

PNABG-945
69694

**A Review of
Coloquium Summary "The Role of Education
and Training in Development in the 1990s
Policy Report and Conclusions"**

by

Institute of International Education

October, 1988

Prepared by

Center for Research on Economic Development

In partial fulfillment of

Contract #PDC-0180-0-00-8121-00

Bureau of Program and Policy Coordination

U.S. Agency for International Development

**"Colloquium
The Role of Education and Training in Development in the 1990s
Policy Report and Conclusions"**

Institute of International Education

Overview

This paper is a draft policy report and recommendations based on the colloquium "The Role of Education and Training in Development in the 1990s." The participants agree that, at a minimum, basic education for entire national populations is a prerequisite to attaining other goals of economic development.

Summary Points

Background (pp. 2-5)

- Among the many critical areas of individual and national development in which educations play a central, if not the most important, role are:
 - 1) creating a citizenry (with emphasis on socializing and preparing the young of both sexes, but encompassing all ages) with a stake in building a strong, stable nation;
 - 2) empowering that citizenry to be effective participants in its country's political system and economy and to earn incomes sufficient to meet at least its basic needs for physical well being;
 - 3) providing the best and the brightest of each country's young people, regardless of sex and economic and social background, with a realistic opportunity to better themselves and, in time, the groups from which they spring;
 - 4) providing a flow of prepared, committed, and creative potential leaders not only for the nation as a whole but for such crucial sub-sectors as industry, agriculture, health, government, the private voluntary sector and, of course, education itself.
- While recognizing that a solid basic education for all is the highest priority, the participants also stressed the value of higher education. Higher education is necessary for attaining teachers (to provide basic education), technology transfer, economic planning based on data, and appreciation of certain cultural heritages. But higher education is too often ineffective, excessively costly, and often not as supportive of national development goals as it should be, necessitating careful review of policies, strategies, and resource allocation patterns.
- While participants from the US (particularly Dr. Heyneman co-author of the paper "Higher Education in Developing Countries" that was presented at the colloquium) argued that third world institutions should set their sights on disseminating knowledge, third world participants argued that this view

was too limited and that local universities should provide leadership for national development through research.

- Until local educational systems are fully sufficient, provisions should be made for overseas training.

Relation to U.S. Policy and Interests (pp. 6-11)

- US policy makers need patience and a long term perspective

- Economists argue the case for education as a rational investment, to be assessed by measurable quantitative outputs, while noneconomic social scientists stress the importance of education as a moral imperative, as a right or an end in itself, the positive benefits of which are givens.

- Only if the developing countries have educated citizens will they be able to collaborate with the United States in the solution of some of the critical problems of our day.

- Benefits are particularly large and clear in international educational exchange and other foreign training in the the United States. The US benefits from cultural diplomacy, and it benefits economically.

- Curiously the participants comment on the US's "fortunate" comparative advantage in education. It seems that the goal of assistance is too minimize this advantage.

- The cost of educational development assistance should be relatively low. The US should concentrate on human resources (the training of teachers, professors, managers, administrators, planners, researchers, statisticians, and strengthening of the primary education system which undergirds all) not on capital improvements.

- Why has US assistance become marginal? Scarcity of resources is often cited, but disillusionment that results from a lack of patience is the real reason.

Guidelines for Action (pp. 11-14).

- The third world is not a homogeneous unit, and the US response must recognize and adapt to differences.

- Education is one of the most political of functions in any society. The US must be more than usually sensitive to local needs, and it must be concerned with how assistance is offered.

- Seek out in each country setting the critical margins at which external assistance can be most effective.

(*See the list of suggestions on pp. 13-14*)

Understanding and Coping with Brain Drain Problems (pp. 14-15)

- One third of all foreign students are fully or partially supported by public or private institutions from their home or host countries. Most of these students return home because good jobs are awaiting them and immigration laws make it difficult for them to change their status. The US should provide services that will enable returning students to reenter their societies

effectively and maintain the competences they acquired through foreign study.

- Many nonsponsored students remain in the US for numerous reasons including the perception that their career opportunities are better. Such students should be provided balanced information about how badly their country needs them, and incentives to return home should be created.

Mechanisms (pp. 15-17)

- Carrying out the many tasks that we have set for the US will require, at a minimum:

- 1) careful planning and choices at both national and regional levels;
- 2) mobilization and coordination of a wide variety of local, regional, international and US government resources;
- 3) a great deal of patience and persistence, and;
- 4) enough separation from short-term swings in US foreign and economic policies to ensure that the effort is not hostage to transitory problems.

- Education and training is so closely interrelated with efforts in the other major sectors such as health and agriculture that it seems appropriate to keep education related activities in the same agency as the other sectors. On the other hand, efforts to promote science and technology, including education, require a kind of specialized expertise that is not commonly found in agencies broadly oriented to development.

Recommendations (pp. 17-19)

- The paper concludes with a list of eight recommendations based on the body of the paper.

(*See pages 17-19*)

Evaluation

This paper provides a nice overview of the role of education in development and contains numerous suggestions regarding US education assistance. The major drawback to the work is its failure to examine what forces in both the US and the recipient country will oppose these changes. Presumably the policies that need to be changed are not rational, and therefore there must be some other explanation, political or economic, for their existence. This paper does not address the underlying reasons for current distortions in policy and how these obstacles can be overcome in making future changes.

DRAFT 4/27/88

COLLOQUIUM

THE ROLE OF EDUCATION AND TRAINING

IN DEVELOPMENT IN THE 1990s

POLICY REPORT AND CONCLUSIONS

Institute of International Education

New York, New York

April 11, 1988

INTRODUCTION

A colloquium on "The Role of Education and Training in Development in the 1990s" was organized by the Institute of International Education and held in New York City on April 11, 1988. Part of a larger Cooperation for International Development project being undertaken under the coordination of Michigan State University, the IIE meeting focussed on the role U.S. development assistance should play with respect to the vast unmet education and training needs of developing countries and attempted to formulate appropriate U.S. policy responses to the challenges and opportunities resulting from these needs.

Approximately 50 participants assembled for the one day meeting. Commissioned papers were presented by Ruth Zagorin and David Sprague (on "Education: the Cornerstone for Development"); by Stephen Heyneman and Bernadette Etienne (on "Higher Education in Developing Countries"); and by Richard Krasno (on "International Educational Exchange").

The following draft policy report and recommendations stem from the meeting and reflect the broad consensus of the participants. It has been sent to the participants for their reactions and comments, following which the official final report will be issued.

BACKGROUND

In both developing and industrialized nations, education plays a central role that is not always fully recognized. Just as there is now urgency in the calls for attention to the quality of education in the United States, it is similarly urgent that U.S. policymakers cease to neglect the vital contribution that education makes to the economic, political, and social development of poor countries and make renewed efforts to help them develop their educational systems. It is in our interest as well as theirs that we do so.

It is by now axiomatic that the developing countries in Africa, Asia, and the Americas, and especially the poorest countries in those regions, have little or no hope of achieving their national goals if they are not successful, at a minimum, in providing basic education to their entire populations. An eloquent and persuasive statement of this case for attention to education in Third World countries is made in the Zagorin/Sprague paper. As they put it, "Education constitutes an essential and critical component -- indeed, the cornerstone -- of any country's economic and social development." And they go on to assert that general agreement on this point extends to further agreement on the fact that "the greatest payoff to society comes from investments at the primary level."

There was little if any disagreement with the key points made by Zagorin and Sprague. The fundamental importance of education in giving individuals not only essential cognitive skills but an equally important sense that they have a right to full participation in society is beyond question. Among the many critical areas of individual and national development in which educations play a central, if not the most important, role are:

- + creating a citizenry (with emphasis on socializing and preparing the young of both sexes, but encompassing all ages) with a stake in building a strong, stable nation;
- + empowering that citizenry to be effective participants in its country's political system and economy and to earn incomes sufficient to meet at least its basic needs for physical well-being;
- + providing the best and the brightest of each country's young people, regardless of sex and economic and social background, with a realistic opportunity to better themselves and, in time, the groups from which they spring;
- + providing a flow of prepared, committed, and creative potential leaders not only for the nation as a whole but for such crucial sub-sectors as industry, agriculture, health, government, the private voluntary sector and, of course, education itself.

While assuring a solid basic education for all clearly must be the highest priority for developing countries, other levels of education also have key roles to play. So far as higher education is concerned, there

was considerable consensus in the meeting as to its importance, but there was also vigorous discussion of alternative strategies. It was agreed that basic education of the young cannot be accomplished without the right kind of teachers, curricula, and materials, and that these critical inputs are impossible in the absence of an effective higher education enterprise to produce them. Nor is it possible for developing countries to make progress without the trained leadership, capability for technology transfer, capacity for planning based on the collection and analysis of data, or the ability to study and appreciate particular cultural heritages that higher education provides. An exclusive focus on basic education, thus, is not desirable or feasible. But higher education in developing countries is too often ineffective, excessively costly, and often not as supportive of national development goals as it should be, necessitating careful review of policies, strategies, and resource allocation patterns. The participants in the meeting felt that the United States should, where possible, help developing countries in making such reassessments of their higher education systems.

One of the key policy decisions to be made, discussed at length in Dr. Heyneman's paper, is what functions a country wishes its higher education system to perform, and specifically, the extent to which research, i.e. production of new knowledge, should be carried out in developing countries. Dr. Heyneman argues that for the foreseeable future it would be well for most developing countries not to try to emulate the scale and quality of the higher education enterprises of the industrialized

countries and to concentrate instead on teaching and "dialogue" with researchers in other countries. Efforts at emulation, he feels, are doomed to failure -- the kind of failure of quality that is already pervasive.

But Third World participants objected to such a limited vision of the role of developing country universities. Universities need to be a source of intellectual leadership and example. It was noted, for instance, that it is only after a local research tradition is fostered that traditional methods of rote learning are ultimately abandoned. Locally relevant research can also have great importance for development at both national and provincial levels. Third World universities need sound, realistic development strategies and must do their utmost to maximize the use of scarce resources in the service of their countries, but to play the key nation-building role expected of them they must also be free to aspire to eventual excellence by international standards.

There was strong consensus throughout the meeting on the central importance of human resource development. The clear message of the meeting is that the formal educational system, at both basic and higher levels, has a critical role to play and the UNited States should once again make concerted efforts to help developing countries in this area of need. For the foreseeable future, until local educational systems are fully sufficient to do the job, major investments in overseas training also will continue to be required.

RELATION TO U.S. POLICY AND INTERESTS

What, then, is the significance of the various diagnoses of the educational needs of the developing countries for U.S. development assistance policy and for U.S. interests?

The strongest prescription for U.S. policymakers that emerges from the discussion is the need for patience and a long-term perspective. Time and again, the most experienced participants present stressed the need for serious, long-term efforts whose success is not measured by short-term results.

Whether and how results of educational development should eventually be assessed is not so clear: economists argue the case for education as a rational investment, to be assessed by measurable quantitative outputs, while noneconomic social scientists stress the importance of education as a moral imperative, as a right or an end in itself, the positive benefits of which are givens. An economist at the meeting noted that the efficiency argument is most persuasive in government circles. A sociologist on the other hand drew attention to the fact that there are significant long-term attitudinal changes resulting from education that are difficult to measure, but nevertheless critical to the development process. The fact is, they are both right.

Whether moral or instrumental goals are stressed in the rationale for educational development, the United States has a major stake in it. Only if the developing countries have educated citizens will they be able to collaborate with the United States in the solution of some of the critical problems of our day. These problems include the global pandemics of drug abuse and AIDS; the progressive degradation of the environment; population growth rates that overtax economic, social, and political systems; and the various forms of discrimination -- racial, ethnic, religious, sexual, and class -- that both imperil the internal stability of countries and spill over into regional warfare.

In addition to these compelling global arguments for U.S. aid to educational development in the countries of the Third World, there are major direct benefits to the United States. One area in which the benefits are particularly large and clear is that of international educational exchange and other foreign training in the United States. The case for these programs was spelled out in the paper delivered by Richard Krasno at the colloquium. As Dr. Krasno notes, the United States benefits in terms of both the positive results of cultural diplomacy and of the economic results of foreign student flows to this country.

Whether training in the United States has a variety of purposes, as in the case of the Fulbright program, or is more specifically targeted to development objectives, as in the case of AID's participant training program, the students who come to this country leave in the great

majority of cases with positive attitudes towards the United States: they come to appreciate our institutions and our values. Krasno quotes from a study of returned Brazilians by Craufurd Goodwin and Michael Nacht: "But equally or more important than the direct benefits [i.e., skills] are the intangibles: a change in style and work habits; a new method of reasoning; a different set of values; a more sophisticated and more objective outlook on the world."

Beyond this longterm pay-off in mutual understanding and goodwill there are the benefits that flow directly to the United States. The Krasno paper identifies two kinds: first, the creation of more U.S. citizens who are sophisticated and compassionate in their relations with other nations; and second, the emergence of a large group of foreigners who return home to positions of commercial responsibility and subsequently are disposed to enhance the trade relations between their countries and ours. Furthermore, higher education in the United States is in a commercial sense an extraordinarily successful export industry, in that foreign students bring perhaps as much as 4 billion dollars annually into the U.S. economy.

The United States, with 350,000 foreign students enrolled in its institutions of higher education, has a "market share" of more than one-third of all internationally-mobile students. Clearly, it is to our advantage to try to keep that share. And whatever the ultimate verdict on Dr. Heyneman's analysis of the proper eventual scope of the activities of

Third World universities, there is little disagreement that at the present time international educational exchanges are as beneficial to the countries of the Third World as well as to the United States.

Fortunately, the U.S. comparative advantage in education remains very strong. We have the world's largest and most diverse higher education system which remains a magnet for hundreds of thousands of young people from other lands each year. Our instructional language, English, is the undisputed language of international science and technology. We have a well-developed and experienced network of institutions ready and willing to provide high quality and sensitive educational development assistance at all levels and of all types. The existing array of officially and privately sponsored exchange and training programs of all kinds is unmatched anywhere else in the world. And we have a national history and model, whatever our own current problems, for effectively using education for developing national consensus and a democratic tradition of providing citizens with the means to social, economic, and political mobility through education.

From a budgetary point of view, the cost to the U.S. of again becoming a major actor in educational development assistance would be relatively low, even in terms of the AID budgets, not to speak of the federal budget as a whole. We see no justification for the U.S. financing major educational capital improvements except as may occur indirectly through international lending mechanisms in which the U.S. participates. The

principal needs, as noted, are for investment in human capital -- for more targetted training of teachers, professors, managers, administrators, planners, researchers, statisticians and strengthening of the primary education system which undergirds all. The additional resources required would probably be no more than a few hundred million dollars a year -- a substantial sum of money, of course, but well within our reach if the will is there, and, it might be added, quite inexpensive in relation to the alternatives. Not all of the extra money would go to the AID education budget per se. The human resource development components of the major sectoral programs such as agriculture, health, population, and private sector development also need to be enlarged and strengthened.

Why has the U.S. in recent years become an increasingly marginal participant in overseas educational development? Scarcity of resources is often cited, but that argument is not really persuasive. In spite of its real and severe budget problems, the U.S. continues to have the capacity to expend huge sums abroad for a variety of purposes that it deems important. Surely, we can, if we choose do a bit more in such a critical area as education, especially when we also would be a major beneficiary. Part of the explanation is disillusionment with past efforts. Not everything we have tried in the past has worked and some of the experience we now possess was gained the hard way and aid administrators are, as a result, a bit gun-shy.

A more profound answer lies in the typically American desire for quick results and our frequent inability to work on something patiently and wisely over a long enough period of time to achieve the very results we seek. The negative effects on our development assistance efforts of frequent swings in short-term goals and public attitudes towards aid are related phenomena. The fact is, that investments in people and the institutions that educate and train them require a lot of time, trouble, patience and above all persistence. But there is nothing else that really works and, as noted earlier, the long range cost of failure to help developing countries develop an internal capacity to solve their problems will be far greater than anything we are called upon to invest now.

To sum up, it is plainly in the interest of the developing countries and in ours as well to increase development assistance to education at all levels and, as an integral part of that process, to continue to open our doors to foreign students who seek to study in our country.

GUIDELINES FOR ACTION

If the U.S. determines to apply its undoubted capacity and a greater measure of its still more than adequate resources to human resource development in the Third World -- both in their interest and our own -- it will be essential to adhere closely to a number of operating

principles and guidelines which grow out of past experience and conform to present realities.

The first is that the so-called Third World, is not (nor ever was) a homogeneous entity. All the countries involved are in fact quite different economically, politically, and socially. In particular for our purposes, they are at distinctly varying levels of human and institutional development, requiring substantially different educational policies and programs. The U.S. response must recognize and adapt to these differences.

Secondly, we must recognize and deal with the fact that education is, at bottom, one of the most political of functions in any society. Because Third World countries tend by definition to be underdeveloped institutionally, moreover, their educational institutions, particularly the universities, play political roles to which Americans historically are unaccustomed. Effective external assistance to the educational sector, thus, has to be more than usually sensitive to local needs and concerns, which is emphatically not to say, however, that we should shrink from the task or conclude that we have nothing to offer. On the contrary, we have a great deal to offer both in terms of educational values as well as technology. But in this case, how we offer it makes a large, even crucial, difference.

Which leads to the third guideline which the colloquium participants urge on U.S. policymakers as they plan and execute development assistance in the educational and human resource areas: to seek out in each country setting the critical margins at which external assistance can be most effective. Where circumstances permit, the most valuable inputs which the U.S. can provide appear to us to be the following:

- + Constructive dialogue with national leaders and other policymakers on educational and human resource goals and concepts;
- + Provision of policy relevant information and other high impact educational inputs (materials, technology);
- + Capacity-building, particularly in the universities, teacher training, and other tertiary level institutions to help produce the human beings able to effectively process advice and information, make sound decisions in their own contexts, and implement (manage) effective programs;
- + Carefully tailored complementary education and training programs, both long and short-term, in the U.S. and Third countries to supplement local educational programs, introduce new technologies and professional standards, help provide a new generation of leaders with international exposure and contacts, and give encouragement and support to effective reentry in their societies;
- + Gradual development and strengthening of indigenous knowledge production, R & D, and institutional development capability to render the need for extensive outside assistance obsolete;

- + Helping coordinate the efforts and inputs of other interested donors, including the World Bank and the other major sources of development financing; close coordination of all the relevant U.S. programs, both public and private is another important requirement. The Fulbright Program and other USIA-funded exchange programs, for example, are an often overlooked asset for development purposes, especially in education.

UNDERSTANDING AND COPING WITH BRAIN DRAIN PROBLEMS

Mention is needed here of the brain drain problem. It is important in this connection for policymakers to keep in mind that the foreign student population consists basically of two major groups: one-third of all foreign students are sponsored students, with full or partial support from public or private agencies in their home or host countries; the other two-thirds are nonsponsored students, with major support from personal or family resources. Very few sponsored students become part of the brain drain, partly because in most cases there are suitable jobs waiting for them in their home countries and partly because immigration laws make it very difficult for them to convert their status to that of permanent immigrant. Most of those who remain in the United States are nonsponsored students, who have made the judgment that their career prospects are better in this country. It is quite possible that many of them are not aware of the extent to which they are needed in their home countries; and it would be very desirable to provide for them the kind of counselling

that permits them to make fully informed choices. It may even be possible to help provide positive inducements to nonsponsored Third World students to return home. Be that as it may, it is unwise to dissipate our energies and resources in negative or exclusionary rules that will in any case probably be ineffective.

With regard to sponsored students, who generally do return to their home countries, it would be highly desirable to provide services that will enable them to reenter their societies effectively and maintain the competences they acquired through foreign study.

One of the regular responsibilities of U.S. overseas missions should be to work with local authorities, to improve employment opportunities for returning students and provide appropriate support mechanisms: alumni clubs, career counseling, peer group support mechanisms, access to international journals and other professional networking devices and, for the most critically needed people, refresher training opportunities at home and abroad.

MECHANISMS

We have argued that U.S. development assistance policies and budgets must be revised to give a much higher priority to education and training. We are confident that the U.S. has the skills, talents, and

institutions to be effective partners in educational and human resource development in the Third World. But we are less certain that our current national development assistance mechanisms are adequate to accomplish what we propose.

Carrying out the many tasks that we have set for the U.S. will require, at a minimum:

- + careful planning and choices at both national and regional levels;
- + mobilization and coordination of a wide variety of local, regional, international and U.S. government resources;
- + a great deal of patience and persistence; and
- + enough separation from short-term swings in U.S. foreign and economic policies to ensure that the effort is not hostage to transitory problems.

It is premature to decide whether these needs can be met adequately within the framework of existing development agencies or whether a new institution is required. Arguments can be made for both approaches: on the one hand, education and training is so closely interrelated with efforts in the other major sectors like health and agriculture that it seems appropriate to keep education-related activities in the same agency as the other sectors; on the other hand, efforts to promote science and technology, including education, require a kind of specialized expertise that is not commonly found in agencies broadly oriented to development.

There was surely some merit to the previously proposed Institute for Scientific and Technological Cooperation, and we recommend that the issues that stimulated that proposal be carefully reexamined.

Whatever official mechanism is selected, there will be no need for that organization to develop a large bureaucracy of its own. Overseas, though a network of regional educational advisors may be needed, the educational development effort should be carried out primarily through and in intimate cooperation with other elements of the U.S. country team. At home, the effort should place primary reliance on accessing and making the best possible use of the vast array of U.S. educational and training talent and institutions, both public and private, which are already in place and ready and willing to do the job. More generally what we have proposed cannot be done without developing a broad national consensus, including bipartisan support in the Congress and the Administration, the enthusiastic support and participation of the entire U.S. educational establishment, and understanding and support by the concerned public.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The United States must reverse direction and again assign high priority to assisting developing countries with strengthening their educational systems. As our own history amply proves, effective education is an essential ingredient for successful nation-building.

2. Future educational assistance programs should emphasize constructive dialogue on educational values and goals, provision of high impact educational inputs including appropriate technology, related institutional development and capacity building, and greatly increased investment in education and training of the people needed to make improved educational strategies work.
3. Expansion and strengthening of primary or basic education should be the highest priority objective both for developing countries and U.S. development assistance agencies..
4. Selective and sensitively applied U.S. assistance at higher secondary and tertiary levels also is needed to underpin the total educational development effort, provide upward mobility opportunities for relatively disadvantaged groups in the society, build a strong pool of potential leaders, and help the U.S. establish linkages with that future leadership.
5. For the foreseeable future, substantial funding will still be needed to educate and train key personnel in the U.S., in both long and short-term programs designed to ensure an adequate human infrastructure for development and also one that has a deep, genuine exposure to the U.S., its values and institutions, and its professional and technical riches. While a major share of this overseas training investment should be directed to the educational sector itself, increased funding is needed also to buttress human resource development components of other key sectors including agriculture, health, population, and private sector development.

6. Close coordination of the education and training efforts of the major involved U.S. government agencies, notably USAID and USIA, will be essential. Although their programs are different, serve different objectives, and should remain separate, there is greater potential for complementarity and mutual support than is now recognized. The two agencies should cooperate, closely, for example, in encouraging foreign students in the U.S. to return to their home countries and helping them be more effective there. They should work together as well to improve the quality of the experience in the U.S. for the hundreds of thousands of non-sponsored students who come to the U.S. every year.
7. As the U.S. assumes a larger role in educational development, it can and should become more active in coordinating inputs from other donors, including U.S. government funds flowing through international and regional banks and organizations.
8. The implementation of these recommendations will require a substantial sum of money, perhaps, several hundred millions of dollars a year. But there is no higher potential development return for the dollar available anywhere and very substantial direct benefits -- political, economic, commercial, and educational -- will flow back to the U.S. We strongly urge a degree of budgetary boldness matching the major priority shift here recommended.