and as war-torn as Sierra Leone (see the chapter by Jasmine Renner). These chapters suggest that national contexts critically filter the impact that the global, multilateral EFA movement does or can have on basic education within nations. It is not simply a matter of laying a mass schooling model on a country and plugging it in. EFA may be a global goal and national priority, but cannot be implemented "on the ground" without negotiating the specific local contexts and challenges within each nation.

This volume concludes with a chapter by Phillip W. Jones that places the EFA movement in a more critical historical context and suggests that as a movement it may have run its course. In particular, multilateralism, while still an important force in global educational change and development may have relied on politically driven coalitions that have slackened since the demise of the Soviet Union. As this final chapter shows, there is certainly evidence to suggest that this is the case.

Regardless of one's theory about the efficacy and impact of EFA, the speed at which real educational opportunity will be made for all children depends on serious, honest, and cogent analysis and debate of both the promise and challenge of EFA. The range, detail, and quality of comparative scholarship on the central issue of EFA in the world today are reflected in these chapters. It is our belief that the policy-relevant research and scholarship in this volume's chapters explain both the impact that EFA has and several global trends in policymaking and policy implementation. Of

course, only time will tell us what the legacy of the EFA movement will eventually be.

David P. Baker
Pennsylvania State University

Alexander W. Wiseman
The University of Tulsa

EDUCATION FOR ALL: PARADOXES AND PROSPECTS OF A GLOBAL PROMISE

Karen Mundy

ABSTRACT

Education for all has become a rallying call among heads of states, international organizations, corporate leaders and transnational advocacy groups. Implementation of EFA goals has also expanded, and today enjoys both new volumes of aid spending and new modes of aid delivery. This chapter considers why the global promise of EFA has moved beyond international rhetoric to action, and explores what the current EFA movement can tell us about the prospects of rights-based and redistributive forms of global governance.

INTRODUCTION

Since the 1999 Dakar World Education Forum, the achievement of “education for all” has steadily built momentum as a focus for discussion and action within international fora. Today it would be difficult to find any meeting of world leaders in which the universal right to education is not trumpeted as a common international goal. “Education for all” is a rallying call among heads

Education for All: Global Promises, National Challenges
International Perspectives on Education and Society, Volume 8, 1–30
Copyright © 2007 by Elsevier Ltd.
All rights of reproduction in any form reserved
ISSN: 1479-3679/doi:10.1016/S1479-3679(06)08001-7

of state and international financial institutions, and a focus for transnational advocacy by civil society actors. More recently it has emerged at the fore of meetings among the world's corporate leaders. "Education for all" is also an expanding arena for international development cooperation, characterized by widespread experimentation with new modes of aid delivery, new kinds of donor-recipient relationships and relatively high volumes of aid spending.

Why has the global promise of EFA moved beyond international rhetoric to action now? This paper argues that the resurgence of interest in EFA by the global community today is tightly linked to two new developments. The first is the emergence of fragile and deeply paradoxical consensus about international development among G8 governments. This consensus links development to democracy, good governance and human rights in a more extensive manner than ever before, while also strongly asserting the primacy of markets and capitalism. Education bridges these two sets of development ideals. In addition, EFA has been fed by the burgeoning of transnational social movements that have used education as a core venue for advocating for global redistributive justice.

To explore the recent resurgence of interest in EFA, the following section provides a critical overview of the history of the "education for all" goal within the international community from 1945 to 2000. The paper then examines what has changed in the context, rhetoric and agents of the international regime for educational development since the late 1990s. A final section explores what the current EFA experiment can tell us about the prospects and paradoxes of rights-based and redistributive forms of global governance in our new century.

"EDUCATION FOR ALL" AND ITS IMPLEMENTATION IN THE POST-WORLD WAR II ERA

Efforts to remake world order following World War II saw the inclusion of education as a universal right in the 1948 Universal Declaration on Human Rights (Article 26), and the establishment of the United Nations Education Science and Cultural Organization with a broad mandate to support (among other things) the extension of a universal right to education. After a century of expansion in systems of mass public education in Western countries, it is perhaps not surprising to see education emerge as a central focus for post-World War II multilateralism. At the level of norms and ideas, the institutionalization of state-led and universally accessible education systems

in the Western world played a “chartering” or steerage role in the construction of an education for development regime (Meyer, 1977; Anderson, 1983; Chabbot, 2003). Educational multilateralism, like other forms of post-World War II multilateralism, emerged from the idea that the spread of national social and political institutions modeled on the experiences of Western nation states was crucial for world peace.

However, rhetorical commitment to a universal entitlement to education did not translate into a strong form of international collective action to ensure educational rights. The highly state-centric structure of world politics in the period after 1945 limited appetite for collective action and coordination around either universal rights or issues of global inequality. Thus, what emerged after World War II was a highly decentralized regime to support national educational development, not universal educational rights. Several United Nations organizations – UNESCO, UNICEF and the UNDP – along with the bilateral aid organizations formed during the 1960s and 1970s – took up the notion that education could be used as an important tool in national development. Rich country aid for educational development grew quickly (see [Tables 1 and 5](#)), accounting for close to 10% of all aid flows after 1960. The idea of a universal right to education (the initial meaning of the term “education for all”) was quickly displaced by a focus on education as a requirement for economic development.

As governments and international organizations began to involve themselves in education for development activities, a loose international regime for educational development emerged. This regime had no formal system of governance or coordination among its many actors – it simply operated under the aegis of the idea that more education = more development. It was dominated by “official actors” – a handful of multilateral organizations (UNESCO, UNICEF and the World Bank) and bilateral aid organizations (CIDA, SIDA, USAID, DFID, etc.). Southern governments were recipients of the regime, but often not active participants within it. Individual citizens were typically treated as the “targets” (Samoff, 1999, 2001). Few nongovernmental actors were involved or recognized within this official regime. They remained outside its conferences and conventions, despite a history of activism by International Teacher Unions and international humanitarian and religious organizations from the early 20th century (Mundy & Murphy, 2001). By and large, educational development was seen as the job of national governments, supported by funding and expertise from bilateral donors and international organizations.

By the mid-1970s, virtually every industrialized country supported educational development through its bilateral foreign aid program, but this

Table 1. The Expansion of Aid for Education, 1965–2004 (In Millions of Constant 2004 US\$).

	1965	1970	1975	1980	1985	1990	1995	2000	2004
Bilateral educational aid (OECD countries) ^a	3,357.31	3,723.40	4,500.44	6,904.15	6,232.24	7,350.14	6,382.15	4,374.88	6,776.98
World Bank lending to education ^b	179.86	425.53	710.66	894.85	2,015.49	1,821.96	2,262.22	903.90	1,684.0
UNESCO									
Total regular budget ^c	293.76	411.65	539.34	616.19	806.41	491.55	480.62	675.90	610.00
Education programs ^d	68.35	86.70	117.00	114.07	189.27	89.42	102.71	135.61	109.87
Extra budgetary support for education programs ^e	138.54	120.27	238.58	202.54	n/a	96.48	108.40	124.16	105.96
UNICEF ^f	n/a	53.19	79.31	70.37	69.69	73.97	89.72	162.65	282.00
OECD/DAC GDP deflator ^g	16.68	18.80	31.52	49.17	46.49	77.06	94.73	80.54	100

^aDAC: International Development Statistics (IDS) online databases on aid and other resource eflows, www.oecd.org/dac/stats/idsonline. Query results DAC online database on annual aggregates (Table 5), 16 April 2006.

^bWorld Bank figures available at: <http://devdata.worldbank.org/edstats/worldbank/ending/file2005/file%202.xls>, accessed 6 April 2006. *Note:* There is a break in the series because a new coding series for sectoral analysis was instituted in FY2003 and backdated to 1990.

^cUNESCO approved program and budget, various years. Figures refer to biennial budgets.

^dUNESCO approved program and budget, various years. Figures refer to biennial budgets.

^eEstimated extra-budgetary contributions as they appear in the approved program and budgets, various years. Figures refer to biennial budgets.

^fFigures for 1970–1995 from UNICEF Annual Reports, various years 1996; figures for 2000 from: UNICEF Executive Board, report of the mid-term review of the mid-term of the UNICEF medium-term strategic plan (2002–2005), 13–17 September 2004, p. 25, http://www.unicef.org/about/execboard/files/04_13, accessed on April 6, 2006; figures for 2004 from: UNICEF Executive Board Annual Session 2005, 6–10 June 2005, report of the Executive Director: results achieved for children in 2004 in support of the medium-term strategic plan, p. 37, [www.unicef.org/about/execboard/files/05-06_ExecDirs_repor2\(1\).pdf](http://www.unicef.org/about/execboard/files/05-06_ExecDirs_repor2(1).pdf). *Note:* Figures for UNICEF for 2000 and 2004 are reported as girls' education.

^gDAC GDP deflator: 2004 = 100, www.oecd.org/dataoec/43/43/34980655.xls, accessed 16 April 2006.

occurred at wildly varying and often volatile levels of between 3 and 30% of their total official aid. No single bilateral donor outweighed the others financially or could claim to provide intellectual or political guidance to the others – not even the US, despite its status as hegemon in the global system. Yet bilateral aid represented more than 3/4 of the overall aid for education. The net result was an “education for development” regime dominated by many small- to medium-sized, short-term, bilateral transactions, often working at cross-purposes. For four decades (1960s–1990s) ambitious attempts at global level coordination of bilateral education for development activities failed, and usually failed quite quickly.¹ At least in part this failure occurred because each OECD government sought to use educational aid to promote its own unique political and economic interests.

Alongside these fragmented bilateral efforts, UN organizations also failed to develop a coordinated approach to support educational development. UNESCO, the putative leader in the field, kicked things off with ambitious regional conferences and targets for educational development in the late 1960s and 1970s (Chabbott, 2003). Despite initial hopes however, UNESCO became neither center nor coordinator of the education for development regime. OECD member governments failed to fund UNESCO at levels sufficient to allow it to play a global coordinating role (its funding never rose above that of a medium-sized university). Limited resources and intense politicization caused UNESCO to lose the confidence of OECD governments in the 1970s and 1980s (Jones, 1988; Mundy, 1998, 1999). In turn, UNESCO’s weakness created space for other, more entrepreneurial UN organizations to become active in educational development. UNICEF developed its own distinctive approach to educational development during the 1960s, making a bid for funding from OECD governments by focusing a part of its work on the educational needs of the world’s children, and later by highlighting the plight of the girl child (Black, 1996). The World Bank entered the arena in the 1960s, and began to argue for investment in education for its economic outcomes (Jones, 1992; Mundy, 2002; Resnik, 2006). By the 1990s, the Bank had overtaken UNESCO in terms of both expertise and flow of funding (in its case, in the form of loans). Increasingly, the Bank sought to encourage other donors to orient their educational aid to meet the goals of structural adjustment reforms. By and large, however, these multilateral actors acted independently and often competitively: only rare efforts were made at programmatic coordination.

The diffuse nature of the education for development regime also played out in its growth as an epistemic and professional community (Chabbott, 2003). From high level manpower planning to vocational education,

nonformal education, adult literacy, higher education and back again, a vague and expansive menu of what was “needed” was reported or endorsed in a succession of international conferences and publications. A growing professional expert community on educational development, largely housed within international organizations and research institutions, could do little to harness donors behind a common agenda because their own assessment of priorities changed so rapidly and diverged quite widely (King, 1991; Chabbott, 2003). Apart from major divisions between those who viewed education primarily as a productive investment and those who argued that it should be treated primarily as a human or citizenship right were many smaller divisions between those who saw in higher education, primary education, vocational and nonformal education, etc., the next “magic bullet” for development (Mundy, 1998, p. 464). A fractious epistemic community allowed for a very loose coupling between rhetorical commitments and practical activities – creating in effect a smorgasbord of priorities and approaches from which donor countries might choose according to their own geo-political and economic interests. Countries like France, England and later Australia focused attention on scholarships and provision of teachers; others adopted vocational, adult and literacy education as the focus of their support (the Nordics). All of this occurred outside of any systematic or coordinated effort to support national planning for educational change (King, 1991).

The operational modalities of this education for development regime followed from this basic framework, and focused on specific projects, never the recurrent costs of educational systems. Aid for education did not focus primarily on the universal right to education or the construction of mass public education systems. Instead, most aid flows to education were focused at levels beyond primary schooling. More than half of all aid to education was devoted to the provision of teachers, experts and training from donor countries. Almost all of it was provided in the form of short-term projects. Flows of expertise and project funding were highly fragmented and based on the geo-political or economic interests of bilateral donors governments or the idiosyncratic approaches of specific multilateral organizations. The reasons for this were varied. (1) Donors assumed that national governments would/should fund and provide universal primary schooling. (2) Recurrent costs like local teachers and textbooks, which are the largest piece of any public education budget, were seen as ineligible for aid funding. Funding of the recurrent costs of educational systems was viewed as “unsustainable.” (3) The bilateral donors who dominated the field tended to tie aid to their own economic and political interests and thus were biased toward programs

of post-primary training, foreign scholarships and institution-building where their own institutions and services could be tapped. In particular, “technical cooperation” flows (training, scholarships and experts) operated as a form of tied aid, with strong returns to the economies of the donor countries. (4) The escalation of Cold War politics and the history of colonial relationships fed the focus on higher levels of training.

Although the international aid regime grew quite rapidly in the period between 1945 and 1990 (Table 1), its architecture worked against the realization of a formally coordinated international system for guaranteeing the provision of education for all children.

A New “Education for All” Consensus

While it is important not to overstate the case, the education for development regime has experienced some sweeping changes over the past decade. These changes are particularly dramatic when placed alongside what has been widely assessed as the failure of the international community to achieve the goals established for education at the World Conference on Education for All in Jomtien, Thailand, in 1990 (Torres, 2000; Chabbott, 2003). The 1990s saw a precipitous decline in overall flows of aid, and an even steeper decline in aid for education. Instead of the “peace dividend” (expected by many at the end of the Cold War), issues of global poverty and inequality were sidelined as governments struggled to adjust to a rapidly integrating global economy.

By the late 1990s, however, a new consensus about international development appeared to be gaining momentum among OECD governments and across multilateral organizations. “Education for all” emerged as a cornerstone within what several authors have described as a new development compact (Therien, 2005). As I will show below, the current agreement about the importance of basic education within the international community is unprecedented in terms of scope, density and consistency. This agreement has led not only to new flows of aid, but also to new forms of donor coordination and changes in the delivery of educational aid. New actors – most importantly networks of international nongovernmental organizations – have emerged to support the achievement of education as a basic right. Many organizations have also adopted a rights-based approach to education.

Embedding Education in a New Consensus on Global Development

In the period since 1995, some of the most dramatic shifts in the education for development regime have come on the heels of renewed efforts to build

international consensus about how to deal with global inequality and poverty. Several authors have characterized this new “consensus” as part of a broader rapprochement between the neo-liberal and pro-economic approaches to globalization and development endorsed by the IMF and the World Bank in the 1980s–1990s, and the more equity-focused and globalization-skeptic approaches adopted by the United Nations and some OECD governments. The origins of this rapprochement can be located in the need to respond to both rising international protests against globalization and the aftermath of the East Asian economic crisis of the late 1990s (Stiglitz, 2003). The rising importance of the European Union, with its more expansive approach to welfare state capitalism, has also played an important part in the emergence of this consensus (Noel, 2005). After more than a decade of declining aid and neo-liberal policy reforms, OECD governments and their multilateral institutions have begun to develop a consensus about international poverty and inequality that appears to offer a framework for a global “Third Way” (Therien, 2002, 2005; Ruggie, 2003; Noel, 2005). Ruggie describes this new global compact as encompassing:

“... the centrality of governance, the rule of law, education, and health to economic success; the positive role of investment, including skills and technologies embodied in foreign direct investment; the need for further debt relief and other forms of development assistance for poor countries; the urgency of lowering trade barriers imposed on developing country exports by agricultural subsidies and other non-tariff barriers in the rich countries; the protectionist potential posed by pursuing social and environmental objectives through linkages to trade agreements; and the need for governments and international institutions alike to forge partnerships with the private sector and a wide range of civil society actors.” (Ruggie, 2003, p. 305)

The emergence within this consensus of renewed attention to international development can be traced back to the OECD Development Assistance Committee’s endorsement of “Shaping the 21st Century” (OECD/DAC, 1996). In this 1996 document OECD governments promised to increase bilateral aid, harmonize their activities and focus on a handful of top development priorities – including universal education. It was followed by a joint declaration among the IMF, OECD, World Bank and UN in 2000, entitled “A Better World for All” (IMF, OECD, & World Bank, 2000), promising closer coordination, more attention to country ownership of development and tighter focus on specific development priorities (including education). Both agreements fed into the Millennium Development Summit and Millennium Development Declaration (United Nations General Assembly, 2000), which aligned the United Nations and its agencies, the Bretton Woods institutions and OECD governments behind a unifying

framework. The Millennium Development Declaration sets out eight Millennium Development Goals with time-bound, measurable targets. These targets included halving world poverty by 2015, reducing infant mortality by 2/3, halving spread of HIV/aids, combating malaria, halving the number of people without safe drinking water and promoting gender equity and environmental sustainability. Universal primary education and gender equity in education are Goal numbers 2 and 3 in the MDGs.

Education, particularly primary education, plays a central part in this new international consensus about development and global poverty. This is reflected not only in the priority given to education within the Millennium Development Goals, but also the near-to-revolutionary attention that the World Bank and the IMF now pay to the achievement of universal access to basic education in their country programs and Poverty Reduction Strategy Framework (United Nations Millennium Project, 2004; UN Millennium Project, 2005b; Mundy, 2002, 2006). Table 2 tracks some of the many new commitments made to education by the G8, international organizations and UN World Conferences over the past decade.

The elevation of education within the new development compact can be partly explained by the fact that education straddles both equity and productivity conceptualizations of development. As the following quote from the World Bank suggests, education bridges the divide between the neo-liberal and the social welfare orientations of the 1990s:

“The expansion of educational opportunity, which can simultaneously promote income equality and growth, is a win-win strategy that in most societies is far easier to implement than the redistribution of other assets, such as land or capital. In short, education is one of the most powerful instruments known for reducing poverty and inequality and for laying the basis for sustained economic growth, sound governance and effective institutions.” (World Bank, 2002a, p. v)

Maxwell (2005, p. 3) sums this up somewhat differently: “A crude characterization of the current approach is to encourage internal and external trade liberalization, and simultaneously invest in health, education and good governance, so that people are able to take advantage of new economic opportunities.” “Education for all” combines the ideas of liberalization, equality enhancement, guaranteed citizenship rights and effective governance central to the new consensus on international development.

The emergence of a new consensus about international development has moved beyond the establishment of a common ideology and approach to global development within the international community. Alongside the MDGs have emerged a multitude of new mechanisms to improve the quality of relationships between donor organizations and recipient governments

Table 2. Evolution of “Education for All” in the New Development Compact.

	Year	Forum	Commitment or Action
United Nations conferences	1989	Children’s Summit	Covenant on the Rights of the Child (right to free primary education) – 190 states are signatory
	1990	World Conference on Education for All, Jomtien, Thailand	World Declaration on “Education for All” UPE by 2000
	1993	World Conference on Human Rights	Vienna Declaration and Program of Action states obliged to promote gender equality, esp. in education
	1995	World Summit for Social Development, Copenhagen	“Universal and equitable access to education ...” is 1 of 10 commitments
	2000	World Education Forum (Jomtien follow-up) Dakar Senegal	Dakar Framework for Action (a) Expand early childhood education (b) Free universal primary education by 2015 (c) Access to life skills (d) 50% improvement in illiteracy (e) Eliminate gender disparity 2005 (f) Improve quality of education World Bank presents idea of a fast track plan ^a : “no countries seriously committed to education for all will be thwarted by their lack of resources”
	2000	Millennium Summit and Millennium Declaration	Millennium Development Goals Goal 2: Achieve UPE Goal 3: Promote gender equality and empower Women (target 4 – eliminate gender disparity in primary and secondary schools)
	2002	United Nations Conference on Financing for Development, Monterrey, Mexico	“Monterrey Consensus on Financing for Development” Commits governments, international financial institutions and United Nations organizations to work through new forms of development partnerships and coordinate external aid – France and US promise first increase in ODA in a decade

G7/8 OECD	1996	OECD Development Assistance Committee “Shaping the 21st Century”	Commits OECD governments to coordination of aid at country level and to a common set of development priorities – including universal access to primary education
	2000	G8 Ministerial Meetings	Commitment to fund viable national education plans ^b Commitment to debt relief for education
	2001	G8 Ministerial Meetings	Re-affirmation of commitment to education, establish an education taskforce for 2002 G8 meeting ^c
	2002	G8 Ministerial Meetings	Endorsement of EFA fast track plan as funding mechanism for EFA, commit to increase bilateral assistance for UPE ^d
	2003	OECD DAC meeting	Rome Declaration on Harmonization (OECD/DAC 2003)
	2005	G8 Ministerial Meetings (UK launches Commission for Africa Report)	Endorses the idea that Northern governments should provide funding necessary for governments to abolish user fees. Confirms that total promises for increased aid would mean a US\$ 50 billion or 60% increase in Official Development Assistance by 2010
	2005	OECD “Paris Declaration”	Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness adopted by more than 100 OECD countries. Includes commitments to untie aid, strengthen accountability to citizens and parliaments
International Organizations	2006	UK Government	Promises US\$ 15 billion for education over next 15 years – challenges other OECD governments to do the same
	1999	IMF/World Bank Poverty Reduction Strategy Initiative introduced	Establishes basic norms for educational expenditures in budgetary allocations linked to medium term national development plans and expenditure frameworks; also criteria for debt relief
	2000	UNESCO appointed coordinator of interagency follow up on EFA and DAKAR	High level Task Force and EFA Working Group established EFA Global Monitoring Task Force to work with revitalized UNESCO Institute for Statistics In 2002, UNICEF and UNESCO endorse the EFA Fast Track Plan and call on G8 to do so ^e
	2000	IMF, OECD, UN and World Bank	“A Better World For All” statement sets out agreed and common priorities and targets for development

Table 2. (Continued)

Year	Forum	Commitment or Action
2001	Millennium Development Project Launched	Working groups to suggest ways of meeting MDGs and monitor – one of seven committees is for education
2002	United Nations Girls Education Initiative (UNGEI)	Coordinated by UNICEF
2002	World Bank Board introduces new policy actively opposing user fees in education ^f	
2002	World Bank IDA introduces grant facility	For first time some education sector funding provided on grant rather than loan basis
2002	World Bank Managed Fast Track Initiative	Countries with credible (IMF/WB approved) poverty reduction strategy paper and an education sector plan can join, but fund remains limited to US\$ 200 million over three years
2004	Fast Track Initiative Re-endorsed	Funding for the Catalytic Fund rises to US\$ 243.4 million
2005	Millennium Development Project Report	
2006	Global Task Force on Child Labour and EFA	UNESCO, ILO, WB and Global March
2006	UNESCO launches Global Action Plan	

^ahttp://www.UNESCO.org/education/efa/wef_2000/press_releases/dak_04_27_18h.shtml, accessed 10 January 2003.

^bSee <http://www.g7.utoronto.ca/g7/summit/2000okinawa/finalcom.htm>, accessed 10 January 2003.

^cSee final communiqué at <http://www.g7.utoronto.ca/g7/summit/2001genoa/finalcommuniqué.html>, accessed 10 January 2003.

^dSee education report at http://www.g8.gc.ca/kan_docs/etfr-e.asp and summary at http://www.g8.gc.ca/kan_docs/chairsummary-e.asp, accessed 10 January 2005.

^eSee http://www.UNESCO.org/education/efa/news_en/g8_summit.pdf, accessed 10 January 2005.

^fSee http://www.campaignforeducation.org/_html/2002-news/enews-04-08_en/content-txt.shtml#item5, accessed 10 January 2005.

(e.g., the Poverty Reduction Strategy Frameworks and the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness, described in more detail below), and to stimulate coordination among international aid organizations, international financial institutions and rich country governments.

The solidity of the international consensus about education is reflected in the seeming ease with which many development organizations and advocates are now also calling for a new, global level Education for All Compact (Sperling, 2001a, 2001b; Birdsall & Vaishnave, 2005).² For example, the UN's Millennium Development Project Task Force on Education has argued for a new "Education Compact" to parallel the new development compact devised at Monterrey:

"Bold political leadership is needed in a compact between developing countries and donors ... Under the compact each side is responsible for doing its part. Donors make a serious commitment to and respond to countries that are doing things right, assured that the external resources are being well used. Developing countries take on the tough political reforms in their systems with confidence that they will have sufficient and predictable financial support to deliver on promises made to their own citizens." (UN Millennium Project, 2005b)

Among the most notable aspects of these calls for a new "global compact on education" is the degree to which they demand reform of the aid business itself. Building on recommendations for donor harmonization and coordination advanced by the OECD, the UN Millennium Project (2005b) urges donors to "commit new funds (7 billion per year) in a new way through a strong coordinated global effort that rewards and reinforces countries' measurable progress." What is being demanded is a long-term, steady and reliable source of funding for the recurrent costs of schooling in the poorest countries of the world, as well as major improvements in terms of donor coordination, concentration of aid on the poorest countries, the untying of aid to education and direct funding for recurrent costs of education.

From a Global Compact to Donor Coordination at the Country Level

One part of the emerging consensus on international development that has enormous implications for education is the new interest in achieving coordination of donor efforts within recipient countries. Coordination implies "harmonization" of donor initiatives around a common framework of priorities and targets that can be used to hold recipient governments accountable, as well as pooling of resources and direct support for national budgets. What is sometimes not recognized is how frequently education has emerged as the key sector in which donors experiment with these historically novel efforts at donor coordination and pooling of resources.

The first and possibly farthest reaching of these coordination efforts has been the introduction in 1999 of a World Bank and the IMF joint “Poverty Reduction Strategy Initiative.” The initiative engages recipient governments in the development of a national development plan whose focus is not simply growth but poverty reduction. The “Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP)” in turn is intended to be pivotal in IMF and World Bank funding decisions (indicating eligibility for debt relief and other programs), and acts as a common benchmark for the contributions of bilateral donors. The PRSP is novel in several ways (World Bank, 2002b). It requires governments to formally integrate social development goals with plans for macroeconomic stability, liberalization and debt repayment, and to develop a medium-term expenditure framework that bridges what had previously often been quite separate planning exercises with World Bank, UN and IMF. It commits the IMF to a poverty and social development mandate and bridges the focus on growth, stability and equity that had previously divided donor organizations. A PRSP requires governments to conduct wider consultations about national plans than in the past, and to take more “ownership” of development planning. But it also works in the opposite direction, by providing a common set of targets and plans that can be used by donors and citizens to hold governments accountable.

There is a large, fractious debate about the ultimate impact of PRSPs on national sovereignty and “ownership,” including an impressive empirical literature that suggests that PRSPs often impose specific (IMF-driven) targets that favor stability and liberalization over social development (McGee & Hughes, 2002; Gould & Ojanen, 2003). For our purposes, what is worth noting is that the PRSP process has had the specific effect of bringing about the much tighter integration of educational development planning into national expenditure planning (Carnoy, 1999; UNESCO, 2006a, 2006b). As part of this process the PRSPs create the need for much more sophisticated planning regimes within Ministries of Education, and also tend to establish certain “indicative targets” for educational expenditures that favor reallocation of resources to both primary education and specific line items (i.e., from teachers’ salaries to teaching materials) (Alexander, 2002; Aoki et al., 2002). On the other hand, the PRSP process has also helped to make this information available for public scrutiny in an unprecedented fashion (see, for example, Global Campaign for Education, 2004). Alongside PRSPs have grown some interesting initiatives by nongovernmental actors to track expenditures against PRSP commitments (Dyer & Pain, 2004).

In addition to the far-reaching PRSP process, a number of additional initiatives among donors to achieve national level coordination of

development efforts have cropped up in recent years. This includes the “harmonization” initiative spearheaded by the Development Assistance Committee of the OECD (through which governments have formally committed to pool resources and coordinate aid), and formalized in the 2003 Rome Declaration on Harmonization (with UN, Bretton Woods and OECD governments as signatories) (OECD/DAC, 2003, 2005). It also includes widespread experimentation among bilateral aid donors with “Sector-Wide Approaches” (SWAs) in which individual bilateral programs of assistance are linked to a national sector plan. In many SWAs, bilateral funds are pooled together to provide direct budgetary support to the national Ministry of Education. Sometimes individual donors enter into silent partnerships in which their funds are pooled and managed by another donor – to further reduce transaction costs. Education has emerged as a key sector in which donors are experimenting with SWAs (see, for example, Riddell, 2000; Samoff, 2001, 2004; Dyer, 2005; UNESCO, 2005, 2006a).

Two education-specific efforts at country-level coordination and target setting are also worth mentioning. In the wake of the Dakar World Forum on Education, UNESCO initially interpreted its mandate to include assisting nations and regions to develop and monitor the implementation of national “education for all plans.” More recently, however, UNESCO has yielded to pressure from OECD governments to develop a wide-ranging Global Action Plan (GAP) that will give it a more prominent role in coordinating and monitoring EFA activities at the country level (UNESCO, 2006b, 2006c).

The second coordination mechanism is the Fast Track Initiative (FTI). Initially the FTI was conceived of as a new financing facility sponsored by OECD governments and hosted by the World Bank. Its goal is to ensure that no developing countries with clear plans for achieve universal primary education would fail to make progress due to lack of resources. The FTI has not been funded at anticipated levels by rich country governments, though new pledges from the UK and Netherlands have meant that it is able to offer catalytic funds to countries with a sound plan for achieving EFA. The FTI has now been reconceptualized as a facility that gives governments additional resources to help them plan for, access and manage large programs of pooled sector-wide funding from bilateral and multilateral donors. Countries who apply to the FTI must have a PRSP and a “credible” national education plan for delivering publicly financed and free primary education (World Bank Development Committee, 2004; UNESCO, 2005, 2006a).

Despite these various efforts to ensure country-level harmonization of aid, a degree of fragmentation and inter-agency competition is still

apparent. Even coordination among IFI-led initiatives remains disjointed – thus, according to a recent World Bank report, “as yet there is no regular process to ensure that the connection is made between a country’s PRSP, its medium-term expenditure framework [MTEF], its FTI program and its annual budget” (World Bank Development Committee, 2004). The FTI itself is not sufficiently funded to allow it finance all the countries meeting its criteria, and has been subject to wide-ranging criticism regarding some of its benchmarks.³ One part of the international community seems to view the FTI as a loose body whose job is to ensure donor coordination at the country level. Staff within the World Bank seem more interested in the way it can “become a force for building elements of output orientation, performance measurement, autonomy and accountability into schooling systems” (Pritchett, 2004). Expanding the FTI in either of these directions will bring it ever more clearly into direct competition with the coordination role already mandated by the international community to UNESCO (2006a, p. 122).

Nonetheless, the principles that underpin PRSPs, the FTI, UNESCO’s GAP and the Rome Declaration are remarkable. They imply a more elaborate, consistent and publicly transparent indicative framework for coordinating education sector aid than has ever been in place in the education for development regime since its formation. The transparency of these frameworks allows for broad and informed public debate in ways that were not possible in previous aid arrangements. As an example, consider the tendency of the International Financial Institutions to assert their view that the private provision of basic education is a crucial element in educational reforms (World Bank, 1995). In the recently revised FTI benchmarks, strong debate led to the setting of a specific limit (10%) of primary pupils at privately financed schools (EFA/FTI Secretariat, 2005).

These new coordinating mechanisms also imply an increasing willingness on the part of a particular group of OECD nations to forgo the traditional, sovereignty-based bilateral model of foreign aid in favor of collective action. Experimentation with pooled funding, direct budgetary support and funding of recurrent costs of primary level of education each suggests that universal primary education is being recognized by many OECD governments as a global public good in need of collective rather than unilateral action.

New Resource Flows and Commitments

The emergence of a common set of development priorities has set the stage for the first increases in official development aid from OECD countries in over a decade, beginning with announcements by the European Union and

the US at the March 2002 Financing for Development conference in Monterrey, Mexico.

The Development Assistance Committee of the OECD suggests that aid flows are set to rise to US\$ 75 billion by 2006 from US\$ 52 billion in 2001, according to pledges made in Monterrey. The following five countries: Belgium, Finland, France, Ireland and the UK, have laid down a clear timetable for achieving 0.7% of GDP target for official development aid. If all DAC countries were to meet their express commitments, the ODA to GNI ratio would increase to 0.30% by 2006, and 0.32% by 2010 (from 0.22 in 2001), with just under three quarters of the increase coming from the European Union (OECD/DAC, 2004). Some G8 governments have recently promised an even greater acceleration of ODA commitments: the richest 15 EU governments committed to achieve the 0.7% ODA/GDP target by 2015, while less wealthy members will meet a target of 0.33% (Gupta, Pattillo, & Wagh, 2006). This is significant because the EU makes up 50% of total ODA (US and Japan combine to give another 1/3). Across OECD donors the share of grants (over loans) and the concentration of ODA on least developed countries have continued to rise (Gupta et al., 2006). In addition, private giving for international development in the OECD countries has continued to grow, providing (according to some estimates) as much as an additional 30% to ODA resources (Atkinson, 2005; Gupta et al., 2006, p. 9). However, it is important to note that at least some of the official increase in ODA is the result of debt forgiveness rather than direct increases in bilateral aid budgets, and a substantial share has gone to Afghanistan and Iraq (Gupta et al., 2006; UNESCO, 2006a, p. 108).

These substantial increases have been matched by several interesting proposals for raising available funding for development – as, for example, the UK's proposal for an International Financing Facility (IFF), and France's proposal for a new international tax.⁴

A large number of OECD governments (including the six largest ODA donors) have now also made clear pledges committing themselves to increased funding for universal primary education, as can be seen in Table 3. Among the most noteworthy has been the recent announcement by Gordon Brown of US\$ 15 billion for basic education over 10 years – a commitment that will double the amount of aid to basic education currently given by the UK.

As Table 1 suggests, the majority of aid to education still flows through bilateral, not multilateral, channels. In terms of overall flows, aid to all levels of education has now regained the levels it enjoyed in the 1980s and early 1990s, and has increased 85% in constant dollar terms since 2000, to US\$ 8.5 billion in 2004 (UNESCO, 2006b, p. 87). Flows to basic education have also

Table 3. OECD/DAC Member Support for Basic Education 2000–2006.

Donor countries	Canada	2001: Canada says will double its resources for basic education US\$ 100 million per year ^a . Canada endorses Fast Track Initiative 2006: Canada makes first contribution to the Fast Track Initiative; aid for education reaches 17% of ODA
	Nordics	Norway pledges to increase ODA for basic education by 15% ^b
	Japan	Japan announces US\$ 2 billion for education over next five years ^c
	France	Commitment to the Fast Track Initiative
	Netherlands	Netherlands committed to €135 million for education initiatives ^d 2002: Dutch parliament commits to spending 15% of all ODA on basic education by 2005 2003: 2.5 billion ODA promised for education, 76% on basic education 2003: Funds for Fast Track Initiative for Global Campaign for Education committed
	UK	2001: UK announces increase in aid for education ^e 2001: UK established Commonwealth Education fund to support NGO advocacy in education 2006: Gordon Brown launches new campaign to make free education his government's next global cause. Promises an addition US\$ 15 billion over 10 years (doubling UK aid for education). ^f One hundred million committed to the Fast Track Initiative
	US	2000: US President signs legislation opposing "user fees" in ODA ^g 2001: Gene Sperling, former member of Clinton's Council of Economic Advisors, begins basic education project and US GCE coalition 2002: US pledges US\$ 100 million more in education aid to Africa (US\$ 20 million for five years) ^h 2004: Tabling of the Clinton/Lowey Education for All Act – to provide US\$ 500 million by 2005 and US\$ 2.5 billion by 2009 to establishment of universal basic education systems; establishes high level EFA Interagency task force ⁱ

^aSee <http://www.g8.gc.ca/statements/20020627-e.asp?id=1>, accessed 10 September 2003.

^bSee http://odin.dep.no/ud/engelsk/aktuelt/taler/statsraad_b/032171-090029/index-dok000-b-n-a.html, accessed 10 September 2002.

^cSee GCE News, September 2002, http://www.campaignforeducation.org/_html/news/welcome/frameset.shtml, accessed 10 September 2002.

^dSee mention of this commitment and others in Nelson Mandela's speech, available at <http://www.ei-ie.org/camp/english/gce/GAW02%20Mandela%20Op-Ed.htm>; see also <http://www.minbuza.nl/english/Content.asp?key=431123&pad=257572,428699,430698&usecache=1>, accessed 10 January 2005.

^eSee <http://www.oxfam.org.uk/educationnow/ukspendingreview.htm>, accessed 10 January 2005.

^fSee the *Independent*, <http://comment.independent.co.uk/commentators/article336337.ece>, accessed April 25, 2006.

^gSee <http://www.50years.org/update/userfee.html>, accessed 10 September 2003.

^hSee DevNews, 21 June 2002. Available at <http://web.worldbank.org/WBSITE/EXTERNAL/NEWS/0,date:06-21-2002~menu-PK:34461~pagePK:34392~piPK:34427~theSitePK:4607,00.html#Story3>, accessed 10 January 2005.

ⁱAvailable at <http://clinton.senate.gov/~clinton/news/2004/2004420359.html>, accessed 10 January 2005.

grown very rapidly (Table 4), and can be expected to grow even further if recent pledges are received. Basic education now accounts for more than 1/3 of all bilateral aid to education – up from less than 5% in the early 1990s (UNESCO, 2006b, p. 88). Six countries account for more than 3/4 of all flows to basic education (France, Germany, Japan, Netherlands, UK and US), but more than 1/2 of all DAC countries have increased the proportion of ODA going to basic education (UNESCO, 2005). Nonetheless, several analysts have shown that a large financing gap still must be broached if the world is to meet the MDG target of universal primary education by the year 2015. A World Bank analysis estimates that an additional US\$ 3.7 billion per year is needed through 2015; UNESCO has suggested that in total US\$ 11 billion is needed annually to meet all the EFA goals, including adult literacy and early childhood education (Bruns, Mingat, & Rakotomalala, 2003; UNESCO, 2006b, p. 103). Thus, according to the UNESCO estimates, even with current commitments we are only ~50% of the way toward closing the financing gap for EFA. Levels of aid to basic education across bilateral donors vary enormously, with the UK at one end of the spectrum providing more than 80% of its aid to education to basic levels while Italy giving less than 1% (UNESCO, 2006b, p. 108). Despite increases to basic education aid, a majority of donors still give 2/3 of their aid to education at higher levels.

It is now widely recognized that much of the additional funding for the achievement of basic education will require donor governments to assume some of the recurrent costs of the primary education systems of least developed nations for an extended period of time. Again, in a sharp departure from past trends, donors have become increasingly willing to channel aid as direct budgetary support over somewhat longer time horizons.⁵ The European Union and the British now prefer this modality, and other donors (including France, and the US through its Millennium Challenge Account) have begun experimenting with it. In some countries (e.g., Zambia, Uganda) upwards of 40% of the national education recurrent budget is funded by external donors, implying not only unprecedented levels of commitment to the sector, but also high levels of aid dependency (UNESCO, 2005, p. 208). It is also important to note that a rising amount (perhaps as much as 80%) of all aid to education is delivered in the form of technical assistance – one of the least efficient and most highly tied forms of aid (Berg, 1993; Gupta et al., 2006, pp. 12–13; UNESCO, 2006a, p. 108).⁶

New Actors and a New Global Politics of Accountability

Another aspect of the new educational multilateralism that is unprecedented is the inclusion of new kinds of actors in both international and national

Table 4. Official Development Assistance (ODA) for Education, 1990–2004 (In Billions of Constant 2004 US\$).

	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
Overall education (percent bilateral ODA)	9.76	8.67	9.55	9.42	10.71	11.24	10.59	10.90	10.28	10.79	7.84	8.67	8.79	7.73	9.11
Basic education (percent bilateral ODA)	n/a	n/a	n/a	0.09	0.61	1.19	1.31	1.18	1.02	1.26	1.66	2.01	2.19	1.91	2.66
Basic education (percent overall education ODA)	n/a	n/a	n/a	0.95	5.68	10.61	12.38	10.79	9.89	11.71	21.21	23.13	24.92	24.70	29.20
Total \$ OECD ODA (bilateral)	75.28	71.67	59.49	60.50	58.61	56.78	54.81	50.90	52.80	55.18	55.82	54.88	62.02	76.24	74.40

Source: ODA figures from International Development Statistics online database, online query, DAC Table 5. <http://www.oecd.org/dac/stats/idsonline>, accessed 16 April 2006.

DAC deflator for resource flows from DAC donors (2004 = 100) from <http://www.oecd.org/dataoec/43/43/34980655.xls>, accessed 16 April 2006.

education for development policy arenas. It is not just that new partnerships with civil society and private sector organizations have come to be seen as essential by official political actors on the international stage (Ruggie, 2003; Gould, 2003). There has also been a remarkable growth of effective transnational organizations representing coalitions of civil society and private sector actors (see Table 5). These organizations often link local level coalitions to transnational campaigns in ways that have proven effective in shaping educational policies at both the national and the global levels.

As Mundy and Murphy (2001) have shown, transnational advocacy networks on such issues as human rights, debt relief, ODA reform and globalization have frequently taken up the issue of the universal right to education as one part of their broader advocacy efforts. In addition, a strong transnational advocacy network on “education for all” has also

Table 5. New EFA Actors and Initiatives Since 2000.

Global Campaign for Education (GCE) formed in 1999	Membership organization of national and regional coalitions of NGOs and civil society organization, INGOs with goal of leveraging achievement of funding for education for all. Includes Northern and Southern national and regional coalitions
Commonwealth Education Fund	UK government and businesses fund southern NGO coalitions in education
African Network Coalition on Education for All (ANCEFA)	A network of national coalitions across Africa, affiliated with the GCE and funded by CEF and Netherlands
World Economic Forum (education initiatives launched in 2002)	Global Governance Initiative: tracks and monitors commitments to the MDGs. One of seven working groups is on education workshop on private/public partnership in EFA (November 2004) “Global Governance Initiative on Education” published in 2005
US Basic Education Coalition	NGO coalition to pressure more and better ODA for basic education, funded by Hewlett foundation.
Centre for Universal Education, Council of Foreign Relations, US	Lobby and research body advocates for more and better ODA for EFA, funded by the Hewlett Foundation
International Business Leaders Forum	Works with the Prince of Wales, UNDP to establish framework for global corporate social responsibility 2005: “Business and the Millennium Development Goals”

emerged. Initiated by OXFAM International, Action Aid and Education International (the international association of teachers' unions), the Global Campaign for Education (GCE) now includes some of the largest international NGOs involved in education (OXFAM, CARE, ActionAid, Global March) as well as national civil society coalitions in more than 30 countries. Originally viewed by the international community as an under-utilized resource in the provision of educational services, today INGOs have taken on new and unanticipated leadership in international EFA efforts. INGOs have asserted themselves as advocates and policy activists (Miller-Grandvaux, Welmond, & Wolfe, 2002; Oxfam International, 1999; Social Watch, 1999).

The GCE has been instrumental in pushing bilateral donors, international organizations and members of the group of eight industrialized countries to make concrete commitments of resources for EFA. It has also emerged as policy watchdog at the international and national levels, raising issues of adequate financing and equitable distribution of opportunities in national educational planning exercises and international forum. In the last two years, for example, GCE or its members have produced research and policy papers on the educational dimensions of PRSPs in individual; provided substantive criticism of the indicative framework for national educational planning set out in the FTI (Rose, 2003); produced a "report card" on developing country and rich country contributions to meeting EFA and MDG goals; and launched a campaign at the annual World Bank/IMF meetings to highlight the negative impact of IMF conditionalities on the achievement of EFA in Zambia (Global Campaign for Education, 2004). GCE or its members are now represented on virtually every High Level Working Group or International Forum on Education for All. Their inclusion and action has introduced a new dynamism to international political alignments – they clearly hope to leverage greater and more coordinated collective action while at the same time introducing more accountability for recipient governments and donor governments to EFA commitments.

The Global Campaign for Education and other civil society organizations have increasingly carved out a place for themselves as the makers and monitors of global EFA goals (Murphy & Mundy, 2002). As an example, the effects of civil society efforts to rid Tanzania of primary school user charges are often cited. In this case, research on the impact of user fees generated by Tanzanian groups was used by US NGOs to press the US government to halt funding to the World Bank if it imposed any form of user fees as part of its loan conditions. The World Bank subsequently removed this loan condition and the Government of Tanzania declared free primary education. The Tanzania experience in turn stimulated a number of

other African governments to remove user fees in education and declare universal free primary education. Here a new form of global accountability spurred significant advance in the achievement of “education for all.”

In addition to these nongovernmental organizations and civil society coalitions, several private sector organizations have recently become active supporters of a global “education for all” initiative. These include the [World Economic Forum \(2005\)](#), a consortium of business organizations which has spearheaded a Global Governance Initiative to monitor achievements of the MDGs (including education) and is actively pursuing discussions about private/public EFA partnerships; the Commonwealth Education Fund (which brings together private sector and public sector fundings in the UK); the International Business Leaders Forum ([IBLF, 2005](#)); and a series of EFA research and advocacy efforts funded by the Hewlett Foundation. As compared to civil society coalitions, these private sector coalitions have different rationale for supporting a global EFA effort: they are more closely interested in trained labor, and more sympathetic to private service provision. Nonetheless, they appear to support the general idea that access to basic education is a public good that should be made universally available.

EFA as a Measure of Change

In this chapter, I have sought to establish the basic parameters of an important series of shifts in the way that one aspect of multilateral activity is conceptualized, organized and enacted: that focused on assisting the poorest countries to ensure the universal right to education. My account has pointed out several unprecedented and surprising shifts. Education is now embedded in a widening consensus about the core features of “good” global development – a consensus that appears to bridge what had been a fundamental divide between those agents who have been more concerned with social equality and fundamental human rights and those less concerned with equity who are convinced that global economic growth through greater global integration is the way forward. The fact that the international community – both official and non-governmental – has chosen to establish the universal right to education as an important part of its emergent vision of world order suggests that there has been a turn away from the *laissez faire* neo-liberalism of the 1980s and 1990s.

The international community has also gone farther, by establishing a clear, common set of priorities for education, focusing on time-bound targets for the achievement of universal basic education. ODA funding (both at large and specific to basic education) has begun to increase. New forms of

donor coordination at the country and global levels, and new aid modalities (most notably forms of pooled funding for the recurrent budgetary costs of schooling) are now well established and growing. The rising interest among OECD countries in pooling resources and coordinating international efforts in a social policy field like education suggests an important turn toward collective action and the construction of global public goods.

Nonetheless, the elevation of “education for all” as a focus for international action leaves much to debate. Of the goals adopted at the [World Education Forum \(2000\)](#) (including the idea, for example, of publicly provided education and adult literacy and nonformal education), only universal access to quality primary education has been widely adopted as an international target. Perhaps even more importantly, many of the “tough political reforms” being advocated by the international community as essential to a new global compact on education are quite contentious. Thus, for example, the Millennium Project and the FTI advocate reductions in the unit costs of primary education, greater involvement of private sector service deliverers, introduction of standardized testing regimes and the decentralizing of educational systems ([UN Millennium Project, 2005a, 2005b](#); [World Bank, 2004a, 2004b](#); [World Bank Development Committee, 2004](#)). Each of these reforms is reminiscent of the 1990s liberalization movement in education. Furthermore, the new compact suggests relatively little about how to work in contexts not characterized by “good governance” – weak, corrupt, collapsed or post-conflict states are largely left off the map.

The rise of an “education for all” consensus can tell us much about the limits and paradoxes emerging in world order today. The limits are apparent in the fact that funding to achieve EFA – though growing at a surprising rate – is still far short of international estimates. They are also apparent in the continued competition among multilateral and bilateral actors in the field of education for development. Many of the older pathologies of educational ODA persist in the new regime: the gap between rhetoric and resources; a hesitancy to empower multilateral channels over bilateral channels for funding; and tensions between competing planning efforts (PRSPs, UNESCO’s EFA and the FTI) and competing lead agencies (UNESCO, UNICEF, the World Bank). We still lack an overarching mechanism for coordinating and ensuring a global entitlement to education.

These limits are also apparent in the choice of education over other forms of social protection by the international community. To borrow from Therien’s critical reflections on the wider emergence of a global development compromise, the new focus on basic education as a strategy for poverty reduction may be seen as a victory for those who continue to frame the

problem of development as one of individuals who are not well adapted to the demands of the market, and states that need to bear responsibility for development failures. As such, we might view the resurgence of interest in EFA as part of a global consensus that actively avoids an understanding of development focused on global structural inequalities and the need for permanent national and global measures of redistribution and social protection (Therien, 2005; Maxwell, 2005, p. 4).⁷

I take a somewhat different view of the resurgence of global EFA commitments. The move toward expanded resources, donor coordination, pooled funding and direct support of recurrent costs of primary education implies an important shift in the commitments of G8 governments – away from once-off projects for educational development, and toward regularized long-term funding of a basic social right. As I have tried to argue here, such changes have come at least in part because of rising engagement and activism of transnational civil society organizations. Global EFA promises have been backstopped by EU governments and other like-minded countries, where citizens have endorsed a more expansive and redistributive approach to global public policy. There are, I believe, significant indications of a transnationally organized global public that is critical of globalization and global economic inequalities. For this global public, advocacy around the right to education has become an important venue for expressing a commitment to redistributive justice on a global scale. I suspect that it is largely because of this global public that EFA momentum will not be lost, this time around. It will prove politically difficult (perhaps impossible) for any of the major OECD governments currently funding upwards of 40% of the costs of primary schooling in countries like Zambia or Uganda to withdraw the bulk of their support. Current technologies and the interconnectedness of civil society organizations guarantee that such backtracking would lead to an immediate global broadcast of the disenfranchisement of millions of young children.

In an important sense, the “education for all” consensus can be read as part of an important and active phase in the restructuring of governance at the global level. With all its limitations and diverse interpretations, universal public access to free basic education has now achieved status and legitimacy as a global public good on a scale not realized during the 20th century.

NOTES

1. Examples of failure include: UNESCO regional conferences of the 1960s; OECD DAC efforts to coordinate education sector activities among OECD

members in the 1970s; World Bank's initiative in sub-Saharan Africa in the 1980s; and the Jomtien World Conference on Education for All (1990). In each case, international targets were set but not met. More importantly, the donor community failed to provide resources promised to meet these targets.

2. Recently, Senator Hillary Clinton also introduced legislation to promote the idea of a global compact in education. The Education for All Act of 2006, which would authorize assistance for developing countries to promote quality basic education and establish the achievement of universal basic education in all developing countries as an objective of US foreign assistance policy, S. 3909 and H.R. 6152 were referred to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the House International Relations Committees, respectively. Both bills authorize increasing appropriations for international basic education up to US\$ 2.5 billion by fiscal year 2011, and call on the President to create an Education for All Task Force to ensure that the US provides the resources and leadership necessary to achieve universal basic education.

3. Among the benchmarks for acceptance into the FTI are an appropriate ratio of primary to post-primary education sector expenditures, plans to achieve set teacher/student ratios and specific levels of teacher remuneration.

4. The IFF would take donor commitments and a down payment and use these to back international bonds that could generate an immediate expansion of funds for development.

5. Gupta et al. (2006, p. 15) report that donor countries have increased their commitments of budget support from ~10% to new highs of 20% of total aid commitments since 2000.

6. Gupta et al. (2006, p. 13) note that almost 70% of the technical cooperation going to sub-Saharan Africa since 2000 has been allocated to social infrastructure (including education and health), a significant rise from 55% allocation in 1990.

7. Thus, in Maxwell's view "Poverty reduction is good, but social inclusion is better" and "there has been too much focus [on health and education] in PRSPs and public expenditure plans, at the expense of productive sectors and social protection." He argues strongly for more attention to food insecurity and malnutrition (Maxwell, 2005, p. 4).

REFERENCES

- Alexander, N. (2002). *Paying for education: How the World Bank & IMF influence education in developing countries*. Research Report, 1998, updated 2002. Citizens' Network on Essential Services, Washington, DC. Available at <http://www.campaignforeducation.org/resources/May2002/CNES%20Paying%20For%20Education.htm>, accessed 4 October 2004.
- Anderson, B. (1983). *Imagined communities*. New York: Verso.
- Aoki, A., Bruns, B., Drabble, M., Marope, M., Mingat, A., Moock, P., Murphy, P., Paci, P., Patrinos, H., Tan, J.-P., Thomas, C., Winter, C., & Yang, H. (2002). Education. In: *World Bank. Poverty reduction strategy paper source book*. Washington, DC: World Bank (Chapter 19).

- Atkinson, A. B. (2005). The way forward. In: A. B. Atkinson (Ed.), *New sources of development finance* (pp. 238–246). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Berg, E. (1993). *Rethinking technical cooperation. Reforms for capacity building in sub-Saharan Africa*. New York: United Nations Development Program.
- Birdsall, N., & Vaishnav, M. (2005). Education and the MDGs: Realizing the millennium compact. *Columbia Journal of International Affairs*, 58(2), 257–264.
- Black, M. (1996). *Children first: The story of UNICEF past and present*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Bruns, B., Mingat, A., & Rakotomalala, R. (2003). *A chance for every child: Achieving universal primary education by 2015*. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- Carnoy, M. (1999). *Globalization and educational reform: What planners need to know*. Paris: International Institute for Education Planning (IIEP).
- Chabbot, C. (2003). *Constructing education for development: International organizations and education for all*. New York: Routledge/Falmer.
- Dyer, K. (2005). *The cost of poverty: Transaction costs and the struggle to make aid work in the education sector in Tanzania*. Human Development Report Office Occasional Paper, UNDP.
- Dyer, K., & Pain, C. (2004). *Civil society budget monitoring for national accountability*. Workshop Report, 17–19 February, Lilongwe, Malawi (mimeo).
- EFA/FTI Secretariat. (2005). *Guidelines for assessment and endorsement of the primary education component of an education sector plan*. Available at <http://www1.worldbank.org/education/efaafti/documents/assessmentguidelines.pdf>, accessed 30 January 2005.
- Global Campaign for Education. (2004). *Undervaluing teachers: IMF policies squeeze Zambia's education system*. Available at http://www.campaignforeducation.org/resources/resources_listall.php, accessed 10 January 2005.
- Gould, J. (2003). International non-state actors and social development policy: Comments on the article. *Global Social Policy*, 3(3), 349–366.
- Gould, J., & Ojanen, J. (2003). *Merging in the circle: The politics of Tanzania's poverty reduction strategy*. Policy Paper 2/2003. Institute of Development Studies, University of Helsinki, Helsinki, Finland.
- Gupta, S., Pattillo, C., & Wagh, S. (2006). *Are donor countries giving more or less aid?* IMF Working Paper WP/06/01. International Monetary Fund, Washington, DC.
- IMF. (2000). *A better world for all*. Washington, DC: Communications Development.
- International Business Leaders Forum. (2005). *Business and the millennium development goals: A framework for action*. Prince of Wales International Business Leaders Forum and the UNDP.
- Jones, P. (1988). *International policies for Third World education: UNESCO, literacy and development*. New York: Routledge.
- Jones, P. (1992). *World Bank financing of education: Lending, learning and development*. New York: Routledge.
- King, K. (1991). *Aid and education in the developing world: The role of donor agencies in educational analysis*. Essex: Longman.
- Maxwell, S. (2005). *The Washington consensus is dead: Long live the meta-narrative*. Working Paper 243. Overseas Development Institute, London.
- McGee, R., & Hughes, A. (2002). *Assessing participation in poverty reduction strategy papers: A desk-based synthesis of experience in sub-Saharan Africa*. Research Report 52. Institute of Development Studies, Sussex.

- Meyer, J. W. (1977). The effects of education as an institution. *American Journal of Sociology*, 83(1), 55–77.
- Miller-Grandvaux, Y., Welmond, M., & Wolfe, J. (2002). *Evolving partnerships: The role of NGOs in basic education in Africa*. Washington, DC: USAID.
- Mundy, K. (1998). Educational multilateralism and world (dis)order. *Comparative Education Review*, 42(4), 448–478.
- Mundy, K. (1999). UNESCO and the limits of the possible. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 19(1), 27–52.
- Mundy, K. (2002). Education in a reformed World Bank. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 22(5), 483–508.
- Mundy, K. (2006). Education for all and the new development compact. *International Review of Education*, 52(1), 23–48.
- Mundy, K., & Murphy, L. (2001). Transnational advocacy, global civil society: Emerging evidence from the field of education. *Comparative Education Review*, 45(1), 85–126.
- Murphy, L., & Mundy, K. (2002). *New roles of INGOs in the education for all movement*. Background Paper for the 2002 EFA Monitoring Report. UNESCO, Paris.
- Noel, A. (December 2005). *The new politics of global poverty*. Downloaded on April 25, 2006 from www.queensu.ca/sps/the_policy_forum/speakers_series/NPGPDDec05.pdf
- OECD/DAC. (1996). *Shaping the 21st century: The contribution of development cooperation*. Paris: OECD.
- OECD/DAC. (2003). *Rome Declaration on harmonization*. Downloaded on April 25, 2006 from <http://www.aidharmonization.org/ah-overview/secondary-pages/why-RomeDeclaration>
- OECD/DAC. (2004). *Annual development co-operation report*. http://www.oecd.org/document/19/0,2340,en_2649_37413_25612371_1_1_1_37413,00.html, accessed 10 January 2005
- OECD/DAC. (2005). *Paris Declaration on aid effectiveness*. Downloaded on April 25, 2006 from <http://www.aidharmonization.org/ah-overview/secondary-pages/editable?key=205>
- Oxfam International. (1999). *Education now*. Oxford: Oxfam International.
- Pritchett, L. (2004). *Towards a new consensus for addressing the global challenge of the lack of education*. Copenhagen Consensus Challenge Paper. Copenhagen Consensus, Copenhagen, Denmark.
- Resnik, J. (2006). International organizations, the “education economic growth” black box, and the development of world education culture. *Comparative Education Review*, 50, 173–195.
- Riddell, A. (2000). *Implications for agencies of pursuing sector wide approaches in education*. Unpublished paper.
- Rose, P. (2003). *The education fast track initiative*. Report prepared for ActionAid on behalf of the Global Campaign for Education. ActionAid, London.
- Ruggie, J. G. (2003). The United Nations and globalization: Patterns and limits of institutional adaptation. *Global Governance*, 9, 301–321.
- Samoff, J. (1999). No teacher guide, no textbooks, no chairs: Contending with the crisis in African education. In: R. Arnove & C. A. Torres (Eds), *Comparative education: The dialectic of the global and the local* (pp. 393–431). Boulder, CO: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers.
- Samoff, J. (2001). The evolution of education aid to Africa: Changing terminology, persisting practice. Paper presented at the annual meetings of Canadian and International Education Society (CIES), Washington, DC.

- Samoff, J. (2004). From funding projects to supporting sector? *International Journal of Educational Development*, 24(4), 397–427.
- Social Watch. (1999). *Social Watch* (No. 3). Montevideo: Instituto del Tercer Mundo-Social Watch.
- Sperling, G. (2001a). The developing world's quiet crisis. *The Financial Times*, Washington, DC. Downloaded from <http://www.brookings.edu/views/oped/sperling/20010716.htm> on January 5, 2006.
- Sperling, G. (2001b). Toward universal education: Making a promise and keeping it. *Foreign Affairs*, 80(5), 7–13.
- Stiglitz, J. (2003). *Globalization and its discontents*. New York: W.W. Norton.
- Therien, J. P. (2002). Multilateral institutions and the poverty debate. *International Journal*, 57(2), 233–252.
- Therien, J. P. (2005). The politics of international development: Towards a new grand compromise? *Economic Policy and Law: Journal of Trade and Environmental Studies Special Issue*. Available at: www.economics-International.org, accessed 15 March 2005.
- Torres, R. M. (2000). *One decade of education for all: The challenge ahead*. Buenos Aires: International Institute of Educational Planning (IIEP).
- UNESCO. (2005). *EFA Global Monitoring Report 2005. The quality imperative*. UNESCO, Paris.
- UNESCO. (2006a). *EFA Global Monitoring Report 2006*. UNESCO, Paris.
- UNESCO. (2006b). *EFA Global Monitoring Report 2007: Strong foundations, early childhood care and education*. UNESCO, Paris.
- UNESCO. (2006c). *Report by the Director General on the global action plan to achieve the education for all goals*. Executive Board 174EX/9. UNESCO, Paris.
- United Nations General Assembly. (2000). *United Nations Millennium Declaration*. UN Resolution A/RES/55/3. United Nations, New York.
- United Nations Millennium Project. (2004). *Interim report on achieving the millennium development goal of universal primary education*. Report of the Millennium Development Project, <http://www.unmillenniumproject.org>, accessed 10 September 2004.
- United Nations Millennium Project. (2005a). *Investing in development: A practical plan to achieve the millennium development goals*. Earthscan and the UN Millennium Project, London, <http://www.unmillenniumproject.org/>, accessed 10 January 2005.
- United Nations Millennium Project. (2005b). *Toward universal primary education: Investments, incentives and institutions*. Report from the Task Force on Education and Gender Equality. Earthscan and the UN Millennium Project, London, <http://www.unmillenniumproject.org/>, accessed 10 January 2005.
- World Bank. (1995). *Priorities and strategies for education*. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- World Bank. (2002a). *Achieving education for all by 2015: Simulation results for 47 low income countries*. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- World Bank. (2002b). *Review of the poverty reduction strategy paper approach: Main findings*. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- World Bank. (2004a). *Fast track initiative news*, August, September, October. World Bank, Washington, DC.
- World Bank. (2004b). *Aid effectiveness and financing modalities*. Available at http://imagebank.worldbank.org/servlet/WDSCContentServer/IW3P/IB/2004/10/04/000012009_20041004095816/Rendered/PDF/300691put0as0vol.02.pdf, accessed 4 October 2004.

- World Bank Development Committee. (26 March 2004). *Education for all fast track initiative. Progress Report*. World Bank, Washington, DC.
- World Education Forum. (2000). *The Dakar framework for action, education for all: Meeting our collective commitments*. Dakar, Senegal: World Education Forum.
- World Economic Forum. (2005). *Global Governance Initiative Annual Report 2005* (see pp. 51–63 on education). Available at <http://www.weforum.org/site/homepublic.nsf/Content/Global+Governance+Initiative>, accessed 15 March 2005.

THE POLITICAL DIMENSIONS OF INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION IN EDUCATION: MECHANISMS OF GLOBAL GOVERNANCE TO PROMOTE EDUCATION FOR ALL

Yuto Kitamura

ABSTRACT

The promotion of Education for All (EFA) in today's globalized world is an important responsibility to be borne by the international community as a whole. International cooperation in education is being undertaken in many developing countries under collaborative arrangements of "Actors" with varying positions. Essential as the backbone of such cooperation is a mutually complementary partnership between the public (governments and official aid agencies) and private (civil society). Without this, international cooperation in education is exceedingly difficult to implement. Thus, led mainly by international agencies, the mechanisms for global governance for the promotion of international cooperation in education have been created.

This paper sets out to analyze the mechanisms of governance on a global level as led by international agencies. Moreover, it attempts to elucidate the role of civil society, which has gained in importance as a partner of

Education for All: Global Promises, National Challenges

International Perspectives on Education and Society, Volume 8, 31–72

Copyright © 2007 by Elsevier Ltd.

All rights of reproduction in any form reserved

ISSN: 1479-3679/doi:10.1016/S1479-3679(06)08002-9

governments and international agencies, leading to a study of public and political dimensions in international cooperation in education. Furthermore, to see how the international community might close the four critical gaps in the areas of “policy, capacity, data and financing” and assist developing countries in promoting EFA, the paper analyzes an example of a recent international initiative called the EFA Fast-Track Initiative (FTI).

INTRODUCTION

The guarantee of educational opportunities to fulfill basic learning needs is a fundamental right of all people. The promotion of Education for All (EFA) in today's globalized world is an important responsibility to be borne by the international community as a whole. International agreements and treaties attest to this ideal. International cooperation in education is being undertaken in many developing countries under collaborative arrangements of “Actors” with varying positions, namely, governments of developing countries, aid agencies of developed countries, international organizations and civil society as a whole. Essential as the backbone of such cooperation is a mutually complementary partnership between the public (governments and official aid agencies) and private (civil society). Without this, international cooperation in education is exceedingly difficult to implement. Thus, led mainly by international agencies, the mechanisms for global governance for the promotion of international cooperation in education have been created.

However, current conditions around the world show that much progress remains to be made in order to realize the goals of EFA. According to the [World Bank \(2003a\)](#), there are four critical gaps in the areas of “policy, capacity, data and financing” that need to be closed if the EFA goals are to be achieved around the world. Different stakeholders have thus introduced various attempts for improving conditions of basic education, particularly in developing countries, through such global mechanisms.

This paper sets out to analyze the mechanisms of governance on a global level as led by international agencies. Moreover, it attempts to elucidate the role of civil society, which has gained in importance as a partner of governments and international agencies, leading to a study of public and political dimensions in international cooperation in education. Furthermore, to see how the international community might close the four gaps indicated by the World Bank and assist developing countries in promoting EFA, the paper analyzes an example of a recent international initiative called the EFA Fast-Track Initiative (FTI).

EDUCATION AS A BASIC HUMAN RIGHT

It is a basic human right of all people to be able to receive an education.¹ It was after the end of World War II that this became a widely accepted idea in the international community and when active efforts, mainly by governments, were made to achieve it. The springboard for action was the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, adopted in 1948, and a number of international agreements have followed, including the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights adopted in 1966 and the Convention on the Rights of the Child, adopted in 1989. The 1989 Convention particularly pays special attention to the needs of developing countries in promoting education and urges international cooperation to achieve this goal.

Based on the concept of education as a fundamental human right, the promotion of education through international cooperation has been actively pursued, principally in developing countries. The embodiment of this drive was seen at the World Conference on EFA, held in Jomtien, Thailand, in 1990 and at the World Education Forum held in Dakar, Senegal, in April 2000. These two conferences were attended by representatives from more than 150 national governments, more than 30 international agencies and over 100 non-governmental organizations (NGOs). The delegates debated how best to conduct international cooperation in education and adopted wide-ranging international targets to achieve it. These conferences were of an unprecedented scale in terms of international meetings held on the subject of educational diffusion. They were also historically highly significant in the sense of redefining international cooperation in education as a task to be tackled by the international community as a whole.

In particular, the Jomtien conference was a watershed. It put forward the concept of EFA and by interpreting the notion of basic education in a broad sense, led to the sharing by the international community of the basic philosophy that came to sustain the subsequent developments in international cooperation in education. In other words, it reaffirmed that the promotion of basic education was a national and international responsibility in view of the fact that the guarantee of educational opportunities to fulfill basic learning needs was a basic right of all children, young people and adults (UNESCO, 1990). What is special about the concept of EFA is that while stating that the universalization of primary education is a fundamental condition of educational development in developing countries, it attempts at the same time to view basic education from a wider perspective that includes areas such as non-formal education for technical and vocational training

and adult literacy. Such an interpretation of basic education reflects the various international agreements that had been formulated until then in the form of declarations and treaties. In September 2000, the UN General Assembly adopted the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). Two of its eight goals prioritizes EFA goals, i.e., universal primary education (UPE) and eradication of gender inequality in education. This is a clear indication that the international community widely acknowledges the improvement of basic education to be an important task in achieving development.

Nonetheless, the ideals enshrined in these declarations and treaties have not always been materialized in many countries. Above all, in today's international community, the gap is widening between people who are guaranteed access to education and those who are denied such access. By way of illustration, since the dismantling of the Cold War bipolarity, the poverty gap between countries and regions is expanding and the number of refugees triggered by the spread of ethnic conflicts is increasing. The result is a huge impact on people who live in politically unstable regions, giving rise to impediments to the promotion of education such as the loss of schooling opportunity.

GLOBAL GOVERNANCE REGARDING INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION IN EDUCATION

When considering cooperation in education in the context of the present-day globalized international community, this paper shall construe "global governance" to mean the situation wherein are found legal models agreed upon by constituent members of society (hereinafter referred to as "Actors"), a certain order created out of democracy, or values such as human rights and compliance basically without coercion by physical force. It must be noted, however, that theories on global governance have been investigated through research conducted from different perspectives of academic disciplines such as political science, sociology and international law. Hence, while all such research approaches share the same standpoint of studying order on a global scale, the subjects of research and the methods of analysis vary considerably. Therefore, as regards the points listed below, all the different theories of global governance have elements in common (e.g., [Hewson & Sinclair, 1999](#); [Nye & Donahue, 2000](#); [Shoji, 2004](#)): (1) by incorporating the concept of governance rather than government, they lower the barrier between international politics and domestic politics; (2) as the mover in forming and maintaining order, they direct attention to all kinds of

Actors outside national governments and (3) by looking at activities and ideas with which Actors actively try to influence society, they direct attention to the active aspects of order and not merely to the static aspects of order as a body of rules.² Based on an understanding of these points concerning global governance, this paper shall attempt to examine how mechanisms of governance are being created in the field of international cooperation in education.

On the ground level in international cooperation in education, in pursuit of the global target of achieving EFA, international organizations have led the way in creating a system of international cooperation based on a certain “order” created out of internationally agreed models (namely, declarations and treaties) and the value placed on the guarantee of educational opportunities as a basic human right. International and interstate organizations were set up alongside the formation of modern nation-states. Thus, international agencies can be thought of as always based on the framework of nation-states but at the same time, within a certain scope, they have autonomy as organizations. This means that while considering the position of international agencies, it is absolutely essential to understand the two standpoints of idealism and realism (or *liberalist* and *realist* views) with regard to the roles they play. That is to say, the view that deems international organizations to be the movers in achieving international ideals in areas including peace, human rights and development and the view that considers them to be merely instruments in the foreign policies of countries. In contrast to the rationalistic approach that focuses on the power and profit structures between governments such as the *realist* and the *liberalist*, the *constructivist* position does not treat national interest and identity as given premises but as “socially constituted” between the players (Hoshino, 2001), pointing to the possibility of making a *constructivist* approach in understanding the formation and changes of models embodied in international organizations. In this paper, all the different approaches will be borne in mind in examining what kinds of models are in the process of being formed through international cooperation in education, as led by international agencies as agents that deliver global governance to the international community.

Promotion of EFA Led by International Agencies

International cooperation in education is being promoted under collaborative partnerships between diverse Actors. In particular, the United Nations

Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), the coordinator of EFA and other international agencies have played the leading role. The Jomtien conference of 1990 was held under the joint auspices of UNESCO, United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and the World Bank. The Dakar Forum of 2000 was organized by five international agencies, the four organizations named above plus the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA). The reason for this multiplicity of international agencies strengthening collaboration in the field of education can be found in the general trends of the development sector as a whole, including growing interest in social development and in turn human development after the 1980s.³

After the Jomtien conference, collaboration among international agencies continued throughout the 1990s. For example, in June 1996, the Mid-Decade Meeting of the International Consultative Forum on EFA was held in Amman, Jordan, hosted by the Director-General of UNESCO with the cooperation of agencies that co-sponsored the Jomtien conference. Some 250 policy-makers and other representatives from governments, international organizations and NGOs attended the Meeting.⁴ Discussions were held on the results of the interim assessment made in 1995 on the progress of EFA in all countries. Delegates then discussed what would be necessary to realize the EFA goals set in Jomtien for achievement by 2000.⁵

Nonetheless, what was discussed at the Mid-Decade Meeting was not transferred into practical action in large measure and EFA was not realized by 2000. For this reason, as demonstrated by the goals agreed upon at the Dakar Forum, the renewed EFA goals had to be adopted at Dakar, a decade after Jomtien. In so doing, the deadline for basic goals (such as universalization of primary education and improvement of literacy) was extended from 2000 to 2015. A new conceptual development was attempted with regard to the goals of life skills and quality of education. In other words, the realms of basic education expressed in Jomtien such as "learning achievement," improvement of "essential skills" and the "knowledge, skills and values required for better living and sound and sustainable development" were reorganized conceptually at Dakar: these were divided into two areas: the learning of skills, including life-skills, and improvement in the quality of education to learn these skills. Furthermore, a clearer intent to tackle of the gender issue was undoubtedly a step forward from Jomtien (UNESCO, 1990, 2000a).

The Dakar Forum reset the EFA goals as described above. Discussions were simultaneously held over the problems that beleaguered action by the international community in the promotion of EFA conducted in the 1990s.

Notably, the following problems were listed: (1) inadequacy of partnership building, (2) lack of continued monitoring and (3) lack of any framework for comprehensive financial assistance.⁶ Each of these problems reveals that international cooperation in education is difficult to promote without global partnerships.

Forging Partnerships

The partnership among EFA partners is forged through the processes of planning, forming and implementing the international community's global public policies, or more specifically, policies on international cooperation in education. An EFA forum is held as a mechanism for coordinating these processes on a domestic or regional level.⁷ This EFA forum comprises relevant government ministries of developing countries and educational aid workers belonging to developed governments, international agencies and NGOs, who meet regularly to exchange information and views.⁸ Whether held on a domestic level or in conjunction with neighboring countries on a regional level, these EFA forums aim to establish partnerships between Actors with differing positions so that the ownership of developing countries' governments can be safeguarded.

The forging of such partnerships is thought to lead to better monitoring and assessment of the processes of policy implementation and the creation of a comprehensive financial assistance framework in the field of education. However, contrary to its concept, the EFA forum has not been functioning well both at country and regional levels, and establishment of the partnership seems have been donor-driven. In many cases, functions of the EFA forum were established at the Donor Coordination meeting, also known as the Donor Group meeting or the Education Sector Group meeting at the country level. Donor coordination meetings are basically organized in collaboration between the government of developing country and donors assisting that country. While it is often necessary to coordinate the different interests of each donor, at the same time, if partnership becomes too much donor-driven, it may result in the neglect of the real needs and demands the government of developing country has for its education sector. In such case, this may work against rather than for safeguarding the interests of the government. Moreover, some countries have introduced separate coordination meetings for donors and NGOs to engage in partnership-building with civil society, while others have integrated donors and NGOs into one group. For example, the Ministry of Education, Youth and Sport of

Cambodia has been organizing joint consultation meetings with both the Education Sector Working Group of donors and the NGO Education Partnership. However, there have been much more close collaboration between the Ministry and the donor group than there have been with NGOs. Many governments of developing countries in addition to Cambodia do not easily agree to work with NGOs and the partnership often takes the form of collaboration largely between the government and donors.

The EFA High-Level Group Meeting (HLG) and the Working Group Meeting on EFA (WGEFA) are in place to engage in a coordination on a global level.⁹ The HLG was organized on the basis of the agreement as stated in the Dakar Framework for Action adopted at the Dakar Forum, that the Director-General of UNESCO should hold a meeting once a year attended by a small but flexible group of high-level personnel who would “serve as a lever for political commitment and technical and financial resource mobilization” (UNESCO, 2000a, p. 10). The first meeting was held in October 2001 at the UNESCO Headquarters in Paris. Ever since, a meeting has been held in autumn of each year.¹⁰ The HLG is attended by heads of state, education ministers of developing countries, ministers for international cooperation of developed countries, representatives of international agencies and representatives of international NGOs, who discuss what direction international cooperation in education should take toward achieving the EFA goals. The HLG has a strong political undercurrent. The results of its discussions are adopted and released as a communiqué at the end of the meeting. The EFA partners are expected to reflect these results in every one of their policies. The communiqué that was adopted at the very first meeting stressed the lack of funding in many developing countries for promoting EFA and appealed for all partners to seek new and creative ways of filling the funding gap (UNESCO, 2002c, p. 29), which should be led by the World Bank in cooperation with UN agencies. In response, the following spring of 2003 saw the institution of the EFA FTI under the leadership of the World Bank, which had further developed its education support policies. The FTI was a new attempt in the funding of basic education which will be discussed later in this paper.¹¹

Unlike the HLG, which has such strong political overtones, the WGEFA is a forum for discussion on a more practical level.¹² Consequently, those who attend the WGEFA meetings, which are chaired by the Assistant Director-General for Education of UNESCO, are working-level officials, including senior staff belonging to education ministries of developing countries, staff responsible for international cooperation in education belonging to education ministries and development agencies of developed countries,

senior staff belonging to international agencies and representatives of international or regional NGOs. The WGEFA is regarded as a place for the international networking of working-level officials, where they learn good practices and exchange dialogue on problems facing different countries. Furthermore, the WGEFA actively invites the participation of NGOs of developing countries, which do not often have the opportunity to attend international conferences, to hear the views of people who do not normally have a “voice” in the international community.

The HLG and WGEFA meetings are given their own place in the global mechanism of promoting international cooperation in education. That is, the HLG determines the global framework for the promotion of cooperation, based on which donors mobilize technical and financial resources. To plan, form and implement specific policies within this framework, the WGEFA provides a forum for discussion and information exchange for working-level personnel who gather from all over the world. The information that emerges is then put to use in discussions at national or regional levels and is given more material shape through policies that fit specific national or regional contexts. However, it cannot be said that these mechanisms always function smoothly. More often than not, UNESCO, and the EFA coordinator, receive criticism from different Actors that the status of these meetings is ambiguous or that coordination between the meetings is poor. It is also important to note that the cooperation of Actors at the global level is essentially for developing an international framework to promote EFA through meetings such as HLG and WGEFA. In comparison with the cooperation found at the global level, we can see more actual and concrete cooperation among the same Actors at country level through, for instance, the Sector Wide Approach (SWAp).

In addition to these meetings, another priority with partnership building in international cooperation for education in recent years is the strengthening of liaisons among international agencies. To illustrate this, there are the Flagship Programmes,¹³ initiated after the Dakar Forum (UNESCO, 2002b). This was conceived as a mechanism for providing a concentrated input of support in a certain area while capitalizing on the specialties of individual international agencies. For many international agencies, liaisons at the time were often merely one-time efforts to carry out individual projects. By contrast, these recent Programmes are for building collaborative partnerships among international agencies, as well as for other related organizations working in the relevant area, on a program-by-program level based on open partnerships. This method of collaboration is in keeping with the general trend in international cooperation today, which is based chiefly

on sector-wide support. Thus, in building a medium- or long-term aid structure, this can be considered to be an effective approach.

Nonetheless, not all programs are working effectively. Depending on the program, the relationship between different agencies may be inadequate. In some cases, while the program name may sound impressive, the assistance offered is on an old-style project-basis rather than the all-round assistance that should be provided. Many problems still exist. Still, under the EFA targets, many international agencies, especially those such as WHO, ILO and UNHCR who have not fully liaised with other international agencies working in the education sector, are strengthening partnerships and this bodes well for the implementation of international cooperation in education within a more dynamic network.

Monitoring System

One of the issues highlighted by the Dakar Forum was the lack of continued monitoring on the progress of EFA. After the Jomtien conference, UNESCO led the establishment of the International Consultative Forum on EFA. As mentioned above, in 1996 in Amman, an interim assessment was held on the degree of attainment of the EFA goals. Disappointingly, this International Consultative Forum was held only irregularly and failed to monitor yearly progress on a continuous basis. Thus, until the EFA 2000 Assessment,¹⁴ which was the survey conducted by some 180 countries on their educational status, was submitted to UNESCO as the key reference material for the Dakar Forum, it was difficult for the international community to assess how much progress was being made in each country during the 1990s.

Having learned this lesson in the Dakar Framework for Action, agreement was reached on the creation of a global monitoring system to be led by UNESCO and operating under collaboration with UNESCO's research institutions and regional or sub-regional EFA forums. Subsequently, in the First HLG meeting, UNESCO, together with key partners, emphasized the need for annual publication of an EFA monitoring report (UNESCO, 2002c, p. 29) that is trustworthy and analytical to assess the extent of effort individual countries and the international community are making to fulfill the commitment they made in Dakar. This led to the Department for International Development (DFID) in the United Kingdom to take the lead among developed countries such as the Netherlands and Denmark. The DFID moved to provide human resource and financial assistance, with the result that the Global Monitoring Report Team was formed in 2002 and