

Human Rights in Quality Education and Development Aid

ZEHLIA BABACI-WILHITE

University of California, Berkeley, USA &

Norwegian Center for Human Rights, University of Oslo, Norway

MACLEANS A. GEO-JAJA

Brigham Young University, USA

STEVE AZAIKI

The International Society of Comparative Education Science & Technology
Nigeria

ABSTRACT This article explores human rights in development aid with emphasis on Scandinavian aid to quality education in Africa. The focus is on self-determination and the role of human rights in a holistic approach in education, which we regard as an important goal in development aid. The potential lessons of Scandinavian aid are explored and an assessment made of how it measures up to the Paris Declaration. The premise is that the right-capability roadmap with its combination of sensitivity to stakeholder ownership and voice seems best practice for systematically addressing the multidimensionality of poverty as well as other systemic challenges. Implicit in this approach is the acknowledgement that recipients have inalienable rights of jurisdiction over their own education and development programs. The authors suggest that pluralism of knowledge and language rights should be the driver of development aid and development aid constructs must break with binding mechanisms and make the emancipation of communities from donors' political, economic, cultural penetration a necessary and sufficient condition. This will allow local control of reforms and indigenize goals, including local languages within a contextualized curriculum to provide quality education for Africa in African terms.

Keywords: Human Rights, Scandinavian aid, Quality education, Local Languages, Rights-capability approach, Africa

Introduction

Aid is not a new concept in the history of mankind. However, it is only in the post-Cold War period that development aid programs and policies became intertwined in a complex global politic involving the promotion of donor interests, sustainable development, and the imposition of global values. Nonetheless, improved coordination of donor efforts could result in greater effectiveness to meet global development objectives. Effective aid patterns will need to accommodate the Accra Agenda for Action (AAA), centered on capacity development, empowering partnership, and ownership. The latter is very significant for aid effectiveness, which is conditioned on the willingness of development partnerships to make space for recipient country ownership. To offer a dynamic and comprehensive review of education, characterized by interactions of myriad agents in the economic, social, political and cultural spheres, this article focuses on Scandinavian aid to Africa, mainly Tanzania. In this regard, the authors reflect on whether development assistance is used politically in order to impede advancement of recipients or is a battleground for geopolitical capturing. The question is whether Scandinavian aid can facilitate institutional capacities, foster localized ownership, and improve social and economic infrastructure. A caveat is that the moral obligation of aid effectiveness in Tanzania is inferred from the performance of individual country-supported projects and programs in terms of mediating capability deprivation through education. The power relations between partners in development as reflected in conditionalities are important to empower local voices and for the achievement of partial or full ownership by aid recipients. In this vein, the conflict between partners over conditionalities is a determining factor for the principal of ownership.

Tanzania has been chosen for two reasons: Scandinavian aid constitutes 45 percent of the total aid to Tanzania; and because it was recently identified by the IMF as a good case for possible scaling up of donor assistance between to social sectors and infrastructures. The purpose of this article is to analyze and explain how the Scandinavian countries' education aid differs in comparison with other donors. The article draws attention to the modalities of human rights and pro-poor development policy in aid from the Scandinavian countries of Denmark, Norway and Sweden. In focusing on enlarging opportunities and improving human capital development, without giving much currency to the historical background, we provide brief case evidence of respective country's operations in Tanzania. The motivation behind this approach is to generate insights into their ideological operations at the conclusion of the Cold War at the country level. A comparison of Scandinavian aid with that of other OECD donors is also a motivating factor for this article. The potentials of alternative aid roadmaps are considered and explored

with regard to how they measure up to the tenets of The Paris Declaration. It is argued that aid's current complexity has its origins in various contextualizations of aid in development frameworks, the general thrust of which is seen as constraining the boundaries of knowledge or mechanisms of dependency (Tandon, 2008; Samoff, 2007, Babaci-Wilhite and Geo-JaJa, 2011).

Drivers and Maintainers of Aid in the Post-Cold War Period

This section alerts us to the importance of an expanded notion of human rights and agency and the extent to which these are inappropriately limited by certain constructs of development aid. Indicators like donors' unbalanced interest with normalized relations, the apparent failure of socio-economic development, as well as promotion of donors security or geo-political interests are prescriptions that capture the weakness of development assistance in the post-Cold War. However, for many commentators aid serves as a unique tool to expand other rights to meet the diverse needs and circumstances of recipients.

Scandinavian donor partnerships are not just about the relationship between them and recipients but based on meeting challenges of failures of development in Tanzania. They have given aid in the context of altruism and have attempted to direct aid to the needs of the recipients. In addition, their development not only creates more fiscal space and voice for recipients, it also advances the prolongation of the social democratic project, as well as on compatibility and interdependency between donor interests and recipient human rights. This aid characteristic is also consistent with their shared historical and cultural-linguistic legacy, namely ethno-cultural Germanic heritage and related languages. It is contended that Sweden, Denmark and Norway, whose aid is motivated by greater respect for human rights disburse a larger share of aid to health, education, and civil society sectors than do other OECD countries. These moral dimensions of aid have positively influenced educational development and promotion of sustainable development.

Despite the similarities among Scandinavia's new aid modalities towards general budget support and flexibility in decentralization of authority, it must be said that there are also significant differences, particularly given the efforts not to promote privatization. Harmonization among donors and budget support, which create a climate of certainty rather than uncertainty, are intended to be part of an effort to resolve the inefficiencies of the donors, ensure the sovereignty of the state and the legitimacy of the public authority, and to be in conformity with empowering ownership and commitment to democratization, human rights and human development. Among the efforts to protect economic and social rights by way of aid effectiveness is the Partnership Agreement (see Geo-JaJa and Azaiki, 2010; Babaci-Wilhite et al., 2012a, 2013) with the government of Tanzania for the establishment of a

good policy platform, to respect democracy and human rights, to fight against corruption and for good governance, to emphasize macro-economic stability, to increase domestic resource mobilization, and to focus government activities on core functions in cooperation with civil society and the private sector (Babaci-Wilhite and Geo-JaJa, 2015). Logic and good reasoning dictates that for indivisibility of rights and the realization of equality of all parties in development Tanzania's country-owned poverty reduction and human freedom strategies must be respected, that devolution of authority and enlarging local capacity should be accorded high priority, that broader approaches to partnership and the management of development assistance are imperative, just as ensuring recipients' voice (political, economic, and development rights) should be the focus in rethinking the promises of development aid. With this understanding they locate their commitment to economic and social rights in support for primary education, health care and nutrition, environment and housing by putting pressure on political leaders to deliver, rather than imposing conditionalities that require recipients to align their economic, political and security interest with theirs. The effort to promote closer harmonization coordination among donors and the positive realities of aid, there is a growing recognition of the links between the forfeit of self-determination and capability deprivation in post-Cold War aid modalities of bilateral and multilateral donors. While some countries have adopted rights-based approaches to development aid, others seem not to see the benefits of recipients' jurisdiction over critical education. In this vein we draw attention to current evidence on the "added value" that concern for human rights brings to development aid.

Education and Nation-building

Education is universally recognized as one of the most fundamental building blocks for human development and reducing poverty. The quality of education, not the quantity of education, is the foundation for change and sustainable development. Education is also not a static commodity. Such characteristics demand a lot more of education as a builder of individual and community assets, necessary in the expansion of a nation's capability to achieve social and economic sustainability (UNESCO, 2002, p. 32).

Clearly, only through such a definition and understanding of education could donors facilitate human capabilities and other necessary elements for a nation to effectively cope with the challenges of development. Despite the evolution of Declaration on the Rights to Development (UNDRD), as "an inalienable human rights" and the Paris Declaration, which brought rights and development together in a way that helps to affirm and validate the central role of the state and human rights in development processes, achieving these rights, particularly rights in education still remains a work in progress.

Evidence shows that multilateral development agencies and donors serve as roadblocks to the inter-linkages between sustainable education and development, security and human rights (Tomasevski, 2006); rather, they foster ‘voicelessness’, ‘powerlessness’ and educational poverty. Right to education – like all human rights – is universal and inalienable, enshrined in many constitutions. Rights in education for development equated with quality education – what we learn in school - is a social and moral obligation for all mankind. With the Millennium Development Goal (MDG), the focus of development aid has been on access to right to education; full access to education does not bring quality education because it does not give priority to the content of curriculum or to the pedagogy. The latter is an essential foundation for critical thinking for developing a sense of agency and tackling capability deprivation. This is a crucial aspect of Katherine Tomasevski’s essential education framework, which features (a) Availability ...; (b) Accessibility ...; (c) Acceptability ...; [and] (d) Adaptability (2006). The implication is that education in all its forms shall acknowledge education as a basic human right and indigenous knowledge as an integral part of the culture and linguistic rights of communities. In many ways, such a process foundation on human rights responds to different society’s contexts to create a more structured and extended quality of life, facilitating collective action in a complex web. With this shared understanding, all tiers of society and government have an opportunity to rethink and pursue focused rights respecting education and development (Tomasevski, 2006). This is not simply a function of having access to schools; rather it is a schooling system with positive steps taken to reach the most marginalized and excluded, guaranteeing their right to improve their economic, political, social and cultural rights.

In sum, such a conceptualization of schooling, as theorized by commentators like Sen (1999), Robeyns (2005) and Untherhalter (2003), is significantly different from education as conceived in marketized aid that is based on neoliberal approaches to education. In contrast to this neo-liberal version, empowering education enables nations to break out of the vicious cycle of poverty and marginalized dependent development. Such a construction of education aid that assigns high priority to human rights in the choice of aid modalities will delink aid as a driver and maintainer of economic inequality.

Rethink Educational Conditionalities and Tied Aid Architecture

In the period 1990-2011 the Scandinavians allocated on average about 50% of their bilateral aid to Least Developed Countries, compared to a DAC average of 25.8%. For some OECD DAC donors historically, aid serves a multitude of objectives. For others the quantity and quality of aid is largely shaped by complex interplay of social justice, opportunities to share self-social values, and the concern for promoting the global common good. Scandinavian

countries are considered world leaders on the issue of redistribution and recognition of social responsibility in development assistance. They give most of their aid to poor countries or countries in conflict in the areas of social and infrastructure and less to commodity aid and program assistance. Indeed, untied aid (on average more than 95% in 2012) and removal of stringent conditionalities, which have remained a core construct of Scandinavian aid, empower recipients' ownership over their desired development path. As pointed out by Selbervik (2006a) and Geo-JaJa (2006), OECD aid is principally determined by political conditionalities, while that of the Scandinavian's top the list in consideration of moral rights, since it tends to connect education to economic functionality and cultural realities—Commitment to Social Infrastructure and Development Index (CSDI). This deeply political, civic, and moral practice, with anti-neoliberal foundations, is indicative of the Scandinavian priority of aid disbursement for health, education, good governance, and civil society. The activities of other OECD DAC are found to apparently favor disbursement to their former colonies or economic trade partners.

The construction of meaning, authority, and subjectivity in development aid from the Scandinavian countries is not governed by instrumentalist/universalism. It offers different possibilities for recipients to construct their own development and to enlarge opportunities of the majority of the population. What changes and developments are considered the most important, what knowledge is deemed the most legitimate, and what forms of development aid matter are largely determined by Tanzania? Scandinavian aid is poverty and right-oriented, principled and determined by socio-political welfare values (Geo-JaJa and Mangum, 2000). It is credited with favoring extension of the principles of the welfare state beyond the Scandinavian domestic borders (see Babaci-Wilhite et al., 2013).

The Challenge for Education Aid Roadmap

The rights-capability approach to education, contrary to the market-driven logic of OECD-DAC aid riddled with conditionalities that devalue all aspects of the public good, is architecture of excellence concerned with matters of quality and equity. Neoliberal structuralism promoted by the World Bank against a "Strong State" has resulted in costly but low quality education with the lowest comprehensive rates of return. The lesson might be that the construction of meaning and subjectivity in aid should not be governed by universalism, but rather be governed by indigenous knowledge—a *sin qua non* for unlocking the full range of individual human capabilities (Alston and Robinson, 2005). The challenge to achieve universal convergence in aid effectiveness and quality schooling is more important than that of equity and efficiency. For educators and donors, aid attention should shift to a roadmap

that offers new theoretical tools to rethink the contexts in which aid is conceptualized. The project of effectiveness in aid could be deepened by expanding its sphere of applicability to increasingly wider social relations and practices, encompassing stakeholders who have been marginalized or excluded by virtue of their class, gender, race, age or ethnicity. What is at stake here is the recognition that the rights-capability roadmap provides educators with a more complex and insightful view of the (un) balanced relationships of culture, power, and knowledge in development aid.

Donors Educational Investment: Thinking About Conditionalities

Education is a great enabler for enlarging socio-economic opportunities because it empowers citizens and communities with unchanging knowledge embedded in culture and history. For the marginalized and voiceless, it positions them to make choices about desired livelihood functioning. But in the aftermath of numerous international conferences on Education, the realization of these positives and the ability of education to reduce poverty or disempowering economism have been at issue with the focus on conditionality. Instrumentalist approach to aid, a broader strategy to protect self-interest but pedagogically the politics of indifference that articulates poverty, underdevelopment, and ownership from a position of deficit and subordination seem to be in conformity with donors who favor selfish market penetrating objective over incorporating human rights in aid. For instance, what is contended in this article is that Scandinavian aid articulates best in positive terms the following questions: what change and development are considered the most important; what knowledge is deemed the most legitimate; and what forms of development aid matter? The answers are largely determined by receiving countries and focus on poverty reduction, health and education, good governance, and control over economic aid.

Education for All is dominated by attention to universal access to learning; broadening the means and the scope of basic education; narrowing the regime of teaching to corporatization of knowledge and skill; and giving limited voice to stakeholders. Today, despite the target set by the World Conference on Education for All, after more than two decades still more than 300 million children worldwide have little or no access to education of any quality (Geo-JaJa and Yang, 2003; UNESCO, 2009). More must be done to protect and enlarge opportunity education for the millions of children deprived of it, a serious moral concern and a matter of social justice, which are not on the moral agenda of most education aid. Internationalization of education is a process of intellectual reproduction and the degradation of education organized and determined by the market. Over the past decade, donor funding for education has increased as countries race to meet the millennium development goal to ensure all children complete a full course of primary school by

2015 (See OECD, 2006). But the emphasis on increasing the numbers of children in school has come at the great cost of declining quality of education and a foolish wisdom that does not allow students to explore and deepen participation in the promise of their locality. The assumption that a simple focus on enrolment would translate into understanding, reflecting and acting on reality, stands disproved. Education aid has hindered attaining basic levels of literacy and numeracy, and has not been an enabler for expanding individual choice (Babaci-Wilhite, 2014a). Neither has it gone beyond reading to promoting capability for control over everyday life or for acquiring many other inalienable rights, (see Babaci-Wilhite, 2015a). This education project that only privileges work readiness over other education values sends a clear common message: a major rethink in approach is needed.

The growing body of observational evidence highlighting the shocking quality of education endured by millions of children around the world, which substantiates the calling into question of instrumentalist aid design, informs the decision to review the effectiveness of Scandinavian aid to Tanzania (Babaci-Wilhite et al., 2014). Of even more concern is that today's education poverty and tomorrow's unbalanced competitiveness are clearly outcomes of clinging to policies of conditionality, as well as to the market that does not give value to local initiatives (World Bank, 2005, p. 40). What we have presented in this section is the non-utility and sustainability of development aid in education, as well as the denial of local context and development history in the target-setting processes, and the inability to reconcile or balance local context and history with development aid (Geo-JaJa and Azaiki, 2010). Specifically, in not promoting the democratic public sphere such aid expansion will only be abusive to broad development.

Freedom in Aid in Education for Broad Development

Rights in education and aid are critical and directly associated with their reengineering as the practice of freedom. Development aid which has the moral courage to be conceptualized in these terms is an effective candidate for matters of human rights and equity, as it is not only for sustainable development, but it also entails considerations of respect we give to each other in promoting empowerment (Geo-JaJa and Mangum, 2003; World Bank, 2008). According to (Silova, 2009), the fundamentals of the reductionist roadmap, caught up in the conflict dynamics of globalization, commodification of knowledge and the liberalization of schooling has pushed aid recipients into one economy, one language and one education system promoting dependency and un-development. Indeed, unless a strong synergy emerges between aid-receiving communities, and structured harmonized targeted aid replaces authoritative aid practices, students will not speak from their own histories and nations will not determine their own development path.

Irrespective of the fact that circumstances are different, neo-colonization of education still persists, as corporatization of schooling today aims not to promote or to enhance the capability of citizens to enjoy either economic or process freedom or critical thinking as a driver for liberation (Babaci-Wilhite and Geo-JaJa, 2014), but rather is an instrument of modernization pushing societies into dependency and instability. Within the existing literature a *rosy* rationalization of Scandinavian aid is by no means unquestioning as strengths and weaknesses have been demonstrated, but our analysis supports its characterization as developmentalist and pragmatic. Although there has been progress made towards right to education, the overarching message from the 2011 EFA Global Monitoring Report is that pragmatic orientation will be missed by a wide margin. The caveat is that since not all aid constructs are supportive of this characterization, outcome is by no means universal, but countries should make sure that “no-one is left behind.” Indeed, the role of education aid has been enhanced by the challenges to neoliberal market informed roadmap, as provocative questions have been raised about the implication for interpreting social returns. William Easterly in his brilliant book, *The White Man’s Burden*, makes it clear, in raising issues on the strict nexuses between aid givers and receivers, and on the one hand, questioning its explanatory power and application to the challenges of galvanizing social energies around human capabilities of recipients. In our opinion, to sustain development aid, involving non-wholeness of nations, or a naïve trust in the goodness of donors, has resulted in development aid lacking a human face and incapable of investment in human capabilities.

Approaches to Education Aid: What is Lost?

Certain donors tend not to allow space for value worthy of desire or localized education—education rooted as an end in itself. The outcome of the aid partnership for control over education, a semblance that is not so much different from that of the imperialist, results in diseconomies bastardized local knowledge and cultures (Mason, 2012) and (Babaci-Wilhite, 2014b, 2015b). Authoritative sources such as Andersen, Harr and Tarp (2006), have unambiguously made it clear that a systematic difference exists between countries committed to international human rights conventions (Scandinavian countries), and those, which do not. The Scandinavian countries distinguish their aid architecture from other donors that use aid as a foreign policy tool or an imperialist market-penetrating mechanism for dumping surplus goods. The latter also tend to use aid for vote getting at the United Nations. This salient difference is articulated by a former Director General of UNESCO, M’bow who noted that:

'Development aid should not be reduced to imitation of donor societies, development can only come from within'. He further stressed that 'aid must be endogenous, thought out by people themselves, springing out from the soil on which they live and attuned to their aspirations, the conditions of their environment, the resources at their disposal and particular genius of their culture (cited in Sifuna, 2001, p. 32).

The link of education with marketization, as characterized by commodification of knowledge and learning, is leaving learners with poor educational opportunities and is merely a donor apparatus for reproduction and market penetration.

Exceptionalism in Development Aid: Normative Platforms of Scandinavian Aid in Tanzania

Scandinavian aid that seeks to promote and protect fundamental human rights, equity, and social inclusion, stimulates the interest of aid recipients. A content analysis of the respective countries' official documents shows similarities in their African policies. The strong support of the Paris Declaration by Scandinavian countries plays an important role in ensuring ownership and in efforts to fulfill human rights and direct poverty reduction. Although the motivation and mission of aid might have changed in the OECD post-Cold War, the fulfillment of quality livelihood still remains the main motivation of Scandinavian aid. In recent times, in some of the Nordic countries motivations such as foreign policy and self-enlightened interest have come into development aid (Geo-JaJa, 2013, Babaci-Wilhite, 2015c). The strong commitment to multicultural education that is intellectually and psychologically liberating predates Scandinavian aid policies post-Cold War. In a nutshell, such a development aid roadmap is driven by 'developmentalism', rather than the 'instrumentalism' that motivates most other OECD countries. The uniqueness of Scandinavian aid is gradually evolving into economic imperialism (driven by trade and investment concerns) rather than political imperialism (concerns for national security) even though some of the traditional features remain, and intense cooperation at the operational level continues.

The logic behind this right-capacity-based aid, illustrates the fact that nations have the right and responsibilities to center themselves in their own subjective possibilities or to refine the best of their education for human functioning (Geo-JaJa and Zajda, 2005). The policy documents cited above underscore clearly that "providing operating parameters that do not undermine the development opportunities of poor countries but expand them whether by cancelling debt or by providing fairer terms of trade so that developing countries' products have genuine access to markets in the Global North" drives Scandinavian development aid (Babaci-Wilhite, 2015c). There is a strong link between Scandinavian aid and avowed objectives, as mutual

benefit dialogue and decentralization address issues of powerlessness, and voicelessness. Education is highly valued as a human resource and as a means for upward social mobility. As in other developing countries primary schooling is the major educational experience for people. Nyerere's (1968) program of schooling, which he named famously "Education for Self-Reliance" [ESR], still remains central to basic formal education in Tanzania. It stressed the need to develop localized functional skills and knowledge by inculcating the right attitude for community as well as nation-building. As was earlier commented rich nations of OECD understand that successful development is almost impossible without quality education and aid.

Danish Aid – DANIDA

Denmark's priority sectors in its aid partnership with Tanzania are multi-sectoral, and mainly extended in the form of budget aid. Even though the stated goal is to move away from traditional projects and align initiatives with partner country priorities, some recent initiatives might not match policy objectives - identify the priority areas and resources needed for partner governments to better respect, protect, and fulfill social equity and human rights. However, at the same time it encourages aid partners, without imposing conditionalities, to integrate the Paris Declaration into their development strategies. A number of crosscutting themes are built into Denmark's development assistance: women's participation in development, the environment, promotion of democracy and observation of human rights and poverty reduction. These crosscutting themes are integrated into DANIDA's development activities more generally. In supporting many projects in Tanzania, DANIDA ensures the mainstreaming of these crosscutting elements in projects beyond the direct support to human rights programs or stand-alone projects that support civil society organizations. Danish aid support also features the use of a rights-capability approach, which empowers and enables enlarging opportunities and inclusion of local stakeholders with strong voices in programs.

It must be understood, that Danish aid programs are constructed beyond the Paris Declaration terms, but boundaries between mission and frameworks are not watertight. However, DANIDA programs contextualized in specific human rights standards help "define" the balance of development partnership and focus programmatic missions, which link sustainable development with such elements as civil and political, economic, social and cultural rights. The motives of human rights and social justice that characterize Norway and Sweden's aid architecture are demonstrated in DANIDA School Maintenance Project. This project exemplifies Denmark's motives to incorporate different kinds of rights. It was a success as it empowered citizens to claim their right to education, nutrition, and better infrastructures, all contributory

elements of sustainable development. In addition it also contributed to the rehabilitation of staff housing, school feeding kitchens, and the reconstruction of facilities and physical plants in 142 secondary and post-secondary schools.

In seeking to promote and improve human rights and democratization it commenced a governance program. In making schooling adaptable and affordable to the marginalized both in rural and urban centers, not only has it accelerated achievement of some MDGs but also it has positively and directly impacted educational poverty (Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 2007). In sum, the Danish commitment to the Paris Declaration agenda is manifested in its strong focus on stakeholder ownership, on promoting human rights and on introducing a human rights-based roadmap to development aid.

Norwegian Aid – NORAD

Norwegian development aid in Tanzania has consistently focused on education, good governance, and natural resource management. These priorities are aligned with the Tanzanian Poverty Reduction Strategy (PRS). The Paris Declaration and political liberalism have positively impacted the mainstreaming of human rights in Norway's aid programs and its global policy in general.

Contrary to the common understanding of aid driven by donor interest or imperialist hegemonic penetration, Norad aid to Tanzania is shaped by cultural sensitivity and self-actualization—focused on integrating key inherent human rights principles into aid processes. As a major donor to a wide-range of education initiatives and programs, its main objective is to correct macroeconomic imbalances and develop the necessary mechanisms to ensure presence, participation and achievement of all learners in education—essential for achieving rights in education (NORAD, 2010). This localized participatory approach informed the affirmation that local jurisdiction in aid is more effective to address inclusion of vulnerable and marginalized groups in education and thereby contribute to social justice. Policy documents show this sentiment that suggests a commitment to a child/human rights approach to education. Recent funding also demonstrates a high priority to local language/mother tongue and teacher education, as NORAD funded the University of Oslo's project entitled Language of Instruction in Tanzania and South Africa (LOITASA), which promoted a range of local language projects in schools (see Brock-Utne, 2011; 2012).

In 2008, to integrate key human rights principles in aid and protect indigenous knowledge, basic education received the lion share of aid disbursement to support quality improvement and teacher education. Norway's aid in education is rights-capability oriented. As a consequence, it focuses on capacity building and promoting indigenous values and the buildup of stocks of

highly educated populations. Contrary to the popular understanding of the capitalistic wealthy members of OECD aid and without glorifying its shortcomings, it is significant to note that Norway's broad comprehensive aid modality seems anchored in the efficacy of country human capabilities and development as freedom roadmap.

From what has been presented, it appears that Norway's aid integrates human rights principles and is deeply rooted in equality, dignity and mutual justice in development. It bridges the gap between home and school in terms of language through using bilingual teachers and ensuring bilingual instruction, especially in areas of ethnic groups. It is also sensitive to the development and education needs of Tanzania. Certain project and program examples are hereby provided. The University of Oslo's Program for Institutional Transformation and Research Outreach (PITRO), in partnership with the University of Dar es Salaam (UDSM), strengthened institutional capacity in science and technology education, as well as contributing to long-term equitable access to quality education and research capabilities for sustainable self-development. The LOITASA project supported by NORAD, with its right-capability ideological aims, contributed to the production of localized learning materials, promotion of indigenous knowledge, and improvement in achievement. Indeed, human dignity does not just happen for minorities, LOITASA providing a meaningful and worthwhile teacher education programs and developed local language materials in many languages along with text books, which by addressing the needs of bilingual/multilingual children in education protects and promotes rights in education (Babaci-Wilhite, 2012; 2013; 2014).

Swedish Aid – SIDA

Sweden has an extraordinarily long and close relationship with Tanzania. Swedish government aid to Tanzania began in 1964 and since then Tanzania has remained one of Swedish International Development Authority (SIDA)'s major recipients. Swedish aid to Tanzania is currently mainly of Budget Support for Sector Wide Approach (SWAp) with the following priority social sectors: education, health care, water and sanitation, democracy and human rights, government and civil service reforms. In addition, not only is Sweden's approach adverse to recipients' ownership; it aligns development support to recipients' education sector development plans. Moreover, it ensures the targeting of marginalized and out-of-school children. Such a conclusion can be made as aid provided support for out-of-school children - such as contributions to support Community Based Education in Tanzania. This has brought about better coordination and empowering participation of the locals; recipient ownership is recognized as an essential component of development aid.

Swedish aid in Tanzania like that of other Scandinavian donors is in adherence with the Paris Declaration principles. The implementing organ SIDA assumes an explicit link between right-capability strategies and aid effectiveness - high levels of participation in the development agenda. Swedish aid to education often involves the minimization of conditionalities and aid tying that creates dependency in undermining indigenous educational patterns. Through General Budget Support, Sweden has proactively impacted and restructured the Tanzanian education system. Aid to education in Tanzania reflects a prioritization of access to primary school, teacher skill development, and language retention projects. Ishumi (1992) contends that Tanzania has benefited from this aid partnership with Sweden in adult education, primary education, and Technical Vocational and Education Training (TVET). As he further argues, Swedish aid to Tanzania has successfully avoided neo-imperialist attitudes as it initiated the checks and balances necessary to prevent elite distortion of programs that are intended to benefit the poor.

In post-1990s SIDA has employed Community-based participatory approach: Decentralization of authority programs to support post-literacy initiatives and to promote democracy and vocational skills throughout rural areas, as opportunities are enlarged. The rural electrification initiative between 2005 and 2009 resulted in lights in the classrooms and improving gender equity in education. The support to the Legal and Human Rights Centre (LHRC) has contributed to 15,500 people across the country getting access to legal advice and legal aid, mainly concerning land ownership, women's rights and employment. Aid provided for distance teacher education and training served 6,856 teachers, and improved the academic and professional competence of primary, secondary, and TVET teachers. This example supports the contention that improved quality of teaching and empowering participation for capability enhancement are necessary conditions for inclusive education, a crucial agent for learning and strengthening human development and promoting human rights. Another important SIDA/SAREC (The Swedish Research Cooperation) project is the Languages of Tanzania project. The focus of this project was to produce a language atlas of geographical location of the different languages of Tanzania. This Atlas detailed the number of speakers for each language and the genetic classification of the speakers. The project produced a number of descriptive studies that documented the grammar and vocabulary of the languages spoken in Tanzania, excluding Kiswahili. The above cited projects attest that identified education aid supports the characterization and rationalization, by no means consensus in the literature, of Scandinavian aid as developmentalist and articulated in human rights. Another visible supportive contribution to the educational sector in 2012 was the Literacy Campaign Program, with the construction of 130 new classrooms for around 4000 students on the island of Zanzibar. Exclusive self-devaluation and consuming to death the creativity and dignity of recipi-

ents' humanity is not an inherent part of the Scandinavian roadmap (see Babaci-Wilhite et al, 2012b). Drawing on Freire's work on education (1978), conventional education aid is organized around the demands of instrumentalized knowledge resulting in educational degradation. According to Francis Nyamnjoh in *Relevant Education for African Development: Some Epistemological Considerations*, instrumentalized knowledge has come to make relevant local knowledge for identities, values and local functionalities and this has become the basis for political conditionalities (Geo-JaJa, 2004, Babaci-Wilhite et al., 2014)). The purpose here is not to indict politically motivated conditional aid, but to recognize that the moral demand of pedagogy amounts to more than the school and classroom being merely the instrument of supporting the modes of agency in which freedom is reduced to consumerism. If we put all these together, only the "visible hands" of Scandinavian aid have tried to bring to bear the power of education aid on the promotion of human rights, national sovereignty, and quality growth (Robeyns, 2006).

To sum up, Scandinavian aid is driven by developmentalist rather than market concerns. We attribute the better outcomes of aid from DANIDA, NORAD and SIDA to the integration of projects in larger systems of realities and localization, as well as linkages of the constituent elements of aid to their cultural and social embeddedness, ignored by other donors. Undoubtedly, while it is true that donors have had a positive role in strengthening institutional capacities, in light of the Paris Declaration, as well as the ongoing debate about aid motives, there is still work to do on human rights and accountability. The factual observations of values of social justice and moral responsibility in Scandinavian aid in policy documents render conditionalities and tied aid obsolete. Despite the fact that this rationalization is disputed others scholars have pointed to factual observations of welfare values of development aid not being governed by universalism as a support (see Selberk, 2006b; Alisana and Dollar, 1998).

From our analysis of aid, we contend that lock-in positive feedbacks in rights in education and sustainable change in development are associated with self-reinforcement of inalienable human rights and own development by recipients. This study has demonstrated the broader features of Scandinavian aid patterns to Tanzania centered on capacity development and improvement in ownership, empowering partnerships, and the delivery of results. In spite of differences in economic weight among OECD members and the complexity of the constituent aid drivers, Scandinavians by conscious aid disbursement have affected more significant changes in education and sustainable transformation in African societies than the average DAC country.

Conclusion

We suggest a new roadmap for aid that is both effective and efficient, embodying the dynamics of a ‘power shift’ or balance from donor to aid recipients. Also suggested is a reorientation of aid practices from the predominantly instrumentalist approach to delinking stipulated commitments to International Conventions and Declarations, and to a developmentalist conceptualization. This rethink in construction and conceptualization in development aid, which is much more cognizant of the unintended consequences of history, mismatched motives of donors, and the importance of systemic involvement of stakeholders at all levels of policy takes the path to rights in education and sustainable equitable growth—pro-poor growth. While perhaps we are not the first to do so, we report that this is currently only met by countries of Scandinavia and a few other OECD/DAC countries. A significant lesson from such practice is that a strong commitment to rights in education and stakeholders’ ownership is a pre-requisite for implementing education aid, empowered to handle quality of life challenges. Furthermore, the need for countries to “adjust, rethink, and localize aid content” will move education systems to heights necessary and sufficient to be competitive in the world on their own terms.

The authors contend that the aid models of Denmark, Sweden, and Norway contribute more to Tanzania’s transformation than aid characterized by the promotion of donor self-interest. Based on the current strength of Scandinavian development aid to education, promoting the larger freedom of citizens and the sovereignty of the nation, there is a need for African countries to take jurisdiction over their education, focusing on local realities and following the kind of development framework that is necessary for self-determination. These are some of the roadblocks and challenges that squarely face donors in their efforts to facilitate the provision of education as an inherent right and a right for self-determination.

In conclusion, development aid constructs must break with binding mechanisms and make the emancipation of communities from donors’ political, economic, cultural penetration a necessary and sufficient condition. This will allow local control of reforms and indigenize goals, including local languages within a contextualized curriculum to provide quality education for Africa in African terms.

Correspondence

Zehlia Babaci-Wilhite
University of California, Berkeley
USA & Norwegian Center for Human Rights,
University of Oslo, Norway
Email: z.b.wilhite@berkeley.edu

Macleans A. Geo-JaJa
Brigham Young University, USA
Email: Geo-JaJa@byu.edu

Steve Azaiki
The International Society of Comparative Education Science & Technology
Nigeria
Email: azaiki1@gmail.com

References

- Alesina, A. and Dollar D. (2000). Who gives foreign aid to whom and why?," *Journal of Economic Growth*, vol. 5(1), 33-63.
- Alston, P. and Robinson, M. (2005). *Introduction: The challenges of ensuring the mutuality of human rights and development endeavors*, in *Human Rights and Development: Towards Mutual Reinforcement* (Philip Alston and Mary Robinson, (Eds), Oxford University Press.
- Andersen, T. B., T. Harr and Tarp F. (2006). On US politics and IMF lending, *European Economic Review*, 50(7),1843-1862.
- Babaci-Wilhite, Z. (2012). A right based approach to Zanzibar's language-in-education policy. Special Issue on Right based Approach and Globalization in Education. *World Studies in Education*, 13(2), 17-33. Australia: James Nicholas Publishers Pty. Ltd.
- Babaci-Wilhite, Z. (2013). An analysis of debates on the use of a global or local language in education: Tanzania and Malaysia. In: Napier, D. B. & Majhanovich, S. (Eds.), *Education, dominance and identity* (pp. 121–133). Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Babaci-Wilhite (2014a). New Perspective on language & literacy in Africa and Asia. A lead paper presented at the 17th Annual National Conference of the Association for Promoting Nigerian Languages and Cultures, July 14th 2014, Owerri – Nigeria. *Journal of Nigerian Languages and Culture*, 15(1), 1-14.

Babaci-Wilhite, Z. (2014b). E-Learning Science Literacy as a right in education in Africa, *International Society of Comparative Education, Science and Technology of Nigeria*. 1(1), 15-130.

Babaci-Wilhite, Z. (2015a). Local language of instruction as a human right in education: Cases from Africa (pp. 1–154). Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Babaci-Wilhite, Z. (2015b) Zanzibar's curriculum reform: Implications for children's educational rights. Prospects, UNESCO's Quarterly Review of Comparative Education. Springer. DOI: 10.1007/s11125-015-9341-6.

Babaci-Wilhite, Z (2015c). *Language, Development Aid and Human Rights in Education: Curriculum Policies in Africa and Asia*. Palgrave Macmillan, UK, available online at: <http://www.palgrave.com/page/detail/language--development-aid-and-human-rights-in-education-zehlia-babaci-wilhite/?sf1=barcode&st1=9781137473189>

Babaci-Wilhite, Z. & Geo-JaJa, M. A. (2011). A Critique and Rethink of Modern Education in Africa's Development in the 21st Century. Papers in Education and Development (PED), *Journal of the School of Education*, (30), 133-154. University of Dar es Salaam, Tanzania.

Babaci-Wilhite, Z.; Geo-JaJa, M. A. & Lou, S. (2012a). Human Rights in Development Experience in Africa: The Foreign Aid and Policy Nexus in OECD and China Aid. *World Studies in Education*, 13(1), 79-90. Australia: James Nicholas Publishers Pty. Ltd.

Babaci-Wilhite, Z.; Geo-JaJa, M. A. & Lou, S. (2012b). Education and Language: A human right for sustainable development in Africa. *International Review of Education*, 58 (5), 619- 647.

Babaci-Wilhite, Z.; Geo-JaJa, M. A. & Mwajuma, V. (2013). Nordic aid and the Education Sector

in Africa: The Case of Tanzania. In: Brown C. A. (Ed.), *Globalization, International Education Policy, and Local Policy Formation* (pp. 81-106). Springer Publishing.

Babaci-Wilhite, Z. & Geo-JaJa, M. A. (2014). Localization of Instruction as a Right in Education:

Tanzania and Nigeria Language-in-Education's Policies. In: Babaci-Wilhite, Z. (Ed.), *Giving Space to African Voices: Right in local languages and local curriculum*. (pp. 3-19). Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Babaci-Wilhite, Zehlia and Geo-JaJa, M. A. (2015). Promoting African Languages and Knowledge in Schools As a Human Right in Development Aid. *International Society of Comparative Education, Science and Technology of Nigeria*. Vol. 2.

Brock-Utne, B. (2011). Language and inequality: global challenges to education. BAICE Presidential Address at the 11th UKFIET International Conference, Oxford.

Brock-Utne, B. (2012). Language policy and science: Could some African countries learn from Asian countries? *International Review of Education*, 58 (4), 481–503.

Freire, P. (1978). *Pedagogy in process: The letters to Guinea Bissau*. New York: Seabury Press.

Geo-JaJa, M. A. (2004). Decentralization and privatization of education in Africa: Which option for Nigeria? Special Issue of *International Review of Education*, 50(3-4), 309 -326.

Geo-JaJa, M. A. (2006). Educational decentralization, public spending, and social justice in Nigeria. *International Review of Education*, 52(1–2), 129-153.

Geo-JaJa, M. A. (2009). Can globalization in Nigeria's Niger delta be humanized for integration and development? *Language and Power. Implications of Language for Peace and Development*. Brock-Utne B. and Garbo, G. (Eds). Dar es Salaam: Mkuki na Nyota. Oxford: ABC, East Lansing: Michigan State University Press.

Geo-JaJa, M. A. (2013). Education localization for optimizing globalization's opportunities. In:

- Ishumi, A. (1992). Colonial forces and ethnic resistance in African education. In K. Schleicher and T. Kozma (Eds). *Ethnocentrism in education*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
- Majhanovich, S. & Geo-JaJa, M. A. (Eds.) Economics, Aid and Education: Implications for Development. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.
- Geo-JaJa, M. A. & Mangum, G. (2000). Donor aid and human capital formation: A neglected priority in development. *Making Aid Work: Strategies and Priorities for Africa at the Turn of the Twenty-First Century*. Koehn, P. and Ojo, O. JB. (Eds.), Lanham: University Press of America.
- Geo-JaJa, M. A. & Yang, X. (2003). Rethinking globalization in Africa. *Chimera*. 1(1), 19-28.
- Geo-JaJa, M. A. & Zajda, J. (2005). Rethinking globalization and the future of education in Africa, In: Zajda, J. (Ed.) *International Handbook of Globalization, Education and Policy Research*, Amsterdam: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Geo-JaJa, M. A. & Azaiki, S. (2010). Development and education challenges in the Niger Delta in Nigeria. In: Geo-JaJa, M. A. & Majhanovich, S. (Eds.) *Education, language, and economics: Growing national and global dilemmas*, Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.
- Mason, M. (2012). Education, policy and poverty reduction. *International Journal of Educational Development* 32(4), 494–498. doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedudev.2012.04.002.
- Ministry of Foreign Affairs (2007). A world for all. Priorities of the Danish Government for Danish Development Assistance 2008-2012. Copenhagen, Denmark.
- NORAD, (2010). Norwegian Agency for Development (NORAD) (2010). Publications on Norwegian development aid. <http://www.norad.no/en/tools-and-publications/publications> Accessed, 2012.
- Nyerere, J. K. (1968). Education for self-reliance. In *Ujamaa*, (Ed.), Essays on socialism (pp. 44–76). Dar es Salaam: Oxford University Press.
- OECD. (2006). Integrating Human Rights into Development: Donor Approaches, Experiences and Challenges, OECD The Development Dimension Series, Paris.

- Robeyns, I. (2005). The capability approach: A theoretical survey. *Journal of Human Development* 6(I), 93-114.
- Robeyns, I. (2006). Three models of education rights: Rights, capabilities and human capital. *Theory and Research in Education*, 4(1), 69–84.
- Samoff, J. (2007). Institutionalizing International Influence. In: Arnone R. F. & Torres C. A. (Eds.), *Comparative education: The Dialectic of the Global and the Local*. (pp. 52-91). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers..
- Selbervik, H. (2006a). Donor dilemmas and economic conditionality in the 1990s: When Tanzania is as good as it gets. Paper presented at XIV International Economic History Congress, Helsinki 2006 Session 86.
- Selbervik, H. (2006b). Nordic exceptionalism in development assistance? Aid policies and the major donors: The Nordic countries. (CMI Report 2006: 8). Oslo: CHR.
- Sen, A. (1999). *Development as freedom*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Silova, I. Ed. (2009). Private supplementary tutoring in Central Asia: New opportunities and burdens. Paris, France: UNESCO Institute of International Educational Planning (IIEP).
- Sifuna, D. (2001). African Education in the Twenty-first Century: first Century: The Challenge for Change, CICE Hiroshima University, *Journal of International Cooperation in Education*, 14 (1), 21-38.
- Tandon, Y. (2008). *Ending Aid Dependence*. Geneva: Fahuma books, South Center.
- Tomasevski, K. (2006). The state of the right to education worldwide free or fee: 2006 global report. Copenhagen, August 2006.
- UNESCO. (2002). Report 2002. Education for All - Is the world on track? Available at: <http://www.unesco.org/new/en/education/themes/leading-the-international-agenda/efareport/reports/2002-efa-on-track/>
- UNESCO (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization). (2009). Report 2009. Overcoming inequality: why governance matters <http://www.unesco.org/new/en/education/themes/leading-the-international-agenda/efareport/reports/2009-governance/>

Untherhalter, E. (2003). Education, capabilities and social justice. Background paper for EFA Global Monitoring Report 2003/2004, Paris: UNESCO.

World Bank. (2005). *Global Monitoring Report 2005*. New York: Oxford University Press.

World Bank. (2008). The evolving allocative efficiency of education aid: A reflection on changes in aid priorities to enhance aid effectiveness, paper prepared for the World Bank High-level Group Meeting on EFA, 16-18 December 2008 in Oslo, Norway, the World Bank, Washington.