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Part I

Chapter 1. Introduction

This report derives from a collaborative endeavour in reviewing research on educational governance (especially decentralization) and its outcomes. The report consists of three parts: (i) Overview of education reform and governance around the world; (ii) educational governance and democratic participation in developing countries; and (iii) summary of findings from case studies conducted at the local level in eight countries (Cambodia, Greece, Nepal, Nicaragua, Norway, Senegal, and South Africa). The report is written in collaboration between the two authors, but Holger Dau is principally responsible for Chapters 1, 3-6, and 8, and Karen Mundy for chapter 7. For chapters 2 and 9 they share the responsibility. The project was funded by the Swedish Research Council.

Over the past two decades, reforms to the way in which educational systems are managed and governed have been attempted across a large number of countries. These reforms typically draw upon an “ideal” governance agenda that includes decentralization, the creation of public-private partnerships, and a variety of efforts to enhance participation and overseeing at local level. As framed in the policies supported by major international actors such as the World Bank, such governance reforms tend to be viewed instrumentally, as a central component of efforts to enhance the efficiency of educational systems in producing skilled human capital, with increasing attention to the skills of the poorest.

A package of educational reforms including introduction or reinforcement of freedom of choice, privatization, decentralization and sometimes centralization of goal formulation, curriculum, and outcomes-based assessment is being globalized and together, they may be seen as a new type of governance (NG). The outcomes the NG seem to consist of a hybridization of globalized features and policies filtered through the national system, on the one hand, and local interpretations, meanings, intentions and actions, on the other hand.

In practically all countries in the world, education has - at least since the beginning of the 20th century - been an issue for the state (central and regional levels). The contemporary reform agenda incorporates a theory of political change and political agency that stresses the value of giving individual citizens of the management of local services, drawing heavily upon concepts popularized through rational choice theory and the literature on new public management. In this framing, political action at the local level is regarded as “good” political agency when forms of public choice are introduced to limit the potential for state corruption and maximize local incentives. Politics at the national level, on the other hand, is widely viewed as negative or tainted. National level collective action and even government itself, are viewed as marred by elite capture; the state, its bureaucracy, and collective actors (as for example, teachers unions) are viewed as essentially undemocratic and unresponsive to equality issues. However, the question of how the local
level voice developed through decentralization policies will feed into national level politics is rarely considered.

Chapter 2. Some Key Concepts

The following key concepts will be discussed, problematized or defined here: civil society, governance, community, participation. When discussing civil society and governance, it is necessary also to refer to the political culture. The political culture and the type of state are highly relevant in relation to the issue of governance. The political culture defines, for example, what is appropriate for the state to do in society, the extent to which state interventions are seen as legitimate and common people are expected to participate in public decision-making (Almond and Verba, 1965; Inglehart, 1997). The legitimacy and preparedness of the grassroots initiative and participation, and local interventions in school affairs may be more or less expected and accepted. Also, cultures vary in their degree of individual orientation and collective orientation (Shweder and Bourne, 1984).

There are numerous definitions of civil society. Some of them include ideas and actions which are non-state, that is, both the market/economy and the “civil sphere” are included. Other definitions reserve “civil society” for the non-profit and non-market ideas and actions that citizens articulate and perform respectively in order to attain collective goals, especially in relation to the state. The latter definition excludes the economy as well as “closed” groups such as families. We use a definition that excludes the market, since the aims and purposes of individuals’ actions differ considerably between the market and the civil arena. In the latter, people act on a voluntary and idealistic basis.

Governing and government refer to what public decision-makers do. Governing has traditionally taken place through the following principal modes of state intervention: (i) regulation; (ii) economic measures, and (iii) ideological measures. Regulation means to establish pro-actively and more or less in detail the frame of action for different bodies and actors. The second mode, economic measures, includes state allocation of subsidies and services as well as extraction of resources. Ideological measures within the educational domain include the definition and selection of knowledge to be handled in schools through the national curriculum, syllabi, teacher guidelines, etc. These modes of intervention overlap or combine when applied in practical policy.

Educational governance is a broader concept including significant forces influencing the nature of the outcomes of educational activities and processes. (A more detailed discussion follows in Chapter 4).

Participation: The definition presented by Arnstein (1971) has been useful when describing and analyzing participation. Arnstein (1971) defines eight degrees or types of participation, varying from the mere use of a service to participation in identification of

---

1 We use “closed” in the sense that they are not voluntarily entered and exited.
problems, the study of feasibility, planning, implementation, and evaluation. Arnstein employs eight degrees or type of participation which then have been used in modified forms. For example, Hart (1992, in Shaeffer, 1994, pp. 3. 16-17) uses seven stages: (1) the mere use of a service (such as primary health care facility); (2) involvement through the contribution (or extraction) of resources, materials and labour; (3) involvement through ‘attendance’ and the receipt of information (e.g., at parents’ meetings at school), implying passive acceptance of decisions made by others; (4) involvement through consultation (or feedback) on a particular issue; (5) participation in the delivery of a service, often as a partner with other actors; (6) participation as implementation of delegated powers; and (7) participation “in real decision-making at every stage (identification of problems, the study of feasibility, planning, implementation, and evaluation...). This implies the authority to initiate action, a capacity for ‘proactivity’, and the confidence to get going on one’s own”.

Social citizenship is to be eligible and have the opportunity to take part in civil and political activities such as organizational work, to have a fair share of welfare, to participate in political organizations and elections, and so on.

Chapter 3. World System and Globalization

Globalization is changing the conditions for the traditional modes of state governance and intervention by restructuring national societies. Therefore, we need to take the world system and globalization seriously. The world system (WS) is here seen from principally two theoretical perspectives: the politico-economic (Wallerstein, 2006), and the institutionalist (Boli et al. 1985; Meyer et al. 1997), and for the globalization approach we use elements from different social science theories on globalization (e.g. Cox, 2000; Robertson, 1992; Sklair, 1995). The two types of WS theory (the politico-economic and the institutionalist) differ in several aspects from each other and from globalization theories. One such difference is that in WS theories, the dynamics of historical development is a principal ingredient, while it is not in most globalization theories (Clayton (2004).

The Economic World Systems Approach

According to the politico-economic WS approach, the drive for competitiveness and profit is the principal “cause” of or condition for what occurs globally (Cox, 2000; Elwell, 2006; Wallerstein, 2006). Market forces and market ideals are reaching most places on the globe, and to a large extent provide the foundation that conditions institutions and individuals’ lives (Cox, 2000; Gill, 2000; Saul, 1997; Story, 2000). People are encouraged or compelled to enter into commodified, monetized and priced exchanges as producers and consumers and also to become competitive.

The world economic system is different from empires, since it does not correspond to a single political unit and it emerges and functions regardless of political units and frontiers. This system is based on an international division of labour that determines the
relationships between different actors around the globe. Wallerstein (2006) defines four different categories of countries or areas: core, semi-periphery, periphery and external areas. Different modes of labour usage develop in these areas. The periphery lacks strong central governments, and the external areas have their own economies, which for the most part exist outside the world economy. However, the system is dynamic and the relationships within and between countries may vary a great deal over time.

The Institutionalist/Culturalist World System Approach

The institutionalist perspective assumes the existence of a world polity, which is not a physical body or institution but a complex of cultural expectations (Meyer and Kamens, 1992; Meyer et al. 1987; Meyer et al. 1997). Some others call it “governance without government” (Griffin, 2003). National decision-makers are assumed to have the ambition or feel compelled to form modern states that fulfil the requirements of the world polity.

The world polity includes world models (for education, for instance). World models consist of “cognitive and ontological models of reality that specify the nature, purposes, technology, sovereignty, control, and resources of nation-states and other actors” (Meyer et al., 1997, p. 144), and they have their core in policy documents stored in and disseminated from international organizations. The world models signal, among other things, that education is an instrument in the struggle for economic competitiveness. They also suggest decentralization, school-based management, privatization, choice, outcomes to be measured, and how to measure them (Wiseman and Baker, 2005). Furthermore, they also include the market orientation as well as the modern communitarian orientation. The market orientation derives from Homo Economicus, the utility-maximizing individual. On the other hand, different ideas are embedded in the communitarian orientation. In this orientation, the individual is seen as mainly driven by idealism and altruism (Doyal and Gough, 1991; Reay and Ball, 1997). Orthodox communitarians reject large scale capitalist and state arrangements (Etzioni, 1995).

A distinction can be made between traditional and modern communitarianism (Barber, 1996; Flacks, 1995). The former is linked to the traditional local community based on residence, kinship, religion or all of them (Wesolowski, 1995), and does not make part of the world models but is strong in many local communities in low income countries. The common good applies to the local community, the clan, the association, or some other unit, intermediate between the central state and the individual (MacRae, 1969). On the other hand, the modern variety of communitarianism is part of the world models and sees society as “atomized”, the individual as autonomous and community as based on some type of “sameness” among the “community members” (Offe, 1996). In this view, community does not necessarily imply a geographical area or local group but could have worldwide extension through the use of Information and Communication Technologies (ICT), for example. The key role assumed for Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) and civil society involvement in the world models corresponds to the modern communitarian orientation. The elements of the world models are combined in different ways across countries, but the most common combinations make part of the NG.
The WS is the structure and relationships between different interdependent components (nations, companies, organizations, etc.), while globalization is the processes and flows that take place between the components of the WS. When the interdependencies between the components become more extensive and form chains, networks, exchanges and transactions, these processes may be seen as globalization.

Globalization

Almost any definition of globalization begins with the idea that the integration of human societies across pre-existing territorial units has speeded up, assisted in part by the development of new technologies that compress time and space (Harvey 1990). Central to all theories of globalization is the notion that interregional and “deteritorialized” flows of all kinds of social interaction have reached new magnitudes in recent history (Ruggie 2003).

A distinction may be made between: (i) general processes of globalization (indirect influence on education), and (ii) spread of world models and borrowing, imposition, etc. of educational features (direct influence on education). In the general processes of economic globalization, there is a growing global interdependency between nations, companies, organizations, individuals, and so on. High technology activities, growth and richness are concentrated in a geographical zone including East and Southeast Asia, Western Europe, Oceania and North America. The “market order” on a global scale is country-wise mediated by national and local history, politics, economies and cultures.

Processes of competition and marginalization take place, and more countries than ever before are affected by or involved in global economic processes. The frame of action - even for those countries situated “outside” the most intensive flows - is conditioned by countries’ positions in the world system (Castells, 1993; Griffith-Jones and Ocampo, 1999; Lipumba, 2003). However, globalization processes are uneven, also within one and the same country. For example, Africa as a continent has low levels of “connectivity in key areas that drive globalization” (finance, production, trade, etc) but at the same time, it has high levels of connectivity in politics and policy-making (Bangura, 2001, p. 33). That is, the continent has implemented the institutions and modes of policy-making suggested by the international agencies, while the countries on this continent have to a large extent become marginalized from the global economic flows.

The sector of the economy mostly involved in global processes consists of companies that increasingly restructure themselves and demand a flexible labour force (Waters, 2001), but for certain sections of the economies, the organization of production and work is not very different from before (Carnoy, 1999; Lorenz, Lundvall and Valkyrie, 2004).

Culturally, economic imperatives tend to dominate over all others (Ahmed, 1992; Bauman, 1991; Saul, 1997). Globalization causes or encompasses standardization and homogenization as well as particularization and heterogenization; secularization as well as de-secularization and revitalization of moral and religious values (Berger, 1999; Norris and Inglehart 2004). Modernity as disseminated through the world models and general
processes of globalization - even if not filtered through national policy making - encounter the local realities, and something of *localization* and *hybridization* may occur (Nederven Pieterse, 1995; Robertson, 1995). In the first case, the local is incorporated into the global and in the second case; the global is transformed at the local level whereby the outcome is something different from the originally global and the originally local. On the other hand, particularization also occurs, meaning that values and beliefs linked to a specific group and locality are revived.

For the state, globalization makes governance more complex. Politically, globalization causes restructuring of the relationships between the national state, companies and international governmental organizations (IGOs) and international NGOs, i.e. INGOs (Zürn, 2003:341), but also between different levels within a society. It changes the conditions for the functions of the state and its mode of governance, “We have a global economy but not a global polity and hence our ability to ‘‘govern the market’ and ourselves is weakened” (Griffin, 2003 p. 1). Another important phenomenon involved in governance is the increasing and extending networking among social movements and NGOs.

States now have to handle multiple and sometimes contradictory demands and requirements: the consequences of economic restructuring (e.g. unemployment) (Freeman and Soete, 1994), increasing complexity and specialization in the national society and, at the same time, increasing networking in society and across societies (Castells, 1993; Messner, 1997). As a result, states are restructuring themselves but not necessarily shrinking themselves. Many states in fact do not spend a lower percentage of their GDP than they did some decades ago (Pierre, 2000, p. 1) but spend less on social welfare as percentage of GDP (Gilbert, 2004, p. 3). Resources are transferred towards coordinating, supervising and monitoring functions.

**Education**

The two types of world systems, the politico-economic and the “institutionalist/culturalist”, have different views on education. The former argues that education is restructured according to the requirements and demands of the economy (to make people and countries competitive in order to increase the profit of the transnational companies (TNCs) (Dale, 2000). The latter approach assumes that states structure themselves and their education systems due to the cultural pressure from the IGOs (proposing the world models, for example).

As mentioned before, globalization has direct as well as indirect effects on education; the former is the borrowing or imitation of elements from world models (Steiner-Khamsi, 2004) and the latter is the societal changes that the schools, teachers and students experience related to globalizing economic and cultural features. Education is generally seen as a fundamental social entitlement, and it came to be seen as one among a core of institutions that links citizen to state, by integrating the individual into collective aspirations for economic progress and social justice.

A common strategy in education during the past decades has been to decentralize (shift funding from the central to the local level) and to privatize (shift from the state to the
economic and civil spheres). Subsidies are increasingly distributed in accordance with performance-based criteria, and schools are more and more supposed to compete for pupils, as they are funded on a per pupil basis. Through this type of governance, using rewards and punishments through market mechanisms, individuals and organizations, such as schools, can be governed at a distance.

On the other hand, there is a general tendency to link the measurement of knowledge production and distribution (curriculum) and of the outcomes (evaluation, assessment and monitoring) more firmly to the central state. The framework established at the central level for participation conditions the way governance and participation tends to occur at the local level. Such a combination of loose coupling in some aspects and strong coupling in others may, in fact, bind schools strongly to the central level (Angus, 1994; Gurr, 1999). Generally in the world, pro-active control and regulation of the education system and schools from the central level has been somewhat relaxed, while retro-active monitoring and steering by the means of assessments and evaluations has increased. The mode of evaluating education and schools has also changed; local actors are/or should be more involved than before, and in this context, self-evaluation has become a general feature among schools.

Chapter 4. The New Mode of Governance

The requirements on, as well as the conditions for states’ steering of society have thus changed. According to Foucault (1991), governance is a broad concept (“conduct of conduct”) and may vary from conducting oneself to conduction of political sovereignty, and in his words, “one speaks of ‘governing’ a household, souls, children” (p. 90). Also, in his view, too much attention has been directed towards institutions and too little towards practices (Gordon, 1991). “Governance” is taking place vertically between the central state and local bodies and actors but also horizontally between various social agencies, bodies and systems at the same level (Kooiman, 2000).

According to Foucault (1991), governance is a broad concept, and too much attention has been directed towards institutions and too little towards practices (Gordon, 1991). For Pierre (2000:25) political governance is to “to ensure at the different levels within this division of labour.....that the actions of a body at one level do not systematically negate decisions at another”. Barroso (2004) finds three tendencies that challenge the processes of governance: (i) Increase in transnational regulation (i.e. regulation across countries); (ii) hybridization of national regulation (e.g. mix of market and other forces and mechanisms); and (iii) fragmentation of local regulation. The state is thereby confronted by two principal challenges: To manage “multi-regulation” and to assure meta-regulation (p. 3).

The relocation of decision-making to lower levels, and introduction of market mechanisms and educational choice allow non-state forces to affect the processes and outcomes. Thus the broader concept of governance is applicable. Such an analysis deals
both with the vertical top-down dimension as well as the horizontal, among actors at the same level, and requires a historical and broad perspective including economic, political and cultural changes (Kooiman, 2000). Governance should not be seen merely as that which is done from the national level in order to get policies implemented but also as the forces that condition or determine the outcomes. It includes: (a) steering mechanisms (forms of funding, accountability, school choice, etc.), and (b) steering forces (socioeconomic conditions, cultural patterns, ideological orientations, etc.), which combine and condition the outcomes. At the local level, mechanisms for involvement vary according to the central intention behind the decentralization program. Local forces condition the outcome, and together with forces situated outside of the domain of education, the mechanisms constitute the mode of governance.

Deliberate steering mechanisms: (a) national curriculum (with or without detailed instructions concerning the distribution of time per subject); (b) national goals or national guidelines; (c) accountability requirements (including reporting of student achievement, economic accounts, etc. from lower to higher levels or to boards/councils at the local level), self-evaluation/self-assessment; (d) inspection, evaluation or monitoring from the central level of attainment of national goals; (e) local arrangements for “site involvement”/participation and decision-making; (f) market mechanisms (choice possibilities, per pupil pay, vouchers, tax reduction, etc.) (Hamilton, 2003; Hannaway and Woodroffe, 2003). Steering forces: Scope of decentralization program (general for all sectors or specific to education); Constitutional status of decentralization (from simple delegation or de-concentration to devolution protected in the Constitution); Socio-economic and cultural context (economic level, political culture, cultural heterogeneity-homogeneity, etc.); Ideological orientations in society; Gender.
Figure 1 Mechanisms and Forces of the New Mode of Governance Assumed to Condition Outcomes
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Governance may be seen as the ways in which the relationships between the state, the economy and the civil sphere are structured and monitored, and it now more than ever before implies global level in addition to national and local levels. The state leaves - either deliberately or due to pressure from globalization forces - to market and civil forces to implement and administer educational issues.

Decision-making has been moved to lower levels, and market mechanisms have been introduced, allowing other forces (than those driven by the state) to affect the educational processes more than before. Consequently, also national and local forces, such as local level, particularistic and de-secularizing forces are implied in the NG and condition the outcomes. Thus ‘governance’ in education involves a range of actions, from the deliberately control-oriented to forces that condition outcomes more indirectly.

At least in the technologically advanced countries, the state employs ideological measures more than before through: scienticization, information, persuasion and self-regulation, efforts to influence the public discourse, and retroactive monitoring by the help of evaluations and commissioned research. This requires more information and more effective flows of communication than ever before (Neocleous, 1996; Offe, 1984). Thus, the NG presumes a sophisticated and ICT-based communication network for rapid information flows horizontally and vertically in society. Governments in low income countries tend to have a weak ability to shift governance to new forms requiring intense production and flows of information. This has been a salient feature in Sub-Saharan Africa, for example (Naidoo, 2005; Ribeiro, 2006).

As mentioned before, the components of the NG are here divided into steering mechanisms and steering forces. At the local level, they are condensed and combined with everyday practice, making “school site councils ... micro political contexts” (Beare, 1993,
Decentralization has been accompanied by the establishing of new and specific bodies for steering, monitoring and assessment. In most cases where there is a national curriculum, there is also central assessment, monitoring and/or inspection. This may take the form of broad evaluation, national testing, reporting, self-evaluation, and so on (Riley and Rawles, 1997). Reporting to higher levels is increasingly used and normally deals with plans and outcomes and takes the form of self-evaluation/self-assessment, school reports, school reviews, reporting of student achievement, and so on. When it comes to funding, schools in most parts of the world have traditionally received a certain amount related to their size and catchment area characteristics, but increasingly they are now subsidized on a per student basis. Additional funds are often provided related to socio-economic conditions of the geographical area and for children with learning difficulties and children from minority or low income homes. However, several examples from different countries demonstrate that these supplementary funds are not sufficient as compensation for the economically weak situation of the area or the school district (Daun, 2004, Daun and Arjmand, 2006).

Decentralization during the past two decades has often been combined with market forces. For example, if choice exists, the flows of students between schools due to choice determine the resources of the schools and this becomes one aspect of governance. For some schools, to lose even a few students can have far reaching consequences if this loss implies the most motivated students and if it means that classes have to be merged.

Chapter 5. Decentralization

Decentralization has most often been initiated from above, and behind this approach, there is a rational, linear and deterministic view; people are assumed to behave rationally in relation to the parameters established by the central state, by market forces or both (Esteva and Prakash, 1998; Hammouda, 1997).

**Aspects of (De)centralization**

Issues or items generally decentralized/centralized are, according to Welsh and McGinn (1999): Mission; operation; finance; clients; and staff. The most radical types of decentralization from above are school-based management and some types of charter schools. Generally, charter schools are required to establish a board whose members are elected among and by the parents (Wells and Scott, 2001).

There are three principal types of decentralization - Deconcentration, Devolution, and Delegation. They have different implications, especially for local participation and democracy. Deconcentration is largely a shift of administrative and executive matters to lower levels in the state administration, while devolution implies move of decision-making power to lower levels and/or to bodies outside of the central state decision-making and
administrative bodies. It is evident that deconcentration and delegation do not necessarily lead to more participatory approaches (Shaeffer, 1994). In Sub-Saharan Africa, Naidoo (2005) found that the countries on this continent have tended to move towards decentralization with limited authority for the local governments. Also, there is the pressure to introduce market mechanisms in education, even in countries at a low level of GNP per capita and with limited public resources.

Another aspect of educational decentralization is whether it makes part of a more general decentralization program, something which has been the case in many countries (Castillo, 2002; Hanson, 2001: Hudson and Lidström, 2001). In such reforms it is likely that local communities have gained authority to lever tax in order to cover at least some of the local expenditures.

Finally, decentralization is given different legal status - from being defined and protected in the constitution to being regulated in administrative laws decided upon by the government. Once provided for in the constitution, transfer of powers and functions can be reversed only on the basis of an amendment to the appropriate law. Some countries have amended to their constitution the decision-making rights to regional governments (Bolivia-Sida, 2000; Ethiopia-Sida, 2000).

**Arrangements for Local Participation**

The local arrangements for involvement, decision-making and the way in which the participants have acquired their mandate seem to be decisive for the role of different stakeholders and their decision-making power of various actors. These local arrangements may be of different kinds, and - as Beare (1993, p. 215) argues - each model “has an internal logic of its own, and constitutes the role of teachers, parents, students, and the government in quite different ways”. Is there a school site body or not? Does the body consist of school staff only, local people only or both? How have they become part of the decision-making body and (d) what is their mandate? The mandate of the local decision-making body may vary from being a local body of the central state executing the state’s decisions, to an autonomous and locally elected body with own power and economic resources (extracted locally, unconditionally received from the central state or both).

School-based management has different varieties or different names: site-based management (SBM), shared decision-making (SDM), school-based decision-making (SBDM) or school-site decision-making (SSDM) and school-based curriculum development (SBCD) (Abu-Duhou, 1999; Papagiannis, Easton and Owens, 1992). These different terms may denote genuine varieties but may also be different terms for one and the same type of decentralization. Since the local body seems to be strategic for participation opportunity, this body will be discussed more in detail. According to David (1990 cited in Abu-Duhou, 1999, p. 33): the core of SBM is the idea of participatory decision-making at the school site... With some varieties of SBM, school leaders are given more autonomy and more freedom to take initiative, especially in budget matters, in different degrees of cooperation with teachers, students, parents and/or other community members (Levacic, 1995).

Also, the composition of the local body varies considerably from one place to
another and from one decentralization arrangement to another. Sometimes professionals are in majority, sometimes laymen (e.g. parents and/or politically elected members). The number of members varies; the minimum seems to be five. In some cases, representatives of teacher unions are automatically included - either as full members or as members without vote. The members of the council or board may be nominated or appointed by another authority (above or parallel) or they may be directly elected locally. Normally, in the devolution approach, the members of the school site decision-making bodies are locally elected in one way or the other.

As to the mandate or decision-making power, there are variations from the boards of trustees producing a school charter to the setting of key objectives each year, controlling management, reporting to community and appointing the head teacher and the teachers to the opposite where the head teacher is recruited from above and the members of the local body do not have very much power (Fiske and Ladd, 2003; Robertson, 1998.

| Varieties of School site body: | 1) School-site or school-specific body responsible for one school. If not school site, then: 2) local body commanded from the higher level in the state, or 3) locally elected political body (representing a district, municipality, commune, etc.). 2 and 3 responsible for several schools. |
| Varieties of Composition of the site body: | a) Only members politically elected in general, local elections; b) Politically elected members in majority; c) Professionals (school staff) in majority; d) Parents/laymen in majority. Or mixed b + c; b+ d; c + d; or all three of these. |
| Varieties of Membership: | Nominated, appointed, or elected representatives. |
| Variation in Number of members: | 5-20 |
| Variation in Power of head teacher: | Chairman of the site council/board. With or without veto. Hired and fired by the site council/board. |
| Variation in the Mandate of the School Body: | Deliberate and controlling or advisory simply being involved. |
| Variation in Areas of decision-making: | From details to budget, and recruitment of teachers and head teacher. |
Chapter 6. Remarks on Development Policies

In 1990, an educational conference was held in Jomtien, Thailand, and its theme was “Education for All” (EFA). The conference was called the World Conference on Education for All (WCEF). For the first time state agencies and representatives gathered together with representatives of NGOs and private companies, and the conference set as a goal that all countries in the world should be able to provide Education for All in 2010. NGOs and private interests have since then been strongly involved in development policies and their implementation. The Jomtien conference was followed up in Dakar, Senegal, in 2000. Due to the fact that many countries still were far from attaining the goal set in Jomtien, the time frame was postponed to 2015. It was evident at the Dakar conference that not only educational quantity should be focus but also quality since spread of low quality would be a wastage of resources.

When it comes to the form of development assistance, some changes have already been mentioned above, but the most important change has perhaps been from project orientation to the sector-wide approach (SWAP). The new forms of sector-wide support and partnership have been accompanied by a decrease in bilateral assistance.

Development policies were reformulated in certain aspects: from project or program support to principally sector support; from donor - receiver relationship to partnership and ownership; from detailed and specific evaluations and assessments to sector assessments and evaluations (involving local stakeholders and interests). As far as development assistance is concerned, the following features may be mentioned: (a) its changing pattern; it has been channelled over from poor and/or unstable countries to middle income and/or stable countries (Väyrynen, 2002, p124); (b) it has come to be seen as an investment (and it should serve social cohesion and financial stability); (c) its shrinking volume; (d) its changing direction and form; and (e) its implementation increasingly relies upon NGOs.

Also in 1990, the United Nations Development Program (UNDP) suggested the concept of Human Development (HD) as an alternative to and a more appropriate approach than human capital, basic human needs and human resource development. Individuals should not be seen primarily as instruments to be improved or as passive receivers of items satisfying their needs; they should be seen as active and complete persons instead. Education should not, according to UNDP (1990), be seen only as something contributing to more productive and technological competence but also to well-being in a wider sense, etc. HD is “a process that enlarges people’s choices” and it is “for people to lead a long and healthy life, to acquire knowledge and to have access to resources needed for a decent standard of living” (p. 11). The framework for the construction of well-being should be guaranteed by the state, but individuals themselves are assumed to have a potential for the active construction of their own realities and, consequently, their own well-being. Apart from the common themes of health conditions and material/economic things, poverty in imagination and creativity are also important to combat.
Part II

Chapter 7. Global Governance and Participation in Developing Countries

Though there is now in development policies rising emphasis on the role played by partnership and participation in the achievement of “good governance” and democracy, the conceptual underpinnings of these new norms are often framed in vague, and sometimes contradictory terms, both by governments and by non-governmental actors, within the educational arena.

This chapter first outlines the “official governance reform agenda” for Education EFA (as set out primarily by the World Bank, the most powerful of international actors in the education for development arena) are outlined – suggesting some of its assumptions and limits, as well as its more recent inclusions. This can be accomplished by conceptualizing educational governance as a series of nested social compacts operating across sub-national, national and global scales and increasingly supported by globally networked social citizenship regimes.

**EFA Governance Reforms: The Core Agenda**

Although the past decade has seen the endorsement of a wide range of governance reforms to support Education for All, it is fair to say that the governance reforms that occupy the greatest space in officially sponsored programs and policies for educational development revolve around the call for greater local accountability mechanisms and decentralization of governance. In the 1990s and into the new millennium, large-scale experimental projects and a substantial research literature emerged to support an expanded role for non-governmental, community schools, and for local, decentralized accountability structures within educational systems. The common sense view that emerged in the 1990s is typified in the 1990 WCEFA declaration and the following quote from the UK Department for International Development (DFIDs) 2001 education sector policy paper:

> Partnerships at the community level...should be encouraged: they can help harmonize activities, utilize resources more effectively, and mobilize additional financial and human resources where necessary (WCEFA secretariat 1990:58).

DFID (2001:19) greater participation of parents and communities in education of their children...plays a central role in stimulating education at a local level, in building pressure for improving quality, and in developing accountability.
As summarized in documents, this reform agenda includes decentralization of educational management and financing, the involvement of parents in school based management, the provision of better information on school performance and student achievement to parents and communities, the introduction of choice mechanisms (including demand side mechanisms), and the expansion of NGO and public-private service provision to stimulate competition and system reach.

Several ideological assumptions, and many pragmatic concerns, have fed into this reform agenda. As Bray (1999), Carnoy (1999), Colclough (1991), Plank and Boyd (1994b) and Rose (2003; 2006) among others have argued, the idea that centralized bureaucracies are not the best or most equitable providers of educational services was key to the initial framing of this reform agenda, as was a significant pragmatic interest in opportunities for local level resource generation in situations of clearly deteriorating access to education.

The World Bank’s (2004) World Development Report (WDR) sets out perhaps the clearest articulation of this official paradigm on localizing governance reforms in education. Both the 2005 Millennium Development Task Force and the 2004 WDR, favor “short route” accountability as the key to education for all (see also, for example DeStefano and Crouch, 2006). "Short route" forms of accountability emphasize the power of client-citizens as the main form for political agency in the education sector. Long route accountability mechanisms – which we would recognize as comprising both the aggregation of interests at a national level and operation of formal democratic politics (elections, legislative oversight of policies) – are marginalized or viewed as relatively impotent to the achievement of better services for the poor in the model. The promising possibilities for action, looking at the WDR 2004 figure provided below, are to be found in the bottom right corner, in the relationships between clients and providers -- even though there is often an acknowledgement that not enough research exists to support the positive outcomes idealized for local level governance reforms (Bray and Mukundan 2003; IEG/World Bank 2005, 43;).
Figure 2 Pluri-Scalar Governance of Education

PLURI-SCALAR GOVERNANCE OF EDUCATION
The role envisaged for collective action at the national level in donor documents is usually captured in a hortative call for greater engagement with “civil society.” But engagement with civil society is usually either left quite vague, or is carefully circumscribed (especially in contrast to the local accountability relationships). Thus reference to civil society often excludes or marginalizes teachers unions or presents them primarily as the “bad sort” of political agents, those involved in elite capture and blockage of educational reform (c.f. Corrales 1999; Grindle 2004; Stein et al. 2006). Beyond the exclusion of teachers unions, there is rarely much elaboration of the actors that belong to nationally-organized civil society or any discussion of conflicts or tensions among them.

The overall “theory of action” for civil society that is set out in key official donor documents on educational development focuses on using civil society for accountability and service delivery purposes at the local level. Technical expertise trumps deliberation at the national level; and teachers unions are typically viewed not as part of civil society, but as an oppositional force to be managed and contained (Global Campaign 2002; WB 2002). The concept of civil society is frequently used interchangeably with that of local level participation, and local level accountability mechanisms are generally identified as the optimal arena for civil society engagement in the education sector (WB 2002, pp. 256; 259; 26).

However, more recently there has been considerable mobilization around the idea of an international compact for achieving education for all (Birdsall and Vaishnav 2005; EFA Global Monitoring Report 2005; Millennium Project 2005; Pritchett 2004; Sperling 2001; Sperling and Beru, 2005).

This new compact can be characterized as a rapprochement between the neo-liberal approaches to development endorsed by the World Bank and the IMF; and the more equity-focused and globalization sceptical approaches to development adopted by the United Nations (Mundy 2006, 2008; Ruggie 2003; Therien 2005). It also encompasses a compact between developing countries and aid donors. Here, international donor organizations promise to harmonize, pool and increase their development aid; and to focus aid more acutely on social sector development. For their part, developing countries promise to take the lead in developing a detailed and well-balanced national development and poverty reduction plan, usually through the preparation of a Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP). For the compact to work, national ownership of sound development plans is essential; and ownership has increasingly been seen as involving the endorsement of citizens and organized non-governmental actors.

Descriptions of this new compact in the education sector rely heavily on the notion that local level accountability mechanisms and decentralized governance will mobilize citizen voice in the achievement of education for all. Limited attention is paid to national level collective action or to the idea that local citizen voice needs to be aggregated in some way in order for the compact to work. Perhaps even more surprisingly – particularly given the path breaking efforts of transnational civil society networks in recent years – descriptions of the new compact say very little about the link between national and transnational civil society actors in constructing citizen demand. In contrast, as we shall see below, the theories of action being mobilized by transnational civil society actors focus
explicitly (although again without much evidence or research) on the efficacy of linking up citizens’ demands for fundamental rights across national boundaries.

**Education, Governance and Social Citizenship**

Clearly, the idea that we need to harness democratic participation and “the political” in order to achieve education for all has now been widely accepted across the international community. However, the model of the political that underlies the officially sponsored agenda for governance reforms in education is too thinly drawn: it is too focused on citizen voice at the local level, lacks specificity and clarity about the nature of national level politics and collective action; and provides mainly hortative (rather than analytically grounded) attention to the transnational dimension of governance. If we look at the origins of education as a fundamental social entitlement; we now have evidence about how and why different types of democratic polities deliver and distribute such entitlements differently; and the literature on globalization and its effects on social citizenship.

**Education and Social Citizenship**

What Plank and Boyd (1994a:4587) argued more than a decade ago remains true today “scholars and policy analysts of widely different persuasions find common ground in their aversions to the politicization of educational issues, on the ground that choices about the education of the young are too important to be made in the grubby and unpredictable arena of interest conflict and compromise”.

From the beginning of the 20th century, the relationship between the state and education – in terms of its provision, regulation, ownership and funding – has become increasingly complete and taken for granted (Dale 2003; Fuller and Rubinson 1992; Ramirez and Boli-Bennett 1982). Although years of systematic borrowing and comparison led many of the core institutional features of schooling to look quite similar across industrialized countries, it can be argued that these varied governance and allocative arrangements have remained distinctive, and that they produced and reinforced very different popular imaginaries about the kind of polity to which schooling contributes. Schooling came to be seen as one among a core of institutions that links citizen to state, by integrating the individual into collective aspirations for economic progress and social justice. As Robertson notes “education has been a key institution for nation states in constructing citizens, not only in terms of identity but also as potential workers and members of a polity” (2006:2). Education also became a major sight for claims-making by citizens.

Recent research from political science and economics reinforces this idea, showing first, that educational spending is strongly affected by the existence of left leaning political leadership (Ansell n/d); by the extension of the franchise (Lindert 2004; Stasavage 2004); and by the presence of various standard measures of democratic governance (Dable-Norris and Gradstein 2004).
In short, although established industrialized states all have mass systems of education, they “differ fundamentally” because they reflect very specific political settlements at the national level (Myles and Quadagno 2002). Existing literature allows us to draw out three “ideal types” of relationship between the state or polity, citizenship regime and the shape of educational entitlements.

1) **Corporatist conservative** state forms in which there is a high level of collective bargaining between state, capital and labour at the national level, and an ongoing commitment to Christian conservatism, tend to have more centralized educational systems with greater stratification and differentiation in educational pathways. Educational stratification and inequality, however, is offset by greater employment guarantees for those on different educational ladders, and larger expenditures on social insurance for families.

2) **Social democracies** (primarily the Nordic countries) which have highly organized and secularized forms of collective political agency and well developed leftist parties at the national level, have educational systems that are comparatively well-funded, and until quite recently, administratively centralized. These countries achieve high levels of achievement and high equality of achievement in their educational systems, and they spend little on private provision. They also used to dedicate enormous resources to systems of income equalization and protection that limited economic inequality and guarantee a common standard of living.

3) Finally, **liberal states** (usually Anglo-American states), in which there is less in the way of nationally organized popular collective agency, typically have more decentralized educational systems, strong traditions of local governance in education, and greater levels of private and local funding of schools (Archer 1979; Green 1990; Manzer 2003). In these contexts education is often heavily funded (i.e., at levels similar to those in social democracies), but it is seen more as an “alternative” rather than a compliment to other forms of social redistribution, preferred because it provides equality of opportunity without limiting the role of markets in allocation of resources (Castles 1989; Hega and Hokenmaier 2002; Weir 2002). These systems produce higher levels of inequality in educational achievement than either models 1 or 2 (Windzio et al. 2008, p. 14).

This typology, of course, is a rather rudimentary one – no individual state conforms to all the dimensions of the relationships between social entitlements, educational governance and educational allocation as described above, and there are many additional distinctive cultural and historical factors that have contributed to national differences across educational systems. Much more research needs to be done if we wish to illuminate the way in which different forms of state and collective action at the national level come together to
produce different types of educational entitlement and governance.

A set of simple lessons can be drawn from the existing research on educational entitlements and the evolution of social citizenship in established industrial democracies, in order to offer a counterpoint to the official view of ideal educational governance reforms being advocated in the international community.

1. Forms of educational governance and allocation are tightly linked to the evolution of different types of polities (Green 1990; Hega and Hokenmaier 2002; Heidenheimer 1997).

2. As a starting point, we can conceptualize these polities in a typology that looks both at the level of resources allocated to socially redistributive purposes, and at the tradeoffs made in terms of social entitlements that are both different in type (i.e., education vs. income guarantees) and in organizational arrangement (level or scale at which various aspects of the system are governed/controlled; the rungs of the educational ladder) (Archer 1979; Green 1990; Hega and Hokenmaier 1998;).

3. The variation in social citizenship entitlements across different “ideal” types of polities generally reflects the evolution of different forms of negotiated settlements among collective actors at the national level (Esping-Anderson 1990). Historically, the single most important factor in the expansion of socially redistributive capacities in capitalist welfare states has been the establishment of sustained forums for negotiating power in which working class/popular interests are represented. This has usually depended on the formation of unions, left leaning political parties, and the development of working class or popular and middle class political alliances (Huber et al. 1997; Rueschmeyer et al. 1992).

4. The interests of collective agents are not primordial or fixed (though they can become “sticky” or “path dependent”). Such interests are socially and historically constructed and therefore evolve as part of the political process of institutionalization and re- (or de-) institutionalization of specific social settlements (Anderson 1983; Esping-Anderson 1990; Thelan 1999).

5. Sustained forms of socially redistributive policy rely heavily on state capacity to shape such working class/middle class alliances around support for specific state projects. One of these projects has been the introduction of a legislated right to schooling and the institutionalization of a system of mass education. Educational systems, in the words of Anderson, helped to construct an “imagined community” – lengthening social “chains of interdependence”
In short, collective action at the national level, although marginalized in current governance reforms, has played an enormous – and primarily positive - role in shaping the scope and organization of educational entitlements across established industrialized democracies. The shape and character of collective action yields different “types” of political compacts, and has also shaped variations in the governance and allocative structures of educational systems. Over time, national political compacts and the social citizenship regimes they set in play, encompass and shape the evolution of educational systems, their governance structures, and their allocative/redistributive roles.

Rather, and over the longer duration, it is the formation of a stable political compromise or compact, negotiated among formalized collective actors at the national level, that shapes the structure and redistributive capacity of educational systems – importantly influencing the extent to which citizens enjoy equitable educational (and other) social entitlements, and the legitimacy and strength of various forms of popular claims making in the educational arena.

**Social Citizenship Regimes, Educational Entitlements and Globalization**

The impact of globalization processes on social citizenship regimes has been hotly debated by both policy makers and researchers. Many initial analysts pointed out that the combination of a shift towards liberalization of economic markets and the rise of new forms of transnational market power (mobile multinational corporations) and new global institutions (e.g., the WTO), had significant impacts on the ability of governments, even in rich countries, to generate the tax resources needed to sustain their social welfare and redistributive policies. As inscribed in what came to be called the Washington consensus (Maxwell 2005; Williamson 1993), these reforms typically included downsizing, marketizing, and privatizing social welfare regimes (Mundy 2005).

Globalization also spawned a new kind of policy rhetoric about education – one increasingly focused on the creation of a competitive workforce (as opposed to the more traditional goals of equality, redistribution of opportunity, and entitlement); and on introducing decentralization and market-like incentives into educational systems (Ball 1998; Carnoy 1999; Dale 1997; Henry et. al. 2001; World Bank 1995). As such reform endeavors became endemic to education systems and other of the core arenas for social citizenship, governments often experimented with new forms of voice and accountability – seeking a kind of legitimation from the citizen-client that moved beyond the traditional state-led granting of entitlements, and corresponds to the Human Development approach.

The broad shift towards a more globalized economy and globally networked state clearly forced a renegotiation of the social settlements achieved in established industrialized countries. But the outcomes of these renegotiations implied, yet again, that very different sets of political actors, with distinctive, socially constructed identities and interests, led to a heterogeneous change in social settlements at the national level. The
social meaning of decentralization and the move towards more direct participation could look quite different in these different contexts, even when reforms were administratively similar.

Furthermore, processes of globalization opened up new spaces for collective action. Recent history has seen an explosion of global social movement activism in response to the emergence of increasingly globalized forms of political and economic power (Keck and Sikkink 1998; Smith 1997). It has also seen the emergence of new state-led efforts to construct post-national social citizenship regimes, most notably within the European Union (Habermas 2001); and significant efforts by international organizations to forge partnerships with business aimed at engaging them in the construction of an international public sphere which accords greater attention to basic rights and social equality (Ruggie 2004).

While the absence of a centralized government-like authority limits the ability of these new actors to negotiate a “global social settlement,” they are proving important in two ways. First, transnational actors have proven quite effective in leveraging changes on specific issues within individual nations and within intergovernmental organizations (Keck and Sikkink 1998). Second (and perhaps more significantly) they help to construct an imagined global community in which the demand for basic rights and entitlements is universalized – that is to say, these organizations advocated for a form of “global social citizenship” and for the means to realize it through both national citizenship and transnational citizenship regimes (Cornwall and Nyamu-Musembi 2005; Davies 2005; Kabeer 2005; Nelson and Dorsey 2003). The net result of these developments is the gradual (some might say “tentative”) construction of a global public sphere that is no longer “contained” by states and their formal interstate relationships, and that is increasingly capable of holding states accountable to its own goals (Held 2005; Ruggie 2004).

International organizations are now a permanent and expanding feature of an increasingly multi-level (or what Dale (2004) terms “pluriscalar) arena for educational governance, challenging previous patterns of sovereignty even in some of the richest countries. There is also a variety of new, non-state actors implicated in transnational educational politics. National systems of schooling have wide and often well-organized constituencies – think of parents associations, teachers unions, student unions and other professional associations. These constituencies have always challenged plans for educational reform. What is new is that they increasingly see their interests as linked transnationally, and are able to utilize new information technologies to mobilize. Around the world burgeoning transnational social movements repeatedly turn to education as a venue for demonstrating the negative impacts of globalization and the need for more effective global governance (Mundy and Murphy 2001).

We can summarize these developments and their implications for the governance of an “education for all agenda” in three points.

1) First, improving education is a central feature of national efforts to adjust to globalization. But the approach to education reform (particularly the weight given to
equality concerns), as well as the meaning of key governance reforms (such as decentralization or local participation), depends heavily upon the character of a nation’s negotiated regime for citizenship.

2) Second, the rise of transnational forms of collective political action suggest that a new avenue for political leverage and alliance is building around the idea of social citizenship entitlements – a form of collective action that transcends national borders. However, transnational citizens’ movements are clearly a long way away from negotiating a truly “global” social citizenship regime, in the sense of a negotiated settlement comprised of state-sponsored projects for redistributive justice.

3) Finally, the combination of neo-liberal governance reforms with a focus on education (advocated by intergovernmental organizations), and of transnational efforts to extend forms of global social citizenship, might be expected to produce an especially active – though highly contradictory era of multi-layered governance experiments around “education for all” – especially directed at those countries where the right to education is farthest from realization. There is a keen need to look more closely at the articulation and effects of these new governance experiments in the developing world.

A Social Citizenship Lens on Governance Reforms in the Developing World

A series of challenges arise in any effort to transpose the problematic of “social citizenship” to the developing world – not least because the construct itself has deep historical roots in Western polities, and may further render local political processes “illegible”. However, a social citizenship lens offers a corrective for the tendency within current development thinking and practice, to make uncritical use of concepts like democracy, participation and good governance that are drawn from an idealized model of the Western liberal polity. Furthermore, we know that the evolution of the international aid regime itself has been shaped and influenced by the emergence of social citizenship regimes in the North – and that transnational civil society actors also draw on this same Western repertoire in their advocacy efforts (Lumsdaine 1993; Mundy and Murphy 2001; Noel 2005).

For many developing countries, independence and anti-colonialism struggles revolved not only around the demand for political rights and equality. The demand for self-rule also focused on livelihoods and economic equality (Cornwall and Nyamu-Musembi 2005). Furthermore, both the character of a country’s colonial administration and the nature of a country’s anti-colonial struggle, are likely to have left an indelible imprint in national politics. How popular constituencies were organized for collective action, and whether armed conflict was part of that struggle, influenced independence policies, both in terms of the later extension of civil and political rights and the structure of formal politics in a country, and in terms of the allocation of social entitlements.

After independence, governments in many developing countries played a very weak role in social redistribution; they quite frequently circumvented formal procedural democracy and also denied basic civil and political rights.
In the 1990s, a wave of democratic transitions in the developing world fed international interest in the question of how to structure new forms of accountability in developing states – not only to prevent elite capture but also to ensure a social foundation for democracy -- leading to a rapid expansion of official interest in mobilizing “civil society” (Blair 2000). Decentralization and local governance reforms – often initially motivated by a pragmatic interest in resource mobilization -- increasingly came to be seen as essential to the construction of a social foundation for democracy.

Advocates of decentralization generally argue that it has “great potential to stimulate the growth of civil society organizations…. Prevent widespread disillusionment with new policies from turning into rejection of the entire democratic process…[and] boost legitimacy by making government more responsive to citizen needs (Diamond 1999, quoted in Hiskey and Seligson 2003, p. 66). Governance and sector reform programs by donor agencies created “a profusion of sites in which citizens came to be enlisted in enhancing accountability and state responsiveness” (Manor 2004b). This view of a link between decentralization and democracy and between democracy and social citizenship is also reinforced by international civil society actors, whose years of work in participatory approaches to local development condition lead them to favor locally controlled approaches to development (Cornwall and Coelho, eds. 2007).

However, an increasing number of researchers dispute the idea that decentralization of governance naturally leads to the effective mobilization of clients and citizens and the institutionalization of more equitable and effective social sector policies. The overlay of two contrasting motives – the first for direct resource-mobilization and the second for legitimation through the provision of citizenship entitlements -- often plays out in contradictory and confusing ways in decentralization reforms that aim at greater participation (Cornwall and Coelho, eds. 2007, p. 5; Robinson 2007;). Empirical research has found that decentralization reforms are often shaped by mixed motives – for example, by governmental desire to offload responsibility or (alternatively) by governmental resistance to ceding downward control (Cornwall and Coelho, eds. 2007). There are also key administrative demands that make the institutionalization of good governance at the local level as difficult as at the national level; opportunities for elite capture and patronage relations at the local level are often just as great (Ahmad et al. 2005). Finally, when decentralization reforms do not yield effective benefits, they can actually create greater levels of distrust and disillusionment with democracy as a mode of operating (Hiskey and Seligson 2003).

Overall, there is simply too little empirical research to tell us whether increased participation in decentralized local governance structures either improves services (Robinson 2007) or enhances democracy (Cornwall and Coelho 2007; Manor 2004 a, b) across different contexts. A tendency to merge prescriptive and empirical accounts of what is happening further blurs the debate. Overall, there is a “need to unpack the category of civil society, to examine who comes to represent citizens…” (Cornwall and Coelho, eds. 2007, p.6).
Social Citizenship Lens at the Community-School Interface

Most of us feel an instinctive affinity with the notion that local citizens and their voices ought to matter in the shaping of educational services. We also know that a wide range of “democratic decentralization” experiments are underway in developing country contexts. For example, in recent field research in Africa we found widespread use of direct user committees (primarily in the form of “school management committees”); devolution of system oversight to elected local authorities; and a myriad of cross cutting experiments in citizen engagement in education through “social funds” or funds placed at the discretion of individual parliamentarians; and pilot projects focused on the creation of community “school report cards” (Mundy, 2008).

A substantial body of mainly World Bank funded research supports such experiments, by offering convincing examples of cases in which local level citizen voice improves the quality of educational services. However, an equally large body of research argues against such policies – for many of the reasons noted in the section on democratic decentralization experiments above. Thus, for example, there is often tension or lack of clarity about how different decentralization experiments map onto one another, with the relationships between local elected authorities and school committees particularly unclear (Chapman et al. 2002; Mundy, 2008). Administrative challenges at the local level undermine the implementation of democratic decentralization efforts; or lead to the creation of highly scripted forms of engagement (Bray 1999, 2003; Cadell 2005; Gershberg 1999; Mukundan 2003). Efforts to introduce private providers or to mobilize local level contributions to schools operate at cross purposes to the message of citizenship entitlement sent out by national promises of “free” education (Barrs 2005; Bray 1999; Chapman et al. 2005; Gershberg and Meade 200X; Kendall 2003; Miller Grandvaux and Yoder 2002; Rose 2002, 2003, 2005, 2006). Parents typically view these types of resource-mobilizing engagement as temporary fixes on the path to state-led schooling in their communities (Mfum-Mensah 2004). Researchers also find that these reforms re-produce intra-community as well as inter-community inequality, limiting the redistributive scope of central government (Bray 1999; Dyer and Rose 2005; Pryor 2005).

A Social Citizenship Lens at the Interface between “Civil Society” and the National Polity

In a wave of recent research, political scientists have shown convincingly that a movement towards free multiparty democracy reinforces promises of universal access to basic education, and to increased spending for this purpose, at least in Africa and Latin America (Brown 1999; Brown and Hunter 1997; Stasavage 2004, 2005). To some degree, formal democracy seems to lock governments in to greater spending on the needs of the median voter, for whom entitlement to basic education remains an important matter.

We also know that even across formal democracies, educational entitlements are surprising varied both in terms of the extensiveness and structure. A sharp institutional overhang from colonial policies seems to influence just how aggressively even newly democratized societies pursue the later goal of universal basic education (Brown 2000),
even when economic factors are held constant. The character of the relationship between civil society and the state, and the way in which popular voice has been institutionalized in forms of collective agency vis à vis the state, may be the defining factor in such variation.
Part III

Chapter 8. Outcomes of the New Mode of Governance

General Features

When success of decentralization reforms has been mentioned, this has most often been in terms of factors such as degree of restructuring, new structures implemented, frequency of activities and interactions (among stakeholders), generation of local resources and reinforcement of existing regional and national bodies for monitoring, assessment and evaluation or creation of new ones. Apart from this, it is not very evident in detail, to what extent decentralization has led to greater participation. The literature, according to Kemmerer (1994, p. 1414), suggests four factors that seem to determine the outcomes of decentralization: (a) social, economic, and cultural context; (b) political support from national leaders and local elites; (c) adequate planning and management and local empowerment; and (d) the scope of reform.

The cultural and economic contexts around the globe vary enormously. The geographical area where the school is situated or from where the pupils are recruited is a steering force in itself. Various studies show that features at the local level are determined both by initial conditions and measures taken from higher levels in order to “steer” the situation (Abu-Duhou, 1999; Hanson, 1990, 2001; Levacic, 1995; Ornelas, 2000, 2004; Santos Filho, 1993).

The central level often establishes the parameters for the local boards: mandate, composition of the local bodies, and so on, guided by a linear view of the whole process: decisions are made, implementation takes place and people at the local level interpret centrally decided policies in the way intended by the central decision-makers.

The local ability to take over tasks defined at the central level differs, and is often taken for granted. However, in order for decentralization to contribute to enlargement of the space for decision-making to be for everybody’s participation at the local level the local conditions have to allow them to participate. In places as different as Mexico, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Spain, Sweden and Tanzania, the local populations and school staff claim that they were not prepared for their new roles (Hanson, 2001; Mmbaga, 2002; Ornelas, 2000; Ruiz de Forsberg, 2006; Skolverket, 2001).

With the implementation of decentralization, new functions and roles emerge, and individuals at local level receive more tasks and duties. Therefore, decentralization has tended to carry ambiguity in regard to responsibility and authority (Elmore, 1993; Ethiopia-Sida, 2001; Samoff, 1999). Uncertainty as to decision-making competence and different interpretations of the new rules tend to cause confusion and conflicts (Caldwell, 1993; Elmore, 1993; Hannaway, 1993; Odden and Wohlstedter, 1993; Papagiannis, Easton and Owens, 1992; Ruiz de Forsberg, 2006; Skolverket, 1999, 2000).
Focus on Participation

Participatory approaches to development are not neutral or ‘value-free’, but they are based on a number of assumptions which need to be taken into account (Shaeffer, 1994). The roles and functions of local bodies differ and they give school leaders, teachers and parents varying opportunities to participate. However, both “community” and “participation” are ambiguous terms. “Community” is often used without definition and specification. Bray (1997) raises some questions in relation to this: Is community a geographical area, an ethnic, racial or religious group, and so on? If community is seen as a geographical area, the situation is that such areas are not homogenous units; communities vary from “organic” units to artificial constructions created for administrative purpose. Municipalities and districts tend to differ in the way local boards interpret and practice the decentralization processes (Daun, 2003; Hanson, 2001; Levacic, 1995; Slater, 1993). Community tends to become “school community”, i.e. the pupils attending the school in question and their parents. This is especially the case when freedom of choice has been introduced, whereby community becomes an aggregate of individual choose rs (Blackmore, 2000) or “only the locale where the market operates” (Angus, 1994, p. 30).

When it comes to participation, Beare (1993, p. 200) argues that the vocabulary “needs to be clarified”. Various attempts have been made to define “participation”. Participation implies a much more active role than involvement, a role established by right (Shaeffer, 1994, p. 17). However, in reality, most often this is not the case. For instance, in Nicaragua, rural women have the principal responsibility for the schooling but due to poverty, they have to find an income in addition to their household and family tasks. With their double work load, they are not able to participate in school life to any large extent. Also, local elites can take advantage of the fact that power is relocated from higher levels down to the local level, while common people cannot (Alternative Sud, 1997; Hamidou, 1997; Patrinos and Lakshmanan, 1997; Pryor, 2003; Siddique, 1997).

Analyzing the situation in some Sub-Saharan African countries, Durston and Nashire, 1998) found six different models for community participation in educational affairs mainly in terms of material input to the school: a) Pure community self-help (community does everything); b) some measures of community support (coupled with support from NGOs); c) community provides buildings, government provides teachers and some materials; d) community is able to make contributions in order to elicit outside funding; e) a private individual or company establishes its own school and funds 100 per cent of the costs; f) major funding agencies are able to provide the majority of capital costs. In most of the cases, participation means contributions.

The function of the head teachers in relation to the “site council” varies considerably - even if he or she in most cases chairs the council meetings. At one extreme, practically all power stays with the head teacher, and the other members are there just to give advice or to legitimize the head teacher’s proposals. At the other extreme, the head teacher is recruited by the site council or board and can be fired if the site board is not satisfied with his or her performance. As far as the scope of the mandate is concerned, it may vary from details within a framework set by an authority higher in the hierarchy to a rather autonomous organ which decides on economic and staff issues and some of the
content of education.

Head teachers tend to enjoy more power than before and are satisfied with their new role, although it is more demanding. They also felt that they had more freedom over the budget. On the other hand, they also felt that they were managing somebody else’s agenda (Abu-Duhou, 1999; Elmore, 1993; Levacic (1995; Samoff, 1999; Skolverket, 1999, 2000; Weindling, 1998; Whitty, 1996). In most cases, administrative tasks take more of the head teacher’s attention and time then before decentralization, at the expense of pedagogical leadership (Power and Whitty, 1997).

However, head teachers have roles that are difficult to combine. Robertson (1998) argues that the the head teacher has to deal with three conflicting roles for school leaders - that of statesperson (leader of an institution), connoisseur (know the prerequisites for learning), and entrepreneur (initiate change). Grace (1997) found that school leaders - in the pressure between the state and the market - have to keep a balance between three broad ideal types of roles: (i) head teachers-managers; (ii) head teachers-professionals; and (iii) head teachers-resistors. The first category was managerialists in their professional orientation, while the second were concerned about professional issues and the third category reacted passively to the pressures and tasks. For example, during the first phase of decentralization in Spain, many teachers volunteered to be director for the three year period. By time, they became less and less interested in volunteering and the same happened with parent representatives for the councils (Hanson, 2001, pp. 46-47). This trend made the national authorities change the legislation in order to give head teachers more power.

In several places, there have been tensions, if not to say conflicts, between the head teacher, on the one hand, and the school council, on the other hand (Codd, 1994; Hanson, 2001; Harold, 1998). In all, head teachers have been pushed into more administrative and management tasks at the expense of pedagogical leadership in a broad sense. This trend seems to be stronger, the stronger market mechanisms (choice and vouchers) are applied.

Teachers participate in different degrees. In some schools, teachers have responded positively to the reforms whereas in other schools they have been less enthusiastic. They tend to become more actively involved in various interactions not directly related to teaching and are less satisfied than the school leaders with their new situation (Abu-Duhou, 1999; Falkner, 1997; Whitty, 1996, 1997), and they have to face the different pressures from parents to improve school, and as a result their workload has increased (Whitty, 1997). When decentralization is combined with market mechanisms and freedom of choice, this increases the pressure on the teachers. Chosen schools have to handle an increasing number of pupils, while schools not chosen tend to face economic problems. In the USA, according to Daresh (1998, p. 325), teachers “can no longer retain their separate identities as those who are involved only in classroom activities”. Teachers feel that their work has been intensified and that they have to work with a broader area of issues than before, some of which they do not feel competent to deal with (such as administration, financial issues, and so on). In England teachers felt that: a) there had been an intensification of work, b) they had to deal with issues of which they had no experience before, and c) the reforms had been mandated by others (Southworth, 1998). Similar findings have been reported from
several other countries (Daun, Slenning and Waldow, 2004; Fiske and Ladd, 2003; Harold, 1998).

In all, teachers become more involved in different activities not directly related to their teaching in the classroom, but it is not very clear to what extent they can influence the decision-making in their school.

Parental involvement: Today, especially in low income countries, parents are expected to contribute to school activities in various ways. The most common forms of are fees, sponsoring, or that communities pay teacher salaries (Bray, 1998). Opportunities for parental involvement may vary from sporadic school visits to a situation in which parents form the majority in a school-site council with decision-making power. If these arrangements allow strong parental participation, at least theoretically, then what happens is to a large extent due to how much the parents are able to use their opportunities and this, in its turn, tends to mirror societal and community structures and cultural patterns. The studies reviewed show the anticipated pattern: parents with more cultural capital (especially education) are more active and more than other parents elected to boards.

If decentralization leaves “space” for local initiative, it is then a matter of how this is perceived and who exploits the new opportunities. In Mexico, local elites have, according to Ornelas (2000, p. 21), taken advantage of the powers emanating from decentralization. Case studies conducted in Ghana (Pryor, 2003), India (Leclercq, 2003), Cambodia (Pellini, 2006), Nicaragua (Ruiz de Forsberg, 2006), and Senegal (Clemons, 2006) illustrate this. In the case of Mozambique, traditional chiefs were deliberately involved (Ribeiro, 2006). Pryor (2003) found in a case study conducted in Ghana that no females were ever elected to the school councils, and the majority of the members were teachers (as parents), while the remaining ones were more well-off, and better educated people. Parents tend to be left with the role to come in when called upon by the schools or to share costs with the state (Leclercq, 2003; Parajuli, 2006; Pellini, 2006; Pryor, 2003). In South Africa (Grant Lewis and Naidoo, 2006) and Nepal (Parajuli, 2006), parents participate on conditions formally or informally established by the head teacher and the teachers. In Nicaragua, a great deal of parental participation takes the form of parents attending school meetings and school fairs and parents helping with school repair and painting (Ruiz de Forsberg, 2006).

In all, the pattern of local participation tends to mirror the socio-economic and cultural (capital) distribution in the local area of the school. If we use the ladder of participation presented by Arnstein (1971), we find that parent participation tends to take place at lowest stages (1-4), which imply use of schooling, material contribution, attending meetings for receiving information, or involvement in specific issues.

Case Studies Conducted in Eight Countries

Case studies conducted in eight countries during the period 2002-2005, most of them low-income countries, show the following. These countries are similar to many other countries in that decision-making, tasks and/or functions have been moved from higher levels to
school level. De-concentration and delegation have been most common or at least the most commonly decided upon in the case countries as well as in several of the other cases reviewed. In all countries except Norway the district level deals with primary and secondary education. The low income countries among them have of strong national/local cultures based in traditional communitarianism, whether they are relatively egalitarian or highly stratified along caste, clan or purely socio-economic lines. These cultures do not accept all the ingredients of neo-liberal modernity (e.g. individualism, profit-making). Thus, the project of modernity disseminated through the world models and general processes of globalization - if not filtered through national policy making - encounter the local realities, and something of glocalization and hybridization occurs (Nederven Pieterse, 1995; Robertson, 1995). This means that universal features are translated and adapted to local cultures and the universal and the local are more or less merged. All of these countries increasingly are object of (I)NGO interventions. Since the (I)NGOs carry modern communitarianism, the encounter with traditional communitarianism tends to result in hybridization and glocalization. For example, in Cambodia, (I)NGOs make efforts to implement specific structures for local decision-making and to use traditional pagoda associations for modernization purpose (Pellini, 2006).

Basically, there is public funding from the central state but also some share is expected to come from local or medium levels in the form of private funding (fees, sponsoring). Cambodia is unique in that parents contribute a large proportion of the school funds.

Comparisons across countries or even across provinces in one and the same country have to take into consideration that: (i) the baselines differed when the implementation of decentralization started; (ii) the levels, forms, types and issues of decentralization vary; and (iii) some countries have combined decentralization with introduction of market forces (choice arrangements, per student subsidy, etc.), while others have not. All of these features have not been possible to study in detail here.

The most radical or comprehensive decentralization programs have been introduced in Norway, Nicaragua, South Africa and (in community-based education - CBE) in Senegal. All these programs imply devolution of decision-making and tasks from the central level to the schools. This is combined with rather detailed instructions from above concerning mandates and composition of the school-site bodies. When it comes to sited-based body, most countries formerly did not have such bodies at regional level but at best a PTA. The countries differ in involvement of parents or other local people in the school-site bodies, and whether these bodies have decision-making power or not. Since the beginning of the 1990s, all eight case countries have introduced a decision-making or advisory body at the school. Decentralization efforts (mainly de-concentration) have been weakest in Greece, and Mozambique, where most of the decision-making power has stayed at the regional or district levels. In Greece, most of the decision-making takes place in de-concentrated state bodies, but in parallel to these, there are at school level (and other levels) of the parent association with an advisory role. The schools have councils and committees with an advisory role, and the real power stays with the head teacher.

As far as market mechanisms are concerned, they are most extensively used in
Norway and South Africa. In Norway, there are per student subsidies and almost unlimited choice (at least theoretically). South Africa is similar in these regards but schools have also spent time on fund raising. Nicaragua had per student subsidies, fund raising and school fees from the start of the decentralization reform, but when it became evident that this was in contradiction with the constitution, the fees became voluntary contributions from the parents. In some of the other countries, there is choice (at least theoretically) in that children can choose a private school.

In all countries, there is a national administrative structure or framework and then decentralized bodies for decision-making within this framework. The framework is week in low income countries, and the central state has often weak capabilities, and this results in lack of support to the local levels and problems for information to go in both directions - upwards and down-wards. Within the national framework, local or community people are expected to be involved, but this involvement most often takes the form of economic contribution and rarely of genuine participation at the highest level of Arnstein’s (1971) ladder. Apart from the traditional regulative and steering mechanisms, retro-active assessments conducted by the central state; choice exerted by parents and pupils; and per pupil funding are steering mechanisms as suggested in the world model. This is of course most elaborated in Norway where the levels of technology, income and competence are sufficiently high and infrastructure exists for applying such measures.

Policies of school accountability have to a large extent been introduced; schools have to report their activity, budgets and student achievement, often upwards in the hierarchy as well as horizontally to school boards/councils or other bodies.

Norway has introduced essential elements of the world models for education: market mechanisms, move of decision-making from national level to school level, and so on. The school-site body in the case schools studied in Norway have an advisory role and most power stays with the head teacher (Smehaugen, 2006). On the other hand, Greece’s has been reluctant to appropriate elements from the worlds models and has mostly deconcentrated and delegated from the national to regional and prefectural levels (Siminou, 2006).

In South Africa, decision-making has been moved from national to provincial level and school level. The provinces differ in regard to how much and what they have decentralized to districts and schools. However, the general trend is devolution of decision-making to the school-site body. The country had such bodies before the shift to democracy, but these bodies were organized along racial lines so in practice only white schools had them. Nowadays, parents should have a strong voice, but it was found in the case study schools that, in practice, the head teacher decides. Some resource generation has been placed at local/school level; market mechanisms and outcomes-based performance tests have been introduced (Grant Lewis and Naidoo, 2006).

Nicaragua implemented one of the most radical types of decentralization in that a great deal of decision-making but also of funding from the national level to schools have been devolved to the schools. According to the regulations, parents are in majority in the school council but in reality, the head teacher decides in most matters. The school-site
council came with the decentralization in the 1990s (Ruiz de Forsberg, 2006).

In Senegal, the central state was pressured from international agents to increase enrollment in the world wide endeavour to accomplish Education for All, and it was internationally legitimized for the state to leave the complete responsibility for this new type of community (CBE) schools to local communities and (I)NGOs. The only role taken by the state is monitoring and supervision from the district (prefecture) level. The position of the CBE schools is not quite clear, since they have been seen by the central state as formal as well as non-formal. The school-site body is a new phenomenon in Senegalese school matters and exists in the CBE schools. In practice, most decisions are made by NGO representatives (Clemons, 2006).

Mozambique had not introduced market forces to any large extent and decentralization had been made mainly to the regional and district levels, even if schools will be required to take more responsibility than before. Mozambique has decided on a policy implying the establishment of school-site councils including local people, but implementation had not yet started when the field study was conducted in this country (Ribeiro, 2006).

Cambodia is among the poorest in the world, but its population contributes significantly to the direct funding of education (not via the tax system). There are local pagoda associations but they are mostly staffed by people who participate by tradition. At the local level, mechanisms for involvement vary. The composition of the school-site bodies tend to reflect the socio-economic, gender and other inequalities in the local community. Efforts are made to decentralize some of the formal and modern type of decision-making, but these efforts seem not to have been successful in linking to the traditional pagoda associations, which are handling a great deal of school matters at the local level (Pellini, 2006).

In Nepal, schools were run by local communities until the end of the 1960s when they were taken over by the central state. With the pressure from international community, decentralization has been gradually implemented since the 1990s, principally as de-concentration to state bodies at the district level. Cambodia and Nepal have also de-concentrated but more so to the district level. Most decisions are made by officers in the de-concentrated district office (Parajuli, 2006).
Chapter 9. Conclusion

What ever the causes, reasons and mechanisms (imitation, borrowing, imposition, etc.) are, governments have implemented essential elements similar to or of the same type as those suggested in the world model for education. This has occurred, although all countries are not economically incorporated into the most important flows of the world economy. Societies are pressured by economic globalization to become competitive and the countries with the lowest income are marginalized from economic flows.

Economic globalization itself does not require or cause decentralization but the discourse of the world models carries a mixture of elements from the market orientation and the communitarian orientation in which decentralization is explicitly pointed out. As part of the NG, decentralization may be seen as an attempt to respond to the above mentioned requirements but also to relocate “wastage”, uncertainty, risk, finance and conflicts to local levels in society (Weiler, 1993). In fact, in many cases, the new type of governance has not been demanded by local and national people and it does not always fit local or national needs and demands.

When the NG is fully implemented, it includes components that logically belong together. Decentralization can change the supply side in the education, but markets mechanisms have to be introduced in order to enable parents, children and schools to respond to the demands.

The outcomes of decentralization are conditioned by a large number of factors, such as formulated policy, type of decentralization, whether market mechanisms have been included, implemented policy, and local cultural, economic and political contexts. Also, the outcomes are conditioned by the countries’ position in the world economic system by the globalization forces and also by the pressure to implement features from the world model. Hybridization and/or glocalization seem to occur from the encounter between the world model and and local perspectives, beliefs and ideological orientations.

Parent participation at the highest levels as defined by Arnstein (1971) seems to be rare. However, the fact that there exists a discourse on and policy of decentralization makes it more legitimate than before for local people to use their voice in educational matters.

Governance in high income countries tends to be rather sophisticated and requires advanced technology and is directed by a relatively strong central state. Abu-Dhou (1999, p. 20) argues that the reform efforts have to “balance increased diversification, flexibility and local control, with an orderly delivered quality of education across geographical, socio-economic and ethnic divisions of society”. However, NG in itself does not seem to be able to achieve this.

For decentralized education systems, the role of the central and regional governments is critical in ensuring equity and protection of minority interests. Decentralization might require careful planning and extensive training and more staff, resources, and equipment, rather than less. From a policy point of view, since the dimension of decentralization - centralization is one aspect of governance and others have
been introduced, it is difficult to establish what outcomes are due to what.

The country cases and the findings reported in the last chapter indicate that the decentralization programs have been successful in changing existing administrative and decision-making structures and in installing new ones, but they seem to have been less successful in terms of genuine local participation and social citizenship. Generally, the certain outcomes of governance reforms are then that they have been successful in the implementation of structures and new type of governance but many such reforms have failed to achieve other important objectives set for them.
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