ABSTRACT
                Past notions of educational planning have been overly
mechanical, technical, and apolitical. The have overestimated the
effectiveness of quantitative techniques, underestimated the
importance of qualitative, historical, and political factors, and
oversimplified the complexity of the relationship between education
and social change. As a result, planning has been undertaken from too
universal a standpoint and without enough consideration for the
specific national or regional context. This context should also
determine the proper role of the planner. Participation in the
planning process by those most affected can improve the
responsiveness of the process to the context if communication among
participants is adequate. The information base for planning needs to
be extended in most cases, and the capacity of each educational
system to implement the plans must be considered. Economic and
political dependency, the funding of planning by extra-national
agencies, and the dominance of the international model of educational
planning all tend to aggravate these problems in developing nations.
(PGD)

IFG

Institute for Research on Educational Finance and Governance

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION   STANFORD UNIVERSITY

2

Project Report No. 80-A1

THE FALLACIES AND PROSPECTS OF
EDUCATIONAL PLANNING:
REFLECTIONS ON A SHOPWORN CRAFT

Hans N. Weiler*

January 1980

INSTITUTE FOR RESEARCH ON
EDUCATIONAL FINANCE AND GOVERNANCE

The Institute for Research on Educational Finance and Governance is a Research and Development Center of the National Institute of Education funded under the provisions of Title IV of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. The Institute is administered through the School of Education at Stanford University and is located in the Center for Educational Research at Stanford. The research Activity of the Institute is divided into the following program areas: Finance and Economics; Politics; Law; Organizations; and History. In addition, there a number of other projects and programs in the Finance and Governance area that are sponsored by private foundations and government agencies outside of the special R & D Center relationship with NIE.

THE FALLACIES AND PROSPECTS OF EDUCATIONAL PLANNING:

REFLECTIONS ON A SHOPWORN CRAFT

Abstract

The paper reviews the major criticisms raised in discussions of educational
planning in recent years. Proceeding from a discussion of the shortcomings
and failures of educational planning and the resulting changes in the
concept of educational planning, attention is given to the relationship
between education and politics, to planning as a process and to the role
of the planner. In discussing the relationship between planning and the
identification of needs in educational development, participation and
communication are singled out for special consideration. Dealing with
information and implementation as particularly underdeveloped aspects of
planning, the paper concludes with a special section on the international
context of educational planning under the conditions of underdeveloped
societies.

THE FALLACIES AND PROSPECTS OF EDUCATIONAL PLANNING:

REFLECTIONS ON A SHOPWORN CRAFT

by

Hans N. Weiler

Professor of Education and Political Science

Stanford University

THE FALLACIES AND PROSPECTS OF EDUCATIONAL PLANNING:

REFLECTIONS ON A SHOPWORN CRAFT[1]

> For one thing to avoid is a universalized
> planning; one thing to ascertain is the
> limits of the plannable.
>
> T. S. Eliot[2]

Introduction

Something seems to have gone wrong with educational planning. Once acclaimed and propagated as one of the key strategies to overcome educational underdevelopment in the countries of the Third World, it has now become a source of increasing frustration and the object of rising skepticism. Both the assumptions on which it was based and the models which guided its efforts have come in for serious questioning, and for some, the gap between the theory and practice of educational planning has become so vast as to raise serious questions about the continued utility of this craft.

This article reflects on the nature and causes of this crisis, and proceeds to review a number of thoughts on what a more realistic notion of educational planning might look like. It has grown out of the author's experience in directing the International Institute for Educational Planning (IIEP)[3] in Paris, which gave him an opportunity to listen carefully, over a period of several years, to the experiences, ambitions and frustrations of educational planners around the world. These discussions have formed into a first set of observations which are summarized in this article, and which will be much in need of more systematic and scholarly investigation. For the moment, however, without the claim and usual apparatus of formal scholarship, they may serve as a useful and fairly tenable set of working hypotheses.

1. The changing concept of educational planning

Whatever the variations in the original concept of educational planning and its applications had been, it had by and large been predicated on the notion that the future of an educational system could be seen as the end result of a fairly autonomous, technical planning process. As the contingent nature of planning, its dependence on a complex set of contextual conditions and constraints, and its essentially political nature has become clear, the concept of educational planning itself has come to need "a second look". This second look takes its guidance from a number of different sources, all of which have a contribution to make to reformulating some of the basic aspects of educational planning. First of all, it is instructive to look at some of the failures in educational planning, and to reflect on why they occurred. Secondly, we will have to review some aspects of the relationship between educational planning and social change as they, too, bear upon the need to revise the concept of educational planning. A third, and related input comes from realizing the political dimension of educational planning. Against this background, it becomes necessary to think through the notion of planning as a process, and to identify the main elements of that process, before turning to the planner in order to see whether and in what way his or her role would be affected by the kinds of changes which the concept of educational planning is undergoing.

Shortcomings and failures in educational planning

As a first set of observations on what "went wrong" in educational planning, and pending a more thorough investigation on the failure of educational planning in different situations, the following list would seem to be a good starting point:

(a) Educational planning has initially been "oversold": It has led people
and governments -- in a "euphoria" of planning -- to expect more from
it than it was realistically able to deliver in terms of development
and change in educational systems;

(b) Models, methods, and tools of educational planning were implanted too
uncritically into a wide variety of different educational, social,
economic, and political situations;

(c) The development process, and the role of education therein, is so complex
that the relatively simple and limited models of educational planning are
not able to accommodate adequately the multitude of factors involved in
the development of educational systems;

(d) Planning has been conceived and executed in a social vacuum, essentially
as a technocratic activity, without adequate regard for the particular
conditions, possibilities and constraints of a given cultural and social
system;

(e) Educational planning has suffered from a lack of prior assessment of the
feasibility of particular courses of action, and has been too loosely
connected with other areas of educational management and administration
to assure implementation of plans.

The list could be continued, but the cross-section of observations
reported here is instructive in that it emphasizes the shortcomings of an
overly mechanical, technical, and apolitical notion of educational planning.
Such a notion tends to overestimate the effectiveness of projection and
other quantitative techniques, to underestimate the importance of qualitative,
historical, and political factors in the development of education, and gen-
erally to oversimplify the complexity of the relationship between education
and social change.

Planning as a function of its environment

If there is one notion that is perhaps most consistently and vigorously criticized in the contemporary discussion of educational planning, it is that of the universality of planning or of any given approach to planning. Planning, it is argued, is meant to serve the purposes and needs of very specific educational, social, and political contexts, and hence has to adapt to these contexts in order to serve them well. Not only should educational planning reflect the specificity of national objectives, policies and goals, but it should actually help create and strengthen more authentic national systems of education through reform and innovation. In a related perspective, educational planning is seen as always taking place in the context of values, and thus as being unable to function in an "axiological vacuum". Even the time-honored argument about the "rationality" of planning is increasingly found to be in need of revision since, both over time and across different societies and cultures, what may be considered "rational" in one context may become "a-rational" in another, and again "rational" in yet another context.

Planning, in other words, does not have at all the same meaning in every context; which concept of planning is appropriate in a given setting depends very much on the nature of that setting -- an observation which has profound implications for training in educational planning. Different kinds of societies need different kinds of planning, and it becomes an important task to identify those characteristics of a society which are particularly relevant to finding the particular shape and kind of planning that would be most appropriate to that society. One can bring together a number of such characteristics which, without any claim to completeness, would seem to constitute a first step towards a typology of the contextual conditions of planning:

10

- The degree of structural integration of a society (e.g., highly

    centralized vs. highly decentralized systems);

- the kind of overall policy goals (e.g., rapid industrialization,

    development of rural areas, mass participation, etc.);

- the financial and other means at the disposal of the political authority;

- the degree of autonomy of the planner vis-a-vis the government;

- the degree to which a society allows conflict to express itself (through

    media, associations, dissenting groups and individuals, etc.);

- the capacity of societies to resolve conflict by peaceful means

    (persuasion, compromise, toleration of dissent, etc.); and

- the degree to which forms of popular participation are established or

    are possible within a society.

Whether or not and to what extent any of these (and certainly other)

traits exist in a society will have a determining influence on the kind of

educational planning that would be possible and effective in that society.

To devise and pursue planning processes without careful regard for these

contextual factors is likely, as experience has shown, to reduce the

planning effort to irrelevance and ineffectiveness.

In this same category of considerations belongs an argument which

specifies different conceptions of educational planning as a function of

the different orientations towards social change which the planner may

have an option to adopt:

- at the _functional_ level, the planner is essentially concerned with

    serving to maintain the status quo,

- at the _reformist_ level, the planner seeks, while remaining

    identified with the government, to bring about gradual change in

    the political basis of educational policy, and

- at the <u>radical</u> level, he would assume the role of social activist

   in order to work for fundamental structural change as a condition

   for further educational development.

The choice between these three options clearly has important individual

dimensions in terms of the readiness of the planner to engage himself in one

of them. At the same time, however, the double question of which of these

options would be needed and which would be feasible depends very much on the

configuration of social and political factors that is characteristic of a

given society at a given point in its history. A society that is fully

engaged in a process of social transformation and redistribution will need

planners and a planning process that are fully compatible with the system's

overall effort to transform its social structures. On the other hand,

societies that are basically oriented towards maintaining the status quo

and towards paternalistic forms of governance will have difficulty allowing

or tolerating a more change-oriented and participatory planning process of

the reformist or radical variety.

Educational planning and politics

The general argument about the concept of educational planning being

a function of the kind of society which it is meant to serve leads inevit-

ably to a further consideration of the relationship between educational

planning and politics. In the broadest sense, the very decision on whether

to plan or not to plan is a political act, as the intense political debate

about economic planning in some Western countries has shown. Even where

this matter is revolved in favor of planning, however, the nature of planning,

especially in education, depends very much on the "political project" of a

society. Explicitly or implicitly, the "political project" has as its base

an ideological position, a more or less specific vision of the future of the

society to which those in power subscribe. This position may or may not

be shared by the masses or by specific groups in the society, and to the

extent that there is latent or overt disagreement on the "political project",

educational planning faces a more or less delicate task of interpreting the

relative weight of the various elements in the country's political system.

One might say that educational planning is located at the intersection of

at least three political forces:

- The institutionalized political power of the State;

- the political power of the social actors (masses, pressure groups,

    regional groups, etc.); and

- the political power of the planner.

In this perspective, the planner would not only have the task of

analysing and interpreting the political factors that tend to determine

the direction for the development of the educational system, but he would

have a political role in his own right in which he would try either to

utilize the "political space" which the other actors leave him, or to

affect, with his own power of expertise, knowledge of the system, and

political alliances within the system, the overall direction of the

"political project". It would seem inconceivable that somebody as intimately

linked and committed to the future of an educational system as the educa-

tional planner should not have a political identity and set of values of his

own. To cast the planner in the role of a neutral and a-political technician

is to ignore the intensely political nature of planning the development and

reform of education. At the extreme one would even have to conceive of edu-

cational planning as an "instrument of subversion" if there was no other way

to achieve for education a future that would be humane and liberating.

Planning as process

There used to be a tendency to consider planning primarily in terms of its product, i.e., the plan. In discussions on educational planning in recent years, however, there has been a strong emphasis on the process of planning itself.

An important dimension of this is the cooperative nature of the planning process: Planning as an exercise in cooperation between different elements and levels of the system is seen as an effective alternative to a form of planning which was characterized by the authoritarian handing down of neat and consistent decisions. This notion of the planning process as an exercise in cooperation can be seen also very much in pedagogical terms: A cooperative conception of the planning process as a means of making people and groups in the society understand better the choices they have and the consequences they would have to anticipate.

More will have to be said a little later in this chapter about the importance to be attached to the notion of participation in planning. Both of these points, the emphasis on planning as process and the one on planning as participation, are closely related and reflect the strong sense of dissatisfaction with a conception of planning that was exclusively concerned with the formal outcome of the planning process, and ignored the many ways in which the process itself could affect not only those who are involved in it but also the society at large.

The role of the planner

If there is a need for rethinking the concept of educational planning along the lines reported so far, what does this mean for the role of the planner? If the notion of planning in education is no longer to be restricted to a matter of techniques, how do we redefine the role of a planner whom we

used to characterize as a technician? Can the expanded notion of educational

planning still be accommodated in a single role, or do we have to start

thinking about a variety of roles all of which pertain to a more complex

definition of the task of planning?

There is no single answer to these questions, and it is important to

avoid the temptation of settling for replacing an obviously simplified role

definition of the planner with another, equally inadequate one. However,

there are a number of elements that ought to be taken seriously in any

attempt to arrive at a new definition of what a "planner" in education is,

even if that definition will eventually be such that it does require a div-

ision of labor among several different people with different competencies

and skills.

For a start, a number of those competencies might merely be listed:

- The planner should be able to identify the implications of various courses

    of action, and to anticipate all possible external and environmental in-

    fluences that are likely to affect their implementation;

- He should be a facilitator of change, an agent of change and, by that same

    token, a "political man in the widest term of the word";

- The planner should be a "catalyst" in the development of projects and

    plans, somebody who brings a diverse set of ideas, aspirations, and needs

    into a coherent whole;

- He should be aware of the qualitative dimension of educational planning,

    and should understand the processes through which the quality of the

    educational process is determined;

- The planner should be a politician in his own right and try to affect

    the political decision-making process in the direction of his own ideas

    of the future of the educational system.

Clearly, not all of these definitions are mutually compatible with each other; they reflect different priorities on what is needed in the further development of educational planning, and may eventually lead to the definition of more specific roles within a more global concept of educational planning. Whatever this future scenario may look like, however, it will contain at least four major elements:

(a) the planner as _researcher_ -- generating, commissioning, evaluating, updating, and utilizing an increasingly complex knowledge base on the dynamics of the educational system and its relationship to the processes of change that are going on in its social, economic, and political environment;

(b) the planner as _communicator_ -- providing a communication link between the expression of need at the base, the "upward flow of information", and the decision-making process;

(c) the planner as _advocate_ -- seeking and utilizing ways to bring his own values and ideas about the future of education and society to bear upon the process that sets the boundaries and directions of the planning process;

(d) the planner as _technician_ -- not limited to, but in command of the methods and techniques of analysing both the present state of the educational system and the trends that are likely to determine its future shape, size, and quality, and duly critical in recognizing the limitations of such techniques.

While these elements are likely to describe the overall range of competencies and qualities that a more adequate definition of the task of educational planning will require, two further lines of argument are pertinent here. In keeping with what has been said before about the need

to see the mode of educational planning very much as a function of its specific environment, the definition of what the educational planner should be, know, do and not do is again very much a function of the characteristics of the social and political system within which he has to operate. Educational planners, while carrying the same organizational label, may vary widely from one country to another as to their tasks, qualifications, and responsibilities -- and, by consequence, their training.

The second point to be made here is the argument for a more diffuse notion of who is a planner in education. If the notion of a more pervading, cooperative and participatory planning process in education is taken seriously, there are important planning tasks (albeit of a somewhat different kind) to be performed at various levels of the society. Most importantly, perhaps, there is the task of planning at the local level (what somebody has once called a "barefoot planner") -- generating, mobilising, articulating information about the educational and developmental needs of the local community or region. At other, intermediate points of the upward and downward process, planning will require more of the "honest broker" type who can mediate between increasingly conflicting needs and aspirations.

2. Planning and the identification of needs

It goes without saying that any kind of planning should be based on some kind of a definition of needs. The question is, however, how this definition of needs could or should be accomplished. Conventionally, educational planning has been largely based on a set of "pre-determined ideas of needs"; it is necessary now to contemplate alternative forms of identifying needs which provide for a more direct expression of what people expect in terms of educational development and change.

The key issue thus becomes participation. Participation in planning
and in making decisions about educational futures on the part of those who
would be affected by the results can be seen as a possible alternative to
the more hierarchical-bureaucratic-consensual models that have traditionally
been more characteristic of educational planning in most countries.

Participation in planning

The criteria of what does and does not constitute effective partici-
pation depend on a given situation: There are countries where formal voting
procedures are a meaningful form of participation, while there are other
countries where they are not. The decisive element is whether there is,
beyond all rhetoric, a genuine political will to provide the country's
"silent majorities" with an effective role in the planning of the country's
future. If this is the case, participation will be more than a formal
procedure for procedure's sake, but will serve as an effective instrument
of emancipation of those at the base of the political and social pyramid,
and will provide them, by virtue of their involvement, with a continuously
increasing awareness not only of their own needs, but of the needs and the
problems of the country at large. In this dual function of "liberation and
education", participation also becomes an important instrument for counter-
acting the pressure of external influences on national development ideas
and processes. It is only through a participatory process in which the base
of the system is actively involved that a genuinely national "model" of
development can be generated, even though one should be aware of the political
dynamics that are likely to arise between the conflicting forces of external
dependency and the mobilization of popular participation. If it is true
that educational planning as we know it depends heavily on assumptions and
models which are introduced from outside the national context, the development

of participatory forms of devising future developments in education should
have a similarly corrective function.

In discussing the question of participatory planning in education and
its feasibility and effects, it is well to be aware that, in many cases,
participation serves as a pretext for the political authority to extract
additional resources from a population without providing any real increase
in their impact on the decision-making process.

The question, however, remains of how participation is to be organized
and, specifically, how the kinds of conflict are to be handled which are
bound to arise between the interest of different sub-groups of the partici-
pating masses. Even though one takes for granted that the notion of consensual
planning is to give way to a more realistic and, hence, conflictual reflection
of reality, it remains a puzzling problem to reconcile conflicting choices
made by different groups of the same national population at least to the
extent of allowing a reasonably coherent national policy.

Communication and participation

In seeking an answer for so intractable a question, a great deal of
importance is to be attached to the role of communication in making partici-
patory forms of planning work. In fact, effective communication -- between
the planners and the masses, between the planners and the political
decision-makers, etc. -- has to be seen as the most vital condition for the
success of participation in planning. In this sense the educational planner
is given a particularly important role as a communicator or facilitator of
communication. The masses may require assistance in the articulation of
their needs and demands just as the political authorities may require
assistance in understanding the message; where the future of education is
concerned, both may depend on the educational planner as somebody whose

understanding of social reality is such that he is capable of providing this crucial mediation. To the extent that the communication process can be made to work both ways, not only will the political decision-makers become more cognizant of the needs of their people, but the people in turn will become more conscious of the full range of possibilities, problems and constraints which their society faces, and will thus be able to express their needs in more enlightened and realistic terms. The quality of a process of consultation depends on the completeness and accuracy of the information base underlying the process, and it seems that the educational planner has a major role to play in building and sustaining that information base.

Participation is not limited to the involvement of the people in anticipating and planning the future of their educational system. It can also be an important approach to the ongoing evaluation and adjustment of educational developments and reforms. If the process of communication to which we have referred works, then it should provide valuable input into a system of accountability in which the community becomes the main arbiter of the success or failure of a given program.

3. Information and implementation: Underdeveloped areas of educational planning

A good many things seem to be in need of improvement where educational planning is concerned, but two aspects of educational planning have been particularly neglected: the information on which educational planning is based and the implementation capacity of educational planning.

The information base of educational planning

Given both the importance of an adequate information base for effective

educational planning and the general inadequacy of the actual information
base in many countries, the following criticisms seem to be particularly
pertinent:

- lack of completeness and accuracy in information on both the present
  state of education and the determinants of its future development;
- limitation of the information base to intra-educational data, and
  absence of data on social, economic and political factors which are
  of vital importance for anticipating the future development of
  education;
- unavailability of information to the planner;
- information that does not really convey a sense of the reality of
  the educational and social system;
- information that is systematically biased by groups in power in
  order to serve their purposes;
- lack of historical "depth" in the information base, etc.

Many of these criticisms carry implications for future efforts in
establishing and maintaining solid and adequate sources of information as
a basis for effective educational planning, and affect any future research
agenda in educational planning. It is of the utmost importance that the
planner proceed in his task from a thorough and penetrating diagnosis of
the present state of the educational system and of the factors that determine
its present and future shape. Such a diagnosis will require an extensive
and dependable information base not only on the educational system (including
such elements as information on the distributive aspects of the system in
terms of both access and success), but also on the distribution of economic
wealth, social status and political power in the society as the prime deter-
minants of possible future policies for the development and reform of the

educational system. In short, the main criteria with regard to an adequate

information base in educational planning are that such information be

- realistic,

- accessible,

- verifiable,

- comprehensive, and

- explanatory (rather than merely descriptive).

In addition, it is important to stress the need for a more explicit historical

dimension in the information base for educational planning, especially from

the point of view of better understanding, in the context of a given society,

the complex dynamics of the relationship between education and social change.

The problem of implementing plans

For a good many plans which are nothing but exercises in wishful

thinking or even futility, it is just as well that they never get implemented.

However, even more serious and carefully designed plans in education encounter

implementation problems with alarming frequency, and it is not surprising that

the question of implementation is considered one of the most problematic and

preoccupying aspects of the entire issue of educational planning. The problem

results in part from the traditional image of educational planning and educa-

tional planners who were considered (and considered themselves) primarily as

responsible for the design of plans, but had very little to do with under-

standing or coping with the problems of implementation.

It seems that there are two directions in which answers to the problem

of implementation ought to be sought. In the first place, it will be

necessary to make implementation a much more integral part of the concept of

educational planning; even though there may continue to exist people and

agencies which are primarily concerned with design or with implementation

problems, it is essential that there be a much more effective communication
and interaction link between them. Unless the "design-planner" is exposed
to the full range of problems which the "implementation-planner" faces, he
will be unable to provide the kind of input that anticipates and accommodates
the problems of implementation of a particular policy. The administration of
educational policies faces a key challenge in solving the organizational
needs of such a more broadly conceived notion of educational planning.

The problem of implementation in education has a vertical dimension
as well, however, which is at least as important as the horizontal linkage
between design and implementation at a given administrative level. In the
final analysis, the implementation of plans for the development and reform
of education takes place at the base of the system. Whatever decisions may
have been taken at higher hierarchical levels, the key to the success or
failure of a given plan lies in the hands of local teachers, administrators,
parents. Many of the contributions to the discussion stress the importance
of paying much greater attention to the implementation capability of the
local level in the educational system, and to make sure that the community
at the base of the system has the information, the resources and, most
importantly of all, the commitment necessary for the successful implementation
of educational development programs. The chances for this to happen will,
of course, increase with the degree to which the community is involved in
the formulation of such programs in the first place. In this sense, the
question of implementation capacity at the base of the system is not so much
a question of competence as it is a question of the real power which the
people and institutions at the base have for taking the implementation of
educational plans in their own hands.

4. The international context of educational planning

The fact that educational planning is in so many ways determined by outside factors is at the root of many of the weaknesses which planning in education is fcund to have. Difficult as it is to separate from one another the elements of external influence on planning the development and reform of education, especially in developing countries, one can suggest three distinct, if interrelated elements of this influence: The overall context of economic and political dependency which characterizes many developing countries; the "international model" of educational planning; and the particular problems arising out of external financing of educational development. Obviously, these three aspects hang together very closely, and one cannot be understood without the other.

Dependency and education

Most developing countries are, albeit in different degrees, tied to and dependent upon an international network of economic wealth and political power over which they have little or no control. Patterns of trade, investment, and profit distribution are set and controlled by the richer industrialized countries of Western Europe and North America, and both the resources available for allocation in a dependent country and, in many instances, the priorities for such allocation are determined by decisions which are not taken by the country itself, but by governmental and corporate agencies which are guided primarily by the interests of their constituents and shareholders.

It would be surprising if, in such a pattern of dependency, education would be an exception and remain unaffected by this complex set of external conditions. Given the high degree to which education in any society is a function of its social, economic and political environment, the development

24

and reform of educational systems in a dependent country is conditioned by external forces not only in terms of resources available to the country for investment in education, but also by such factors as the development of the labor market, patterns of internal and external migration, consumption patterns, expectations of social mobility, etc., all of which are in their turn affected by the international alliance of dominant economic interests. Dependent countries face the awkward choice of either cutting themselves loose from the international network on which they depend -- at the expense of great and perhaps fatal losses in resources -- or in planning their development in compliance with the interests and aspirations of the dominant partners in this international power structure. However that decision is made, it would be unrealistic to conceive of the task of planning the development and reform of education in dependent countries without the full awareness of this powerful conditioning element.

The "international model" of educational planning

In speaking of the many kinds of dependencies in which a developing country finds itself, one could argue that, in many ways, educational planning itself was part of this pattern of dependence on the outside world. Views like this one reflect not only the fact that many developing countries adopted certain forms of educational planning under the pressure of outside funding agencies, but also the increasing realization that universalistic models of educational planning are unable to come to terms with the specific social, political and educational conditions in a given country. But the model, inappropriate as it may be, is hanging on tenaciously: Administrators as well as researchers have internalized it and defend its continued existence as a vested interest; basic concepts of what a curriculum, a diploma, a teacher is have spread through the world as part of the model, regardless

of whether they are appropriate; alternatives which do not carry the legit-imation of the model -- such as part-time schooling, out-of-school educational programs, etc. -- have a hard time fighting the connotation of second-class opportunities; and educational planning in many countries perpetuates the fallacy that the development and reform of educational systems follows from a set of manipulative techniques and exercises. The search for alternative models is being pursued in many countries, especially in the direction of seeking alternative targets for educational planning that differ from the expansion of existing school systems and of developing a more participatory process for setting the course of educational development, but the persist-ence of the conventional, international model, backed as it is by the dominant economic interests of the international community and by the expectations of outside funding agencies, continues to be a veritable obstacle.

External funding and educational planning

Any kind of coherent educational planning is meaningless where, as in the case of many developing countries, outside aid supplies a major portion of the funds required. There is thus a virtually irreconcilable conflict between a country's desire for a coherent effort for the development and reform of its own educational system and the often divergent agendas and criteria imposed upon them by the variety of national and international funding agencies on which it depends. International banks and other financing agencies appear to be the real actors in educational planning in developing countries, and it proves very difficult to convince such agencies of what the country itself considers to be its needs. The well-known pref-erence of many donor agencies for assistance to the development of higher education rather than to less conspicuous and tangible developments in rural primary education can be cited as one of many cases in points; others

include the insistence by donor agencies on extensive evaluations which are extremely costly in scarce local manpower and often of dubious diagnostic value, or the external specifications of training needs for local personnel who are to be involved in externally funded projects.

The triple jeopardy of foreign economic domination, an alien model of educational development and planning, and high dependence on outside financing for educational development turns the development of genuinely autochthonous models of education and educational planning into a virtually impossible task. Thus, in the final analysis, the future of a meaningful form of educational planning hinges on some rather basic, drastic changes in the structure of the international system.

NOTES

1 This manuscript owes its existence in large part to an international
   seminar which the author organized for the International Institute for
   Educational Planning in the summer of 1977 at Arc-et-Senans (Franche-Comté),
   and which was devoted to a critical review of the present and future state
   of educational planning. A complete report on this seminar, which includes
   an earlier and more extended version of this manuscript, has just been
   published: Hans N. Weiler, Educational planning and social change.
   Paris: The Unesco Press, 1979.

2 Notes towards a definition of culture. London: Liveright 1948. I thank
   Gene V. Glass for bringing this to my attention.

3 Neither the IIEP nor Unesco are, obviously, responsible for any of the
   statements made in this article.