"Education for All?" Social Inclusions and Exclusions — Introduction and Critical Reflections

Marianne N. Bloch
University of Wisconsin-Madison, Wisconsin USA

Beth Blue Swadener
Arizona State University-Tempe, Arizona USA

Education for All (EFA) is a global discourse as well as what is considered by many as a neoliberal policy agenda focused on the growth of human capital through better child development, early education, and primary education throughout the world. While different strategic objectives exist (e.g., girls' education, inclusion of learners with disabilities, early child development and education), there are many ways of expressing and strategically trying to reach the various "Education for All" objectives. They depend upon the nation, region of the world and its resources, the global/local relations of power including different institutions (external, governmental, non-governmental, and community/private-based). They also are related to the knowledge/power relations embedded in the language and practices of different reform plans, such as pressure and moral authority for enhanced Early Child Development (ECD), Early Child Care and Education (ECCE), and universal primary schooling for all (EFA), which is currently a very strong initiative (e.g., UNESCO, 2006). One of the contingencies/incentives for nations adopting EFA is the urgent need for financing to reach the diverse goals set by multi-lateral organizations, governments, and NGOs in response to perceived needs, or in response to the U.N. Convention on the Rights of the Child, which was formally approved in 1989 and began to be implemented in 1990. The 1990 Jomtien, Thailand meeting, focusing on specific goals to be met related to "Education for All," was reinforced by the 2000 Dakar, Senegal meeting, in which objectives to reach Education for All at the primary school level were set for completion by 2015.

The focus on early child development initiatives or ECD has largely been to enhance the rate of child survival through health initiatives, including universal childhood immunizations, prenatal and perinatal health checks, and better nutrition—from breastfeeding campaigns to locally relevant and available "balanced" nutrition for young children. In addition, different initiatives around the world since at least the early 1970s have focused on the importance of parent and community education as well as cognitive and social stimulation in and out

of formal early education settings as ways to enhance child development, survival, and to prepare children for primary schooling. A recent report titled *Strong Foundations* (UNESCO, 2006) focuses on a world-wide comparison of early child development and education initiatives, comparative data to date, and policy recommendations.

At the pre-primary and primary school levels, international organizations, and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) that are both international and local in different countries, as well as community and governmental initiatives, have focused on the importance of schooling at the primary level, in particular, for girls, as well as boys. In a recently published volume, Lewis and Lockheed (2006) highlight the issue of the "girl child" as a particular issue with their title: *Inexcusable absence: Why 60 million girls still aren't in school and what to do about it.* UNICEF (2004) estimates that 121 million primary school-age children are what they describe as "out of school," and are "… deprived of their right to education by poverty, either because their families cannot afford school fees, because scant national resources stand in the way of adequate school facilities, or because they have to work to put food on the table" (p. 17).

Various reports since the 1990s, particularly since the Dakar conference in 2000, have related to EFA goals of access, equity, and quality in primary education, as well as achievement of world-wide functional literacy and numeracy skills. International donor agencies, national governments, and communities and families have pushed and been pushed to develop and finance initiatives to enhance and increase the access to school for the majority of the world's children, with the targeted date of 2015 for accomplishing this task world-wide, now perceived as extremely difficult if not out of reach. Even for the minority of the world's children who have access to early education and child care, or schooling at the elementary, secondary levels, or tertiary levels, social and educational exclusions occur with regularity in relation to race, class, gender, ability, age, and language background (among other characteristics.) It is no accident that in the USA, the richest nation in the world while also characterized by enormous inequities, "No Child Left Behind" (NCLB), universal PreK for four year olds, and other EFA-style initiatives have been linked to the world-wide push for ECD. Such global discourses circulate in, out, and around richer and poorer nations, influencing reform language as well as actions. The perceived importance of preschool education for later development as well as completion of schooling, and the relation of schooling to national and global emphases on the importance of education/schooling for national competitiveness is a reflection of neoliberal policy discourses, as well as constructions of what well-developed and educated national and global citizenship will require in the "future."

There are a variety of rationales for these initiatives at this point in time. They include a sense of outrage at the high rates of child mortality during the first five years of life in many of the poorest populations in the world (including poor children in the USA, as well as in other rich nations of the world) (see UNICEF, 2004, for statistics on this, UNESCO, 2006, or UNICEF, 2007). There is a recognition that many of the diseases children and their mothers face can be and have been wiped away through immunizations, preventive health care, and sufficient resources and knowledge (e.g., HIV drugs as well as means of prevention and related education; polio vaccinations, and benefits of breastfeeding over bottle feeding with unclean water). There is also, as suggested above, a call for increased national competitiveness in relation to building "human resources" through greater "human capital" expenditures such as Education for All. In the past, schooling for girls and women has been associated with lowered fertility, increased nutritional knowledge, and greater ability of girls and women to participate more effectively in the local as well as global economy. Primary education, at least to grade four, has been associated with functional literacy, as well as greater ability to be productive and participatory citizens, whether through greater agricultural or non-agricultural output, or the ability to read newspapers, speak a formal language, or complete further and higher levels of schooling (Birdsall, Levine, & Ibrahim, 2005, Lewis & Lockheed, 2006, UNESCO, 2006). While critiques of these empirical relationships and discourses have been made (see Bloch, Beoku-Betts, & Tabachnick, 1998, for one example), the current reform efforts are based on these empirical relations, as well as the logic and reasoning built into current trans-national and local reform efforts to build "human capital" through enhanced schooling, education, and "care" for all.

International agency reports, as well as the studies they cite, claim that enhanced schooling will improve individual children's chances, as well as their country or region's chances to compete in a fast changing global economic and knowledge-based marketplace. The emphases have been on competition, and an enhanced efficiency in the delivery of accessible as well as "quality" education for "all." At times incentives are provided, while in other policies, fees and privatization of schools have been added to enhance the number of places, and ways in which countries and different rural and urban regions can increase school opportunities. Because of the strong pressure to increase access to affordable care, early education, and primary schooling in "efficient and effective" ways, there has been an emphasis on building new schools through various partnerships across communities, governments, and international donor agencies, increased textbook production and distribution into schools, and increasing parent/community education to support the idea that schooling is important for girls, as well as for boys, despite forgone child labor, or other opportunity costs, and beliefs to the contrary. The emphasis on human capital formation, competitiveness, public-private partnerships, efficiency, investments

and incentives, spurred by the economic outlook related to schooling as a human capital investment have been associated with the neoliberal market-based reforms of many of the big donors, such as the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund, and other donor agencies, and are part of the general "development" framework that has been historically part of reforms since at least World War II (see Escobar, 1995 for this perspective).

Borrowing and Lending: Traveling Discourses

As noted above, EFA, ECD, and other initiatives and labels, such as the "girl child" have been found in education reform literature, and national policies and practices throughout the world. These labels are commonly used by international organizations, contributing to the pervasive phenomenon of "borrowing and lending" in education (Steiner- Khamsi, 2004). These seemingly well intended reform policies, which appear to be aimed at equitable treatment of the world's children, in terms of at least access to schooling, have been themes of international education policy donors that have been reinforced (reified) in numerous global summits, declarations, and documents including, as stated earlier, both the Jomtien Education for All conference, held in Thailand, March, 1990, as well as a series of subsequent summits and conferences monitoring progress, and establishing new benchmarks. Since the Dakar summit on Education for All in 2000, there have been conferences and reports on the "Millennium Development Goals" (to be achieved by 2015) (Millennium Challenge Corporation, 2006) as well as the "Fast Track Initiative" of 2002 (Fast Track Initiative, 2002) in which the G-8 nations selected 18 "developing" nations for more intensive inputs, the UNICEF and UNESCO initiatives on the education of the girl child, and, among others, the 2007 summary statement about the need for "strong foundations" for early childhood education and development (UNESCO, 2006).

There have been an array of World Bank policies and mandates to recipient nations that focused on universal early childhood development (ECD) initiatives (e.g., World Bank, 2000, 2002), as well as primary education for all of the world's children (see above references). In the UNESCO document on EFA for 2005, the goals were summarized in the following ways:

> The World Education Forum in Dakar, Senegal, in April 2000, held ten years after the meeting in Jomtien, re-affirmed a broad and comprehensive view of basic education and its critical role in empowering people and transforming societies. The Forum's core messages are: universal access to learning; focus on equity; emphasis on learning outcomes; broadening the means and the scope of basic education; enhancing the environment for learning; and strengthening partnerships. It also provided an opportunity to assess achievements and failures and lessons learnt from the past decade. Six goals, drawn

from the outcomes of the regional EFA conferences and the
international development targets, constitute the Framework for
Action and were designed to enable all individuals to realise their
right to learn and to fulfill their responsibility to contribute to the
development of their society…

- Expanding and improving comprehensive early childhood care and education, especially for the most vulnerable and disadvantaged children.
- Ensuring that by 2015 all children, particularly girls, children in difficult circumstances and those belonging to ethnic minorities, have access to and complete free and compulsory primary education.
- Ensuring that the learning needs of all young people and adults are met through equitable access to appropriate learning and life-skills programmes.
- Achieving 50 per cent improvement in levels of adult literacy by 2015, especially for women, and equitable access to basic and continuing education for all adults.
- Eliminating gender disparities in primary and secondary education by 2005, and achieving gender equality in education by 2015, with a focus on ensuring girls' full and equal access to and achievement in basic education of good quality.
- Improving all aspects of the quality of education and ensuring excellence of all so that recognised and measurable learning outcomes are achieved by all, especially in literacy, numeracy and essential life skills (UNESCO, 2004, p. 28).

Reconceptualizing "Education for All"

At first glance, the goals of "Education for All" embody ideas that seem natural and good for everyone in the world. Which groups or nations wouldn't want their children, or their nation's children, to have greater access to an early "healthy" start in child development, including immunizations, nutrition, preventive or necessary health care, and anything necessary to ensure child survival? Who wouldn't want their children to have greater access to pre-primary as well as primary education to a greater degree? Who wouldn't want to provide high "quality" schooling for all of the world's children to ensure good development, as well as skills in numeracy, literacy and social skills (social/cultural capital and habitus) that would allow children to participate in an increasingly competitive workplace and intensifying global marketplace of knowledge, communication, and global economy?

However, despite the rhetoric or discourse of "Education for All," or universal free public education or calls for universal child care, within the USA as well as many other countries, with their important goals as well as potential benefits, it is always important to ask critical questions. For example, aren't children already "educated" in many different ways throughout the world? Who is defining the new education or schooling children are to have? What education or

child care for "all" is to be taught or provided? Who is receiving the benefits of the new international, governmental, or local initiatives? What are the costs and benefits of the reforms, and for which families, groups, nations, or donors? What are the hidden assumptions within the international and national efforts toward mass schooling for all?

As one example of a critique of these seemingly well-intended goals and the success of strategies used to achieve them, Samoff (1999) has written about the "strikingly similar" and prescriptive nature of national education reviews of the past decade, with very little local input or consideration of cultural context or other unique local factors. In addition, Smith (1999), the authors in Mutua & Swadener (2004) and others have suggested these patterns can also be named as postcolonial or "colonizing" practices, reflecting a western hegemony of what is considered "universal best practice" or meeting standards of quality (see Dahlberg, Moss, & Pence, 1999; 2006 for critiques of this). Dahlberg, et al. (1999; 2006) and Cannella (1997) also critique the notion of child development, that is embedded within the ECD reforms (e.g., UNESCO, 2006), the Convention on Rights of the Child, as well as in the majority of other reforms that focus on improved "child development" as the major goal. The very image, or *imaginary* of the innocent, segregated child, in need of protection, so carefully set out as a goal by the 1989 UN Convention on the Rights of the Child, while protective of children from sexual and labor exploitation, and envisioning them as having and "holding" their own rights, is, therefore, contested, and requiring debate and critique as a universalizing "right" that demeans some practices that are culturally valued as against "all" children's rights. The conception of "developmental stages" and criteria for judging universal "good" development, while well-intentioned, clearly continue to require critique and ways to reconceptualize "development" (again, see Cannella, 1997, Dahlberg, et al., 1999; 2006, Swadener & Kessler, 1991; Pence & Hix-Small, Ritchie & Rau, this issue).

The conception of the very idea of "universal" laws and rights as well as the construction of a universality about childhood as the same helps us to imagine a globalized, modern child with the same rights and protections, as well as responsibilities (to become educated, for example), while at the same time, these notions embody a history of exclusion of many cultural ways of reasoning, and a misunderstanding of the importance of cultural and economic practices in the very act of "education" as we think more contingently about children in different times, place*s*, and cultural spaces. Opening up to new possibilities for rethinking "childhood" itself, and how education could be conceived is part of the task set out by many authors in this special issue (e.g., Kaomea, Ritchie & Rau, Ndimande, Kosleski, and Baker, Pence & Hix-Small, this issue).

Cannella and Viruru (2004) focus on the ways mass schooling in No Child Left Behind, in the USA, have also represented ways of colonizing as well as social inclusion and exclusion through the approach to standardized testing and targeting certain groups of children for narrow skills-based education, while others, richer, and less affected by rules, regulations, and surveillance mechanisms, receive less scrutiny. Finally, Popkewitz (2004), quoting Antonio Novoa's idea (2002), also discusses educational reform and planning discourses, as a form of "planet speak," with globalization of ideas as empty signifiers that often signal fulfillment of the progress (in this case of schooling) that modernity was to bring. In Popkewitz's words, more specifically, "Globalization as economic and social changes, however, leaves unexamined particular and distinctive patterns of knowledge"…"Ignoring the central role of knowledge in globalization is an odd omission in contemporary studies" of schooling and educational reform. (Popkewitz, 2004, p. viii).

Used as a tool or yardstick to measure progress toward the inclusion of "all" children in public (or private) educational opportunities, EFA has served many functions and has become a slogan (as Adams, this issue names it) or "planet speak," serving as a source of funding-related pressure or incentives to so-called developing countries, and a leverage for some equity movements, including those favoring full "inclusion" of all learners (including those with disabilities and those from class or indigenous ethnic backgrounds that had not previously had access to an affordable education).

Articles in this special issue of the *International Journal of Educational Policy, Research, and Practice: Reconceptualizing Childhood Studies* offer an array of ways to rethink and reframe "education" for "all," in order to consider how notions of education are formed, as well as clarify the universal promises and assumptions embedded in the "all." Articles focus partially on informal, culturally framed early care and informal education, as one part of the critique of ECD and EFA, which often appears to equate schooling with modernization, civilization, and an almost evolutionary development beyond "primitiveness." The special issue reexamines assumptions inscribed within universal ideas of schooling (see Baker, this issue), as well as education and child care applicable for "all" that excludes many groups/nations and individuals, while fabricating ways of reasoning about westernized models of schooling as the only way of "making progress." The global discourses of EFA, ECD, "the girl child," and even universal pre-primary and primary schooling often overlook the complex interweaving or hybrid nature of global and local knowledge, values, and beliefs that make universal prescriptions appear good and beneficial, even unquestionable to most, while reinscribing or reinforcing segregated practices, exclusionary thinking, and omitting critical questions that need to be continually asked (Bhaba, 1994; Bloch, Kennedy, Lightfoot, & Weyenberg, 2006).

Brock-Utne's (2000) work in Tanzania was directed particularly at some of these issues when she published *Whose education for all?: The recolonization of the African mind*. The articles in this special issue, while acknowledging the perceived importance and the spread of schooling (even a "world system of schooling," as explored by Anderson-Levitt, 2003) across the world over the past two centuries, and its potential for "good," also looks critically at many of the issues that are still faced in implementing the reforms "on the ground," within a variety of national/regional contexts. In addition, selected articles problematize the historical reasoning embedded in the notions of "universal" education for all that will bring *progress* to the world, *develop* good globally competitive citizens within and across nations, and, in a sense, bring *modernity* and *civilized* behavior and knowledge to all. While these ideas have been critiqued by many others (e.g., Bloch, et al., 2006; Mutua & Swadener, 2004; Smith, 1999), the critiques are rarely related to the spate of new reforms that are traveling the world today, embodying the same ideas that are being critiqued and in need of reconceptualization. Pence and Hix-Small's article in this issue focuses on this point. The slogan and reforms related to "Education for All" appear to be so naturally well-intended, and embraced by so many (nations, international agencies, and people). Yet, it is the very naturalness of the well-intentioned reforms that must continually be open to criticism, deconstruction, and reconceptualization. This process includes raising questions related to EFA, including the following:

Who and what (people, nations, organizations) are the reforms benefiting?

Are they reaching their intended audiences? In which ways yes, and in which ways no, and why not?

Why are universal schooling, early education, child care and child development, largely drawn from neoliberal and western models of development, care, education and schooling, appropriate for "all" children? In what ways is this sense of schooling for the world's children a "good" reform, and in which ways is it another variation of (neo-)colonization.

How can global discourses of schooling and reforms be understood in different ways once we examine the ways in which they travel in and out of "local" spaces and places (Anderson-Levitt, 2003)?

Do the reforms reinforce a modern notion of linear and scientific progress that is potentially reinstating hierarchically organized "privilege" as well as patriarchal and racist discourses of superiority?

Is the reasoning, and history of the notion "Education for All" at the early childhood level as well as the primary school level embodying certain notions of democracy, equity, and "inclusion," while at the same time reinforcing/reinstating varieties of social exclusion? In which ways, have different groups translated policies and reforms

that illustrate indigenous methodologies and practices, anti-colonial
or resistance efforts?

The articles in this special issue focus on the "good" potentialities of "Education
for All," Early Child Development (ECD), and Early Child Care and Education
(ECCE) goals and reforms, the hopes of many in different nations around the
world, *and* the critical questions raised above. They address specific national
and geopolitical contexts, using examples from research in New Zealand, Chile,
Tanzania, Kenya, South Africa, Mexico, Europe, Taiwan, and the U.S. to raise
issues related to full inclusion, access in education in post-Apartheid South
Africa, systematic barriers, complexities and contradictions of "free primary
education" initiatives, and unintended consequences of policies intended to
increase an emphasis on indigenous education and cultural inclusion.

As scholars have begun to document, local communities pay a high cost for
globalization, as social investment and equitable distribution of wealth are
declining (Arnove & Torres, 2003). These realities collide with the global
rhetoric of inclusion and compel many communities to transcend the laudable
goal of EFA to ask, *education for what and for whom*? That is, if education is
seen as a universal human right and socially just "good," then what kinds of
educational opportunity should all children have access to, and which types of
rights and socially just "goods" are to be locally determined rather than
universally prescribed? How do local and global contingencies shape the
meanings of inclusive and "equitable" care, education, and schooling across
national contexts? Are issues of access, capacity, and the fundamental purpose
of education contested and if so, in what ways? In which ways are reforms,
seemingly well-intended, in fact, acting to produce or reproduce ideas of social
inclusion, while also reinforcing cultural reasoning that constructs those who are
"different," targeting some for intervention as well as new ways to colonize the
body and mind.

While there may be *political* consensus on the need to embrace an inclusive
global education agenda, how it is accomplished and the degree to which a deep
and sustained commitment to inclusiveness exists in policy and practice remains
unexplored, or often purposely unexamined (Kozleski, Artiles, Fletcher, &
Engelbrecht, and Ndimande, Ritchie & Rau, and Vavrus, this issue). Indeed,
although there is growing discussion about broad definitions of social inclusion
as well as exclusion, differentiated from but in many ways similar to the
construction of an *inclusive* education, these concepts have complex local
meanings that are shaped by historical, cultural, political, and economic forces.
At the most fundamental level, the notion of universal education for all suggests
monolithic notions about what is to be taught, by whom and how and reinforces
a notion of mass schooling that is largely based on a global growth in "world
schooling" that must also be recognized as being highly localized (Anderson-

Levitt, 2003), "glocal" (see Junck, in Anderson-Levitt, 2003), or hybrid in formation (Bhabha, 1994). While the growth of schooling at the primary level has increased in wealthier countries over the past two hundred years, the recent push for enhancing "human development" and "human capital" through schooling around the world has been based upon a variety of empirical and free-market economic assumptions that are too rarely questioned (see Escobar, 1995 for his critique of "development" and human capital theories as a basis for development initiatives by international agencies since World War II), as well as the circulation of "schooling" as a desirable *modern* reform that has resulted in many nations moving toward secular schooling, European or English languages (again, see Bloch, et al., 2006, Mutua & Swadener, 2004; Baker, Lee, Ndimande articles, this issue.)

The tensions on educating and caring for young children outside the home run deep, even in a rich nation such as the USA. Tensions about (an essentialized notion of) girls' education, or how to stretch scarce resources in very poor countries across urban/rural localities, and between those with privilege and those considered (historically) unworthy of the "privilege" of schooling (whether at the pre-primary or pre-K level, first grade, fourth grade, secondary or university levels) simply raise the questions that are obvious—to reformers, and to all of the contributors to this issue. While it is not easy to stem the tide of schooling, and the constructed *desire* for schooling, research that takes account of a critical approach to the notion of "schooling for what" (Brock-Utne, 2000; Ginsburg, 2000) and "for whom" is fundamental. Mark Ginsburg, (2000) for example, suggests that:

> Much of the rhetoric and action stemming from the 'Education for All' conference convened by UNESCO, UNICEF, UNDP and the World Bank…in 1990, has highlighted the technical dimension of the issues. The focus of such discourse has been on strategies for increasing the number of schools and improving the quality of schooling, without problematizing the issues of what kind of education for what kind of world. (p. xviii)

Furthermore, Brock-Utne (2000) states:

> In the wake of this conference [EFA] there is an intellectual recolonization going on in many countries of sub-Saharan Africa. Countries that after independence had great hopes for an independent development… are becoming more and more dependent on the West for aid in the education sector, for textbooks, and even recurrent expenditures. With the aid follows Western curricula and languages, Western culture, and the idea of education as schooling. …Western donors together with parts of the African elites trained in the West are involved in this recolonization to the benefit of themselves but to the detriment of the African masses." (p. xxiii)

While this statement fails to acknowledge notions of hybrid cultures (Bhabha, 1994), or the complexities of the translations between global notions of schooling and local contingent practices (Bloch, et al., 2006), or, particularly, the resistance of African (and other) scholars and communities, (see Ndimande's article, this issue), it is important to emphasize Brock-Utne's direct and well-known critique in this special issue. It is also important to address the complexity of examining current discourses and practices, while also acknowledging the desire of many to participate in different ways of engaging in education/schooling/care and forms of "development" that minimize (post)colonial influences (for examples in this issue, see the discussion by Kaomea, Ritchie and Rau; and Tressou, Mitakidou and Daniilidou).

Resistance, Hybridity, and Transformation
from Below and on the Side

Articles in the special issue address the contradictions of well-intended reforms in the context of historically racist, gendered, and classed societies (see Ndimande for the case of South Africa), as well as the impact of rhetorics or discourses of choice in relation to voucher policies that appear equitable, democratic, and "free," while embodying clear exclusions (see Lee, for example). Vavrus and Moshi suggest that "free primary education," even in the context of new reforms in Tanzania are not truly "free," and multiple authors suggest that there is great complexity in understanding reforms, their acceptance, and resistances within diverse contexts (see Adams, Kosleski, et al., Kaomea, Mitakidou, et al., Ndimande, and Ritchie & Rau for examples). As suggested earlier, there are unintended consequences of policies intended to increase an emphasis on indigenous education and cultural inclusion that require us to interrogate whose rights to education and care for all are to be upheld, and under what conditions, and visions (for example, see Kaomea's article on indigenous cultural versus universal rights in the case of the USA, this issue)?

Similarly, articles in the special issue offer several alternative or reconceptualist theoretical lenses with which to view and critique EFA. Pence and Hix-Small focus our attention on the assumptions of the major donors to dictate reforms for what they might consider the "third world," while overlooking the distinction of a "minority/majority world" view, in which the rich nations are the "minorities." "Indigenous" and non-"minority-world" contributors, as well as some from the richer nations ask for more attention to indigenous epistemologies and decolonizing methodologies and critiques (see Mutua & Swadener, 2004, as well as articles here). Histories of assumptions of the "good" and naturalness of universal theories of rights, and of education for all also require greater deconstruction and understanding in order to see how the growth of schooling in industrialized nations, now traveling all over the world, embodied colonial reasoning of the "other" and the construction of difference to reconfirm a need

for an *education for all* that would assimilate the difference into sameness (see Baker's article this issue, as one example). Again, Pence and Hix-Small's call for different actors, researchers, and reformers—on the stage where the big players are now playing responds to this same set of questions and needs.

"Sometimes, (when) a global reform arrives in a country, local educational decision makers transform it into something new, and then local teachers either creolized it anew or resist it outright," (Anderson-Levitt & Diallo, 2003, p. 91). (Yi) Che (2007, p. 23) adds, "Through these claims, it seems logical that a reform idea can be creolized as a result of selective adoption, reinterpretation, resistance, or other processes. Indeed, this is even more likely to be the case in many developing countries, where reform ideas usually come from outside."

While decentering many prevailing assumptions about EFA, the different articles in this special issue barely touch the surface of the many issues that could be examined under the theme: "Education for All?: Social Inclusions and Exclusions." Contributors have sought to raise a variety of issues and questions that focus on the historical and cultural complexities, and contingent nature of how education "for all" is occurring on the ground, in relation to global discourses, different mandates and standards, diverse perspectives, and materially and culturally different possibilities. They raise more questions, of course, than they answer. They also add to critiques that have already been made related to these (and other) taken for granted global reforms in education, as well as to resist and reconceptualize different ways of reasoning about such common "goods" as child or human development, human capital formation, modernity, economic development, and the power as well as knowledge relations between local/ global visions and strategies of education and care.

References:

Anderson-Levitt, K., & Diallo (Eds.). (2003). *Local meanings, global schooling: Anthropology and world culture theory*. New York: Palgrave Press.

Arnove, R., & Torres, C. A. (Eds.). (2003). *Comparative education: The dialectic of the global and local*(2nd ed.) Waveland Press.

Birdsall, N., Levine, R., & Ibrahim, A. (Eds.) (2005). *Towards universal primary education: Investments, incentives, and institutions.* Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing.

Bhabha, H. (1994). *The location of culture*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Bloch, M. N., Beoku-Betts, & Tabachnick, B. R. (Eds.) (1998). *Women and education in Sub-Saharan Africa: Power, opportunity, and constraints*. Boulder, CO: Lynn Reinner Press.

Bloch, M. N., Kennedy, D., Lightfoot, T., & Weyenberg, D. (Eds.) (2006). *The child in the world/The World in the Child: Education and the configuration*

of a universal, modern, and globalized childhood. New York: PalgraveMacMillan.

Brock-Utne, B. (2000). *Whose education for all?: The recolonization of the African mind*. New York: Falmer Press.

Cannella, G. (1997). *Deconstructing early childhood education*. New York: Peter Lang.

Cannella, G. & Viruru, R. (2004). *Childhood and (post) colonization: Power, education, and contemporary practice*. New York: Peter Lang Publishing.

Che,Y. (2007). Teachers in transformation: Preschool teachers' reaction to the educational reform in China. Tempe, AZ: Unpublished dissertation proposal.

Dahlberg, G., Moss, P., & Pence, A. (1999). *Beyond quality: A post-modern perspective on early education and development.* London, UK: Routledge Press.

Dahlberg, G., Moss, P., & Pence, A. (2006). *Beyond quality in early childhood education and care: Languages of evaluation* (2nd ed.). New York: Routledge.

Escobar, A. (1995). *Encountering development*. Princeton: Princeton University Press. Fast Track Initiative (2002). Retrieved April 4, 2007 from http://www1.worldbank.org/education/efafti/overview.asp

Ginsberg, M. (2000). Questioning assumptions and implications of an educational/ political slogan [Series Editors Introduction]. In B. Brock-Utne, *Whose education for all? The recolonization of the African mind.* New York: Falmer Press.

Lewis, M. A. & Lockheed, M. E. (2006). *Inexcusable absence: Why 60 million girls still aren't in school and what to do about it*. Washington, DC: Center for Global Development.

Mutua, K. & Swadener, B.B. (Eds.) (2004). *Decolonizing research in cross-cultural contexts: Critical personal narratives*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Millenium Challenge Corporation. (2006). Retrieved April 4, 2007 from http://www.mca.gov/about/reports/annual/mcc-annualreport-2006.pdf

Popkewitz, T. S. (2004). Foreword. In G. Steiner-Khamsi (Ed.). *The global politics of educational borrowing and lending*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Samoff, J. (1999). Education sector analysis in Africa: Limited national control and even less national ownership. *International Journal of Educational Development, 19*(4), 427-438.

Samoff, J. (2001). 'Education for all' in Africa but education systems that serve few well. *Perspectives in Education*, *19*(1), 5-28.

Smith, L. T. (1999). *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and indigenous peoples*. London, UK: Zed Books.

Steiner-Khamsi, G. (Ed.) (2004). *The global politics of educational borrowing and lending*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Swadener, B. B., & Kessler, S. (Eds.). (1991). Reconceptualizing early childhood education (Special issue). *Early Education and Development, 2*(2), 85-174.

UNESCO. (2004). *Education for all: The quality imperative (EFA global monitoring report, 2005)*. Paris: UNESCO Publishing.

UNESCO. (2006). *Strong foundations: Early childhood care and education*. [EFA Global Monitoring report-2007]. Paris: UNESCO Publishing.

UNICEF. (2004). *The state of the world's children 2005*. New York: UNICEF.

UNICEF. (2007). *Child poverty in perspective: An overview of child well-being in rich countries*. New York: UNICEF.

World Bank. (2000). *Early Childhood Counts: Programming Resources for Early Childhood Care and Development*. Washington, DC: The World Bank.

World Bank. (2002). Retrieved April 4, 2007 from http://www.worldbank. org/afr/findings/english/find200.pdf

Authors: Marianne N. Bloch is a professor in the Department of Curriculum and Instruction, College of Education, University of Wisconsin-Madison, Madison, Wisconsin, USA and Beth Blue Swadener is a professor in the Division of Curriculum and Instruction, College of Education, Arizona State University-Tempe, Tempe, Arizona, USA. They are co-editors of this special issue.