Asia Pacific Education Review
2003, Vol. 4, No. 1, 1-10.

Educational Strategies for the New Development Orthodoxy

Don Adams

University of Pittsburgh
U.S.A.

In the opening years of the 21st Century it would appear that a new development model has emerged supported by multilateral assistance groups such as the UN Group, World Bank, Asian Development Bank, and various NGOs. This paper will: (a) briefly sketch the emergence of the major concepts and proposed actions which form the new model for development; (b) analyze the strategic implications for national and local educational change; and, (c) critique both the general model, and in particular, examine its limitations in planning and implementing educational reform. The analysis and critique will include an argument that the new development orthodoxy requires significant and, at times, unrealistic changes in the capacities and consequences of education programs and systems.

Key Words: education, strategies, development, policy

Over the last few years leaders of bilateral, multilateral, and regional aid agencies and heads of state of most industrially advanced countries have come together and achieved a remarkable level of agreement that global poverty is the largest threat to social welfare and global security. Equally remarkable is agreement emerging on the processes and actions necessary to reduce poverty and attain world development. And, to further add to surprises, education has increasingly emerged as a centerpiece of strategy for poverty reduction, social, and economic development. Thus, what might be termed a global development orthodoxy has emerged with far reaching implications for educational strategies from the sector level to the classroom. Although neither the contextual, cultural, social or economic changes, nor the accompanying changes in educational policy and planning, have fully taken institutional and operational form, there is something approaching a consensus on the core dimensions of the new development approach.

Don Adams, Professor Emeritus, University of Pittsburgh, USA. Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Don Adams, 1106 Gilchrest Dr. Pittsburgh, PA, U.S.A. 15235. Electronic mail may be sent to pakdadams@aol.com.

This paper will attempt to: (a) briefly sketch the emergence of the major concepts and proposed actions which form the new model for development; (b) analyze the strategic implications for national, and local educational change, and (c) critique both the general model, and, in particular, examine its limitations in planning and implementing educational reform. The analysis and critique will include an argument that the new development orthodoxy attempts to alter significantly and, at times, unrealistically, the functions of education systems and capacities and consequences of education programs (Asian Development Bank & World Bank, 1999; Asian Development Bank, 2001).

The Evolvement of the New Development Orthodoxy

The emerging development orthodoxy, although presenting no single, elaborated ideology, constitutes an attempt to respond to earlier failed orthodoxies. The 'development problem' as currently largely defined by bilateral and multilateral assistance agencies (i.e., the World Bank, UN Group, and the Asian Development Bank) would likely include the following general interpretations: the number of poor people globally is

growing; poverty has not been eliminated by economic growth; the gap between poor and rich is increasing between and within many countries; honest and efficient government has been achieved in few developing countries; and, only rare progress has been made toward sustainable social development and social inclusion. Thus, a new approach to development planning is needed which seeks to sustain economic growth, create good government, and reduce poverty through empowering weaker population groups.

Shifting interpretation of development

Early theories of development concentrated largely on economic growth with a focus on national product with GNP and GNP *per capita* the favored indicators of success. Lewis (Lewis, 1955) in his popular early book on economic development explained: "The subject matter of the book is growth of output per head of population. Growth or output are treated as synonyms or even occasionally for the sake of variety these terms may be substituted with *progress* or *development*" (p.11). To Lewis, the ideas of growth, output, progress, and development are identical. What matters in this view of development is the total sum or aggregation of outputs of the economy with little attention to distribution or characteristics of growth.

Subsequent modifications in development theory added to growth the idea of 'redistribution' (Chenery, 1974), thus, to a degree, recognizing the need for protection of the poorest sectors of the population. Recently, views of economic development have been further supplemented with a variety of social objectives, even with some recommendations that the popular development measure of income be replaced by a needs-based concept. The importance of economic growth has persisted, but "basic needs" and the ideas of fairness and justice have been increasingly, but not universally, accepted as a component of the conceptualization of development (Leach & Little, 1999; McMahon, 2000)

The emerging approach to development, at least in rhetoric, goes well beyond, interpretations of most of the literature emphasizing growth and basic needs. Within the new development orthodoxy, outlines of a localized participatory model for policy and planning are beginning to emerge, hastened by national policies and international trends in decentralization, publicized by the grass-roots experience of NGOs and other organizations working in local health, education and rural development, expedited by the market place, and, recently strongly encouraged by changing priorities of major international donors.

Table 1 represents an attempt to capture similarities and distinctions on nine dimensions of three general models of development. There is some empirical evidence suggesting an historical trend across the approaches toward acceptance of the language of institutional capability. However, during the last several decades elements of all three approaches can be found at any given time. Thus, for example, even in the 1960s when development goals were dominated by a focus on economic growth, with only occasional references to noneconomic factors, there were a few scholars and practitioners calling for more attention to the human side of development.

Modifications and extensions of development goals have seen the idea of basic needs, most explicitly in health and education, gain importance in the 1970s and remain a priority today. However, the emerging overarching goal of most development agencies and many developing countries has become poverty reduction, a condition achieved through empowerment of the poor in processes of social development and social inclusion as well as economic growth.

Another change in emphasis recognizes the strong inhibiting effects of government corruption and the importance of honest, effective governance as a context for endogenous change. Human capital concerns continue to dominate the policy dimensions; however, the additional concepts of cultural capital and social capital have become part of the broader capital concept. Implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the development process, and therefore the measurement of outputs and outcomes, have been freed from domination of quantitative approaches and a preference for 'objectively verifiable indicators,' giving encouragement to inclusion of a wide range of qualitative research methods. The success and legitimacy of the new development model is assumed to lie in participatory activities central to the processes of policy making, planning, assessing and sustaining change involving and serving local and national aspirations and expectations.

Strategies for the new development orthodoxy generated largely by multilateral agencies, in particular the World Bank, attempt to: (a) reverse traditional patterns of centralized dominance of decisions, (b) extend social participation and opportunity, and (c) demonstrate good governance and institutional efficiencies. Clearly, greater challenges and higher expectations of the contribution of education are found in the new model. The following sections examine the expectations for education and provide a critique of the key concepts associated with the new development model.

Table 1. *Approaches to Development*

Dimension	Economic Growth	Economic Growth and Basic Needs	Institutional Capability
Goals	Sustaining economic growth.	Sustaining economic growth; Economic Stability; Meeting basic health and educational needs.	Good governance; Poverty reduction; Social development; Social inclusion; Economic growth; Productive assets.
Policies	Investment in technologies; Human capital; Technical and higher education.	Investment in technologies; Human capital; Basic education for all; Nutrition and health programs.	Basic education; Work training; Health programs; Political training; Public and private partnerships.
Planning Mode	Top-down; Government-driven Public; Technocratic.	Top-down; Public; Technocratic; Some decentralization.	Bottom-up; Transactive; Participatory; Generative; Political process.
Evaluation	Pre-Post testing; Expert driven; Quantitative.	Pre-Post testing; Expert driven; Standardized.	Participatory; Ongoing; Qualitative.
Outputs	Satisfactory growth.	Satisfactory growth; Safety nets for poor.	Reduction in the number of poor; Increased assets of the poor; Empowerment and reduced corruption.
Outcomes	Higher *per capita* income.	Higher *per capita* income; Equitable basic educational opportunities.	Increased local capacity; Improved well being of poor; Equitable social capital.
Change Prosess	Exogenous.	Largely exogenous.	Endogenous.
Sustainability	Little focus on implementation and sustainability.	Increasing concern for sustainability.	Implementation and high sustainability integral to model.
Constraints/ Limitations	Growth uneven; High level of dependency.	Very poor often excluded; Few opportunities for employment of poor in globalized economies.	Required high rate of capacity building; Strong political will; Necessary access to accurate information.

Implications of the New Orthodoxy for National and Local Educational Reform

There are at least three major implications of the new development orthodoxy for education policy, planning and practice: (a) the increased centrality of education in development policy and planning; (b) the increased focus and priorities on decentralization and localization; and, (c) empowerment of teachers and administrators.

Centrality of education

The human capital revolution of the 1960s gave an economic *raison d'etre* for international restructuring and promotion in education. Only recently, as development goals focus on poverty reduction and empowerment of the poor, has education surged to the forefront as a social, as well as an economic, priority. The new development orthodoxy calls for increased bilateral and multilateral assistance to poor countries, and an expanded, more pervasive propoor role for education, implying changes both in the policy center and locally in administration, instruction, and learning. The president of the World Bank in 2002 stated, without any challenge, before the meeting of the Bank's policy setting Development Committee: "There is a growing understanding that education is the number one development priority" (Stern, 2002; Wolfensohn, World Bank press release, April 22, 2002).

Policy papers prepared by the World Bank, the Asian Development Bank, USAID and the UN Group have suggested for recent decades that education is indisputably accepted as an essential element in economic growth, individual and familial health, and skills for the labor market. The educational level of a population is a major indicator of the investment climate. Investment in the education of women is expected to yield especially high development dividends in the form of reduced fertility rates, lower infant mortality rates improved child nutrition, and greater likelihood of enrolling children in schools. Recent examples of the expanded effects of investment in education as described by quotations from WB and ADB documents are as follows:

> ADB: "The fundamental purpose of investment in education is to empower people with the knowledge, skills and attitudes to improve their quality of life enhancement, their productivity, and their capacity to learn new skills and enable them to participate more fully in the development process" (p. 2).
> ADB: "Education has come to be considered a human right and not merely an ingredient in the recipe for economic development" (p. 2).
> ADB: " All children and adults will have equitable access to education of sufficient quality to empower them to break the poverty cycle, to improve their quality of life and to participate effectively in national development" (p. iv).
> WB: "Education is a cornerstone of the World Bank Group's overall mission of helping countries fight poverty with passion and professionalism to achieve lasting results" (p. iii).
> WB: "… why education is important is that it contributes to improving people's lives and reduces poverty: (1) helping people to become more productive and earn more…; (2) improving health and nutrition…; (3) enriching lives directly (e.g., the pleasure of intelligent thought and a sense of empowerment …); (4) promoting social development through strengthening social cohesion and giving more people better opportunities (and thus greater equity through opportunity)" (p. iv).
> ADB: "… the relationship between education and poverty reduction is very clear: … [educated people] have higher income-earning potential; … improved quality of life; … avail themselves of a range of social services; … participate more actively in local and national government through voting and community involvement; … they are less likely to be marginalized…within the larger society" (p. 3).
> (ADB, 2001; World Bank, 1999)

Education's potential empowering role in poverty reduction, social development, social inclusion, and participation in good governance constitute relatively new emphases.

Decentralization, localization and empowerment

The new development orthodoxy contributes to a global trend already well underway in deconcentration and decentralization of education decision making. The general argument for localized decision power goes as follows: actors who have the most to gain or lose and who have the best information about what actually goes on in schools are best able to make appropriate decisions about how such institutions should use scarce resources and how students should be taught. Following this argument, countries have shifted responsibility and power to communities, school actors (principals and teachers), parents and, even occasionally, to students (King, Orazen, & Wohlgemuth, 1998).

An ADB document supports the trend in decentralization among all member countries as a necessary condition for successful and accountable education governance:

> Education governance [provides] for effective policies and institutions, which will include support for public sector management at all levels, legal and judicial reform, and improving public accountability. Governance must also promote processes and procedures for more effective participation in decision making to promote equitable and inclusive growth, especially by civil society (ADB, 2001, p. 8).

The emerging development orthodoxy does not necessarily prescribe the elimination of all central responsibilities in education. Irrespective of various styles of educational governance, the central education authority is likely to maintain several important direct or indirect roles. For example, the center can create as part of its national data base information on the poor and can develop directly and fund a variety of propoor compensatory programs. The center can establish a legal framework for participation of the poor in civic society and in its deliberations can demonstrate transparency, public dialogue, and freedom of speech. Further, the center can encourage women's and minority organizations at the national level, which will, in turn, assist the creation of informal or formal local affiliates.

Proponents of decentralization and localization convincingly argue that communities can do what central governments cannot do. The central government cannot build capacity of the poor women and men to participate in local educational

governance. Only communities can directly provide skills and social capital for poor men and women. In the community good governance can become real, important, and within the power of the people to improve. Likewise, participation and dialogue can become recognized and accepted ways to set educational priorities and to choose strategies.

Empowerment is integral to building the core centrality of education in development and for encouragement of the decentralization trend. Empowerment of administrators and teachers within a decentralized pattern of administration, it is claimed, makes educational change possible, continuing, and can lead to higher enrollments and better quality schools. The argument goes as follows: "When communities can hold teachers, administrators and government officials accountable through formal institutional mechanisms, community members become more interested in school improvement – more willing to commit their own resources to the task" (Narayan, 2002, p. 231). Such empowerment thus transforms the way schools operate making them more directly accountable to students, parents and communities.

Critique of Development Orthodoxy and Supporting Education Strategies

Critique of the central concepts of the new development model will be limited to participation and to education strategies that support the prime education goal of developing pro-poor educational systems. In this section: (a) a summary is offered of the reasons given by advocates for emphasizing participation as the core process of the new development orthodoxy, (b) the conceptual and operational criticisms of participation are identified, and (c) a critique is presented of the arguments for a significantly expanded role of education in development.

Participation: Democracy in action or a new tyranny?

Participation is the centerpiece in design, implementation, and sustainability of the new development orthodoxy. As such, participation appears to have become both a major means for attaining development objectives, and a valued outcome. Participation can include: doing, thinking, talking, feeling, belonging and implies membership in social communities and active involvement in social enterprise, Participation both conceptually and operationally is closely linked to other concepts, such as good governance, empowerment, and social development. Indeed, Chambers (Chambers, 1997) argues that participation (by itself) constitutes a new paradigm of development. Although there is a significant history in use of participatory techniques in various local, "grass roots" community and rural development efforts and there is a body of criticism stretching back several decades, limited intensive dialogue has been recorded as to the efficacy of participation in educational decisions.

1. *Why should participation be emphasized?*

There are three general categories of reasons given for participation: (a) to fulfill an initial value of 'putting people first'; (b) to enhance efficiency; and, (c) to promote democratic decision-making. To "put people first" contrasts with the externally defined model of development with its reliance on external experts, and may be viewed as a move towards a new paradigm of planning and change which is less positivist, less reductionist, and less top down. Through incorporating local knowledge in fostering change the new approach is expected to promote efficiency in local cost recovery, new accountability, and better local resource management. Changes in roles and relationships of teachers and administrators result from empowerment, creating new decision processes and new leaders.

Participation becomes the key to democratic decision-making through empowering teachers, administrators, parents, and the poor, infusing communities with new values and behavior and, by incorporating open dialogue to generate stakeholder views, and priorities (Narayan, 2002; OECD, 1995) Personal and collective empowerment includes: individual agency, self-esteem, group identity, and collective agency.

2. *Conceptual criticisms*

Conceptual criticisms of participation flow directly from the range of potential interpretations of its meaning. Participatory approaches allow so many interpretations that evaluation becomes exceedingly complex making the concept of limited value within a formal planning structure. Moreover, participation objectives may act as means or ends resulting in a blurring of the normative and descriptive worlds of development projects. Participation may, thus, represent a self-validating theory of relationships of successful outputs and people involvement.

Participation within the new development orthodoxy tends to be associated with localization and community action. Yet, communities, in contrast to the image projected in the many development prescriptions, may be neither homogenous, static, nor harmonious. Indeed, they may not exist as geographic, political, or social entities. Portraying the community as a unit with ability to plan and implement major change may be highly inaccurate.

As advocates attempt to incorporate and promote participation in development projects, a new participatory technology is evolving associated with planning, evaluation and assessment. Thus, particularly in development efforts involving or influenced by international agencies, participation may become reified as explicit tools and through global usage decontextualized from specific cultures.

3. *Operational criticisms*

Empirically, a case can be made that participation has increased the efficiency of some, typically, small-scale projects. However, the economic effects of participation on poorer segments of populations remain subject to debate. There is little evidence of the long term effectiveness of participation as a strategy for social change or in improving the well-being of the poor. The potential obstacles to more productive participation in planning and decision making are several and daunting (Chambers, 1997; Dudley, 1993; Esman & Uphoff, 1988; Krishna et. al., 1997; Michener, 1998; Uphoff, N, Esman, M., & Krishna, A., 1998).

- *Participatory approaches require much labor and money, often incurring more costs to beneficiaries.* Two common weaknesses emerge particularly with the application of the new participatory tools for assessment and evaluation: (a) These tools applied in the context of severe time constraints and prior commitments may become formulaic; and, (b) the technology tends to overlook such highly personal criteria as respect, trust, and friendship, which may be crucial in determining success.
- *Participatory planning may be an explicit challenge to prevailing bureaucratic practice*. *C*entralized bureaucratic policy and planning may make participatory planning impossible or relegated to a few selected activities, such as setting broad goals.
- *Determining which groups and individuals have incentives to participate and providing incentives for those who do not participate comprise a complex undertaking.* In some contexts, nonparticipation may be a rational choice. There is little understanding of how parents, teachers, community, citizens learn to participate where nonparticipation may be deeply ingrained in the culture. Existing local schools, particularly those serving poor children, may offer little encouragement for new initiatives and few connections between the education system and the outside world. How should nonparticipation be interpreted? Is nonparticipation a strategy to resist or to embrace? Is it disengagement or is it boredom? Is it the source of freedom, or status, or a way to avoid blame? Much is written about the advantages of engagement and shared activities, but perhaps disengagement also can be critically important in some stage in the process of planning and implementing change. We may need time simply to dream a little, to generate new, and contradictory scenarios.
- *Participatory approaches may not be compatible with the common requisite of international donors for clear objective and quantifiable measures of outcomes. Such* requirements may assume a non-existant causality between activities and objectives which emphasize an ordered sequence of events and functional integration of different components.
- *Determining the appropriate kind and amount of participation for a given purpose may be crucial for effectiveness*. How can decisions be reached as to choices between, for example, information gathering, discussion, dialogue, setting objectives, decision making, monitoring, and evaluation? Surely, more does not necessarily mean better. Can scales of participation be developed associating level of participation with particular projects? Can extensive participation or other demonstration of concern for people outweigh demonstration of program or project impact? Whose participation really matters? When does the political value of participation decrease?
- *There are few simple indicators for the readiness of villages, communities or schools to engage fully in participatory processes.* By what criteria will decisions be made to invest in developing the incentives and building the information infrastructure for effective ‘mutual engagement,’ ‘joint enterprise’, and ‘shared repertoires’?

Critique of expanded role of education systems in development

The new development orthodoxy calls for education to play a key role in attaining not only such traditional goals as economic growth, but also in contributing to the social development and social inclusion of poor and marginalized populations. The new model implies ambitious changes in education policies, in the management of education, and in education practice at the school level. The focus of this section is on one current central theme and global development priority, the contribution of education to the reduction of poverty.

1. *Developing a propoor education system*

Like earlier foci on basic-needs models of development, initial education priority under the new orthodoxy remains 'basic education for all.' There are many good arguments for such priority (ADB, 2001; Adams, 2002; World Bank, 1999). However, a focus of policies, and presumably resources, within the education systems on basic education will not necessarily significantly empower the recipients nor create equalization of education opportunities.

At best, educational expansion is a necessary but insufficient condition to increase equality of educational and social opportunity. Education can decrease, create or reinforce social inequalities. Schools can construct, reconstruct and assist in reproducing or altering divisions and classes in society. Thus, going to school or staying in school longer may not eliminate invidious differences. Universal basic education, even when including preschool education, could be attained and the educational system could remain fundamentally elitist in the educational benefits distributed to poor and nonpoor and in its effects on income and social inclusion. The poor will not necessarily progress far enough in the system, because of cost, selection procedures, and tracking, to be able to take advantage of more advanced and higher quality education and to obtain the many social benefits extended to nonpoor. Even under successful implementation of basic education, the children of the poor may continue to have insufficient education and social capital to participate on an equal footing for any but a narrow range of economic or social opportunities.

Education empowers only when translated into action. Educational strategies to assist in poverty reduction are needed that address persistent gaps in educational outcomes and reinforce ongoing social programs to remove obstacles to social inclusion, such as gender, 'old boys' networks, and orthodoxies favoring the status quo. Opportunities at one educational level influence opportunities at the next level; that is, utilization of compensatory supports for any subset of students is progressive. Beyond 'education for all,' equity in educational opportunities is needed for the poor at all levels of the education system.

Further education, social and cultural capital are needed by those who wish to advance educationally, fully participate in civic society, and compete equally under the increasingly sophisticated employment demands of the labor market. Implied are greatly improved selection procedures for expanded post-basic education and training, which, in turn, require sophisticated information and knowledge demands, higher fiscal resource commitments, and probably require higher quality teachers and other professionals. There currently is no applicable international model, and no explicit set of technologies, that can be borrowed and installed to implement fully this scenario. The popular strategies of localization and privatization with reliance on user fees may actually decrease government support and, without effective counter policies, lead to more difficulty for the poor to attain high quality education.

The education system works within the context of a supporting state, enforced legal rights, and individual incentives. What Reimers notes as the case of Latin America appears also to be true in Asia: "It is possible to observe changes in inequality that have a minimum impact on the incidences of poverty. It is also possible to reduce poverty, in an absolute sense, without influencing inequality. The reduction of social exclusion, however, calls for reductions in poverty and inequality" (Reimers, 2000, p. 434).

Within the proposed enhanced role for education, perhaps the most controversial implications for school administrators and teachers are those integral to the new development orthodoxy which advocates a broader development role for schools. The new development model can be interpreted as calling for empowerment of teachers as well as community members in a participatory process of reconstructing community and society. The process of empowering would seem to suggest, at minimum, that teachers become knowledgeable and active in local education planning, and offer special assistance to poor children to acquire capabilities for collective action (Narayan, 2002).

Thus, empowered administrators and teachers are expected to help build the social capital of the poor, creatively participate in the civil society, and be a dynamic force for community change. Societies, which prize or have traditions of pluralism and diversity, may be more receptive to the expansionist role of the school. These societies are in a minority. Embedded in problems of development of education systems in poor countries are many ongoing weaknesses at the school level which can not be examined in detail here. Clearly, the gap is huge between the conditions in current schools and those perceived in the development vision. The typical school in poorer areas within developing countries is characterized by: (a) poor financing; (b) small or nonexistent recurrent budget; (c) high absenteeism of teacher and pupils; (d) high pupil drop out rates; and, (e) low remuneration for teachers. These schools are usually avoided by children from wealthier families who attend better financed schools and are taught by teachers better prepared. It is difficult to envision such schools performing the Herculean tasks demanded under the new orthodoxy.

2. *Participatory planning and management of the system*

With an information base on local populations, which includes knowledge, interests, skills, criticism and concerns of the poor regarding schools, the educational task is to develop planning, implementation, and monitoring processes that incorporate and give voice to the poor. The strategic planning and management processes centered around localization and participation include: (a) mobilizing community and local educational personnel for planning; (b) incorporating national, provincial, and local mandates; (c) conducting community needs assessment of political, economic, and social conditions and trends, and identifying partners to provide resources or services; (d) responding to influence hierarchies and demands of different stakeholders including the poor; (e) assessing fiscal and information sources, leading to the building of a community data and information base; (f) analyzing comprehensive individual schools, their programs, teacher and administrative roles, classroom culture, and pedagogical techniques; and, (g) developing strategic plans to identify priorities, and translating them into financial implications.

a. The Center Partner

Historically, the center through the ministries associated with education set policies, plans, and generated finances and coordinated evaluation of system. Although centralized economic planning has largely been rejected, national short and long term education plans remain popular. The new orthodoxy would seem to radically reduce, if not eliminate, the education role of the center. Yet, the center's leadership in education reform may continue to be crucial in many countries, particularly in equalizing educational and social opportunities. Concurrently, the center may need to build new public-private partnerships: contributing to capacity building of local organizations in support of a range of localization efforts; maintaining system-level R & D efforts; fostering national dialogue on educational issues; demonstrating good education and good governance, and discouraging monopolization of power by local elites.

The serious limitations of centralized economic planning have been well demonstrated. Some have argued that decentralized educational planning is equally inefficient, and, at minimum, strong public-private partnerships are crucial for education development. Clearly the past record suggests that the central government often has failed in its effort to provide equitable, quality education for children and youth. Nevertheless, in many developing countries, particularly smaller ones, it is difficult to envision sustained major educational improvements without a strong state involvement.

b. The Community Partner

Decentralization does not necessarily improve equality of opportunities for the poor nor improve the quality and relevance of education. Indeed, after a few years of coping with the frustrations of local politics, scarce local fiscal resources, and complexities of local planning, some countries may consider recentralizing certain functions. Nevertheless, the trend is strong, and although interruptions may be expected by fluctuations in particular areas of control, local involvement is likely to persist.

Communities and villages are becoming more important focal points for quality and equity improvements in planning and implementing change in education. Globalization, some argue, by reducing the power of central governments, will further enhance the power of local communities. Additionally, the current focus of bilateral and multilateral agencies on poverty reduction and social inclusion gives further attention and vitality to community-driven development. Several observers have pointed out that no central policy or plan is ever sufficiently well worked out to be completely applied in practice. Thus, frequently it is the strategies and ideas emerging during attempts at implementation, not during policy formulation and strategic planning, that tend to impact most effectively on educational change. Moreover, at the school level, teachers, principals, and communities may be able to transform policies and plans in way unintended by reformers, thus dominating outcomes.

Localized participation in decision processes, even with the *imprimature* of powerful international agencies such as the World Bank and certain expressed popularity by governments of industrialized countries, in practice may encounter severe constraints. The accomplishments and speed of planned educational change depend on the readiness for change. Readiness, in turn, depends on answers to such questions as:

1. Which organizations and actors accept the efficacy of participation?
2. Can local participatory actions coexist with local power structures?
3. What are the organizational capabilities for the sustained empowerment of marginalized groups?

A realistic model of planning is likely to have aspects of both centralization and decentralization. Central governments through policies, laws, and allocation of resources establish, monitor and assess a national system of education. Local planning and management teams generate local knowledge

and information, and coordinate the educational involvement of local organizations. Outputs of the planning process should include a clear decision process for reviewing and building consensus about major educational innovations and interventions, and flexible multi-year educational plans which provide incentives for initiating innovations.

Stakeholder analysis is especially critical in the new model. Planning knowledge is shaped by priorities, resources, and preferences of beneficiaries. The persons who expect to gain or lose by localized decision-making may be capable of affecting the outcomes of new policies and programs. In addition to educational and pedagogical data and information on schools, pupils and teachers, examining and understanding the environmental and organizational contexts of schooling and non-formal educational and training efforts are at the core of strategic and comprehensive educational planning.

A good localized management system of education is more difficult to develop and sustain than a good centralized system. Even if national policy makers, international aid actors, and local leaders can broker local consensuses on educational priorities to utilize participatory approaches, such agreement may conceal a variety of aspirations and frustrations. The experience of the author is that in the context of real or assumed differentials of power, those with less power tend to ask for what they think they can get. Moreover, the openness of participation to a range of interpretations while reducing conflict in establishing plans allows any given definition to become politicized.

Conclusions

A new discourse on development with powerful advocates is emerging. Like many former paradigms and models of change, the new development orthodoxy resulted not from the direct synthesis of results of systematic research efforts but from widespread dissatisfaction with past development efforts and scattered cases of success with more participatory and localized efforts. Nevertheless, in the last few years a remarkable quantity of analytic literature and some growing empirical underpinning has evolved supporting the new approach. The danger, as with all new models of change, reflected in policy prescriptions and associated tools of assessment, planning, and evaluation, is a possible hardening of orthodoxy that may impede lively discourse.

The ideas of participation and of equals in dialogue seeking to acquire new knowledge and to foster new, more equitable education programs are attractive alternatives to the more elite traditional, centrist approaches to educational planning and management. However, the new development orthodoxy, and specifically in its foci on efforts at poverty reduction and social development, may expect too much from the education sector. Exhortative and extravagant rhetoric about the practices and benefits from participation and naïve interpretations of the behavior of education systems may hinder, rather than help in meeting the challenges of a broader vision of development. The new development model requires ambitious educational changes at the very core of the organization and practice of education, assuming extensive supporting political commitment outside the system and strong incentives within the system. Dare the schools accept further responsibility and explicitly plan to participate more fully in building new communities and societies?

Schools and teachers in some developing countries against great odds have demonstrated remarkable energy and enthusiasm, becoming islands of hope and promise in even the poorest of regions. Some schools in many countries not only teach basic literacy and numeracy but also create values, intentionally or not, and play dynamic leadership roles in local development. More commonly, schools in developing regions tend to be dreary places, isolated, under-appreciated and under-supported. Asking schools to assume a responsibility for initiating and implementing a community and nation building agenda is probably asking too much.

Poverty, inequalities, social exclusion, marginalization, and gender restrictions did not happen overnight. Nor were they by chance or accident. They resulted over time by implicit or explicit actions, traditions, and policies. Nevertheless, those who are creating the new orthodoxy surely are partly right: the greatest challenge of the 21st Century is likely to be poverty and associated exclusions. These can be radically reduced. And, bilateral and multi lateral assistance groups can make significant contributions. However, ignoring the inhibiting conditions, oversimplifying by merely chipping away at problems at their margin, or failure to commit the necessary resources under excuses of avoiding risk are unsatisfactory responses.

The above review and analyses suggest a few simple guidelines for those attempting to assist in moving educational change and propoor reform forward toward the new development model.

- Avoid the arrogance of certainty by assuming limited understanding of educational change, treating conclusions found in the current development literature as ideas to be tested, maintaining a healthy skepticism toward the feasibility and acceptability of

a participatory and empowering mode of decision making, and recognizing that institutions vary greatly in their readiness for change.

- Acknowledge that inequalities of power exist and accept the possibility of minimum limits to which acquisition of power by the powerless can be actualized through participation and dialogue.
- Strongly support sustainable successes in basic education but also encourage debate and dialogue on comprehensive public and private strategies for education, recognizing that even fulfilling priorities of basic education for all, at best postpones other necessary education policies to cope with social inequalities.
- Encourage both top-down and bottom-up planning, management and evaluation informed by accurate information, building as necessary new types of extra school educational organizations; creatively destroying many existing ones, realizing that the most fundamental partnership in designing, delivering, maintaining, and improving education involves home, school, and community.
- Beware of dreams of a global, uniform, Western, liberal, economic and social paradise. Development may take multiple paths and mimetic supporting educational strategies are not mandatory.

References

Adams, D. (2002). Education and national development: Priorities, policies and planning. Manila, ADB and University of Hong Kong.

Asian Development Bank. (2001). Education Sector Policy Paper. Manila.

Asian Development Bank and the World Bank. (2000). *The new social policy agenda in Asia: Proceedings of the Manila social forum.* Manila: Asian Development Bank.

Chambers, R. (1997). *Whose reality counts? Putting the first last.* London: Intermediate Technology Publications.

Chenery, H. B. (1974). *Redistribution with growth*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Dudley, E. (1993). *The critical villager: Beyond community participation.* London: Routledge Press.

Esman, M., & Uphoff, N. (1988). *Local organizations – Intermediaries in rural development.* Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

King E., Orazen, P., & Wohlmuth, D. (1998) Central mandates and local incentives: The Columbia education vouchers. Working Papers Series World Bank.

Krishna, A., Uphoff, N., & Esman, M. (1997). *Reasons for hope: Instructive experiences in rural development.* West Hartford, CT: Kumarian Press.

Leach, A., & Little, F. (Eds.). (1999). *Education, cultures, and economics: Dilemmas for development.* New York, NY: Falmer Press.

Lewis, W. (1955). The theory of economic growth, Richard. D. Irwin.

McMahon, W. (2000). *Education and development: Measuring the social benefits*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Michener, V. J. (1998). The participatory approach: Contradiction and co-option in Burkina Faso. *World Development, 26*, 2105-2118.

Narayan, D. (Ed.). (2002). *Empowerment and poverty reduction: A sourcebook.* Washington, DC: The World Bank.

OECD. (1995). Participatory development and good governance. Paris: Development Guideline Series.

Reimers, F. (2000). *Unequal schools, unequal chances*: *The challenges to equal opportunity in the Americas.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Stern, N. (2002). A strategy for development. Washington, DC: The World Bank.

Uphoff, N., Esman, M., & Krishna, A. (1998). *Reasons for success: Learning from instructive experiences in rural development.* Hartford, CT: Kumarian Press.

Wolfensohn, J. (2002, April 22) (press release). *Finance summit focuses on poverty*. Washington, DC: World Bank.

World Bank. (1999). *Education sector strategy.* Washington, DC.

Received March 23, 2003
Revision received June 27, 2003
Accepted July 3, 2003