The Historical Development of SDG4: Evolution of the Global Governance of Education

3

Kazuo Kuroda and Lauren Nakasato

Abstract

Sustainable Development Goal 4 (SDG4) aims to "ensure inclusive and equitable quality education and promote lifelong learning opportunities for all". This chapter describes the historical development of SDG4 by tracing the history of three fundamental approaches to international education development underlying the goal: education for peace, education as a human right and education for socio-economic development. The approaches are then used to frame discussion of three prominent academic debates and perspectives in research in educational development: (1) the external and internal efficiency of education; (2) "education for development", "educational development" and "education and development" and (3) dependency theory and modernization theory. SDG4 is then considered within the framework of these approaches and perspectives. The chapter concludes with a discussion of the challenges and possible solutions for the realization of SDG4.

Keywords

SDG4 · History · International education development

3.1 Introduction

Sustainable Development Goal 4 (SDG4) aims to "ensure inclusive and equitable quality education and promote lifelong learning opportunities for all" (United Nations, 2015b, p. 21). This chapter contributes to SDG4 by tracing its historical and theoretical foundations, facilitating a deeper understanding of the challenges faced in achieving SDG4. By understanding these challenges within the context of the historical development of SDG4, implications can be drawn for ways forward.

With the explosion of cross-border migration, rapid advancement of the global and knowledge economies and the rise of information technology, the international community has recognized the necessity for the further development of the educational global governance system which has been evolving over the past few decades. Between 2000 and 2015, the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) aimed to alleviate world poverty and improve life in developing countries by setting a development agenda for national governments of developing countries and aid agencies of developed countries. The

K. Kuroda (✉) · L. Nakasato
Waseda University, Tokyo, Japan
e-mail: kakuroda@waseda.jp

L. Nakasato
e-mail: lauren.nakasato@fuji.waseda.jp

MDGs consisted of eight goals including one aiming to achieve universal primary education based on the Education for All initiative, first launched in 1990 to ensure access to quality education for every citizen in every society. The existence of an education-specific goal within the MDG agenda attests to the rising prominence of education within the international development agenda at the time. By the conclusion of the MDGs in 2015, the number of out-of-school children at the primary level had fallen by nearly 50% to 57 million in 2015 compared to 100 million in 2000 when the MDGs began (United Nations, 2015a). With the net enrollment rate in developing regions and the youth literacy rate both reaching 91% in 2015, the goal was considered met and the push for universal primary education successful.

Yet despite these gains, there remained vast inequalities in access to education, for example based on disability or socioeconomic status (United Nations, 2015a). Further, subsequent to the MDGs, studies examining student learning outcomes in developing countries found that although more students were attending school, many were not completing school and/or had shown little to no significant gains in their learning (e.g. UNESCO 2014; Filmer and Fox 2014). Thus, these remaining challenges became a springboard for the 2015–2030 development agenda, coined the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). SDG4, the "education goal", aims explicitly to improve quality and equality in education, reflecting the shortcomings of the MDGs. Yet both Goal 2 of the MDGs and Goal 4 of the SDGs are products of rich theoretical debates within the field of international education development. In the context of globalization, international education development has grown in importance both at the policy and research levels, highlighting the importance of gaining a deeper understanding of the history of the field. Thus, this chapter aims to introduce the theoretical approaches, debates and perspectives that have shaped the field of international education development, then discuss the current SDG4 agenda within this framework.

The chapter is organized as follows. In 2., three fundamental approaches to international education development are introduced. The peace approach, the human rights approach and the development approach are pillars of international education development theory which underly SDG4. In 3., shifting trends in policy usage of the three approaches are discussed. In 4., the approaches are used to frame discussion of three prominent academic perspectives in international education development: the external and internal efficiency of education; "education for development", "educational development" and "education and development" and dependency theory and modernization theory. Together, these approaches and perspectives form the theoretical foundation of SDG4, which is explained in detail in 5. In 6., challenges facing the achievement of SDG4 and possible ways forward are discussed in the context of the approaches and debates introduced in 2. and 4.

3.2 Three Approaches to International Education Development

Three fundamental approaches to international education development have been conceptualized and promoted by global governance organizations since the end of the second World War: the peace approach, the human rights approach and the development approach. These approaches form the foundation of SDG4 and are discussed in detail below.

3.2.1 The Peace Approach

The peace approach is considered the founding philosophy of international education and has long been a central to international cooperation efforts in the field of education. Born in the aftermath of World War I and popularized in the wake of World War II, the peace approach is based on the belief that international education can promote international understanding for

peace. Indeed, the peace approach is the underlying philosophy of the 1945 Preamble of the United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) Constitution:

> That since wars begin in the minds of men, it is in the minds of men that the defences of peace must be constructed; That ignorance of each other's ways and lives has been a common cause, throughout the history of mankind, of that suspicion and mistrust between the peoples of the world through which their differences have all too often broken into war; (…) *That the wide diffusion of culture, and the education of humanity for justice and liberty and peace are indispensable to the dignity of man and constitute a sacred duty which all the nations must fulfil in a spirit of mutual assistance and concern* [emphasis added]; That a peace based exclusively upon the political and economic arrangements of governments would not be a peace which could secure the unanimous, lasting and sincere support of the peoples of the world, and that the peace must therefore be founded, if it is not to fail, upon the intellectual and moral solidarity of mankind.
>
> (UNESCO 1945)

The UNESCO Constitution preamble explicates the necessity of education for the realization of peace in the statement "peace must therefore be founded, if it is not to fail, upon the intellectual and moral solidarity of mankind", emphasizing the role of education not only in building mutual understanding but also in building a common moral standard.

While UNESCO laid the groundwork for the peace approach in international education, the approach first began to take shape in the realm of international higher education cooperation, particularly in international student mobility and exchange. In 1946 the Fulbright Program, a scholarship program offering grants for international exchange to and from the United States, was proposed and launched by then-US senator J. William Fulbright. The program was founded on Fulbright's strong conviction that "educational exchange can turn nations into people, contributing as no other form of communication can to the humanizing of international relations" (Fulbright 1983), becoming a model for the international education policies of other countries receiving international students. In Japan, the peace approach was a founding philosophy for international exchange and cooperation in higher education. During the Nakasone Cabinet in 1983, a highly influential report, "Proposals for International Student Policies for the 21st Century" was published by the Advisory Committee on International Student Policy for the 21st Century. This report heavily influenced future higher education internationalization policies in Japan, and was clearly rooted in the peace approach, stating: "international exchange in education, especially at the higher education level, contributes to fostering and promoting a spirit of international understanding and international cooperation, and serves as an important bridge for developing and strengthening friendly relations between Japan and their respective home countries" (Ministry of Education of Japan 1984). Thus, the peace approach for mutual understanding is one of the foundational approaches to international cooperation and internationalization in higher education, as evidenced in subsequent literature (e.g. Knight 2008).

The peace approach has not only been limited to the field of higher education. At the 2002 Kananaskis G8 Summit in Canada, Japan introduced the Basic Education for Growth Initiative (BEGIN). The initiative reflects the peace approach, stating: "as globalization tends to bring about uniformity in the economy and lifestyles, it is of great significance to foster interest, understanding and acceptance of different cultures from an early age. Basic education gives people the ability to think and to understand other people and other cultures through dialogue, and therefore, when providing support, full attention should be paid to the role of basic education" (MOFA 2002).

International educational cooperation for peace and mutual understanding originated from the discussions of the International Commission for Intellectual Cooperation of the League of Nations and the Bureau of International Education in the interwar period and was further conceptualized in UNESCO discussions in the postwar period (Jones and Coleman 2005). As a result of such discussions, the peace approach was written into policy at the 18th Session of the

General Conference of UNESCO in 1974 with the Recommendation concerning Education for International Understanding, Co-operation and Peace and Education relating to Human Rights and the Fundamental Freedoms (hereinafter referred to as the Recommendation). The Recommendation, based on the UN Charter, the UNESCO Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, comprehensively lists major issues facing international society and outlines the indispensable role education, particularly through the peace approach, should play in the resolution of these issues. The Recommendation had a significant impact on educational practice as it succeeded in reshaping policy directions in UN member countries toward the internationalization of education, including education for international understanding and international educational cooperation. While the Recommendation was not taken up for revision at the 44th International Education Conference in 1994, it has lasting relevance today as evidenced by Target 4.7 of SDG4, which aims to "ensure that all learners acquire the knowledge and skills needed to promote sustainable development, including, among others, through education for sustainable development and sustainable lifestyles, human rights, gender equality, promotion of a culture of peace and non-violence, global citizenship and appreciation of cultural diversity and of culture's contribution to sustainable development" (United Nations, 2015b, p. 21).

The 9/11 terrorist attacks of 2001 and subsequent conflicts in Afghanistan and Iraq were wake-up calls for the international community, refocusing efforts on refining the peace approach and education for mutual understanding. This triggered a wave of new research on various aspects of education's role in post-conflict reconstruction and peacebuilding, including research on education in post-conflict situations. A striking trend that emerges from this body of literature, however, is the development of research and practice on curriculum and textbook reform focusing on peace and mutual understanding. This literature identified mainstream education itself as a potential driving cause of conflict, making it difficult to rebuild post-conflict education systems that take all stakeholder needs into consideration, stalling attempts to rebuild society and prevent future conflicts. Yet this is precisely the reason why the international community has taken on the role as mediator in this area. From the 1990s, UNESCO began advocating a "culture of peace", engaging in various reconciliation projects in conflict and post-conflict countries and regions (Nelles 2003; World Bank 2005; Davies 2004; Tawil and Harley 2004).

Thus, the peace approach can be considered the founding rationale behind efforts in international cooperation in education. However, as educational aid to developing countries increased and the international community became acutely aware of the lack of access to quality education in developing regions, two new approaches emerged as the dominant policy principles. These approaches, the human rights approach and development approach, are explained in detail below.

3.2.2 The Human Rights Approach

A fundamental assumption underlying the international community's involvement in educational development in developing countries is that education is a basic human right. This assumption is based on the 1948 United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights, Article 26:

1. 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.

2. Education shall be directed to the full development of the human personality and to the strengthening of respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms. It shall promote understanding, tolerance and friendship among all nations, racial or religious groups, and shall further the activities of the United Nations for the maintenance of peace.

(United Nations 1948)

There are three points of interest in Article 26. Firstly, the "education" in 1. Refers to school education, not including education that is carried out informally at home or in the community. This equation of education as a human right to school education as a human right has been echoed and reinforced in subsequent declarations and treaties. Secondly, even prior to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights in 1948, there was a push to make basic education free and compulsory. Over 70 years later, these goals have yet to be accomplished, reflecting the idealistic nature of the goals. Thirdly, the expected role of education is stipulated in 2., which states that education "shall promote understanding, tolerance and friendship among all nations, racial or religious groups," reflecting the peace approach. Further, education should be aimed at "the full development of the personality", "strengthening respect for fundamental freedoms" and "maintaining peace". Thus, while Article 26 is a founding text of the human rights approach, it is also an important basis for the peace approach. Importantly, there is no mention of education's expected contribution to socioeconomic development, which will be discussed in 2.3.

In 1959 the United Nations Declaration of the Rights of the Child was adopted at the UN General Assembly. Principle 7 pertains to education, stating that "the child is entitled to receive education, which shall be free and compulsory, at least in the elementary stages," reflecting Article 26 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Further, the Declaration states that a child "shall be given an education which will promote his general culture and enable him, on a basis of equal opportunity, to develop his abilities, his individual judgement, and his sense of moral and social responsibility, and to become a useful member of society," reflecting neither the peace approach nor the development approach.

Further, the 1969 International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, 1976 International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights and the 1981 Convention on the Elimination of all forms of Discrimination Against Women reaffirmed the ideals of eliminating discrimination in education and securing the right to education for all (UNICEF 1998).

In 1989 the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child was adopted by the UN General Assembly and was entered into force in 1990, providing a legal basis for the human rights approach in education. The Convention stipulates the child's right to education in Article 28 and the aims of education in Article 29. While essentially in line with the philosophy of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR), these articles go beyond the UDHR to elaborate upon what constitutes a "right" and an "aim". While the UDHR made no mention of higher education, for example, the Convention explicitly stipulates the child's right to access to higher education. Further, in Article 29, the Convention states development of respect for the environment as an additional aim of education beyond what was previously outlined in the UDHR. This indicates that global governance through such documents has adapted to changing needs and circumstances while adhering to the founding philosophy of the UDHR.

While Articles 28 and 29 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child provide the legal basis for the human rights approach, the fundamental concepts supporting the approach can also be found in other articles of the Convention, as outlined in UNICEF's 1999 State of the World's Children report: "Articles 28 and 29 of the Convention are buttressed by four other articles that assert overarching principles of law. All have far-reaching ramifications, particularly in terms of what is needed to mould an education system—or an individual school. These are article 2, on non-discrimination; article 3, on the best interests of the child; article 6, on the child's right to life, survival and development; and article 12, on the views of the child" (UNICEF 1998, p. 11).

Regarding the aims of education, above and beyond the aims specified in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, Article 29 of the

Convention on the Rights of the Child states that education should foster "the development of the child's personality, talents and mental and physical abilities to their fullest potential" and "the development of respect for the natural environment" (United Nations 1989), widening the scope of the aims of education beyond international understanding and peace.

Further, UNICEF has advocated for educational quality, access and learning environment to be conceived from a human rights perspective and reflected in educational policy. Similarly, UNESCO has advocated for the peace approach in international education development in various conferences and statements. For example, at the 44th International Conference on Education in 1994, the Declaration and Integrated Framework of Action on Education for Peace, Human Rights and Democracy was adopted. While the Declaration reinforces the peace approach and education as a basic human right, it also calls for international consensus on education's contribution to the promotion of human rights.

Yet why is education a human right? In the foundational documents described above, education is considered integral to human development, reflecting a fundamental belief in the field of education. Further, the definition of education as a human right reflects the international community's expectations for the role of education in achieving peace through mutual understanding. The human rights approach has been embraced by NGOs and international organizations alike, with UNICEF and UNESCO leading the ideological push toward the human rights approach through numerous declarations and resolutions. As a result, it has become one of the main principles underpinning international educational cooperation by bilateral aid agencies and international organizations. However, the declarations, resolutions and treaties detailed above had yet to recognize another aspect of the human rights approach—that of the role of education as a tool to achieve the socio-economic conditions that support human rights. This approach, or the development approach, is examined in detail below.

3.2.3 The Development Approach

As former colonies gained independence, educational development became the center of larger modernization efforts. Using scarce budgets, these newly independent countries sought to develop their educational systems by sending students abroad to developed countries to acquire knowledge and technological skill. Japan's modernization effort during the Meiji Era is but one of countless examples of developing countries positioning education policy as modernization policy, aiming to expand education through continuous policy and financial efforts.

Developed countries have supported such efforts with educational aid and scholarships reflecting their prototypical aid agendas. The United States Institute of International Education (IIE) cited promotion of international understanding and preparation of foreign students to benefit their home countries by acquiring new knowledge and skills (IIE 1955) as the purposes of international education exchange. Japan's "Proposals for International Student Policies for the 21st Century" also cites cooperation in the development of human resources in developing countries as one of its key aims along with mutual understanding. Further, the Basic Education for Growth Initiative (BEGIN) embodies Japan's fundamental aid philosophy that investment in education is effective in reducing poverty and promoting economic growth in developing countries based on the principle of self-help (MOFA 2002).

At the international level, the focus shifted to education's role in economic development. First raised at the OECD Policy Conference on Economic Growth and Investment in Education in Washington, DC in 1961, the importance of education in economic development was subsequently asserted in the 1962 United Nations Development Decade: Proposals for Action, which made a case for increased investment in education. In response to these trends, the international community steadily increased investment in the education sector with the World Bank at the helm. In its 1995 publication

Priorities and Strategies for Education: A World Bank Review, the Bank clearly delineates the connection between educational investment and economic outcomes. The review examined research in the economics of education, ultimately recommending the prioritization of education as a policy issue, an in-depth examination of the labor market outcomes of education and an increase in public investment in education, particularly basic education.

This direction in educational development, however, met with intense debate and sharp criticism from some scholars and academic communities such as the Comparative and International Education Society (CIES) of North America. At the CIES annual conference in 1996, education for economic development was contentiously debated and these viewpoints were summarized in the 1996 special issue of the International Journal of Educational Development. Among them were voices critical of the input-output approach to education in which the processes of education are oversimplified, ignoring the richness and complexity inherent in education.

A key proponent of this view was Joel Samoff of Stanford University, who feared that the use or overuse of economic theory in policy recommendations for developing countries was quickly reaching the level of dogma (Samoff 1996). Rather, Samoff argues, aid providers should recognize the complexity of education and learning processes and embrace the local wisdom of developing countries when seeking solutions to issues in education.

Yet such critical views triggered a series of rebuttals, for example Burnett et al. (1996) claiming that the use of economic theory in educational development has been misunderstood. Further, the World Bank itself responded to these criticisms by revising key wording it its 1999 Education Sector Strategy, adding "the most important actors and decision makers are the key education stakeholders and government staff in client countries. Progress in education is in their hands and depends in large part on local traditions and culture. The role of the Bank is to support and help strengthen their hands, where

values and priorities converge" (World Bank 1999, p. 12). At the same time, however, then-World Bank President James D. Wolfenshon is quoted as saying "All agree that the single most important key to development and to poverty alleviation is education" (World Bank 1999, p. 4), reinforcing the development approach as the basic philosophy behind World Bank efforts in education.

Thus, while education for economic development has been mainstreamed as a major approach to international education development, the aims of education for social development, basic human needs, poverty reduction and human development have yet to be fully conceptualized although some studies have emerged. In an analysis of demographic data of several developing countries, Le Vine (1982) found that maternal education was associated with lower fertility and reduction of family mortality. Further, it was found that educated mothers show greater concern for the education of their preschool-aged children. Such effects of education on social development and poverty reduction through the development approach have been instrumental not only in bringing focus but also resources to educational development. These outcomes have become a core rationale for investment in educational aid as put forth in major international policy documents not only from the World Bank, but also the UNICEF White Paper on the State of the World's Children and the United Nations Development Programme's Human Development Report.

3.3 Shifting Trends and Issues Amongst the Three Approaches in International Education Development

In the years since their establishment, the three approaches introduced above have undergone various levels of fusion at the global governance level. The first is the trend toward fusion of the human rights and development approaches in educational development policy. As we have seen, UNICEF and UNESCO have led the

human rights approach while the World Bank has relied on the development approach as the basis for its aid activities. Yet with the increase in educational cooperation and international collaboration, these lines have become blurred. UNICEF and UNESCO now reference education's effect on social development and poverty reduction in major policy documents and statements, while the World Bank bases its practice on education as a human right. The 1991 World Conference on Education for All and subsequent World Declaration on Education for All, co-hosted by UNICEF, UNESCO, the World Bank and United Nations Development Programme is widely considered the impetus for such fusion, as the diversity of organizations in attendance led to a diversity of ideas and approaches present at the conference. Through the joint coordination of the EFA and MDG initiatives, international organizations integrated the human rights and development approaches into educational development policy and they soon became the core policy principles of the international community.

However, the de facto fusion and mainstreaming of the two approaches without proper examination of the relationship between the two creates risk for future international efforts to address issues in education. In the case of EFA, the lack of provision of basic education to disadvantaged children, known as the "last 5–10%", is a major policy issue from the human rights approach. However, from the perspective of the development approach, it is difficult to justify the high unit cost of investing in disadvantaged groups from a policy perspective as the returns on education are low (see Kuroda 2007 for a discussion of the conflicts between the two approaches to education for children with disabilities in developing countries). From the human rights perspective, however, "all means all" and the cost benefit calculation can be viewed as inhumane.

Further, while much attention was paid to completion of primary education and reduction of gender disparities in education in the MDGs, many have pointed out a relative lack of focus on three other target areas outlined in the 2000 Dakar Framework for Action: early childhood education, literacy and non-formal education. This is due in part to a lack of empirical evidence supporting investment in these areas, and a tendency of the development approach to prefer investment in primary and girl's education, for which high externalities have been explained by cost-benefit and growth accounting analysis. The rise of the knowledge-based economy has also widened the gap between the development and human rights approaches. The knowledge economy has brought greater attention to the higher education sector, leading to its reevaluation from the standpoint of the development approach. Because the social rate of return on higher education tends to grow with time whereas the human rights approach aims for universal primary education, this new interest in higher education puts further tension between the development and human rights approaches.

The peace approach, on the other hand, while paid lip-service in international conferences and statements as a major policy principle, had little influence over international cooperation in education in the 1990s. It wasn't until the terrorist attacks in 2001 that the peace approach was revived and concepts such as peacebuilding, social cohesion and human security found their way into international education development discourse. Further, the peace approach gained traction with the realization that conflicts over ethnicity, religion and culture had been emerging since the end of the Cold War in the 1980's. Despite this, however, little effort was made by the international community to link the peace approach to the realization of the MDGs or Dakar Framework for Action, both of which concluded in 2015.

These struggles highlight the lack of a common framework to conceptualize the relationship between the peace, human right and development approaches in international education development. As previously mentioned, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights stipulates that education is a human right and the content of education must be oriented toward peace. The relationship between the peace and development approaches have also been long debated, with the concept of "human security" as a concrete

manifestation of this relationship. Human security conceptualizes peace as an essential element of the social environment that enables human development. In the postwar era, intercultural understanding, a spirit of tolerance and orientation toward peace have been recognized as essential traits. This recognition should be taken seriously within the field of international education development and consideration should be given to how these traits can be systematized into a policy framework.

3.4 Debates and Perspectives from Research on International Education Development

With the mainstreaming of education into the international development landscape, research in the field advanced, producing a body of analytical frameworks, research methods and empirical evidence that has guided the global governance of international education development. This section illuminates three major areas of academic debate and perspectives within the field.

3.4.1 The Internal and External Efficiency of Education

One of the earliest conceptual distinctions to emerge in international education development is the external versus internal efficiency of education. Tied to the development approach, focus on the external efficiency of education recognized that education is an important input factor in socioeconomic development, rather than simply a product to be consumed. While the founders of modern economics such as Adam Smith and John Stuart Mill had recognized education's importance in the development of the national economy, Solow (1957) and Svennilson (1964) extended this analysis and identified capital, labor, technological innovation and education as inputs of economic growth. Solow and Svennilson's studies defined education's contribution as the difference between economic growth and the sum of capital and labor growth, leading to

subsequent attempts to calculate education's contribution to economic growth in the literature. Such studies have consistently resulted in calculations as large as 10–40% (e.g. Denison 1962; Kendrick 1977).

Human capital theory has become a core theory impacting educational policies of the World Bank and individual governments and is based on the idea of the external efficiency of education. The theory, which gained popularity in the 1960s, provided an empirical basis for the idea that education increases the human capital needed for economic growth, examining both the impact of education on individuals (private income) and society (economic growth) (Schultz 1961 and 1963; Becker 1965). Schultz (1961 and 1963) developed the concept of the social costs of education, including opportunity costs, as well as the basic framework of human capital theory. Based on Schultz's framework, Becker (1965) established a method for analyzing the rate of return on education, which has had a significant impact on educational development discussions and policies for developing countries, particularly those published by the World Bank. George Psacharopoulos' highly influential empirical work confirmed a high social rate of return on primary education and became a major impetus behind the Education for All (EFA) initiative to promote investment in primary education (Psacharopoulos and Woodhall 1985; Psacharopoulos and Patrinos 2002). Psacharopoulos aggregated the results of rate of return analyses from various parts of the world, conducting a birds-eye view analysis. He found that the social rate of return on education is lower than the private rate of return in general but higher in developing countries than developed countries. Further, he found that the social rate of return on investment in education is higher than that on investment in material capital in developing countries. Thus, these findings provided the empirical basis for increasing investment in basic education in developing countries.

Since the Psacharopoulos studies, the mechanisms connecting educational investment and economic development have been clarified through improvements in data and analysis. In

the 1990s, analysis of macroeconomic data on education (Barro 1991, Barro and Sala-i-Martin 1992), the formation of micro-development econometrics for the empirical study of social sector issues such as poverty, education and health care (Deaton 1997; Kurosaki 2001), deeper analysis on the returns to education (Thomas et al. 1991, Rosenzweig 1995) and the analysis of the relationship between education and the labor market (Fasih 2008) have all helped to clarify such mechanisms (see Sawada 2003 for details).

Economic growth has not been the only focus of studies using the concept of the external efficiency of education. Other studies have examined education's efficacy in reducing inequalities (Carnoy 1992; Campos and Root 1996), reducing infant mortality (Lockheed and Verspoor 1991), population control (Barro and Sala-i-Martin 1992), reducing gender discrimination (Tembon and Fort 2008), facilitating mutual understanding and reconciliation between conflicting social groups (Davies 2004; Tawil and Harley 2004) and political democratization (Kendall 2007; Kubow 2007) among others. This body of literature has formed the basis for research on the external efficiency of education, becoming a mainstream philosophy in international education development research. Further, such research provided an empirical basis for the development approach described in 2.3.

The other major research inquiry pursued by researchers in international education development relates to the internal efficiency of education. This body of work takes the external efficiency of education as a given and instead focuses on comparing educational outcomes within an education system, such as student achievement or enrollment growth, with the inputs and methods used to achieve them. While quantitative analyses such as cost-benefit analysis using the education production function (comprehensively reviewed by Harbison and Hanushek 1992) and student flow analysis readily come to mind, qualitative approaches to the analysis of internal efficiency have also been taken (notably Levin and Lockheed 1993, Crossley and Vulliamy 1997). Further, a considerable body of research has been built around a pedagogical perspective (e.g. Caillods et al. 1996; Abandzi 2006, etc.).

These studies have led to a variety of educational policy recommendations for developing countries (namely Lockheed and Verspoor 1991, Nielsen and Cummings 1997, Bruns et al. 2003, Cummings and Williams 2008, etc.). Further, the policy process itself has been the subject of much examination in an effort to realize the goals of Education for All and the Millennium Development Goals, prompting an influx of research linked to specific policy recommendations (King 1991, Little, Hoppers and Gardner 1994, King and Buchert 1999, King and McGrath 2004, Williams and Cummings 2005, Jones and Coleman 2005, Cohen, Bloom and Malin 2006, Yamada 2007, Baker and Wiseman 2007, Hirosato and Kitamura 2009).

Thus, research on the internal and external efficiency of education has developed analytical frameworks, research methods and provided empirical evidence to guide the global governance of educational development. In the context of the peace, human rights and development approaches, research on the external efficiency of education has largely contributed to the development approach. However, as such research supports the larger aims of education policy and international education development to improve the quality of education and expand access to it, external efficiency research is also based on the human rights approach. Yet very few studies have addressed the questions of why education should be a fundamental human right in the first place and what specifically is necessary for education to be a human right in the context of international education development research, particularly in developing countries. Further, research based on the peace approach or examining the process by which education builds peace has been limited in both quantity and quality with the exception of research on peacebuilding and educational reconstruction assistance.

3.4.2 "Education for Development", "Educational Development" and "Education and Development"

The cross-sections of the concepts of "education" and "development" can be classified into three perspectives based on the literature: "education for development", "educational development" and "education and development" (Kuroda and Yokozeki 2005). "Education for development" recognizes education as a means to achieve socioeconomic development, for example education that contributes to the accumulation of human capital for economic growth, welfare or the strengthening of democracy. Indeed, international educational cooperation policy based on the development and peace approaches have considered education as "for development", whether development means achieving peace or achieving socioeconomic outcomes. Thus, both the peace approach and the development approach mentioned above can be considered as belonging to the "education for development" perspective. Further, research on the external efficiency of education is precisely in line with "education for development" view as the focus is on educational inputs affect socioeconomic outputs.

"Educational development", on the other hand, views education as having universal value in and of itself, with development as a tool to achieve the best educational quality and opportunities. Thus, it takes the opposite view of the "education for development" perspective as it places education as the goal with development as the process needed to reach it. By placing value on education itself as a human right, rather than viewing it in terms of superficial and utilitarian functions such as contribution to socioeconomic development, this perspective is in line with the human rights approach, which views education itself as essential to human development and human dignity. In other words, this perspective implies that education itself is development. This perspective is often engaged in research on the internal efficiency of education, although

research in international education development has yet to clearly conceptualize the meaning of human development central to the "educational development" approach.

The third perspective, "education and development", takes an objective approach to education and development, with no assumption of their correlation, positive or negative. This perspective is often critical of the mainstream aid agenda, questioning whether a positive correlation between education and development is indeed positive in a normative sense.

Each of these three views is utilized in research in the field of international education development, either independently or blended with one of the other three. While the "education for development" and "educational development" perspectives both affirm education's importance, the nature of and approach to this importance differs vastly, with the "education and development" perspective arising as a counter-perspective critiquing the discrepancies between the two. On the other hand, these discrepancies may also be attributed to the difference in the disciplines and analytical methods of the researchers and practitioners of educational development. The "education for development" perspective approaches educational development from a social science, particularly an economic angle, while the "educational development" perspective takes a pedagogical approach. Looking at the geographical breakdown of research in international education development, the social science view is common in the United Kingdom and United States, which form the core of the international academic mainstream. Such research has tended to analyze educational development using methods from the four major social sciences: economics, political science, sociology and social anthropology. In continental Europe and East Asia, a latecomer to international education and development studies, the prevailing approach to educational development studies is pedagogical, focusing on the study of human development and emphasizing contribution to socioeconomic development.

3.4.3 Modernization Theory and Dependency Theory

The third perspective, "education and development" as described above is based on two opposing theories: modernization theory and dependency theory. Modernization theory, proposed by Rostow (1959), is based on structural functionalism and assumes that development is linear and all societies will follow the same trajectory toward modernization. In this conceptualization of development, developing countries simply need to "catch up" with developed countries, for example through promoting study abroad and building modern school systems. Human capital theory was built on these values, using analytical methods to show that education increases the human capital necessary for economic growth. This provided both theoretical and empirical justification for the provision of educational aid and had a major impact on the educational cooperation policies of international organizations.

Dependency theory as proposed by Galtung (1971) and Frank (1972) frames development within the historical exploitation and unequal power balance between the former colonial powers (the "center") and their former colonies (the "periphery"). This expansion of educational models from the hegemonic center to the periphery can serve to maintain the subordination of developing countries in a form of neocolonialism (Carnoy 1980, Mazrui 1976 and Arnov 1980). Even prior to the development of dependency theory, Freire (1979) and Illich (1971) observed that developing countries had little autonomy or control over the educational development unfolding within their own jurisdictions. This prompted the advocacy of concepts such as "consciousness-raising" and "deschooling" to break the cycle of dependence and had a significant impact on educational movements in developing countries. These ideas are still actively discussed in the theory of endogenous development in the context of fostering and utilizing "local knowledge" in education.

The discord between modernization theory and dependency theory over the evaluation of educational development prompted critical studies on the impact of structural adjustment policies for education in the 1980s and polarization and academic dispute over the World Bank's education policy in the 1990s. The 2000s saw an influx in critical research examining the relationship between education and globalization and was heavily influenced by the existing rift between the modernization and dependency theory camps. Yet policy research on international education development has evaded such debates, instead simplifying the focus on educational development to quantity (access) and quality. As the core point of disagreement between modernization and dependency theories is over the content of education rather than its quality or quantity, policy research has been free to focus on the technological and functional aspects of educational development from an internal efficiency perspective.

The arguments of Freire and Illich have not lost their persuasive power even after 40 years. When reflecting on the power of their message, one cannot help but conclude that the conviction and sincerity of their arguments and commitment to improving the content of education has helped their message to endure. This has important implications for the current state of international education development research, which tends to uncritically accept the reigning international trends.

3.5 SDG 4 in the Context of Perspectives and Debates in International Education Development

Thus far we have examined three major debates/perspectives in the field of international education development using the three approaches outlined in 2. In this section, we examine SDG4 within the historical and conceptual contexts presented in the earlier sections of the chapter, revealing that SDG4 is an attempt to bridge the various theoretical traditions that are the foundations of the field of international education development.

3.5.1 Sustainable Development Goal 4: The Education Goal

As mentioned in the introduction, the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) are global goals aimed at tackling the world's most pressing challenges. Based in part on the successes and failures of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), the SDGs put forth an ambitious new development agenda for 2015–2030. One major departure from the MDGs is the focus on both developed and developing countries, recognizing that all countries are both affected by and responsible for solving the global issues we face. Resultingly, all 193 member states of the United Nations have adopted the SDGs and agreed to reach the goals by 2030. With a focus on monitoring and progress as the key to achieving the goals, each of the 17 goals are defined by a number of targets (169 in all), which are further defined by measurable indicators (232 in all).

Of the 17 goals, SDG4 focuses on education, aiming to "ensure inclusive and equitable quality education and promote lifelong learning opportunities for all" (United Nations, 2015b, p. 21). As mentioned, the focus on educational quality and equality are direct extensions of the shortcomings of the MDGs. However, SDG4 can also be considered as a product of the diverse theoretical traditions that are the foundation of the field of international education development. SDG4 consists of ten targets and 11 indicators, which will be considered below in the context of the perspectives, debates and approaches previously discussed.

3.5.2 The External and Internal Efficiency of Education and SDG4

The legacy of studies on both the external and internal efficiency of education in the international education development literature is readily apparent in the targets of SDG4. Targets 4.1, 4.2, 4.3 and 4.6 all take an internal efficiency approach to educational development, with focus on the individual outcomes of each student based on a specific input. The indicators for these targets are also straightforward and easily measurable, as they represent a clear education production function model. Target 4.4, on the other hand, aims to "substantially increase the number of youth and adults who have relevant skills, including technical and vocational skills, for employment, decent jobs and entrepreneurship" (United Nations, 2015b, p. 21). This target clearly links education to socioeconomic development, embracing both the external efficiency of education and the development approach. It should be noted, however, that the indicator for Target 4.4. is much more vague and loosely defined.

A further argument can be made by taking an external efficiency approach to education in the context of the entire SDG initiative. If education is considered an essential input for socioeconomic development, it can be argued that SDG4 is the foundation for all or most of the other SDGs. Though not explicitly stated, the same argument could be extended to the targets of SDG4, even those attributed to the internal efficiency of education, by making explicit connections between learning outcomes and socioeconomic outcomes.

3.5.3 "Education for Development", "Educational Development" and "Education and Development" in SDG4

The targets of SDG4 also reflect the perspectives of "Education for development" and "educational development", as well as "education and development" to a certain extent. For example, Target 4.5 aims to "eliminate gender disparities in education and ensure equal access to all levels of education and vocational training for the vulnerable, including persons with disabilities, indigenous peoples and children in vulnerable situations" (United Nations 2015b, p. 21), which is in line with the perspective of "educational development" and the human rights approach. The target clearly approaches education as having value in and of itself, implying that educational development is necessary for all people to realize the right to human development and

dignity. At the same time, however, "education for development" is also represented with the inclusion of the term "vocational training", implying that education should be tied to socioeconomic development.

While there is no explicit reference to the viewpoint of "education and development", a closer look at Target 4.7 finds that critical thinking and an ability to question the status quo are contained within the concepts of sustainable development and global citizenship. Thus, while SDG4 generally assumes a positive link between education and development, Target 4.7 encourages moving beyond blind acceptance of the established ways of thinking to imagine new possibilities for educational development. This is in line with the arguments of Freire and Illich, who stressed the necessity for local actors to spearhead educational development efforts in their own countries.

Thus, SDG4 represent an attempt at the harmonization of the various perspectives, debates and approaches that have defined the international education development field since its inception. While a noble goal, however, the task is not without its challenges.

3.6   Discussion

While the diverse theoretical underpinnings of SDG4 reflect an attempt to embrace the needs of various stakeholders and represent the various theoretical traditions, this diversity has also presented issues for the achievement of SDG4. Three key challenges and proposed solutions are outlined below.

3.6.1   Clear Goals and Monitoring

The SDGs are designed for monitoring. As mentioned above, each of the 17 goals have associated targets and each target has at least one measurable indicator, totaling 169 targets and 232 indicators. Efforts for tracking progress on the SDGs continue to be made by both global governance organizations and independent think tanks and agencies. Yet SDG4 has faced issues with

monitoring due to the complexity of measuring certain targets. For example, Target 4.7 aims to "ensure that all learners acquire the knowledge and skills needed to promote sustainable development, including among others, through education for sustainable development and sustainable lifestyles, human rights, gender equality, promotion of a culture of peace and nonviolence, global citizenship and appreciation of cultural diversity and of culture's contribution to sustainable development" (United Nations 2015b p. 21) yet only one indicator has been agreed upon by the relevant stakeholders: "Extent to which (i) global citizenship education and (ii) education for sustainable development, including gender equality and human rights, are mainstreamed at all levels in: (a) national education policies, (b) curricula, (c) teacher education and (d) student assessment" (United Nations, n.d.). This reflects the difficulty in both measuring abstract outcomes such as sustainable development and in building consensus around the values that education should aim to teach. While meaningful measurements and frameworks for these concepts are a must for monitoring SDG Target 4.7 and other targets, global governance organizations and other stakeholders should also clarify the theories and principles underlying the goals to generate discussion about the significance and institutional limitations of such principles.

3.6.2   Need for More Empirical and Theoretical Research in the Field

For clear goals and monitoring to be achieved, more empirical and theoretical research in the field should be conducted. It is clear from the text of Target 4.7 and lack of concrete indicators that key conceptual differences between terms have yet to be agreed upon. Theoretical research should be conducted to spark discussion and reach consensus on what these terms mean. Such theoretical research should be supported by empirical studies reexamining the interrelationships between peace, human rights and educational development. In particular, research on the

external efficiency of education should expand the definition of development to include peace and human rights as potential social outcomes of educational investment to examine these relationships. Further, research on the internal efficiency of education should also expand beyond the focus on quantity and quality of education to include such outcomes as cultural transformation and human development.

3.6.3 Focus on the Content and Aims of Education

From both a policy and research perspective, the field of international education development should boldly engage in discussions, research and practices concerning the aims and content of education. While historical factors and concerns over cultural relativism and state sovereignty over education have relegated the field to systemic considerations and quantity-quality debates, it is now more imperative than ever to tackle discussions such as Freire's and Illich's that approach educational development from the standpoint of developing countries. Target 4.7 as mentioned above is a step in the right direction. Based on the four pillars of learning (learning to know, do, be and live together) as introduced in the Report to UNESCO of the International Commission on Education for the Twenty-first Century (the Delors Report) and subsequent concepts of sustainable development and global citizenship, Target 4.7 is an early attempt to build consensus around the aims and content of education. Though many challenges exist as is inevitable with normative discussions, these are questions that must be tackled in our rapidly globalizing society.

3.7 Concluding Remarks

This chapter examined the historical development of SDG4 within the framework of fundamental approaches (education for peace, education as a human right and education for socio-economic development) and perspectives (the external and internal efficiency of education; "education for development", "educational development" and "education and development" and dependency theory and modernization theory) in the field of international education development. The chapter has shown that these approaches and perspectives have been brought together within SDG4 in an attempt to harmonize the diverse theoretical traditions that define the field. SDG4 reflects all of the five P's: people, prosperity, planet, peace and partnerships, and this chapter has traced the theoretical background behind this holistic emphasis. While the SDGs are necessarily interconnected due to the complexity and multifaceted nature of the issues themselves, SDG4 lays the foundation for the realization of all 17 SDGs. From the perspective of the external efficiency of education, education is an important factor in supporting development in many realms beyond just the educational realm. Further, Target 4.7 aims to cultivate the understanding, dynamism, sincerity and ability necessary for the current and future generations to achieve the SDGs and future global initiatives and challenges. Thus, SDG4, which clearly integrates the three approaches and three perspectives introduced in this chapter, is indispensable not only to the realization of all 17 SDGs but to the future of life on this planet. The theoretical underpinnings of SDG4 presented in this chapter thus provide the basis for understanding the essence of SDG initiative as a whole and the future direction of international development.

References

Abandzi H (2006) Efficient learning for the poor: insights from the frontier of cognitive neuroscience. The World Bank, Washington D.C.

Arnov RF (1980) Comparative education and world-systems analysis. Comp Educ Col 24:48–62

Baker DP, Wiseman AW (eds) (2007) Education for all: global promises, national challenges. Elsevier, Oxford

Barro RJ (1991) Economic growth in a cross section of countries. Q J Econ 106(2):407–443

Barro RJ, Sala-i-Martin (1992) Economic growth, McGraw-Hill, Inc., New York

Becker GS (1965) A theory of the allocation of time. Econ J 74:493–517

Bruns B, Mingat A, Rakotomalala R (2003) Achieving universal primary education by 2015: a chance for every child. World Bank, Washington D.C.

Burnett N, Patrinos HA (1996) Response to critiques of priorities and strategies for education: a World Bank review. Int J Educ Dev 16(3):273–276

Caillods F, Gottelmann-Duret G, Lewin K (1996) Science education and development: planning and policy issues at secondary level. Elsevier Science Ltd., Paris

Campos JE, Root HL (1996) The key to the Asian Miracle: making shared growth credible. Brooking Institution, Washington D.C.

Carnoy M (1980) International institutions and educational policy: a review of education-sector policy. Prospects Q Rev Educ X(3):265–283

Carnoy M (1992) The case for investing in basic education. UNICEF, New York

Cohen JE, Bloom DE, Malin MB (eds) (2006) Educating all child: a global Agenda. American Academy of Arts and Science, Massachusetts

Crossley M, Vulliamy G (eds) (1997) Qualitative educational research in developing countries: current perspectives. Garland Publishing, New York and London

Cummings WK, Williams JH (eds) (2008) Policy-making for education reform in developing countries: policy options and strategies. Rowman & Littlefield Education, Maryland

Davies L (2004) Education and conflict: complexity and chaos. RoutledgeFalmer, New York

Deaton A (1997) The analysis of household surveys: a microeconomic approach to development policy. Oxford University Press, Baltimore

Denison E (1962) The source of economic growth in the united states and alternatives before the U.S. Committee of Economic Development, New York

Fasih T (2008) Linking education policy to labor market outcomes. World Bank, Washington D.C.

Filmer D, Fox L (2014) Youth employment in Sub-Saharan Africa. Africa development forum; World Bank. https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/handle/10986/16608

Frank AG (1972) Lumpenbourgeoisie: lumpendevelopment; dependency, class and politics in Latin America. Monthly Review Press, New York

Freire P (1979) The pedagogy of the oppressed. Sheed and Ward, London

Fulbright JW (1983) Speech before the council on international educational exchange

Galtung J (1971) A structural theory of imperialism. J Peace Res 8(2):81–107

Harbison RW, Hanushek EA (1992) Educational performance of the poor: lessons from rural Northeast Brazil. Oxford University Press, Oxford; New York; Toronto and Melbourne

Hirosato Y, Kitamura Y (eds) (2009) The political economy of educational reforms and capacity development in Southeast Asia: case of Cambodia, Laos and Vietnam. Springer, Dordrecht and London

IIE (1955) Committee on educational interchange policy, 1955, the goals of student exchange institute of international education New York

Illich I (1971) Deschooling society. Harper & Row, New York

Jones PW, Coleman D (2005) The United Nations and education: multilateralism, development and globalisation. Routledge

Kendall N (2007) Education for all meets political democratization: free primary education and the neoliberalization of the Malawian school and state. Comp Educ Rev 51(3):281–305

Kendrick JW (1977) Understanding productivity: an introduction to the dynamics of productivity change. Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore

King K (1991) Aid & education in the developing world: the role of the donor agencies in educational analysis. Longman, Hong Kong

King K, Buchert L (1999) Changing international aid to education: global patterns and national context. UNESCO Publishing, Paris

King K, McGrath S (2004) Knowledge for development?: comparing British, Japanese, Swedish and World Bank Aid. HSRC Press, New York

Knight J (2008) Higher education in turmoil: the changing world of internationalization. Sense Publishers, Rotterdam

Kubow P (2007) Teachers' constructions of democracy: intersections of western and indigenous knowledge in South Africa and Kenya. Comp Educ Rev 51(3):307–328

Kuroda K, and Yokozeki Y (eds) (2005) Kokusai kyoiku kaihatsu ron—riron to jissen (Education and international development—theory and practice]. Yuhikaku Publishing

Kurosaki T (2001) Kaihatsu no mikuro keizaigaku—hinkon sakugen he no approachi (the microeconomics of development: an approach to poverty). Nihon Hyoronsha

Le Vine R (1982) Influences of women's schooling on maternal behavior in the third world. In: Kelly GP, Elliot CM (eds) Women's education in the third world: comparative perspectives. State University of New York Press, Albany, pp 283–310

Levin HM, Locheed ME (1993) Effective schools in developing countries. The Falmer Press, London

Lockheed ME, Verspoor AM (1991) Improving primary education in developing countries. World Bank, Washington D.C.

Mazrui A (1976) The impact of transitional corporations on educational and cultural processes: an African perspectives. Prospects Q Rev Educ. VI (4):541–557

Ministry of Education of Japan (1984) Nijyuuisseiki he no ryuugakusei seisaku (proposals for international student policies for the 21st century). Bureau of Science and International Affairs, Department of International Students

Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan (MOFA) (2002) Seicho no tame no kiso kyoiku inishiatibu (BEGIN: Basic Education for Growth Initiative). https://www.mofa.go.jp/mofaj/area/af_edu/index.html

Nelles W (ed) (2003) Comparative education, terrorism and human security: from critical pedagogy to peacebuilding? Palgrave, New York

Nielsen HD, Cummings WK (eds) (1997) Quality education for all: community-oriented approaches. Garland Publishing, New York and London

Psacharopoulos G, Woodhall M (1985) Education for development: an analysis of investment choices. Oxford University Press, Washington D.C.

Psacharopoulos G, Patrinos H (2002) Returns to investment in education: a further update. Taylor Francis J 12(2):111–134

Rosenzweig MR (1995) Why are there returns to schooling? Am Econ Rev 85(2):153–158

Rostow W (1959) The process of economic growth, 2nd edn. Clarendon, Oxford

Samoff J (1996) Technical change and the aggregate production function. Rev Econ Stat 39

Sawada Y (2003) Kyoiku kaihatsu no keizaigaku – genzai to tenbo" (the economics of educational development: current status and prospects). In: Otsuka K, Kurosaki T (eds) Kyoiku to Keizai hatten: Tojokoku ni okeru hinkon sakugenn nit mukete (Education and Economic Development: Toward Poverty Reduction in Developing Countries. Toyo Keizai Shinposha, pp 13–48

Schultz TW (1961) Investment in human capital. Am Econ Rev 51:1–17

Schultz TW (1963) The economic value of education. Columbia University Press, New York

Solow R (1957) Technical change and the aggregate production fund. Rev Econ Stat 39(3):312–320

Svennilson I (1964) Economic growth and technical progress: an essay in sequence analysis. In: Verily J (ed) The residual factor and economic growth. OECD, Paris, pp 103–131

Tawil S, Harley A (eds) (2004) Education, conflict and social cohesion. UNESCO International Bureau of Education, Geneva

Tembon M, Fort L (eds) (2008) Girls' education in the 21st century: gender equality, empowerment, and economic growth. World Bank, Washington D.C.

Thomas D, Strauss J, Henriques M-H (1991) How does mother's education affect child height? J Econ Perspect 26:183–211

UNESCO (1945) The UNESCO constitution. http://portal.unesco.org/en/ev.php-URL_ID=15244&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html

UNESCO (2014) EFA global monitoring report 2013/4: teaching and learning: achieving quality for all. https://en.unesco.org/gem-report/report/2014/teaching-and-learning-achieving-quality-all

UNICEF (1998) The state of the world's children 1999. UNICEF, New York

United Nations (1948) The universal declaration of human rights. https://www.un.org/sites/un2.un.org/files/udhr.pdf

United Nations (1989) Convention on the rights of the child. https://www.ohchr.org/en/professionalinterest/pages/crc.aspx

United Nations (2015a) The millennium development goals report 2015a. https://www.un.org/millenniumgoals/2015a_MDG_Report/pdf/MDG%202015a%20rev%20(July%201).pdf

United Nations (2015b) Transforming our World: the 2030 Agenda for sustainable development. https://sdgs.un.org/publications/transforming-our-world-2030-agenda-sustainable-development-17981

United Nations (n.d.) Goal 4 targets and indicators. https://sdgs.un.org/goals/goal4

World Bank (2005) Reshaping the future: education and postconflict reconstruction. World Bank, Washington D.C.

World Bank (1995) Priorities and strategies for education: a World Bank review. World Bank, Washington D.C.

World Bank (1999) Education sector strategy. World Bank, Washington D.C.

Yamada Y (ed) (2007) The local meanings of educating all, and the process of adopting EFA development goals in Kenya, Tanzania, and Ethiopia. GRIPS Development Forum, Tokyo