Tikly, L. P. (2016). Education for All as a Global Regime of Educational Governance: Issues and Tensions. In S. Yamada (Ed.), *Post-Education-for-All and Sustainable Development Paradigm: Structural Changes with Diversifying Actors and Norms* (pp. 37-65). (International Perspectives on Education and Society; Vol. 29). Emerald. <https://doi.org/10.1108/S1479-367920140000029013>

Peer reviewed version

Link to published version (if available):
[10.1108/S1479-367920140000029013](https://doi.org/10.1108/S1479-367920140000029013)

[Link to publication record in Explore Bristol Research](#)
PDF-document

This is the author accepted manuscript (AAM). The final published version (version of record) is available online via Emerald at <http://www.emeraldinsight.com/doi/abs/10.1108/S1479-367920140000029013>. Please refer to any applicable terms of use of the publisher.

University of Bristol - Explore Bristol Research

General rights

This document is made available in accordance with publisher policies. Please cite only the published version using the reference above. Full terms of use are available:
<http://www.bristol.ac.uk/red/research-policy/pure/user-guides/ebr-terms/>

1
3
5
7
9
11
13
15
17
19
21
23
25
27
29
31
33
35
37
39

PART I
POST-EFA DISCOURSE IN THE
HISTORICAL, STRUCTURAL,
NORMATIVE, AND
GEOPOLITICAL CONTEXTS

Uncorrected Proof

1
3
5
7
9
11
13
15
17
19
21
23
25
27
29
31
33
35
37
39

EDUCATION FOR ALL AS A GLOBAL REGIME OF EDUCATIONAL GOVERNANCE: ISSUES AND TENSIONS

Leon Tikly

ABSTRACT

The chapter traces the genealogy of the Education for All (EFA) Movement understood as a global regime of educational governance between 1990 and 2005. The chapter sets out the achievements of EFA including some success in uniting diverse interests around a common set of goals. It will also discuss the key tensions related to the Northern and Western-led nature of EFA; tensions between the multilateral agencies over the leadership of EFA and the issues associated with the hegemonic status assumed by the World Bank; the tension between a wider EFA agenda and a narrower focus on a few quantifiable targets; and the associated tensions between more economic and rights-based views of EFA. It will be argued that the development of these tensions can be understood in relation to different kinds of power linked to the international political economy and to the impact of other global regimes.

AU:2

Post-Education-for-All and Sustainable Development Paradigm: Structural Changes
with Diversifying Actors and Norms

International Perspectives on Education and Society, Volume 29, 37–65

Copyright © 2016 by Emerald Group Publishing Limited

All rights of reproduction in any form reserved

ISSN: 1479-3679/doi:10.1108/S1479-367920140000029013

INTRODUCTION

The aim in this chapter is to provide an understanding of Education for All (EFA) as an evolving global regime of educational governance. The chapter will outline key historical events in the period between 1990 and 2005 that have been the key in shaping EFA as a movement. It is hoped that such an analysis will provide a useful context for considering other contributions to this volume that deal with more recent developments in EFA in the context of the emerging post-2015 education and development agenda.¹ In developing understanding the chapter will set out the achievements of EFA including the extent to which it has proved successful in uniting diverse interests around a common set of goals as well as on the identification of key tensions. These include the Northern and Western-led nature of EFA both in terms of its governance and its underlying norms and values; tensions between the multilateral agencies over the leadership of EFA and issues associated with the hegemonic status assumed by the World Bank; the tension between a wider EFA agenda and a narrower focus on a few quantifiable targets; associated tensions between more economic and rights-based views of EFA. It will be argued that the development of these tensions can be seen in relation to the exercise of different kinds of power linked to the broader international political economy as well as to the relationship between EFA and other global regimes. The chapter will commence by presenting a conceptual framework for understanding EFA as a global regime of educational governance and in relation to different forms of power. This will provide a basis for a discussion of key events in the development of EFA through which key issues and tensions will be traced.

UNDERSTANDING EFA ARCHITECTURE AS A GLOBAL REGIME OF EDUCATIONAL GOVERNANCE

In seeking to explain the development of EFA the chapter will build on recent work on global governance in the field of international relations (e.g. Barnett & Duvall, 2014; Digwerth & Pattberg, 2006; Mosse, 2005; Orsini, Morin, & Young, 2013; Ruggie, 2014) including a more specialised literature that has sought to apply the concept to education (e.g. Jones, 2005; Mundy & Manion, 2014; Mundy & Murphy, 2001; Mundy & Verger, 2015).

1 In an oft-quoted passage, the UN-endorsed report on global governance
2 provided the following definition:

3 Governance is the sum of many ways individuals and institutions, public and private,
4 manage their common affairs. It is a continuing process through which conflicting or
5 diverse interests may be accommodated and cooperative action may be taken. It includes
6 formal institutions and regimes empowered to enforce compliance, as well as informal
7 arrangements that people and institutions have either agreed to or perceive to be in their
8 interests At a global level, governance has been viewed primarily as intergovernmental
9 relationships, but it must now be understood as also involving nongovernmental
10 organisations, citizens' movements, multinational corporations, and the global capital
11 market. Interacting with these are the global mass media of dramatically enlarged
12 influence. (Commission for Global Governance, 1995 in Mundy & Manion, 2014, p. 41)

13 The idea of global governance has emerged relatively recently as an alternative
14 to the previous, state-centred way of understanding how global issues
15 such as EFA are governed. Mundy and Manion (2014) explain the emergence
16 of the concept in relation to three phenomena that are deeply implicated
17 in the emergence of the EFA architecture. Firstly, the end of the cold
18 war signalled a shift from bilateral to multilateral support for education
19 and other areas of donor assistance. Secondly, the development of contemporary
20 globalisation which has been associated with the opening up of
21 national boundaries, and the strengthening of regional and multilateral
22 institutions that although influenced by national governments (and in particular
23 powerful national governments and alliances of governments) operate
24 with a degree of relative autonomy. Thirdly, as careful scholarship has
25 shown (e.g. Jones, 2006; Jones & Coleman, 2005; Mundy & Verger, 2015),
26 global issues such as EFA are shaped by tensions and contradictions linked
27 to the peculiarities of organisational structure, purpose, norms and values
28 of these institutions as much as they are by overt national or global interests.
29 Important for our discussion, global governance understood in these
30 terms is contested in that the effects of global flows and networks are
31 mediated and modified at the regional and local levels. Significant here has
32 been the emergence of a global civil society that has at times challenged
33 and modified dominant global agendas, and this has had implications for
34 the way that EFA has been shaped (see also, Tikly, 2001).

35 At a theoretical level the end of the cold war and the deepening of globalisation
36 processes have increasingly been explained in terms of constructivist theories
37 of international relations in which shared normative and ideational structures
38 and processes – of which EFA is an example – are seen as influencing the
39 actions of actors at different levels including national governments. Extending
the above, EFA can best be understood

1 as an educational example of a ‘governance regime’. Regimes are com-
2 monly defined as ‘sets of implicit or explicit principles, norms, rules, and
3 decision-making procedures around which actors’ expectations converge in
4 a given area of international relations’ (Orsini et al., 2013, p. 29). In this
5 sense EFA has involved the convergence of key governmental and non-
6 governmental institutions at the global, regional and national levels around
7 a distinct series of international agreements, framework documents, proto-
8 cols and reports as will be discussed. Significantly, as Mundy and Manion
9 (2014) explain, EFA has emerged from previous education and develop-
10 ment regimes (below). It is also the case that EFA sits alongside other
11 regimes. Of significance here, for example, is the regime around the
12 Millennium Development Goals (MDGs); around international assess-
13 ments and educational policy development clustered around the OECD,
14 which continues to have an impact on EFA thinking; regimes concerned
15 with aid effectiveness and regimes in other sectors that have influenced the
16 EFA agenda such as those around the global campaign against HIV/AIDS
17 and those concerning the regulation of global markets. We will return to a
18 consideration of the implications of this in the discussion below.

19 The work of the international relations theorists (Barnett & Duvall,
20 2014) has been found particularly valuable in understanding the tensions at
21 the heart of EFA. These scholars argue that much work on global govern-
22 ance has not included a sustained consideration of power and that ‘this
23 is paradoxical because governance and power are inextricably linked.
24 Governance involves the rules, structures, and institutions that guide, regu-
25 late, and control social life, features that are fundamental elements of
26 power. To account for how global activities are guided and how world
27 orders are produced, therefore, requires careful and explicit analysis of the
28 workings of power’ (p. 2).

29 The authors define power as ‘the production, in and through social rela-
30 tions, of effects that shape the capacities of actors to determine their own
31 circumstances and fate’ (p. 3). They distinguish between different kinds of
32 power that operate within the sphere of international relations. They are
33 each relatively autonomous, linked to different global structures and causal
34 mechanisms with different loci and have causes and effects at different
35 levels and scales. They define *compulsory* power as comprising the relations
36 of interaction that allow one actor to have direct control over another. In
37 the context of the present discussion this is most obvious that it will be
38 argued in the conditionalities that have been attached to aid.

39 A second type of power is *institutional* in which states design interna-
tional institutions in ways that work to their long-term advantage and to

1 the disadvantage of others. In relation to the development of EFA it is
2 manifested in the historical dominance of the interests of powerful,
3 Western nations in the governance structures of global financial institutions
4 such as the World Bank (e.g. Jones, 2005, 2006). Similarly, the OECD
5 which has been influential, as we will see in the development of EFA dis-
6 course, is made up of an exclusive club of highly industrialised countries.
7 EFA discourses, it will be suggested, are also the outcome of contestation
8 between different institutions and between multilateral organisations and
9 global civil society each wielding different amounts of institutional power.

10 Barnett and Duval also identify *structural* power, which concerns the
11 constitution of social capacities and interests of actors in direct relation to
12 one another. One expression of this form of power is the working of the
13 global capitalist economy, in producing unequal social relations of produc-
14 tion between capital and labour. Class relationships of dominance and
15 subordination in international relationships also intersect in complex ways
16 with those of gender and race (Rupert, 2014). Although less obvious to
17 observe empirically in relation to the development of EFA, an understand-
18 ing of structural power is nonetheless fundamental for understanding the
19 wider political global economy against which the development of EFA
20 must be understood. Although a detailed discussion of the nature of struc-
21 tural power is beyond the scope of the present chapter, reference will be
22 made to deeper analyses of the relationship between education and the
23 global political economy that have been undertaken elsewhere (see,
24 e.g. Robertson et al., 2007; Tikly, 2003, 2004).

25 Finally, *productive* power is the socially diffused production of subjectiv-
26 ity in systems of meaning and signification including the way that 'develop-
27 ment' itself is defined and understood. As with structural power the
28 workings of productive power are less obvious than those of compulsory
29 and institutional power but no less important than other kinds of power
30 for understanding how the identities of different actors are constituted and
31 the policies of different institutions are discursively framed. In the sections
32 below, it will be argued that the underlying view of education and develop-
33 ment informing EFA has been informed by dominant economic discourses
34 on the one hand and by rights-based discourses on the other.

35 Importantly for our analysis the different forms of power do not operate
36 in isolation from each other but interact. Thus, for example, the ability for
37 governments or groups of governments to exercise compulsory power
38 over other governments relies on the extent of institutional power within
39 institutions that preside over global governance regimes and indeed to the
relative power exercised by competing institutions in the context of specific

regimes. Institutional power is in turn linked to how ruling coalitions within national governments are positioned in relation to global markets. Productive power can be seen to operate in and through different 'epistemic communities' (Haas, 1992) clustered around different disciplinary understandings of education and development that can inform the workings and programmes of different institutions sometimes in contradictory ways.

THE GENEALOGY OF EFA AS A GLOBAL REGIME OF EDUCATIONAL GOVERNANCE

The focus of this section is on tracing the genealogy of EFA as a regime of global governance. The section will be organised around discussion of key events including the Jomtien and Dakar conferences on EFA in the so-called decade of conferences which set out the vision of EFA in a series of principles; the DAC/OECD framework and millennium summit which endorsed the use of time-bound targets as a means for holding governments and donors to account for delivering on EFA; the Fast Track Initiative (later to evolve into a Global Partnership for Education) which provided a mechanism for donors to pool resources around key EFA priorities and the Rome and Paris Declarations and protocols which set out a series of principles relating to aid effectiveness. A rich literature describing the key moments in the emergence of the EFA architecture already exists and has been useful for the present discussion. The aim here is not to repeat this rich history in detail. Rather, as suggested in the introduction it is to identify key tensions that have characterised EFA and to relate these to a consideration of the influence of different kinds of power.

Before proceeding to a discussion of events pivotal to the development of EFA it is important to provide some historical context. As many commentators have pointed out, EFA needs to be seen against the background of the wider shift in development thinking between the so-called Washington and post-Washington consensuses. The emergence of EFA needs to be set against the crisis of the so-called Washington consensus and the emergence of the post-Washington consensus. Much has been written about this shift (see e.g. Robertson et al., 2007). The Washington consensus can be seen as a response to the global economic crisis of the 1970s and was influenced by the spread of neo-liberal thinking linked to the rise of Thatcherism in the United Kingdom and Reaganism in the United States. At the heart of neoliberalism is the idea of rolling back the state, increasing

1 the role for the private sector and liberalising trade. More specifically, and in
2 relation to the low-income world, the Washington consensus was linked to
3 the introduction of Stabilisation and Structural Adjustment Policies (SAPs)
4 by the World Bank and IMF. SAPs linked lending to low-income countries
5 to conditionalities. In Barnett and Duvall's (2014) terms this equates to the
6 use of compulsory power by the international financial institutions to impose
7 aid conditionalities on low-income countries. In public services including
8 health and education these conditionalities generally amounted to the intro-
9 duction of user fees, privatisation and decentralisation. The underlying ratio-
10 nale was that these measures would make services more accountable to the
11 public and drive up the quality of services through encouraging diversifica-
12 tion and competition between service providers. However, SAPs had disas-
13 trous consequences for the poor (Samoff, 1994). The introduction of user
14 fees, for example, led to a decline in enrolments in many low-income coun-
15 tries. As some commentators have argued, the growth in the overall levels of
16 poverty and inequality associated with the imposition of SAPs can be seen as
17 an expression of structural power in the global economy as these policies
18 were seen to work in the interests of global and national elites rather than
19 those of the poor (see Tikly, 2003, p. 4; Robertson et al., 2007; Rupert, 2014).

AU:3

20 The period also saw a realignment in the balance of institutional
21 power linked to growing criticisms of the World Bank/IMF Washington
22 Consensus reforms from a variety of sources from the United Nations insti-
23 tutions to civil society organisations and NGOs in the global North and
24 South (Cornia, 2001; Walton & Seddon, 1994). Some of these tensions have
25 their roots in historical differences between a more economist approach to
26 development embraced by the international financial institutions on the one
27 hand and the more rights-based approach adopted by the UN agencies and
28 many NGOs on the other hand. There was also a mounting evidence from
29 cross-national studies as to the failure of SAPs to address poverty. It was
30 argued that structural adjustment policies were undermining the capacity of
31 low-income countries to ensure stability and social cohesion and to provide
32 for the most vulnerable sections of society. The call for 'adjustment with a
33 human face' (Cornia, 2001) represented a challenge to the international
34 financial institutions and the failure of SAPs to either reduce poverty and
35 inequality or to achieve sustained economic growth in low-income countries.

36 For their part, the global financial institutions blamed the failure of SAPs
37 on poor governance including inefficiency, mismanagement, over-centralised
38 services and corruption. The emerging so-called post-Washington consensus
39 thus emphasised poverty alleviation through providing a safety net for
the poorest, a greater emphasis on social cohesion and the need for 'good

1 governance' including great accountability of governments in the use of
2 public funds and decentralisation. At the heart of the realignment of institu-
3 tional power in the context of the shift to the post-Washington consensus was
4 a closer coming together of the major multilateral agencies including the
5 various UN agencies and the international financial institutions around a
6 common commitment to poverty reduction which came to be seen as synon-
7 ymous with development itself (Robertson et al., 2007).

8 There was also a greater recognition of the significance of civil society
9 organisations and NGOs in human development through their role in pro-
10 moting social capital. From 1999 Poverty Reduction Strategy Programmes
11 (PRSPs) began to replace SAPs as the IMF/World Bank mechanism to
12 develop national policy agreements. PRSPs were supposed to be 'country-
13 driven' and thus would promote strong national ownership of development
14 strategies including broad and active involvement of civil society. They
15 were also 'result orientated' with a clear focus on benefiting the poor, 'com-
16 prehensive' in their understanding of the multidimensional nature of pov-
17 erty, 'partnership oriented' involving careful coordination between all the
18 different stakeholders and donors and 'long term' with a view to addressing
19 poverty reduction. In educational terms PRSPs were linked to the removal
20 of user fees for basic education to encourage access for the poorest and to
21 a continued emphasis on decentralisation and privatisation and the priorit-
22 isation of Universal Primary Education. The post-Washington consensus in
23 education as in other spheres thus provided both a degree of continuity
24 and change on the Washington consensus. It also demonstrated despite the
25 realignment in power the continuing influence/hegemony of the global
26 financial institutions within the field of education and development.

27 The emergence of EFA needs to be understood against this broader
28 background. Education was seen by the World Bank as central to poverty
29 alleviation through its role in promoting economic growth. In addition,
30 education, particularly for girls, was also perceived to have other benefits
31 including improved health and a reduction in fertility rates (Robertson
32 et al., 2007). There was also an emerging sense of global collective responsi-
33 bility for access to basic education not just for the purposes of economic
34 development but also as a universal human right. The Bank's commitment
35 to Universal Primary Education (UPE), which came to lie at the heart of
36 EFA, in fact emerged during the Washington Consensus era. The negative
37 effects of SAPs on enrolments proved to be a source of contradiction with
38 the goals of UPE. From the 1990s, however, and in the context of the post-
39 Washington consensus, funding for UPE began to be represented more as
40 an issue for donors and the international community as much as for

1 national governments. This shift in thinking from education being seen pri-
3 marily as a national concern to one that lay at the centre of the interna-
5 tional development agenda provided the basis for the emergence of EFA as
7 a global regime of educational governance.

7 JOMTIEN AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE 9 EFA VISION

11 The origin of the concept of EFA is generally associated with the World
13 Conference on Education for All (WCEFA) in Jomtien in 1990 which resulted
15 in the *World Declaration on Education for All* and a *Framework for Action to*
17 *Meet Basic Learning Needs* (Inter-Agency Commission, 1990). The WCEFA
19 was one of seven World Conferences held during the 1990s, the others being
21 in the areas of children (New York, September 1990); environment (Rio de
23 Janeiro, 1992); human rights (Vienna, 1993); population (Cairo, 1994); social
25 development (Copenhagen, 1995); women (Beijing, 1995); human settlements
(Istanbul, 1996); food security (Rome, 1996) and climate change (Kyoto,
1997). The conference was attended by some 1,500 participants, representing
national and multinational donor agencies, national governments, inter-
governmental and non-governmental organisations, the education research
community as well as specialists in other sectors (Buchert, 1995).

The Declaration stipulated the goal of EFA as attainable by 2000 and
listed the strategies by which to reach it. The goal was rooted in the follow-
ing principles:

- Education as a fundamental right;
- The importance of education for a safer, healthier, more prosperous and environmentally sound world and for social, economic and cultural progress, tolerance and International cooperation;
- The importance of education for personal and social improvement;
- The value and validity of traditional knowledge and indigenous cultural heritage in their own rights and as a promoter of development;
- The deficiency of the current provision of education in terms of quantity, quality and relevance and
- The recognition that sounds basic education is fundamental to the strengthening of higher levels of education and a scientific and technological literacy and capacity and thus to self-reliant development stipulated the goal of EFA as attainable by the year 2000 and listed the strategies by which to reach it.

The framework for action suggested six dimensions rather than specific targets or goals, and these are set out in Table 1. The seeds of many of the tensions at the heart of EFA were present at the outset in the WCEFA. Firstly, in terms of the balance of institutional power within the emerging

Table 1. Jomtien and Dakar Goals Compared.

AU:6

1990–2000: Jomtien	2000–2015: Dakar
1. Expansion of early childhood care and development activities, including family and community interventions, especially for poor, disadvantaged and disabled children.	1. Expanding and improving comprehensive early childhood care and education, especially for the most vulnerable and disadvantaged children.
2. Universal access to, and completion of, primary education (or whatever higher level of education is considered as ‘basic’) by the year 2000.	2. Ensuring that by 2015 all children, particularly girls, children in difficult circumstances and those belonging to ethnic minorities, have access to and complete free and compulsory primary education of good quality.
3. Improvement in learning achievement such that an agreed percentage of an appropriate age cohort (e.g. 80% 14-year-olds) attains or surpasses a defined level of necessary learning achievement.	3. Ensuring that the learning needs of all young people and adults are met through equitable access to appropriate learning and life skills programmes.
4. Reduction in the adult illiteracy rate (the appropriate age cohort to be determined in each country) to, say, one-half its 1990 level by the year 2000, with sufficient emphasis on female literacy to significantly reduce the current disparity between the male and female illiteracy rates.	4. Achieving a 50% improvement in levels of adult literacy by 2015, especially for women, and equitable access to basic and continuing education for all adults.
5. Expansion of provision of basic education and training in other essential skills required by youth and adults, with programme effectiveness assessed in terms behavioural changes and impacts on health, employment and productivity.	5. Eliminating gender disparities in primary and secondary education by 2015, with a focus on ensuring girls’ full and equal access to and achievement in basic education of good quality.
6. Increased acquisition by individuals and families of the knowledge, skills and values required for better living and sound and sustainable development, made available through all educational channels including the mass media, other forms of modern and traditional communication, and social action, with effectiveness assessed in terms of behavioural change.	6. Improving all aspects of the quality of education and ensuring excellence of all so that recognised and measurable learning outcomes are achieved by all, especially in literacy, numeracy and essential life skills.

Source: Torres (2001).

1 aid architecture, although the Jomtien conference included a wide range of
2 stakeholders from Northern and Southern countries, it was still primarily
3 Northern-led. As King has put it:

5 If we were to summarize the role of southern governments, researchers and NGOs in
6 affecting substantially the content of the Jomtien Declaration and Framework for
7 Action, it was minor, if not minimal. Of course, key personnel were included in the
8 international steering group, there were regional meetings held in southern capitals to
9 discuss particular drafts, and there were NGO partners and government representatives
10 in most of the official national delegations. But the core drafting personnel were drawn
11 from the multilateral agencies. What national governments actually thought about the
12 excision from the global education agenda of secondary, technical and vocational edu-
13 cation and training, and higher education is not recorded in the Declaration or the
14 Framework. The mere fact of its being a World Conference at which 155 national dele-
15 gations were present is judged to be sufficient to suggest that the Jomtien agenda was
16 widely shared across the world—which it almost certainly was not. (King, 2007, p. 380)

17 The limited role of Southern governments in formulating the Jomtien EFA
18 agenda has led King to question the extent to which the agenda can be con-
19 sidered to be truly ‘owned’ by Southern countries. Secondly, although
20 Jomtien was jointly sponsored by five multilateral agencies, it was the
21 World Bank that assumed a dominant position in relation to the WCEFA
22 reflected in the appointment of Wadi Haddad, formerly of the World
23 Bank’s central education policy department into the position of chief execu-
24 tive (Jones & Coleman, 2005; King, 2007). The dominance of the World
25 Bank was reflected in its role in the lead up to WCEFA in developing and
26 championing a shared vision drawing on its own work over several decades
27 on the role of basic education as a key to national development.

28 However, although there was an agreement that EFA should focus on a
29 notion of ‘basic education’ and on ‘basic learning needs’ there were differ-
30 ences in the way that these were interpreted. UNESCO, building on earlier
31 conceptualisations of community education, championed an expanded
32 understanding of basic education to embrace early childhood education,
33 primary education, basic secondary and vocational education as well as
34 adult literacy. For the World Bank and UNICEF the focus was very much
35 on primary education and it was this focus that became increasingly
36 dominant throughout the EFA period, reflected, for example, in the
37 MDGs (below).

38 The emphasis on primary education as the best way of linking education
39 and development persisted despite the preferences of many low-income
country governments and arguments about the importance of post-primary
education (see Birdsall, 1996; Hayman, 2005; Palmer, 2006; Post et al.,

2004; Tikly, 2003). One explanation of this continuing emphasis on primary education may be found in the methodologies and associated funding policies of the World Bank. The rates-of-return analyses pioneered by Psacharopoulos (1985) showed that the rates of return to investments in primary education were higher than those from investing in vocational or tertiary education, and these analyses drove Bank lending policy in education increasingly from 1980 onward. The influence of rates-of-return analysis on setting the global education agenda can be seen in Barnett and Duvall's (2014) terms as a specific example of the exercise of 'productive power', that is as the dominance in discursive terms of a particular conception of education and economic growth. In the 1980s lending to the primary sector made up 18.9% of bank funding to education; in the 1990s it made up 35.6% and in 2001, 45%. The corresponding figures for vocational post-secondary education, for instance, were 25.1%, 7.5% and 8.1% for the respective periods (Robertson et al., 2007). The dominance of this kind of analysis and reasoning is recognised both by those in the World Bank who supported and promoted it (see Psacharopoulos, 1994, 2006; Psacharopoulos & Patrinos, 2004) and by those who criticised and opposed it (see Heyneman, 2003).

DAC/OECD REPORT ON 'SHAPING THE 21ST CENTURY'

By 1996 and the EFA mid-term conference in Amman it was already clear that EFA would not be achieved by 2000. During the same year the Development Assistance Committee (DAC) of the Organisation of Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) published a report entitled 'Shaping the 21st Century: The Contribution of Development Cooperation' (OECD/DAC, 1996). Its purpose was to synthesise the lessons learned for the first seven world congresses (above). The significance of the report for the emerging EFA regime was that it reinforced the idea of time-bound development targets that pre-figured the MDGs. The ideas of a general time-bound education target to achieve EFA had previously been championed by UNICEF and was reflected in the Jomtien Framework for Action (above). For the most part, however, the six dimensions of EFA were presented more in the form of guidelines rather than measurable targets. In this sense the intervention of the OECD can be seen as a key moment in the development of productive power linked to an

1 economistic view of education and development. The two targets that
2 related to education were:

- 3 • Universal primary education by 2015
- 5 • Demonstrated progress towards gender equality and the empowerment
7 of women by eliminating gender disparity in primary and secondary
education by 2005.

9 As with most of the other development targets in the report the date for
achieving UPE was set at 2015. The setting of the gender target at 2005 can
11 be seen as a consequence of the development of the gender equity target
within a different regime of global governance involving overlapping but
13 different actors and institutions than those involved in EFA concerned
with gender equity (King, 2007; Unterhalter, 2013). The targets provide
15 continuity on themes that began to emerge in Jomtien. For example, it
reinforces the Northern-led nature of EFA and the use of compulsory
17 power. Thus whilst the report contains much rhetoric about the need for
partnership between Northern and Southern countries in achieving human
19 development the report goes on to add that the targets

AU:4

21 ... represent only a proposal of what we as donors consider to be helpful measures of
progress to inspire effective development cooperation. Their achievement will require
agreement and commitment from developing country partners, through their own
23 national goals and locally-owned strategies. (OECD/DAC, 1996, p. 9)

AU:5

25 As Robertson et al. (2007) argue, the power relations between donors and
low-income countries implied here are clear. Whilst the targets are
27 presented as only a proposal of what 'we as donors consider helpful', it is
difficult to imagine them being resisted by the recipients of aid, whose con-
29 tribution will be 'agreement and commitment through their own national
goals' (see also King, 2007).

31 In terms of the conceptualisation of EFA the report contributed to the
narrowing of the EFA agenda to focus on UPE in keeping with the domi-
33 nant view of EFA within the World Bank. In this sense the report provides
an important milestone in the development of productive power linked to
35 an economistic discourse. As King and Rose (2005) have argued, as so
often happens in the setting of international policy objectives, the more
measurable, quantitative goals take precedence over the other factors that
37 the OECD/DAC Report also sought to emphasise, including the need for a
highly context-dependent approach which 'gives a very different feel from
39 the one-size-fits-all shape of the IDTs' (p. 364). The report in fact argued
that 'these goals must be pursued country-by-country through individual

approaches that reflect local conditions and locally owned strategies' (OECD/DAC, 1996, p. 2). It argued that there were a whole series of 'qualitative factors' that were 'essential to the attainment of these measurable goals' (OECD/DAC, 1996, p. 2). These included capacity development for democratic governance, human rights and the rule of law. These critical qualifications of the quantitative targets get completely side-lined in the presentation of the new 'global development partnership effort' around the six 'realisable' goals (OECD/DAC, 1996, p. 2).

THE DAKAR FRAMEWORK FOR ACTION

The Dakar Framework for Action and EFA targets were agreed at the World Education Forum, held in Dakar, Senegal in 2000. The event was organised by the International Consultative Forum on Education for All (the EFA Forum), a body created in 1991 to monitor EFA and composed of representatives of the five international agencies that sponsored the initiative – UNESCO, UNICEF, UNDP, UNFPA and the World Bank – and of bilateral cooperation agencies, governments and NGOs, as well as by some education specialists. Like Jomtien, over a thousand people, representing governments, civil society and international agencies, attended the Forum. The purpose was to present the global results of the evaluation of the Decade of 'Education for All' (EFA) launched in Jomtien and to adopt a new Framework for Action in order to continue the task. As was already evident half way through the decade, the six goals set in Jomtien for the year 2000 had not been met. Thus, the Framework for Action adopted in Dakar basically 'reaffirmed' the vision of the goals laid down in Jomtien, but extended them for another 15 years, until 2015 reflecting the time frame for the DAC/OECD targets (once again with the exception of the gender targets). Table 1 compares the Dakar and Jomtien targets).

UNESCO was given responsibility by the Forum for monitoring progress towards the Dakar goals. UNESCO has developed a whole infrastructure to monitor progress towards the Dakar Goals and MDGs including the High-Level Group (HLG) on EFA, Working Group (WG) on EFA and International Advisory Panel (IAP) on EFA. It has convened regular meetings of these entities to review EFA progress based on the EFA Global Monitoring Report (GMR), which is submitted annually to the Director-general of UNESCO. The report is translated into 11 languages and widely disseminated. It is written to appeal to a range of stakeholders,

1 although there is some evidence that it is more widely read by members
of the donor community than by national governments (King, 2007).
3 Nonetheless, the GMR has played a significant role over the years in the
development of a more nuanced view of EFA. Through the use of increas-
5 ingly sophisticated statistical analysis and the commissioning of numerous
background papers by leading experts in the field of education and devel-
7 opment, the GMR has played an intellectual leadership role in relation to
EFA. Rather than simply reporting development in achieving targets, the
9 GMR has also attempted to set the agenda in key areas through the use of
thematised annual publications. As such the reports can be interpreted as
11 an example of the development of productive power linked to a rights-
based discourse.

13 There are several points relating to the composition of the Dakar Forum
that are relevant for understanding the structure of the EFA architecture.
15 Firstly, the conference was characterised by in-fighting between the key
sponsoring agencies particularly between UNESCO and UNICEF. In
17 terms of institutional power dynamics it reflected open competition
between the multilateral organisations over leadership of global education
19 and the EFA regime in particular. Whilst UNICEF resented the fact that
governments had endorsed UNESCO's leadership role over EFA,
21 UNESCO resented that the UN had given UNICEF leadership over educa-
tion for girls. Each institution was also dismissive of the technical capabil-
23 ities of the other. The only institution that appeared to not have problems
with its identity was the World Bank that maintained its relative position
25 of hegemony within the sponsoring organisations (Jones & Coleman, 2005;
Torres, 2001). Like Jomtien, the Forum was also Northern dominated.
27 As Torres argued at the time:

29 One salient feature (which was noted with displeasure by several national delegations)
was the overbearing presence of functionaries from international agencies at the confer-
31 ence as a whole and on the various panels and committees, especially the two most
important and most coveted: the Drafting Committee and the 'Futures Group'. The lat-
33 ter was charged with suggesting mechanisms for following up the commitments made at
the Forum up until 2015. (2001, p. 1)

35 Of the governments and NGOs present from Southern countries, there was
a further imbalance in that some regions including Latin America and
37 South Asia were particularly under-represented. Furthermore, as King
(2007) has pointed out, only one plenary speech was made by a representa-
39 tive of a low-income country, namely the president of Senegal. All the other

1 speakers were either from the multilateral agencies, representatives of global civil society or of donor countries.

3 Interestingly, in terms of the view of global governance presented earlier, the emerging concept of EFA was contested. During the same
5 week as the Dakar conference, an 'alternative' EFA event, the International Consultation of NGOs was held immediately before Dakar.
7 The Consultation was organised by the NGOs belonging to the Global Campaign for Education launched in 1999 by two international NGOs,
9 Oxfam and ActionAid and later joined by Education International (EI), the international confederation of teacher organisations. This campaign,
11 was critical of the work done by the EFA movement during the 1990s and put forward its own *Global Action Plan* to achieve EFA. Some of those
13 who took part in the NGO event also participated in the official conference, a number of them fulfilling important functions at it. As Mundy and
15 Murphy's (2001) research showed at the time, some of the claims were met. Amongst these were inclusion of the wording 'free' education; endorsement
17 of the idea of national educational forums and an expanded definition of education that includes commitment to early childhood education and
19 adult literacy and, a commitment to annual high-level EFA review meetings. The campaigners did not wield sufficient compulsory power, however,
21 to realise their more further-reaching goals including a clear commitment of resources by rich country governments including minimum investment
23 targets and a new international funding mechanism for education development under joint International Organisation, government and civil south
25 oversight. Despite its (limited) achievements, the Global Campaign for Education along with the overall role of NGOs in Dakar was subject to
27 criticism by Southern-based NGOs for putting forward a Northern-led agenda. As Mundy and Murphy argued 'the overall pattern of relationships
29 among NGOs at Dakar tended to mimic the structure of the centre-periphery relations in the world system, in which Northern actors play
31 leadership roles' (2001, p. 123).

In terms of how EFA was conceptualised as a result of the Dakar process, it is clear from the comparison of goals between Jomtien and Dakar
33 in Table 1 that there was a degree of continuity between the two reflecting some success on the part of UNESCO in (re-) asserting a more holistic
35 view of basic education, a move also supported by many of the NGOs present. Interestingly, the goals also show a subtle shift towards the notion
37 of education quality linked to improved learning outcomes, particularly in literacy and numeracy. As will be discussed in other contributions to the
39 current volume, this is significant in terms of the subsequent move towards

the notion of ‘access plus quality’ at the heart of current debates about EFA. Although the increased emphasis on quality was presented as a complementary goal to that of achieving increases in access, Dakar also foreshadowed a growing tension between access and quality at the heart of the MDGs as will be discussed below.

THE MILLENNIUM DEVELOPMENT GOALS AS THE DOMINANT MANIFESTATION OF EFA

A key point of reference that has become inextricably associated with EFA are the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). These arose in the context of a different but overlapping global regime of governance, namely that associated with the *Millennium Declaration* that was agreed at the Millennium Summit in New York in 2000 which followed five months after the Dakar conference. The process by which the actual MDGs were developed occurred through the Millennium Project, an agency especially set up for this purpose. Task forces were created for each of the goals, and they issued background papers, interim reports and a summary report a few years later for the MDG + 5 UN summit which followed up on progress on each of the MDGs.

The two MDGs that relate to education are:

MDG 2: Ensure that, by 2015, children everywhere, boys and girls alike, will be able to complete a full course of primary schooling.

MDG 3: Eliminate gender disparity in primary and secondary education, preferably by 2005, and in all levels of education no later than 2015.

From our point of view, the way that the MDGs have been developed and implemented have had profound implications for the nature of EFA as a regime of global educational governance. Firstly, although the MDGs arose from the Millennium Declaration and Summit processes they were actually developed and refined by working groups within the UN and are narrower in scope than the Declaration. Secondly, given that the education MDGs in particular represent such a narrowing of scope compared to the Dakar Framework, it is easy to conclude that in terms of institutional power, UNESCO had less of an influence in their formulation than it had on the Dakar and Jomtien goals (King, 2007). Thirdly, as with the other events seminal to the development of EFA, although the MDGs

(along with the Dakar Framework) clearly enjoy considerable support across large sections of the international development community including many donors and NGOs, there remain issues of Northern dominance in the process of defining the MDGs and a concomitant lack of Southern ownership. As several commentators have observed, it is often difficult to reconcile the realisation of the specific MDG targets with national development priorities (Hayman, 2007; King, 2004, 2007; King & Rose, 2006). In her study of the Rwandan education sector, for example, Hayman has pointed to the real tensions between investing in basic education to fulfil the MDGs and in other sectors of education including higher education to realise other national development priorities (see also Tikly, 2003). As King (2007) points out, further evidence of the Northern-led nature of the MDG process is that whereas all of the goals relation to low-income countries are time-bound, the one goal relating to commitments from Northern countries is not time-bound.

In terms of how the MDGs as a related but separate global regime of governance have impacted on EFA, it is possible to conclude the following. Firstly, as alluded to above, the education MDGs represent a considerable narrowing of focus compared to the Dakar Framework but yet became the major focal point for how the aspirations of EFA subsequently became interpreted in popular and policy discourse. MDG 2, which relates to access to education is focused on the achievement of UPE which provides continuity on earlier World Bank discourses relating to UPE for the 1980s. Secondly, there has been a very real tension between the rhetoric of the MDGs and the ability of governments to realise them. By 2005 the gender MDG had been the first to be missed. This in turn highlights the often substantial differences in capacity between countries in achieving the MDGs. It was this observation relatively early on in the process which was to lead donors to establish the Fact Track Initiative (below).

More fundamentally the above tension highlights a contradiction between the focus of the MDGs on social indicators of development and the reality that that many low-income countries do not have the economic means of achieving them due to their positioning on the periphery of the global economy. This is linked to inequalities in institutional power between rich and poor countries in terms of their influence on global regimes concerned with the regulation of global trade and finance that have a major impact on the capacity of African governments to implement favourable macroeconomic and fiscal policy (see e.g. Ndikumana, 2014). This has implications for EFA as an educational regime of governance and in particular the need to consider EFA and other social regimes such as the

1 MDGs as part of a wider ‘regime complex’ (Orsini et al., 2013) that
2 includes regimes linked to global economic regulation. It also draws atten-
3 tion to an aspect of the MDGs and of donor support for education in gen-
4 eral that there is a tendency for donor aid linked to the MDGs to foster
5 dependency. In some countries, donor support for education makes up
6 more than 50% of the education budget raising real concerns about the
7 extent to which it fosters local leadership on the one hand and is sustain-
8 able in the long term on the other (King, 2007).

9 A final point relates to the tension implicit in MDG 3 between the rea-
10 lisation of gender parity through equal enrolments and the more far reach-
11 ing goal of gender equity that Subrahmanian (2005) describes in terms of
12 gender rights to, in and through education. That is to say, that there has
13 been a tension in the EFA project between basic access to education (impli-
14 cit in the emphasis on UPE) and the experiences of girls once they are in
15 school. That includes forms of discrimination that deny them equal access
16 to parts of the curriculum and sexualised violence (see e.g. Milligan, 2014).
17 Denial of girls access to a good quality education has contributed to
18 unequal educational outcomes between girls and boys. In explaining this
19 phenomenon Unterhalter (2013) draws attention to the historical discon-
20 nect between networks dedicated to gender equity within the MDG regime
21 and those associated with education, and this point is also taken up below
22 whilst DeJaeghere draws attention to the differential ability of many
23 country-level NGOs to advance issues of gender justice both at a national
24 and at a global level in relation to the MDGs (Dejaeghere, Parks, & **AU:7**
25 Unterhalter, 2013).

29 **THE FAST TRACK INITIATIVE**

31 The Education for All Fast Track Initiative (FTI) emerged from the com-
32 mitment made at the Dakar World Education Forum (WEF) in 2000 to a
33 Global Initiative. This was initiated by NGOs and supported by UNESCO,
34 with the aim of holding donors to account with respect to mobilisation of
35 additional technical and financial resources needed to accelerate progress
36 towards the EFA goals. In particular, its aim was to ensure that donors
37 would fulfil their commitment made at the WEF that ‘No countries ser-
38 iously committed to EFA will be thwarted in their achievement of this goal
39 by a lack of resources’. Further motivation was provided by another global
regime, this time the Monterrey Consensus in 2002, at which ministers of

1 finance indicated that they were committed to substantially increasing over-
2 seas development assistance (ODA) (Rose, 2005). Concerns that UNESCO
3 lacked the capacity and confidence of key bilateral donors to lead the
4 Global Initiative, resulted in the World Bank taking on a coordinating
5 role, with a shift from a 'Global' to a 'Fast Track' Initiative (Rose, 2003).
6 As a consequence, an FTI Secretariat was established within the World
7 Bank, with the support of other donors. The FTI was launched in April
8 2002. Despite strong political commitment, initial pledges to the FTI were
9 limited due to concerns over the perceived centralised nature and lack of
10 clarity about the purpose of the initiative (below). Following changes to
11 the structure and with the adoption of the Framework Agreement in 2004,
12 however, pledges began to rise. In keeping with debates about aid effective-
13 ness, countries were invited to join if they were judged to have in place a
14 robust education sector development plan. In this way the FTI was
15 designed to 'reward' countries that prioritised basic education in keeping
16 with the MDGs. The FTI was organised around a 'Virtual Fund' which
17 incorporated donor countries existing bilateral arrangements with recipient
18 countries and a 'Catalytic Fund' that was intended to benefit 'donor
19 orphans', (i.e. countries that had five donors or fewer contributing
20 \$1 million per year to the education sector) and was targeted at building
21 capacity within the education sector that would enable them to develop
22 credible education plans.

23 From the point of view of understanding EFA as a global regime of edu-
24 cational governance, it is quite clear that the initiative provided continuity
25 on previous themes whilst also signalling new directions in the structure of
26 EFA as well as in the norms and values that underpinned it. As with pre-
27 vious initiatives and in terms of the dynamics of institutional power there
28 was considerable in-fighting between the multilateral agencies over initial
29 control of the FTI and as with previous initiatives it was the World Bank
30 that proved hegemonic. The FTI was often perceived by the other agencies
31 as a 'World Bank Programme' (Bermingham, 2011; Jones & Coleman,
32 2005). Indeed, UNESCO only became a member of the FTI steering com-
33 mittee in 2004 but was not formally involved in decision-making processes
34 at the trust fund meetings. UNICEF was only invited to join the steering
35 committee in 2006.

36 Contests over the nature and direction of FTI were not only horizontal,
37 between multilateral agencies but also involved vertical struggles between
38 the World Bank and individual country donors and with civil society orga-
39 nisations and networks at country and global level. There was from the
40 outset considerable confusion about the purpose of the FTI. Seventeen

1 countries were invited to join the partnership, but there was no commit-
2 ment at the time for member countries to commit substantial amounts of
3 money. Part of this confusion revolved around the issue of whether it
4 should become a Global Fund for Education to match the Global Fund to
5 Fight Aids, TB and Malaria (GFATM) which was being developed at the
6 same time. From the perspective of the present chapter this is another
7 example of how global regimes need to be understood in relation to other
8 global regimes, this time around health. Initially, many leaders were reluc-
9 tant to support an initiative which remained conceptually vague.

10 There were also tensions at the outset between the World Bank and
11 some leading donors including DfID who objected to the centralised nature
12 of the initiative that it was claimed would undermine local decision-
13 making. This led eventually to the devolution of country-level endorsement
14 for joining the Fund to the local donor group who would assess the viabi-
15 lity of the education sector plan against international benchmarks. In
16 exchange, local donor groups were expected to contribute more to their
17 existing bilateral programmes. There were also concerns that the fund
18 through only providing support to countries with already developed educa-
19 tion plans, marginalised those that had traditionally not received donor
20 support and the fact that it did not address the needs of the so-called 'big
21 five' countries (Pakistan, Bangladesh, Nigeria, the Democratic Republic of
22 Congo and Sudan) where more than half the children out of school lived.
23 This in turn led to the development of the Virtual Fund which incorporated
24 donors existing bilateral programmes and the World Bank managed
25 Catalytic Fund which provided capacity building support to 'donor
26 orphan' countries (see above). The adoption of a common framework in
27 2004 led to increases in donor support and by 2005 the FTI was judged to
28 be having more of a positive effect at country level. A consensus emerged
29 between donors that the FTI provided a means for increased donor coordi-
30 nation, alignment and harmonisation in keeping with debates about aid
31 effectiveness and the Paris Declaration (below). Indeed, the FTI received
32 endorsements by the G8 and the UN Millennium Summit in 2005.

33 As with previous initiatives, global civil society also played a role in
34 shaping the FTI at key junctures. The Global Campaign for Education
35 played a leading advocacy role in the establishment of the FTI. The Make
36 Poverty History Campaign and the concerted civil society campaigns
37 around the G8 summit at Gleneagles in 2005 were also influential in re-
38 invigorating donor commitments to the FTI. Also characteristic of earlier
39 events in the development of EFA was the subordinate role played by low-
income countries and governments. Even after responsibility for evaluating

country plans had been devolved to country level they continued to be evaluated against global benchmarks that provided a disciplinary mechanism by which largely Northern donors could coerce national governments in the global South towards prioritising global agendas – in this case a narrowed down version of the MDGs – which at times, as we have seen are at odds with national development agendas that may involve investing in a more balanced way across different sub-sectors of education. This can be seen as an example of the use of compulsory power, albeit in more subtle form than was the case with the imposition of SAPs.

THE ROME AND PARIS DECLARATIONS ON AID EFFECTIVENESS

Discussion of the FTI draws attention to a key set of issues and tensions that have characterised EFA since inception, namely those surrounding ‘aid effectiveness’. For example, attempts were made to align the FTI with the principles of aid effectiveness and donor harmonisation that were emerging from the first high-level donor forum in Rome (OECD/DAC, 2003). The Rome Declaration listed the following priority actions:

- that development assistance be delivered based on the priorities and timing of the countries receiving it;
- that donor efforts concentrate on delegating cooperation and increasing the flexibility of staff on country programmes and projects;
- and, that good practice be encouraged and monitored, backed by analytic work to help strengthen the leadership that recipient countries can take in determining their development path.

The Second High-Level Forum resulted in the Paris Declaration (2005) which was an important landmark in the development of the discourse around aid effectiveness. It presented itself as ‘a practical, action-oriented roadmap to improve the quality of aid and its impact on development’. It provided a series of specific implementation measures and established a monitoring system to assess progress and ensure that donors and recipients hold each other accountable for their commitments. The Paris Declaration outlined the following five principles for making aid more effective:

1. *Ownership*: Developing countries set their own strategies for poverty reduction, improve their institutions and tackle corruption.

2. *Alignment*: Donor countries align behind these objectives and use local systems.
3. *Harmonisation*: Donor countries coordinate, simplify procedures and share information to avoid duplication.
4. *Results*: Developing countries and donors shift focus to development results and results get measured.
5. *Mutual accountability*: Donors and partners are accountable for development results.

Although it has been followed up by the more recent Accra and Busan high-level meetings discussion of which is beyond the scope of the present chapter, it is fair to say that the Paris Declaration was pivotal in shaping the current debate on aid effectiveness. In terms of our analysis the principles of aid effectiveness constitute like the MDGs, a parallel regime of global governance that reinforces EFA but also provides potential sources of tension. In terms of institutional power, the Paris Declaration represented a growing consensus amongst donor and recipient countries around underling principles governing aid. There is a tension, however, in that although the Paris Declaration included most of the low-income countries and the BRIC economies, these emerging donors have never been integral to the EFA agenda and indeed, as other contributions to this volume indicate to have increasingly pursued their own agendas. These institutional relationships call into question, the likelihood of achieving a core principle of aid effectiveness, namely that of harmonisation.

In terms of productive power, the way that aid effectiveness has become defined also has implications for how EFA is conceptualised. The aid effectiveness discourse as set out in the Paris Declaration is fundamentally an economic discourse about seeking to achieve maximum return on aid. This is reflected, for instance in the increasing move towards 'payment by results' by key donors such as DfID. It feeds into a reductionist view of the relationship between education understood as a narrow set of quantifiable indicators and development understood principally in terms of economic growth. As such it stands in contrast to more expansive, rights-based conceptualisations of education and development (see e.g. Tikly & Barrett, 2011).

Secondly, there is a tension between the concept of aid effectiveness and the way that EFA has up until now been implemented. It has been suggested, for example, that the principle of 'ownership' is compromised by the limited choice that low-income national governments have in accepting the conditionalities that go along with aid. For example, through linking

aid to MDGs or other targets that may not in fact coincide with national development priorities and the use of global benchmarks to evaluate education sector plans. The principle of ownership is often related to government ownership rather than to that of civil society organisations that may indeed oppose government policy. In this sense ‘ownership’ is understood principally as a ‘technical’ principle rather than a political and normative one linked to an understanding of the political economy of different countries. As has been suggested, a major obstacle to genuine ownership is the dependency that much educational aid fosters. Finally, ‘accountability’ appears as ‘one way traffic’ in the discourse of aid effectiveness as it is applied to EFA. As we have seen, the only EFA target that is typically not time-bound is that relating to the proportion of GDP that ought to be committed to aid, including educational aid, in wealthy countries. In this respect, discourses of aid effectiveness are separated out from an analysis of global political economy and a broader understanding of the legitimacy role played by aid in a global economy marked by historically rooted structural inequality in wealth and power between nations.

CONCLUSION

In this final section an attempt will be made to draw together the main themes and arguments in the chapter. It is suggested that conceptualising EFA as an example of a global regime of educational governance provides a useful lens through which to critically consider the changing institutional relationships and underling norms and values that comprise the EFA aid architecture. In particular, applying a global governance framework makes it possible to consider the extent to which EFA has shaped through the exercise of different forms of power and through its relationship to other global regimes of governance.

Firstly, in relation to the exercise of institutional power, EFA has been successful in bringing together under its umbrella a diverse range of low-income countries including more recently, post-conflict nations and fragile states and coordinating the activities of a range of bilateral country donors. Nonetheless, there have been on-going contests over the governance of EFA between multilateral organisations. Historically in the period under review the World Bank has proved hegemonic in these struggles despite the continued claims to ownership of EFA by UNESCO and to a lesser extent

1 UNICEF. Global civil society has had some influence particularly in an
advocacy role.

3 Related to the above has been the Northern-led nature of EFA. Despite
the rhetoric of inclusivity both in the context of the World Education
5 Forums and in the governing structures of the institutions most closely
associated with EFA, the overall agenda remains Northern- — and
7 indeed — Western-led. This is evidenced in the dominance of Northern
interests within the governance structures of the leading institutions that
9 have in turn been reflected in the processes through which key EFA frame-
works and protocols have been developed. It is also reflected in the use of
11 compulsory power to ensure that education sector plans adhere to EFA
principles in the context, for example, of the FTI Fund. This is in contrast
13 to the use of fewer conditionalities to ensure Northern country compliance
with meeting development targets. Whatever compulsory power has been
15 exerted on high-income countries has often been as a consequence of cam-
paigns on the part of global civil society. It has been suggested that here
17 too, however, it has most often been Northern rather than indigenous,
Southern-led organisations that have had most ‘voice’ in global debates
19 and forums.

There have also been some discernible shifts in the way that EFA has
21 been conceptualised. The broad vision, based on an expanded notion of
EFA and linked to a rights-based agenda has been superseded by a focus
23 on a narrower set of time-bound targets exemplified by the MDGs
although there is some evidence that the debate may be broadening out
25 once again in the context of the emerging post-2015 education and develop-
ment debate. Despite the title of ‘Education for All’, the narrowing of tar-
27 gets implied by the MDGs and the way that funding has been channelled,
particularly in the early days of the FTI have tended to favour low-income
29 countries that have had the capacity to develop robust education sector
development plans. Many, particularly marginalised and disadvantaged
31 groups, were neglected as a consequence of this and of a lack of nuance in
the way that funding was targeted within countries. One can see this as an
33 aspect of the effects of a particular form of productive power in which
narrow and easily quantifiable targets are favoured over more nuanced
35 quantitative and qualitative targets. The advocacy work of reports such as
the GMR and the quantitative and qualitative evidence base on which it
37 draws have provided an alternative source of productive power, linked to a
more rights-based emphasis on targeting the most marginalised.

39 It is also important to consider EFA in relation to other regimes of
global governance. It has been suggested that EFA has developed

sometimes in tension with other global regimes, most notably those governing, the MDGs, aid effectiveness and gender. This has provided both a source of strength for EFA in helping to shape its character and a source of tension through providing contrasting rationale for action and in the definition of targets. On the other hand, EFA has also failed to engage with other key areas of global governance including health despite the potential lessons that can be learnt from such an engagement. In order to become more sustainable as an area of social development and in order to tackle the dependency of many low-income countries on donor support, it has been suggested that EFA also needs to be seen in relation to global regimes in the economic sphere including those governing trade and financial markets over which low-income countries also have limited control.

To conclude, EFA as a global regime has proved remarkably resilient in the face of considerable tensions and contradictions. Only time will tell, however, whether it will continue to adapt in the context of the emerging post-2015 education and development agenda or, whether it will need to fundamentally transform itself into a new global regime of educational governance if it is to survive. Much of this it has been suggested will depend on the extent to which governmental and non-governmental actors are able to recognise and engage with power imbalances at the heart of EFA and to line EFA up more coherently with other areas of global governance.

NOTE

1. In this regard the chapter is also timely given the on-going reviews of the outcomes and processes of EFA currently being undertaken by UNESCO. See <http://www.unesco.org/new/en/education/themes/leading-the-international-agenda/education-for-all/resources/national-efa-2015-reviews/>. Last accessed on August 6, 2015.

REFERENCES

- Barnett, M., & Duvall, R. (2014). Power in global governance. In M. Barnett & R. Duvall (Eds.), *Power in global governance* (pp. 1–32). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bermingham, D. (2009). Scaling up aid for education: Lessons from the education for All Fast Track Initiative (FTI). Background paper prepared for the Education for All Global Monitoring Report 2010, *Reaching the marginalized*, UNESCO, Paris.
- Bermingham, D. (2011). The politics of global education policy: The formation of the Education for All – Fast Track Initiative (FTI). *Journal of Education Policy*, 26(4), 557–569.

- 1 Birdsall, N. (1996). Public spending on higher education in developing countries: Too much or too little? *Economics of Education Review*, 15, 407–419.
- 3 Buchert, L. (1995). The concept of education for all: What has happened after jomtien. *International Review of Education*, 41(6), 537–549.
- 5 Cornia, G. (2001). Social funds in stabilisation and adjustment programmes: A critique. *Development and Change*, 32, 1–32.
- 7 Dejaeghere, J., Parks, J., & Unterhalter, E. (2013). Gender justice and education: Linking theory, policy and practice. *International Journal of Educational Development, Special Issue on Gender Justice, Education and International Development: Theory, Policy and Practice*, 33(6), 539–622.
- 9 Digwerth, K., & Pattberg, P. (2006). Global governance as a perspective on world politics. *Global Governance*, 12(2), 185–203.
- 11 Global Monitoring Report. (2014). *Teaching and learning: Achieving equality for all*. Paris: UNESCO.
- 13 Haas, P. (1992). Introduction: Epistemic communities and international policy. *International Organization*, 46(1), 1–35.
- 15 Hayman, R. (2005). Are the MDGs enough? Donor perspectives and recipient visions of education and poverty in Rwanda. Paper presented to UKFIET Oxford Conference on Education and Development, Oxford, September.
- 17 Hayman, R. (2007). Are the MDGs enough? Donor perspectives and recipient visions of education and poverty reduction in Rwanda. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 27(4), 371–382.
- 19 Heyneman, S. P. (2003). The history and problems in the making of education policy at the World Bank 1960–2000. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 23(3), 315–337.
- 21 Inter-Agency Commission. (1990). *World declaration on education for all and framework for action to meet basic learning needs*. New York, NY: UNICEF.
- 23 Jones, P. (2005). Education and world order. In *Comparative education* (Vol. 43, No. 3). [Special Issue (34): Global Governance, Social Policy and Multilateral Education (pp. 325–337)]. AU:9
- 25 Jones, P. (2006). *Education, poverty and the world bank*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.
- 27 Jones, P., & Coleman, D. (2005). *The United Nations and education: Multilateralism, development and globalization*. London: Routledge.
- 29 King, K. (2004). The external agenda of educational reform: A challenge to educational self-reliance and dependency in Sub-Saharan Africa. *Journal of International Cooperation in Education*, 7(1), 85–96.
- 31 King, K. (2007). Multilateral agencies in the construction of the global agenda on education. *Comparative Education*, 43(3), 377–391.
- 33 King, K., & Rose, P. (2005). International development targets and education: Towards a new international compact or a new conditionality? *Journal of International Development*, 17, 97–100.
- 35 Milligan, L. (2014). ‘They are not serious like the boys’: Gender norms and contradictions for girls in Rural Kenya. *Gender and Education*, 26(5), 465–476.
- 37 Mosse, D. (2005). Global governance and the ethnography of international aid. In D. Mosse & D. Lewis (Eds.), *The aid effect. Giving and governing in international development* (pp. 1–36). London: Pluto Press.
- 39

- 1 Mundy, K. (2007). Global governance, educational change. *Comparative Education*, 43(3), 339–357.
- 3 Mundy, K., & Manion, C. (2014). Globalization and global governance in education. In N. Stromquest & K. Monkman (Eds.), *Globalization and education: Integration and contestation across cultures* (2nd ed., pp. 39–53). Oxford: Roman and Littlefield.
- 5 Mundy, K., & Murphy, L. (2001). Transnational advocacy, global civil society? Emerging evidence from the field of education. *Comparative Education Review*, 45(1), 85–126.
- 7 Mundy, K., & Verger, A. (2015). The World Bank and the global governance of education in a changing world order. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 40(2015), 9–18.
- 9 Ndikumana, L. (2014). *Better global governance for a stronger Africa: A new era, a new strategy*. Working Paper Series No. 369, Political Economy Research Institute, University of Massachusetts Amherst, November.
- 11 OECD/DAC. (1996). *Shaping the 21st century: The contribution of development cooperation*. Paris: OECD.
- 13 OECD/DAC. (2003). *Rome declaration on harmonization*. Rome: High level forum on harmonization. Paris: OECD.
- 15 Orsini, A., Morin, J., & Young, O. (2013). Regime complexes: A buzz, a boom, or a boost for global governance? *Global Governance*, 19(2013), 27–39.
- 17 Palmer, R. (2006). Beyond the basics: Balancing education and training systems in developing countries. *Journal for Education in International Development*, 2(1), 1–21.
- 19 Post, D., Clipper, L., Enkhbaatar, D., Manning, A., Riley, T., & Zaman, H. (2004). World Bank okays public interest in higher education. *Higher Education*, 48, 213–229.
- 21 Psacharopoulos, G. (1985). Returns to education: A further international update and implications. *The Journal of Human Resources*, 20(4), 583–604.
- 23 Psacharopoulos, G. (2006). World Bank policy on education: A personal account. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 26, 329–338.
- 25 Psacharopoulos, G., & Patrinos, H. (2004). Returns to investment in education: A further update. *Education Economics*, 12(2), 111–135.
- 27 Robertson, S., Novelli, M., Dale, R., Tikly, L., Dachi, H., & Ndibalema, A. (2007). *Globalization and education: Ideas, actors and dynamics*. London: DfID.
- 29 Rose, P. (2003). *The education Fast Track Initiative: A global campaign review of progress and recommendations for reform*. Report prepared for ActionAid and Global Campaign for Education, Global Campaign for Education, London.
- 31 Rose, P. (2005). Is there a ‘fast-track’ to achieving education for all? *International Journal of Educational Development*, 25(2005), 381–394.
- 33 Ruggie, J. (2014). Global governance and ‘new governance theory’: Lessons from business and human rights. *Global Governance*, 20(2014), 5–17.
- 35 Rupert, M. (2014). Class powers and the politics of global governance. In M. Barnett & R. Duvall (Eds.), *Power in global governance* (pp. 205–228). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 37 Samoff, J. (Ed.). (1994) *Coping with crisis: Austerity, adjustment and human resources*. London: Cassell.
- 39 Subrahmanian, R. (2005). Gender equality in education: Definitions and measurements. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 25(2005), 395–407.
- Tikly, L. (2001). Globalisation and education in the postcolonial world: Towards a conceptual framework. *Comparative Education*, 37(2), 151–171.

1 Tikly, L. (2003). The African renaissance, NEPAD and skills formation: An analysis of key
policy tensions. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 23(5), 543–564.

3 Tikly, L. (2004). Education and the new imperialism. *Comparative Education*, 42, 173–198.

Torres, R. M. (2001). What happened at the world education forum? *Adult Education and
Development*, 56, 1–14.

5 Unterhalter, E. (2013). The MDGs, girls’ education and gender equality. Expert paper
presented to UN Women in collaboration with ECLAC expert group meeting structural
7 and policy constraints in achieving the MDGs for women and girls, Mexico City,
Mexico, October 21–24.

9 Walton, J., & Seddon, D. (1994). *Free markets and food riots: The politics of global adjustment*.
Oxford: Blackwell.

11

13 **UNCITED REFERENCES**

AU:8

15 Bermingham (2009); Global Monitoring Report (2014); Mundy (2007).

17

19

21

23

25

27

29

31

33

35

37

39

AUTHOR QUERY FORM

Book: IPES-V029-3611226 Chapter: CH002	<p style="text-align: center;">Please e-mail or fax your responses and any corrections to:</p> <p>E-mail:</p> <p>Fax:</p>
---	---	--

Dear Author,

During the preparation of your manuscript for typesetting, some questions may have arisen. These are listed below. Please check your typeset proof carefully and mark any corrections in the margin of the proof or compile them as a separate list.

Disk use

Sometimes we are unable to process the electronic file of your article and/or artwork. If this is the case, we have proceeded by:

- ☐ Scanning (parts of) your article ☐ Rekeying (parts of) your article
☐ Scanning the artwork

Bibliography

If discrepancies were noted between the literature list and the text references, the following may apply:

☐ **The references listed below were noted in the text but appear to be missing from your literature list. Please complete the list or remove the references from the text.**

☐ ***UNCITED REFERENCES:* This section comprises references that occur in the reference list but not in the body of the text. Please position each reference in the text or delete it. Any reference not dealt with will be retained in this section.**

Queries and/or remarks

Location in Article	Query / remark	Response
AU:1	As per style, the right running head is shortened to fit the space. Please check the suggested right running head for correctness.	
AU:2	Please provide a maximum of six keywords to this chapter.	
AU:3	The following references are cited but not present in the reference list:	

	Psacharopoulos (1994); King & Rose (2006); Paris Declaration (2005); Tikly & Barrett (2011). Please provide complete reference details.	
AU:4	Please check sentence 'The setting of the gender target...' for clarity and kindly amend if required.	
AU:5	Please check and confirm whether 'locally-owned' can be changed to 'locally owned' in the quotation 'represent only a proposal of what...'	
AU:6	Please note the shading has been removed in Table 1. Kindly confirm.	
AU:7	Please note reference De Jaeghere et al. Unterhalter (2014) has been changed to De Jaeghere, Parks, and Unterhalter (2013) to match with the reference provided in the reference list. Kindly confirm.	
AU:8	The following references are not cited: Bermingham (2009); Global Monitoring Report (2014); Mundy (2007). Please cite them; if no citations are available then these references need to be removed from the list.	
AU:9	Please provide publisher details for reference Jones (2005).	