

International Conference on Globalization, Education and Social Change  
Ramallah (Palestine) from 4-6 October, 2004

Dr. Mahendra Pratap Rana

"The Relationship between Education and Globalization"

Introduction:

Education is a very powerful instrument for emancipation. It may further be defined as the inclusion of knowledge, values, skills, and attitudes by means of institutions that have been created for this end. It is an important tool for the improvement of socio-economic conditions of people. Education brings about reduction in social inequalities, political assertion and income distribution. Education is capable of transforming the existing social order and of defining the aims and objectives of human beings. One of the main objectives of the education, specially after 1950s was to cater to the educational needs and development of the children belonging to under developed sections of the societies who have remained quite isolated from the ambit of education for over ages. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Article 26(1) declares that 'Everyone has the right to education. Education shall be free, at least in the elementary and fundamental stages. Elementary education shall be compulsory. Technical and professional education shall be made generally available and higher education shall be equally accessible to all on the basis of merit'. It is only after the UN Declaration, systematic efforts have been made to raise educational standard among the marginalized/under developed societies though the result has not been satisfactory in terms of its outcome.

Education is the soul of human civilization and development. The UN Declaration emphasized that "Everyone has the right to education, education shall be free, at least in the elementary and fundamental stages. Elementary education shall be compulsory. The UN declaration has proved merely a slogan in terms of achieving its goal of education for all. Though World Bank, UNESCO and other international agencies have focused on elementary education but the states as a implementing agencies have shown their concern only in theory but practically they are far away from the aims and objectives defined by the UN. The state funded institutions created for elementary education are not equipped with the requirement of modern education. More than 80 percent of the state funding in the name of promotion of elementary education is going for the salary of the teachers in these institutions. There is nothing in the name of academic standard in these schools. The industrialists need profits out of their investment. Their prime concern is to earn profit by any means, which is not possible in the state funded primary schools Therefore, state sponsored elementary education system doesn't qualify the criteria prescribed by the corporate sectors educational funding for elementary education.

The globalization has created economic imbalances in the society. The elementary education has also become a saleable commodity because of the involvement of industrialist groups. Private and public schools are not in fact educating society rather they have turned the entire education system into a profit making industry. They give education to selective number of students. One can choose private and public school for elementary education according to the paying capacity. The states have also surrendered before the corporate houses, consequently, they denied government

directives in terms of carrying social responsibility. Therefore, a qualitative education is beyond the reach to a huge number of population in under developing countries. Globalization has stopped the opportunity of elementary education to a large section of the society. They have to fight for years to get emancipated. It is not as if there was no social division before the globalization bit it has made more visible. Globalization has widened the gape between the rich and the poor. The entry of multi-national companies in the field of education. Most of the states/countries have gave up education as a social mission due to globalization. It has promoted a section of the society against other. A huge state funding is coming in the name of elementary education but the states are not enthusiastic to fix up the accountability in terms of outcome. As a result state sponsored educational institutions for elementary education have reached at the verge of collapse. Realising the ruined conditions of these institutions, corporate houses are not ready to support them financially. The corporate houses ensure the paying capacity of the parents first before admitting any student. Consequently, the students from under privileged societies are bound to join government school without any future. A sharp difference can be seen in every society due to the existence of dual system of education.

The education was an attempt at integration of the marginalized/under-developed groups with the rest of the society, but they continue to remain isolated from mainstream of human life. Education is designed to provide specified learning opportunities and is institutionalized, either as state institutions (Public) or as Corporate ones (Private). Both forms of institution emphasize on knowledge necessary for workforce to compete in the global market economy. But what will happen to those deprived from the public and the private education? In other words, global agencies as well as the states are fundamental violator of UN Declaration at one point or the other to keep larger sections of the society away from the knowledge.

Since the 1980s, universities in many countries have shifted from elite to mass higher education. At the time of economic constraint, public universities have been experiencing pressures from governments to demonstrate maximum outputs from their allocated financial inputs. In line with the global monetarist doctrine of reductions in public expenditures, cuts in university funding seem to be inevitable. With emphasis being given to notions such as “efficiency”, “effectiveness”, “accountability”, and “curbing extravagance”, output-based schemes are being adopted in the university sector. This paradigm shift privileges corporate models of organizational structures and functioning. The popular belief that education should serve economic purposes has been supported and promulgated by several supernational organizations, such as the World Bank and the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD). This shift has been accompanied by a tidal wave of managerialism, including the following: the ideology of “the market knows the best”, reliance on performance indicators, corporate managerilism, commercialization of research, and the commodification of knowledge. These have unquestionably become a dominant “ethos” in the university sector.

It is against this wider policy context that we now have a new use of languages in the education sphere. Students are no longer students but rather clients or customers; admission to the university is about to access instead of selection. The curriculum is market driven, and it encompasses practical courses and options from which students

as customers can choose. Likewise, university professors must participate in the education market by selling/marketizing their skills and knowledge, and institutions of higher learning adopt an entrepreneurial approach to making themselves more competitive in the marketplace. Strong market forces have also caused institutions of higher learning to reorient themselves to be more sensitive to market needs and to produce employable graduates to suit employers' demands. When measuring results, we no longer simply look for educated graduates but give more attention to performance and efficiency indicators, such as research output, teaching scores, and new management initiatives. With more importance attached to the extrinsic value of education, "managers" now search for measurable output to apply to both students and staffs.

Since the success of higher education reforms is measured by reduced state subsidies to education, management has adopted the new discourse and market-oriented instrument to evaluate the state's role. Efficiency and accountability have become the yardstick for accessing the performance of universities. Several empirical studies reveal that strong market forces and the ideas of corporate management have significantly affected the development and reform of education in many countries. The underlying assumption of adopting a market-oriented approach to restructuring education is that "the empowerment of parents and students through resources-related choices in education has potential to produce greater responsiveness and academic effectiveness". Central to this approach is the introduction of competition between education institutions and of stringent regulations and rigorous review exercises, both of which are meant to assure the quality, efficiency, and effectiveness of education.

World Conference on Higher Education held in 1998. That conference declared: Higher education should be considered a public service. While diversified sources of funding, private and public, are necessary; public support for higher education and research remains essential to ensure a balanced achievement of its educational and social missions. Public support, in terms of both finance and regulatory frameworks, is essential but not the whole story. It is wrong to say that the common public aspiration for wide access to higher education can only be satisfied by the action of government, and in particular by having governments provide higher education free. For the industrialised countries research has shown pretty consistently that countries with a regime of tuition fees accompanied by bursary schemes enroll more students in higher education – and from a broader socio-economic base – than those where higher education is free. Degree completion is also higher.

The purpose of this paper is to perceive at in a more in-depth and larger perspective the education and the Globalization. Hence it is centred around certain themes:

1. To analyse the outcome of elementary education in the light of the UN Declaration of Human Rights and the impacts of globalization.
2. To discuss globalization as an ideology, a form of corporatism on the one hand and a vehicle of US imperialism on the other.
3. To study the impact of globalization on social fabrics of the society.

4. To deal about the withdrawal of the state from free and compulsory education for all.
5. To focus on the relationship between globalization, higher education and the under privileged societies.
6. To study globalization as either an economic and social environment to which institutions must adopt or an opportunity structure to alter institutions according to new objectives for teaching and learning.
7. To motivate corporate sectors to adopt UN Declaration of Human Rights on education for all.

As far as globalization is concerned, it is implicitly connected to international economies, as in the concept of world economy; to international relations or politics, as in the concept of global politics; and to culture as in the concept of global culture. Furthermore, the term “global” suggests that there are multiple economies, political systems, and cultures, globally, as well as single, integrative economy, political system and culture. Globalization has got negative and positive connotation.

Globalisation is the de facto merging US economy with the economy of the rest of the world. Educational institutions are now under intense pressure to operate as if they were business. Globalization has an economic influence, and its effects on most of the countries is to move governments towards privatization and withdrawal of fiscal support to education. It is responsible for a wholesale transformation of higher education, including elements of restructuring, reform, privatization, performance based funding, and curricular hegemonisation. Globalization will lead to deteriorating or problematic conditions in educational institutions. Deteriorating is both a fiscal and a social matter; on one hand, institutional dependency upon government and on the other hand a weak relationship between institutions and the public. Another scholarly and critical perspective cites university expansion and under funding as responsible for the flight of institutions to the corporate world. This partnership between private sector business and universities is financially supported by tax payers. Yet there are diminishing returns to either local or national interests. This condition of “corporatism” where money is the central element, and self-interest (not the public) are paramount values, can be constructed as an aspect of globalization but not the whole. It has been observed that there is a significant gap between institutional goals and both public and government expectations for education and training.

Globalization actually started in 90s across the world. In my opinion, globalization is another form of turning towards American imperialistic rule. The entire reforms are guided by World Bank under the leadership of the United States. The economic reforms across the world have started taking place through participation of private capital and initiative. Government and government sponsored or appointed bodies, and provincial agencies, however, do not neglect the role of external forces; indeed these bodies use these forces to rationalize institutional change. Shifting global economies, less government support for post secondary education, the use of new technologies in the workplace, and employer demands for a trained workforce are all part of a conceptualised environment that is determining college actions.

Effect of Globalization on Education:

Globalization has a dual nature in that it promotes homogenisation, on one hand, and localized differentiation, on the other. The whole world is undergoing “ a set of processes which in various ways-economic, cultural and political-make supranational connection. The impact of globalization has not only been felt in the economic realm but, indeed, has also caused significant changes in the ideological-cultural realm and in the transformation of time and space. Even though no country is immune from the impact of globalization, heated debates have been held about the positive and negative consequences of globalization.

Indeed, living as we do in a “global village”, our daily lives are affected by global forces in many respects, including the way in which the way the public sector is managed. In recent decades, there have been considerable question of the state’s ability to monopolise the provision of public services. Realising the importance of productivity, performance, and control, governments have begun to engage in transforming the way that services are managed. Certainly, the role of the state in relation to the formulation of public policies and the delivery of public services has been significantly affected by various forces-the impact of globalization, crisis of the state, fragmentary impulses in society, and the contradictions of identity politics-and these have created immense pressures for the restructuring of the state. Corporate management, devolution of responsibilities from the state to local governments, the role of the markets, and the popularity of “economic rationalism” are some of the key elements of this restructuring. Now slogans, such as “focusing on outcomes and results” and “managing changing better” (effectiveness) and “doing more with less” and “value for money” (efficiency), are becoming very popular in the public sector. In short, corporate managerialism is commonly viewed as the administrative form closely related to the prevailing ideology of “economic rationalism” and the adoption of private corporate practices in running the public.

Globalization may cause tremendous social upheaval as it is always accompanied by large layoffs and heavily biased course controls in favour of professional excellence, irrespective of human excellence which springs from the inculcation of human values. The recommendation of the “World Declaration on Higher Education” issued by UNESCO may be recalled: “The fundamentals of human ethics should constitute the essential component of and be applied to each profession and to all areas of human endeavour”

Instead of leaving globalization to evolve through a natural process, some major developed countries want it to be achieved post-haste through various instruments and processes. This predatory globalization is most evident in the efforts of such developed countries in their actions and behaviour in forums such as the WTO. This has led to increasing tension, polarization and hate in the world. As per the IMF, globalization is characterized by increases in flows of trade, capital and information, as well as mobility of individuals, across borders.

### Higher Education and Globalization

Till the mid 1980s, most countries financed their higher education systems almost to the extent of 90 percent and India was no exception. The scenario has changed with the shift of emphasis from higher to primary to elementary education. Recent reports

of UNESCO and the World Bank suggest that social and private returns of higher education are less than those elementary and secondary education. This has led to the assumption that subsidy on higher education should be reduced. Corporatisation of higher education which is creeping gradually into the university system has the grim possibility of the commercialization, domination of elite groups in admissions and loss of moral values on which the university system has been based. There will certainly be no academic freedom in these universities as they are likely to work like an industry for deriving profits out of their large investment and not for the advancement of learning. A massive erosion in the quality and standard of higher education is likely to take place.

True, the World Bank, in its Educational Sector paper (1995), among other things, recommended the shift of public funding from education for higher education to lower levels. But the reasoning of the World Bank has been contradicted by its own task force (2000), which admits ".....higher education has acted as a powerful mechanism for upward mobility, allowing the talented to thrive irrespective of their social origin". Complete globalization of higher education has certainly to be ruled out. In fact, complete globalisation does not exist anywhere. In Japan, Korea, Philippines, and Latin America mass privatization exists alongside restricted public sector. A mixed system with the domination of the public sector exists in South Asia, Africa and West Europe. In the Netherlands and Belgium both co-exist under public funding. In Sweden, the UK, France, Spain and Thailand, limited private entrepreneurship exists. In India, private participation in the financing and management in higher education is very much in existence in the education system. So my first point is that there is no incompatibility in principle between globalisation and higher education. Because it seeks to discover and teach universal truth, higher education must, by its very nature, be international. The world's first experience of globalisation was the wave of ideas from the European Enlightenment that was propelled around the world by the French Revolution. Higher education has become a market – and a global market. We must manage the global market in higher education in a way that is faithful to the long academic traditions and values of universities and helpful to students themselves.

#### Trade in higher education

Higher education has always been a marketplace but in the absence of tuition fees the market is not very visible. As more countries, most recently Germany for example, introduce some kind of fees regime the market aspect of higher education becomes impossible to ignore. Those who find this distasteful tend to oppose fees by arguing that higher education is a public good. What are we to make of this? The notion of higher education as a public good is at the heart of the debate about the globalisation of higher education. Here the issue is not with the principle itself, but with the ancillary assumptions that accrete to it. Again, UNESCO's charter is helpful. Knowledge is a public good. The ideal of the free exchange of knowledge long predates UNESCO and the ideal of knowledge as the common property of humankind was around long before the rapid expansion of universities of the last fifty years. Similarly the notion of higher education as a public good is older than the massive involvement of states in funding universities. What do the basic texts say?

World Conference on Higher Education held in 1998, declared: Higher education should be considered a public service. While diversified sources of funding, private

and public, are necessary; public support for higher education and research remains essential to ensure a balanced achievement of its educational and social missions. Public support, in terms of both finance and regulatory frameworks, is essential but not the whole story. It is true to a larger extent that the common public aspiration for wide access to higher education can only be satisfied by the action of government, and in particular by having governments provide higher education free. It is also true that in many industrialised countries research has shown pretty consistently that countries with a regime of tuition fees accompanied by bursary schemes enroll more students in higher education – and from a broader socio-economic base – than those where higher education is free. Degree completion is also higher. One should not fear forms of higher education that appear to be new such as distance education and transborder teaching. Indeed, through such developments web-based learning materials could become a free commodity available worldwide, giving a new meaning to the term ‘free trade’ is one aspect of providing higher education but my argument is that the percentages of accessibility to web-based learning in developing countries is very nominal. Therefore, the states has to bear the responsibility of higher education to its people. There should be a clear distinction about the educational need /requirement of developing and developed countries.

#### Indian Experience:

Over the years there have been private initiatives in education in India by the corporate sectors, sometimes for philanthropic reasons, and the late, to meet the growing demands of business and the required skilled manpower. That the opening of new conventional colleges and universities should not be encouraged as stated in the recommendations made in the Eighth Plan (1992-1997) was the first indication of the government’s policy change. Also, the involvement of voluntary agencies and private sector participation in the opening and conduct of higher education institutions with proper checks to ensure maintenance of standard was significant recommendation. In early 1995, the UGC formulated a set of guidelines for establishing private universities but nothing in the form of a Bill could be introduced in Parliament. Then came the ministry of finance’s paper on government subsidies (1997), which put higher education in the “non-merit” category based on the reasoning that higher education benefited individuals more than the society and, as such, suggested that the government should not subsidise it. It should be left to private bodies to provide the requisite finance instead.

In fact, the Indian government is spending as much a proportion of GDP on education in 2000 as it did in 1990. According to the HDR, 2003, it spent 3.9% of GDP in 1990, 4.1% in 1998-2000. The percentage of government expenditure stayed the same (i.e. government expenditure had gone up). In other words, the state is far from “withdrawing. But this is not enough. And it’s spending in the wrong ways – at higher levels and not on primary education; disproportionately on teachers salaries rather than expanding schools. Here we need to stop talking about simply fighting the “privatization of education” (most of the best universities in the world are private, after all) and talk about how government spending should be used to spread education, increase its quality, and provide access to the poor and low castes. There can be a useful public-private mixture here as in road-building, for example. Why not let private schools charge as much as they want but give free scholarship to all SC and ST students to use the school of their choice? E courses became available on the net.

A very meagre number of students belonging to the marginalizing societies have accessibility to the net. Therefore, a large sections of them are deprived with E course. The ones demanded most could be the ones that originate from leading universities in the US or UK due to their global recognition. Such distance learning courses might increase the participation rate of working professional, homemakers and students from non-metro areas.

Dear friends, everybody is well aware with the expansion of the role of World Bank, IMF and their role in capturing internal resources of the developing countries. The Multi-nationals are controlling the entire economy of the developing countries and particularly in Third World. Shrinking job opportunities and privatization of government institutions, will result in losing its employees, and educational institutions will have no responsibility towards the weaker sections of the society and specifically the Dalits and the Tribals. India has lost its Welfare Character. Due to anti-Dalit policies adopted by the Union as well as State Governments. Directive Principle of State Policy ensures that the state will take special care in the case of Dalits and Tribals in promoting literacy. Instead of taking special care, Indian Government has withdrawn all welfare schemes for the Dalits and the Tribals enshrined in Indian Constitution. Indian Government is functioning as an agent of the countries advocating for Globalization. What will be the future of Dalits and the Tribals in Globalized India? Why Globalization at the cost of Dalits and the Tribals? Why not Indian Government admits the reality of caste discrimination before the World community? These questions need to be answered before coming to any conclusion whether they are positive or negative in terms of "Globalization and its impact on Dalits of India". I am worried of those impacts of globalization on Dalits and the Tribals. It is a matter of great concern that 48 percent of the total population is illiterate in India after 57 years of independence. The Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes (Dalits) are the worst victim of present educational system where 63 percent SCs and 71 percent STs are illiterate. The female illiteracy rate among them has been alarmingly high as 76 and 82 percent respectively. Globalization gives space to the people for survival. However, Hinduism closed the gate of social development of the large sections of the society.

Conclusion:

In a situation when globalization has become a part of life and there is no alternative of it, we have to initiate a dialogue with the agencies of globalization to find out modalities to stop social division at grass root level. There are dangers but there are also opportunities. The under developed countries have enough reason to fear trade in education as a new form of colonialism. The fear of social division based on rich and the poor can be reduced only by promoting elementary education only. Corporate sector should be encouraged to promote elementary education on priority basis. Higher education can be strengthened by fair trade and internationalisation. One of the strengths of working with the regional conventions is that regions can develop arrangements for trade and internationalisation that suit them. Open source courseware could allow higher education to achieve academic commitment to the free exchange of ideas and knowledge is a massively greater way. This in turn will help us attain UNESCO's number one priority, namely Education for All.