

Global Education Policy: A Review

M. Damodara & Dr.D.R.Satish Babu

¹Research Scholar, Dept.of Political Science and Public Administration, Yogi Vemana University, Kadapa, A.P, India.

²Asst.Professor, Dept.of Political Science and Public Administration, Yogi Vemana University, Kadapa, A.P, India.

Corresponding Author Email: ravindra.babu753@gmail.com

Abstract:

This Review is an attempt to understand how education policies around the globe have been influenced by the global events that took place in the 20th century. The chapter tries to construct how the idea of global education policy has evolved, the factors that shaped it, the actors involved in shaping such a policy, and the political and economic reasons behind the motives of these actors to come up with such a policy.

1. Introduction

Though there is no such a thing called global education policy, education policies in all most all countries seem to transcend in a particular manner due to globalization. The understanding that there is a global education policy is totally depended on how one understands it. Article 26 of UDHR discusses education as;

1. *“Everyone has the right to education. Education shall be free, at least in the elementary and fundamental stages.*

2. *Elementary education shall be compulsory. Technical and professional education shall be made generally available and higher education shall be equally accessible to all on the basis of merit.”*

3. *“Education shall be directed to the full development of the human personality and to the strengthening of respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms. It shall promote understanding, tolerance and friendship among all nations, racial or religious groups, and shall further the activities of the United Nations for the maintenance of peace”.*

4. *“Parents have a prior right to choose the kind of education that shall be given to their children” (United Nations, 1948).*

The Convention on the Rights of the Child (1989), not an education related



convention though, mentions about the necessity of education. Though there is no explicit policy that clearly defines the need for education at global level, the above said declarations and conventions—and some other conventions implicitly talk about the importance of education and the role of the state and international institutions in providing education to all. This, more or less, constitutes to existence of international level education policy.

Policies are formulated by states. Hence we can say that education policies at international level exist only to the extent that these states adopt them. But adoption of such policies by all the states cannot be expected as some states may not wish to adopt what the other countries are following. This makes it difficult to tell that a particular education policy has been influencing all the countries. Nonetheless, international education policy can be said to an approximation of the exiting education policies of all the states together—and how individual states have responded to the education political at international level by converging their education policies with that of the prominent education policies at global level. Education policies of individual states

may differ from each other but the broader goals of providing education in a particular manner to particular set of people may more or less coincide with each other. And this convergence of individual state's education policy with that of the broader education policy trends dominant at international level—more or less—constitutes the international education policy. But this international education policy is not controlled by one state or one institution. The control is diffused into many hands—basically through inter-governmental delegations or committees. A wide range of organizations play a significant role in influencing the education policy of an individual state. Different entities like UN, individual states, national governments, financial institutions like IMF and World Bank, Multinational corporations, non-profit organizations etc. influence the education policy of a state in a particular manner. And entities like faith-based organizations, market forces, and philanthropic organizations also play a significant role in influencing the education policy of an individual state. All the above said entities were able to design some loosely structured international policy that is reflected in policies like Education for all and

Millennium Development Goals (MDG). The MDG talks about universal primary education for all by the year 2015. But again, its adaptation and level of implementation depends on the states will to adopt and implement it (Chabbott, 2003).

1.1 Universalization of Schooling

Empirical evidence for the spread of universalization of schooling points to the spread of implementation of idea of universal schooling is statistically not related to rates of economic growth (Meyer et al. 1977). Though it is an accepted truth that countries with higher national incomes levels have higher levels of educational spreading, the causal relationship is not visible and the causality is unclear. A large number of countries with relatively low levels of growth in national income have also succeeded in expanded universal schooling. Empirical evidence suggests that growth in high levels of schooling in primary education is not dependent on growth in national income (Caldwell, 1986).

Increases in spread of schooling and convergence of other policies can be explained due to the result of the spread in the process of modernization. Modernization, though discredited by many, is the biggest factor that resiliently contributed to the spread of the idea of universalization of schooling. But the idea of modernization contributing to the spread of schooling has been discarded by world-culture theorists (Meyer and Ramirez, 2000) and critical theorists (Ball, 2008). Those who believe in world-culture theory see universalization of schooling as a result of emerging dominant world-culture that is influenced by the institutionalization of western modernity in the form of nation-states and the global policy that harbors it. The believers of world-culture see the spread of universalization of schooling as a national necessity in the global competition for sustenance (Takayama et al. 2013).

2. International Education Policy, Emergence of New States and International Development



As a result of colonialism and the underdevelopment that it has created, the newly emerged nation-states started struggling with lack of financial and technical resources that is required for the development of their economies. Financial and technical assistance from first world countries to poor countries became a major element that controlled educational policies of newly emerged states. First world countries developed bilateral relationships based on the aid with specific countries. International organizations developed technical assistance and established funding relationships with many countries. Because of this relationship with low-income countries in education and many crucial aspects of government, explanations to the emergence of the idea of international education policy falls short without reference to aid and assistance that the first world countries have started giving. Though there is no clear and visible structure to generate global policy, the nation-states—through inter-governmental relations controlled by the first world countries, started adopting their loosely promoted international education policy without much resistance (Chabbott, 2003).

The idea of universalization of schooling started appealing to the leaders of the third world countries who are willing to develop their human resource and national economies based on the advancements in education. They started appealing to the idea of developing their nations and the idea of advancements in quality of life that the universalization of schooling could possibly bring. The nations that have adopted or that have put efforts to adopt the universalization of schooling started garnering universal recognition, and the markets played their part by making their presence in these countries which started creating economic opportunities the reinforced the belief that education brings development. Schooling also started appealing to the individuals who wanted to brace the market based development. This individual started believing that education enhances capabilities and makes them to compete in the market environment that the first world countries have constructed after the end of the World War II. Schooling has become institutional mechanism for the aspirations of newly emerged states (Chabbott, 2003).

Education related ideas from the first world countries carry significant policy



weight age that the ideas that are generated in the third world countries as the idea of schooling has long roots in the first world countries. Besides that the first world countries have resources, technical knowhow and the hegemonic power to impose their version of schooling. The imperial history of these nations have garnered them the cultural power to influence the third world countries and their ideas about ways of development. Though it is not necessary true that all policies of the third world countries are imposed by first world countries, most of them are adopted based on the policies of first world countries as it sounded the right option for the third world countries to do immediately after their independence from the first world countries. For example, take the example of gender and racial equality in school, all most all the countries have adopted the principle of equality in matters of gender and race in the school environment. Though it is an acceptable truth that many international organizations and civil society organizations have promoted gender and racial equality in schooling, this idea could not have got wider acceptance without the force of the first world countries through various methods like funding, technical support and inter-

governmental treaties and bilateral agreements (OECD, 2008).

Though the ideas behind particular education policies are results of the policy stands of the first world countries, these ideas were adopted by the third world countries with proper interpretations to suit the local conditions. Each and every third world country has its own reason to twist or interpret the policies of the first world to make it fit for the socio-economic, political and cultural conditions that these nations have. Though the schooling policies of the third world countries are loosely structured when compared to the policies of their first world counterparts, their blueprints for universalization of schooling more or less coincided with the broader conceptions of the idea of schooling that the first world countries have started promoting. But the official national education policies of these third world countries have been implemented with limited resources—and with ups and downs in achieving the targets. Nonetheless, these policies broadly resemble the ideas of schooling that the west has started promoting—and the convergence makes the differences in the national educational policies of particular countries



disappear when we look at the larger picture—at international level. Though there are great differences in the framing the education policy and its ingredients across countries, these policies have more or less emphasized basic education and its related aspects like higher education. In the later stages, focus has shifted from access to education to quality in learning. Market started playing a significant role in influencing the curriculum and the structures of education in all the countries—irrespective of the socio-economic, political and cultural settings of each country. And over a period, all the countries and all the individuals started understanding the requirement of education for individual development and overall development (OECD, 2008).

2.1 Universalization of Schooling from 1950 to early 2000s

Between World War II and early 1970s, nearly 100 new states have emerged as a result of decolonization. And most of the governments in these newly emerged states have quickly adopted to nationalize schools so that the schools could play a major role in promoting political socialization, citizenship, loyalty to the

nation and to make the people understand the constraints in achieving the goals of the nation—basically due to depleted resources as a result of prolonged colonization. Educational planners carried out economic planning at national levels based on socialist model of putting the resources in the hands of the state. They have interconnected the schooling models to fit other aspects of the nation like nation building, industrial production, GDP growth rate, and widening the human resources. Universities in the first world countries and international organizations started promoting education. And the competing power—US and Soviet Union started giving state led plans to the third world countries to gain their favor in the cold war environment. The proxy-war tactics also forced these powers to open their resources to the third world countries—and education was always part and parcel of the help that these powers have offered to the third world countries (Ball, 2008).

Throughout 1950s, nation based economic planning was promoted by both the capitalist and the socialist blocs. These plans included focus on self-sustenance of their brother counties in all way; economic, military, resources etc. and spreading of



education was always part of all these plans as it is untenable to implement other plans without proper educated work force. Demand for schooling from citizens of the new states led to fast expansion of schooling. Big education plans in convergence with big economic plans for development were designed—and implemented in the newly emerged states. Serious attempts to use universalization of schooling to develop skilled labor in accordance with manpower requirements were made in these countries. The newly emerged nation states were struggling with lack of managerial resources. And the education policies in these newly emerged states were designed to meet the managerial resource requirements. The national staff capacities of these new states were developed through the newly trained manpower. Hence, school systems were developed rapidly to meet the overall requirements of the nation. Different sets of work force like school teachers, administrative staff, industrial workers, and bureaucratic staff started emerging in the 1950 in the newly formed nation states in the third world (Freire, 1972).

The 1960s saw an escalation in the Cold War rivalry between the US and the Soviet Union—and their respective allies. This escalation in rivalry pushed these powers further to take measures to help their allies in the third world in the development process—including education. The 1960s characterized the highest levels in applying modernization theory. It was felt that with appropriate technology and well-designed economic development models, the national economies of the allies of these powers would reach a sustainable stage. And when it comes to education, the 1960 mirrored the emergence of human capital theory. The basic argument of the human capital theory is that the economic development that the first world countries were able to achieve could not be credited to their access to resources alone. They argue that a significant portion of the development could be due to the human capital i.e., the capabilities, skills and knowledge that the individuals in the first world countries have acquired over a period due to the strong education systems that they have developed. Therefore, schooling started to act like an unavoidable economic investment—and countries could no more neglect this fact. National economies started converging their



growth projections with that of the changes in education levels of their citizens—and education, more or less, has become part of a nation's wealth—like natural resource or something (Rostow, 1960).

But the human capital theory based investments on education was not yielding significant results. And by early 1970s, questions regarding reliability on human capital theory were wide spreading. Hence, the 1970s saw a paradigm shift from economic development to overall well-being of the individuals—the poor especially. Community based bottom-up approach started gaining significance. Now the policy attention started shifting to concentrate on women and children. These sections were seriously neglected and marginalized earlier to 1970s. Arguments pointing to different types of structural inequalities started emerging. Providing access to mere education was seen as a process of domestication and as a cultural imperialism. Non-formal education started drawing attention as a substitute to formal schooling. Non-formal education started gaining support as a solution to the 1960s, 1970s model of standardized formal educational mechanisms. Countries started linking

education with the skills that the industries were looking for. Countries in the Far East like China and Japan started as vanguards to the promotion of non-formal education as a solution to the growing unemployment and the industrial needs that the third world countries needed urgently (Freire, 1972).

The 1980s was the period of debt crisis. Neoliberal economists believed that the governments of third world countries were financially over-stretched. Structural adjustment programs backed by international organizations like World Bank and IMF started controlling the conditions for funding. Structural adjustment programs were promoted with the conditions to reduce the budgets of the third world countries, especially by reducing its size through reduce the reduction of government work force like downsizing the bureaucratic structure. Protection of national markets from international competition also started sounding untenable. Escalated unemployment levels among the educated resulted in downsizing of education related budgets across the world. Efficiency became the master of the market. The neoliberal ideals started influencing the education policies in a significant manner in



the 1980s. Different agencies like the state, international organizations and the market started promoting liability mechanisms to satisfy the clients in the market. Decentralization of responsibilities have become the hallmark of the neoliberal market in the 1980s. Apparently, decentralized roles and responsibilities demands the local staff to be competitive—and this requires education related skills. Decentralized governance started gaining support but without proper training and without proper educated staff at the local level. Women were required to play a pivotal role at the local level in the decentralized governance (OECD, 2008).

Series of surveys conducted during 1980s found significant effects of education, especially women's education. Women who have studied till secondary level were found to be playing significant role in cases of infant and maternal mortality, and birth control. Emphasis shifted to the inclusion of women in the schooling process in an active manner. Different longitudinal surveys that concentrated on rate of returns have concluded that the returns on primary and secondary education were greater than the returns on higher education. And these

conclusions have influenced the international organizations, donor states, and other funding agencies to shift their focus on to improving the basic education skills of the populace rather than pouring funds on the higher education. This led to the World Conference on Education for All (WCEFA) in 1990 at Jomtien with the aim to provide basic education to all by 2000 (OECD, 2008).

Hence, the 1990s can be said to be an attempt to escalate and accelerate the provision of primary education to all—to all in a literal sense and support was garnering for the Millennium Development goals. Much of the 1990s was about achieving the goal of education for all. But by the end of the 1990s it was clear that the basic education for all will remain unachieved. As a result, all the donor states, MNCs, international organizations and market actors started organizing themselves to reschedule the goal of education to all to a later period. This resulted in the framing of Millennium Development Goals in which it was explicitly mentioned that the goal of education for all should be achieved by 2015. Different international events like the end of the cold war, the spread of internet



and other means of information and communications technology, and the emergence of invisible hand of the market as the exclusive foundation of all forms of development models has forced the states to concentrate on primary education (Ball, 2008).

The new Millennium started in the backdrop of failures to achieve universalization of education outlined in the 1990s. The beginning of the century also saw events such as 9/11 which forced the US and its allies to think about terrorism and the uneven development that the world has achieved in the second half of the 20th century. Governments in the first world started to relate education related underdevelopment as reasons for terrorism and other non-democratic activities. They started shifting funding to areas that are prone to be at potential risk for terrorism and non-democratic activities. There was a change among funding entities towards creation of resources devoted to specific problems such as funds to fight AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria etc. *Fast Track Initiative* to address the illiteracy and other problems in the field of education was initiated in 2002. The initiative bypasses the

earlier forms of bureaucratic structures in disbursing funds to the implementing agencies at field level. So the countries and agencies that were able to demonstrate the performance in using the funds for changing the education scenario started getting the aid quickly (OECD, 2008).

This led to a focus on performance based policy formulation and impact assessment as tangible criteria for funding. Concerns about the effectiveness aid have led the OECD countries to formulate the *Paris Declaration of Aid Effectiveness*, with five broader principles to check aid effectiveness. Later, similar attempt was made in late 2008 with the promulgation of the *Third High Level Forum on Aid*, and in 2011 the *Fourth High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness* was promulgated. These declarations found some progress in terms of aid usage but stressed the need for greater efforts by the receiving nations to commit to the tasks for which the funds are meant (OECD, 2008).

Though the international level education policy was successful in its aspirations, it has, more or less, failed to achieve the goals in many ways. Though



more children got enrolled in schools because of continuous efforts for universalization of education, how far the enrolled children were able to learn something was not clear. Schools seem to be operating with inadequate resources, and the situation is bound to worsen with the wide spreading of the idea of education for all. And the curricula is not fit for livelihood after schooling. Universalization of schooling has, more or less, pushed up the unemployment levels (OECD, 2008).

Another problem with the first world engineered international education policy is the inequalities in the partnership between the donor country and the receiving country. The structural adjustment requirements that the receiving countries are supposed to make in order to receive funds made the receiving countries to make unrealistic commitments. Development as a method as more or less wrongly understood by both the donor and the receiving countries. Particular models of development—irrelevant to whether they will work or not—were imposed on other countries. Socio-economic, political and cultural conditions of the receiving countries were grossly neglected. Nonetheless, the success of providing education to all can be

said to be remarkable as schooling has become a part and parcel of modern individual's life(OECD, 2008).

2.2 The Seriousness of Globalization

Though it is not clearly defined, the term globalization is a well-established and popular term in social sciences. It is, more or less, understood to be a process of enhancing the interdependence between nations, organizations and people in terms of economic, political, technological and cultural aspects. The central processes of globalization can be understood as active-liberalism on the economic front, governance replacing government on the political front and spread of consumerism on the cultural front. Globalization is a very broader term in social sciences because of all the meanings that it incorporates within it(Dale, 2000).

Globalization started influencing the education policy in a significant way as the educated work force started moving around the globe (Ball, 1998). Countries, organizations, and individuals started raising



their competitiveness in terms of services, quality of the product and responsiveness in order to stay in competition with other players. And in order to stay in the competition, these entities needed to expand the education and its contents to supply the market with skilled workforce. The onset of globalization altered the nature of the welfare state as they started understanding the necessity to keep their citizens competitive in order for the state to stay competitive in a globalized world. And education has become a welfare aspect of every nation. Therefore, the modern welfare states in a globalized state started taking education seriously. It is not only about primary education or enrollment, but quality and competitiveness in all levels has become the hallmark of education in the globalizing world (Carnoy, 1999).

Globalization redefined the role of international agencies in the field of educational policy. Among them, international organizations such as World Bank, UNESCO etc. stand out with special mandates for educating the world. Besides these organizations, globalization also brought new forces into the field of education policy; international non-

governmental organizations, non-profit foundations, multinational corporations, and social forums. The resurgence of international players in defining the education at international level diminished the role of state boundaries in defining education policy at national level. Though the state remained as the sovereign entity in deciding the things within its boundaries, the state was no longer in position to control the external influence on its stand—and it more or less had to give into the pressure exerted by supranational entities, out of which globalization stood at first. Transnational actors started influencing the educational outcomes through funding based conditions. These actors started to have specific purposes of education—and education based outcomes so as to play big in the global market. Advancements in Information and Communications Technology (ICT) also helped these actors to spread their ideas about education in a speedy manner. The information revolution led to the comparison of policy proposals, budgets, outcomes and all other aspects of a particular education policy. The ICTs also started reducing the costs involved in information exchange. ICT induced cheaper access to information also increased the quality of education that is

offered by various entities. Distance learning also started gaining prominence because of the spread of ICTs (Peck et al. 2010).

Another important element of globalization is it created a transnational private market for education. These transnational private education providing actors were in direct competition with the national education policies of the individual states. Individual states were implicitly forced by these transnational forces to change or streamline their educational goals in competition with theirs. The transnational actors also changed the way the citizens think about nation and nation building. Cosmopolitan outlook started dominating the education arena in the place of national outlook (Ball, 2007).

In conclusion, globalization can be understood to setting new trends in the field of education policy. It has been defining the market and the steps that need to be taken by the states and the individuals to become active players of it. The pressure it exerts on the states—and the individuals is also unsurmountable if one misses to play it according to the changing times and circumstances.

3. Methodological Issues in Global Education Policy Studies

Globalization has changed the way we think about education policy. Global Education Policy has become a new area of research that surveys the different ways in which the process of globalization and its agents contribute to educational policy. Global Education Policy studies is raising different implications in the field of education. Globalization has been redefining the basic unit of analysis at global level—the nation state. As a result nation based education policies and nation centered curricula has been giving way to transnational level policies (Green, 2003). Earlier forms of nation based educational settings have been replaced with policies that transcend the national boundaries—and the outlook that these policies are projecting are cosmopolitan in nature. Hence, education policies at national level have turned to be outcomes of a game by different political, institutional, and corporate forces that have footings from local to global level (Yeates, 2001).



Globalization also led to the idea of global-governance as there needs to be a set of intergovernmental mechanisms to govern and control the transnational level interactions. The non-state actors at the global level need to be controlled by some mechanism—and the mechanism that is taking up this duty can be global governance. The power or influence of a particular state or non-state actor in the global governance process is not easier to define or calculate as it is decided by a combination of factors like economic power, social power, network power, strength of ideas, horizontal or vertical presence of a state or non-state actor etc. On some occasions the state may with stand the pressure from these entities—but on other occasions the state may have to give up to the pressures by supranational entities. And all these factors come into picture when we try to understand global education policies (Dale, 2005). In conclusion, it can be said that the educational polices of present day are decided by a combination of supranational, national level and local level entities. This more or less means that the states are restricting themselves to ensuring

standards in education that meets the global standards (Neave, 1998).

States face adoption problems when they are adopting something that has been making circles at global level. This applies to the field of education also. States have to adopt global level policies or trends in a particular manner befitting particular contexts and resources that they have in their home. Often, states adopt global education policies because they are imposed by the external funding agencies. States also adopt global level policies because they think that these policies work. Policy-makers see global education policy as a suitable solution for the problems in their home countries (Verger, 2011).

International organizations and global policy entrepreneurs and compete among themselves to make policy-makers think that their ideas on policies work. More than the policies themselves, the way they are articulated affects the policy makers judgment to take or reject a policy. International organizations are aware of this fact and spend a lot of resources in propagating their policies. Global policy ideas are propagated through event like



seminars, workshops and reports that are attended by policy makers from around the world. And most of the times, education policy entrepreneurs focus on the cost-effectiveness and the returns on the policies that they propose (Kingdon, 2002).

Besides the global status of policy proposals, the global level reputation of the actors supporting them is equally important. Most of the times, the most persuasive policy entrepreneurs are part of international organizations that are located at important points of social and policy networks. For example, in most countries, the opinion expressed by a World Bank expert will carry more weight than that of an expert from a local university irrelevant to their experience in the field of policy framing. The move for a policy to become globally acceptable comes when global level institutions with high levels of exposure and networks adopts it (Campbell, 2004).

Policy-makers also see adopting new policies from other parts of the world as a necessity when their education systems are not in a good shape. Different aspects like dissatisfaction with the existing education system, inadequate education provisions,

demands for change in the education system etc. pushes the policy makers of different countries to adopt the global level policies. Generally, adopted education policies are twisted to suit the local conditions—and they usually go through different stages of filtration before getting finalized. As a result, the final outcome of a policy becomes unpredictable. And in the process of adopting a particular policy, the policy makers ignore many things like local practices that may come in contradiction with the newly adopted policy which contributes to the failure of the policy. Hence, the idea of global education programs is often criticized for not taking into consideration the socio-economic, political and social contexts of the locality in which they are adopted for. Experts feel that it is not suitable to dump models that worked in developed, well-funded, and highly regulated educational systems to countries whose educational systems are far from away from these standards. Developing countries usually do not have the required men and material to execute costly and technically sound global education policies. The World Bank has been facing this problem with the policies that it funds. The 2011 report by World Bank's Independent



Evaluation Group found that the results of the education policies that it funded are quite uneven due to the loopholes in implementing the programs (Beech, 2006).

3.1 Education Policy in European Union

It is a known fact that due to increased cross-border movement of capital, goods and services, and due to the broad range of control that the corporations have at their disposal, individual state's capacity to organize their economies and regulate the external influence has been severely curtailed. Advancements in ICTs has transnationalized the flow of information. Economic globalization has been coupled with globalization of policy making. Different players like nation-states, MNCs, and international organizations have started functioning in a trans-national environment when it comes to policy making. Major international organizations like World Bank, IMF, WTO, and OECD play a big role in bringing the individual state's policies in line with the policy frameworks of these organizations. Though the above mentioned organizations have existed since World War

II, they have escalated their role in international level policy making since early 1990s. And policies related to education are not free from the clutches of these organizations (Harvey, 2005).

Out of the 192 countries that are part of the UN, 185 countries are part of IMF and World Bank. Since the Bretton Woods, the World Bank has been the main actor in deciding the global education policy—and subsequently the education policies of each and every nation. Today, the World Bank has become the biggest funding organization for education policies that are being in implementation about 85 countries. In the 1990s, the loans by World Bank for education programs accounted to 27 percent of the global funding on education. In the same decade, it has made sure that around 16 percent of funds available to the governments in Africa were spent of education (Alexander, 2001). But it is not the funding alone that makes a key player in deciding the education policies of different nations. It is the influence that it exerts on other aid agencies. The World Bank and the IMF decides the credit worthiness of an individual country, and this credit rating helps the countries to get the required funds

for the development projects that they plan to frame and implement. Apparently, the funding is tied with certain conditions that more or less define the education policies of the fund receiving states (Harvey, 2005).

This kind of external influence on the domestic education policies of the individual states can be seen in European Union also. Different transnational organizations like the World Bank, IMF, OECD, and WTO play a prominent role in deciding the education policies of the member countries of the European Union. Individual states in EU, like any other state around the world, have been entangled with the transnational network structures.

3.2 Globalization and School Reforms

Globalization is normally interpreted as the process of opening doors to international exchange, whether commercial, cultural, or demographic. In many parts of the world, globalization has diminished the role of nation states and, in the opinion of many, forfeited independence in the name of trade. This has been visible

throughout Europe as *Europeanization* resulting from the integration brought about by the European Union (EU). As a consequence, standardization in economies, policies, and culture has become a new normal for nations, corporations, and public services in open and competitive environments (Barber et al., 2012).

Globalization has inconsistent effects on our lives—including schools. Apparently, competition has become the normal state of life and strategic alliances and cooperation between competing parties have become a necessary condition for persistence. Economic markets have opened as a result of weakened sovereign borders. Transnational agreements have increased the mobility of goods and services, capital and human resources. Competition to spread the markets, to increase efficiency of goods and services, and to promote innovation has started defining globalization. And schooling mechanisms are falling in line with the requirements necessary for the individuals and the states to compete in the globalized world. These changes certainly affect teaching and learning in schools. It is obvious that there is no single view of the



consequences that globalization has for schooling (Barber et al., 2012).

The failure of education systems to meet expectations has brought corporate management to schooling. Standardization of teaching and learning in schools, frequent external testing of students and teachers, and alternative forms of providing education to children have come to challenge conventional public education policies and practices in many countries. International student assessments measures like Program for International Student Assessment (PISA) have become the driving force behind schooling reforms at global level. While these international comparisons are helpful in a sense that they provide a benchmark in some school subjects to national policy-makers, they can take on too much importance in defining educational success (Sahlberg, 2015).

Some argue the international labor markets in a globalized world requires benchmark standards in teaching and syllabus that is competitive globally and that the schooling systems must ensure that they are following what the people around the globe are following in order to be employed

from an individual's perspective and for the nation to be competitive from economic perspective. Others argue that what is needed instead in a globalized world is personalization, creativity, and the ability to differentiate teaching and learning in schools to match the interests, curiosity, and passion of students. This tension concerning the ends of education also influence show education policies and reforms in different education systems look (Wagner, 2012).

3.3 The Education for All Agenda and its Implementation

The Convention on the Rights of the Child (1989) and the World Declaration on Education for All (EFA, 1990) reaffirmed education as a basic human right, as first articulated in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights in 1948. These treaties marked a significant shift toward the promise of a new international environment, one characterized by closer cooperation and solidarity. The realization that education progress was stagnant in many parts of the world, the belief that human development should be at the core of all development, and the optimism generated by the end of the Cold War led to an ambitious call in support

of education. The expanded vision of the Declaration concisely articulated education policy concerns (Unterhalter, 2014).

In 2000, around 1100 members of the international community met at the World Education Forum in Senegal. Representatives from international organizations, funding agencies and other civil society groups with representatives of 164 governments designed the agenda to deliver Education for All.

The Framework consisted of six broadly designed education goals to be achieved by all countries by 2015. The six goals are –

1. Providing early childhood care and education for all
2. To provide free and compulsory primary education to *all* by 2015, especially for girls and minorities.
3. To ensure that the learning needs of all young are met with access to life-skill programs.
4. To achieve 50 percent adult literacy by 2015.

5. Achieving gender equality in the primary and secondary schools by 2015.
6. Improving the quality of education by following measurable standards in terms of learning (EFA, 1990).

3.4 Strategies established at Dakar (2000) to achieve Education for All

1. To mobilize international level political commitment for Education for All and to draw national level action plans to invest in basic education
2. To promote Education for All policies linked to poverty elimination
3. To engage participation of civil society in the formulation and implementation of plans for educational development
4. To develop responsible and accountable educational systems
5. To meet the educational systems affected by conflict and instability, and to promote peace, tolerance and understanding
6. To develop plans to combat HIV/AIDS

7. To create inclusive and equitable education environment
8. To harness advancements in the field of ICT to help achieve the goal of Education for All
9. To monitor the progress towards Education for All at national and international levels
10. To build on the existing structures to achieve Education for All (Bolívar, 2011).

3.5 International Aid for Education for All

The Dakar Framework for Action called on national governments and donors to commit to increased financing in order to fulfill the objectives of Education for All stating that governments should allot required funds to achieve basic education. Apparently, this means the national governments should start spending more of their national income on education. There was a strong anticipation that the donor at global level would support the goal of Education for All. Commitment to raise funds at global were subsequently reaffirmed at high level forums in the

later periods. Despite the global level commitments, shortage of resources to finance Education-for-All has been continuing. By 2015, Education for All remained as a grossly underfunded program.

But basic education has attracted the most donor support because it is directly related to poverty reduction and was linked with the second Millennium Development Goal. Between 2002 and 2012, aid to basic education grew, on average, 6% a year, although there are significant regional variations (OECD, 2014). For example, annual growth rates in sub-Saharan Africa during this time only averaged 1%, even though the region had the highest average returns to schooling. Despite this growth in aid for basic education, the share of total aid disbursed for education remained relatively static, not exceeding 10% (Psacharopoulos, 2014).

Within basic education, primary education has received the vast majority of international development assistance. Its share increased, on average, from 87% in 2002–2004 to 92% in 2010–2012. On the other hand, the share of total aid



disbursements to basic life skills training for youth and adults and early childhood education have decreased, on average, from 10% and 3%, respectively, in 2002–2004 to 6% and 2% in 2010–2012 (OECD-DAC 2014). Donor rhetoric suggesting strong support for early childhood care and education has not translated into increased shares of aid. Donor support for secondary education has also been limited. A review of donor strategies showed that only Germany, Japan, and the Asian Development Bank treated upper secondary as a priority subsector in their aid programs. Funding agencies seem to have neglected certain key areas of Education for All like adult education, non-formal learning, and education the children with special needs (Mercer, 2014).

In contrast, throughout this period, many donors have continued to prioritize spending on post-secondary education. In the early 2000s, 20 of 28 donor countries spent more on post-secondary education than on secondary education; by the late 2000s, it was 27 of 39 donor countries, indicating little change. In 2012, 72% of aid to post-secondary education supported students from developing countries studying

in donor countries, a practice that does not directly help strengthen higher education systems in low or middle income countries. In the same year, for every US\$1 disbursed in direct aid to early childhood care and education, the equivalent of US\$58 went to support post-secondary level students studying overseas (OECD-DAC, 2014).

The Dakar Framework called on donors to not just increase aid levels but also to improve the effectiveness of aid. The 2005 Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness marked an unprecedented shift regarding the delivery of aid by promoting national ownership, alignment of donor priorities with national plans, coordination of donor efforts, and a focus on results and shared accountability for outcomes between donors and recipients (UNESCO, 2011). As an indication of how difficult it is to change donor institutional behavior, however, only one of the 13 aid effectiveness targets had been achieved by 2011: aligning and coordinating technical assistance (OECD, 2011).

The Global Partnership for Education (GPE) (previously called the EFA Fast Track Initiative (FTI)), established in 2002, has had potential to play a critical role



in the global coordination of international aid for education but developed too slowly to do this effectively so far. The GPE was the first global partnership focusing on education in developing countries. Its emergence constituted the main response to the aspirations of the international community for coherent and adequate funding to countries committed to achieving EFA, and is an example of how independent initiatives emerged outside formal global Education for All coordinating bodies (Australian Aid, 2012).

In addition to more effective coordination of aid, the Dakar Framework called on donors to provide flexible development assistance within the framework of sector-wide reforms and to make longer-term and more predictable commitments. Sector-wide approaches (SWAs), which were already becoming more popular at the time of Dakar, are one way in which donors have allocated funds to education. SWAs involve funds to a defined sector policy led by government authority in partnership with external donors, and marked a change from the project-oriented approach to aid, where hundreds of individual projects put great

strain on recipient countries' limited economic and human resources. Education Swaps have, to date, been implemented in 25 low income countries; five of these Swaps are sub-sectoral, focusing on primary and basic education. Some evidence of the success of SWAs includes efficiency and cost savings due to better coordination and flexibility. SWAs lost their appeal among some donor agencies from around the middle of the 2000s due to political and economic considerations, including a push to demonstrate short-term results and account for every dollar that was spent. In 2012, just 7% of total aid for education was delivered in the form of sector-wide budget support (OECD-DAC, 2014).

The scope of donor support for education is usually tied to humanitarian aid, and supporting the cause of education in conflicting zones has become a convention for donors. The majority of international humanitarian assistance goes to long-term recipient countries. In 2012, 66% of humanitarian assistance from OECD donors went to countries that had received above-average shares of aid in the form of humanitarian assistance for eight years or more (Development Initiatives, 2014).



However, high impact crises that cause many fatalities in a short period tend to be proportionately better funded than protracted emergencies (Dolan, 2011).

With protracted emergencies occurring more frequently, the education sector has, over the past decade, tried to convince the humanitarian aid sector that investment in education is life-saving. Definitions of aid to education in humanitarian situations, however, continue to be narrow. The Central Emergency Response Fund (CERF), a standby pooled funding mechanism that aims to make money available for relief work as soon as the need arises, has particular criteria for funding education, including provision of school-tents, education, and recreational materials, emergency repair of education facilities, teacher training in emergencies, and provision of life saving skills (CERF, 2010).

Since the World Education Forum adopted the Dakar Framework for Action: Education for All in 2000, there has been a major global effort to ensure that every child gains access to and completes a good quality education. The achievements of the EFA

movement should not be underestimated. While the comprehensive education vision established at Dakar has not been achieved, there is evidence the world has progressed at a faster rate than it would have done if the trends of the 1990s had continued. However, the extent of progress is less than anticipated in 2000 and has definitely been insufficient to match the scale of the ambition. The most disadvantaged children continue to be the last to benefit from education, tens of millions of children are not reaching minimum learning standards in reading and mathematics, and the acquisition of sustainable literacy skills among adults remains a low priority for governments and donors alike. The educational challenges in much of sub-Saharan Africa and South and West Asia are acute, indicating a plethora of missed opportunities. The world has yet to devise a concrete strategy to support the realization of good quality education for all (Development Initiatives, 2014).

Throughout the post-Dakar period, the evidence suggests that at the global level, the pledges made in the Framework were only partially fulfilled. It is possible that the requirements to fulfill the pledges exceeded the capacity of the international

community, particularly to influence major change at the national level. What is clear is that the Education for All movement suffered once the Millennium Development Goals became the dominant development agenda and excessive emphasis was placed on universal primary education (UPE). Although the UPE target appealed to the poorest countries which were furthest from it, and to the richest countries which were prepared to support its achievement, it meant the Education-for-All agenda was less attractive to countries that had already achieved, or were close to achieving universal primary education. An exception to this pattern was a growing emphasis on learning and its assessment, which gained considerable traction among the donors and the supporters of Education-for-All (Development Initiatives, 2014).

In moving forward post-2015, lessons must be learned from the positive aspects of the past period working towards EFA. Areas of progress have been characterized by a strong technical focus. Global mechanisms, initiatives, and campaigns that proved relatively influential have had clear objectives, dedicated strategic and technical capacity, been

financed collectively, and had overt political support from influential bodies. They have been evaluated regularly, and in most cases have had clear targets (Development Initiatives, 2014).

In contrast, the impact of interventions requiring coordination, political commitment, and influence has been limited at best. Such interventions tended to be loosely organized, voluntary mechanisms, which may have had technical strength but were politically weak. There has been relatively little scrutiny of the global coordination model, especially within the UN, and issues of accountability have not been adequately addressed. But an even more ambitious set of education policy priorities is being embedded in the post-2015 vision of global sustainable development. They are meant to be more universal in application, transformative in intent, and inclusive and equitable in practice than the EFA goals (Development Initiatives, 2014).

4. Conclusion

The chapter briefly discussed the evolution of the global education policy, the players and the dynamics involved in the emergence of such a policy, the role of market in channeling the global education policy in a particular manner, and the 'limited' role of the state in adopting or resisting the global level education policies. Overall, the chapter concludes that though there is no such thing called 'Global-Education-Policy', majority of the countries have adopted education policies that sync with the trends of globalization and private market thus leading to a more or less uniform kind of education system at global level, which is loosely termed as global-education-policy.

References

- [1]. Australian Aid. 2012. *Australian Multilateral Assessment March 2012: Global Partnership for Education (GPE)*. Canberra: Australian Aid.
- [2]. Ball, S. (2008). *The Education Debate*. Oxford: Policy Press.
- [3]. Ball, S. J. (1998), 'Big Policies/Small World: An introduction to international perspectives in education policy'. *Comparative Education, Vol. 34, (2)*, Pp. 119-130.
- [4]. Ball, S. J. (2007), *Education Plc: Understanding Private Sector Participation in Public Sector Education*. New York: Routledge.
- [5]. Barber, M., K. Donnelly, and S. Rizvi. 2012. *Oceans of Innovation. The Atlantic, the Pacific, Global Leadership and the Future of Education* London: The Institute for Public Policy Research.
- [6]. Beech, J. (2006), 'The theme of educational transfer in comparative education: a view over time'. *Research in Comparative and International Education, Vol. 1, (1)*, Pp. 2-13.
- [7]. Bolívar, A. 2011. "The Dissatisfaction of the Losers," In *Pisa Under Examination: Changing Knowledge, Changing Tests, and Changing Schools*, edited by M.A. Pereyra, H.-G. Kotthoff, and R. Cowen. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.
- [8]. Caldwell, J. C. (1979). Education as a factor in mortality decline: An examination of Nigerian data. *Population Studies, Vol. 33 (3)*, Pp. 395–413.
- [9]. Caldwell, J. C. (1986). Routes to low mortality in low-income countries. *Population and Development Review, Vol. 12 (2)*, Pp. 171–220.
- [10]. Campbell, J. L. (2004), *Institutional Change and Globalization*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- [11]. Carnoy, M. (1999), *Globalisation and Educational Reform: What planners need to know*. Paris: UNESCO.



- [12]. CERF. 2010. *Central Emergency Response Fund Life-Saving Criteria*. Geneva: Central Emergency Response Fund.
- [13]. Chabbott, C. (2003). *Constructing educational development: International organizations and Education for All*. New York: Rout ledge.
- [14]. Dale, R. (2000), ‘Globalisation and Education: Demonstrating a “common world educational culture” or locating a “globally structured educational agenda”?’ *Educational Theory*, Vol. 50, (4), Pp. 427-448.
- [15]. Dale, R. (2005), ‘Globalisation, knowledge economy and comparative education’. *Comparative Education*, Vol. 41, (2), Pp. 117-149.
- [16]. Development Initiatives. 2013. *Investments to End Poverty: Real Money, Real Choices, Real Lives*. Bristol: Development Initiatives Ltd.
- [17]. Development Initiatives. 2014. *Global Humanitarian Assistance Report 2014*. Bristol: Development Initiatives.
- [18]. Dolan, J. 2011. *Making it Happen: Financing Education in Countries Affected by Conflict and Emergencies*. London: Save the Children.
- [19]. Freire, P. (1972). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. New York: Herder & Herder.
- [20]. Global Partnership for Education. 2013. *GPE Portfolio Review Report*. Washington, DC: Global Partnership for Education.