Education in Emergencies: Standards for Human Rights and Development

Marina Andina
Stanford School of Education Alumnus

Abstract
This article provides an analysis of how the Minimum Standards for Education in Emergencies (MSEE) were created and rationalized, drawing on the framework of world society theorists. Using content analysis, the MSEE, regional standards and website materials were analyzed to determine how the regional documents were reconciled at the international level and how the discourses of human rights and human capital were incorporated and added into the Minimum Standards. Findings suggest that the process of creating and rationalizing the MSEE fits within a predetermined script for international level agreements. In addition, the changes in discourse from the regional to the international level reflect the pervasiveness of global norms and their importance in providing legitimacy to international standards.

To a large degree, standardization has become a part of the way in which the world functions in the 21st century. Different types of organizations have accepted standardization as a means through which to gain credibility or increase efficiency. Standardization is often used as a means to rationalize [1] a disordered situation. Professionals have also played a role in the rise of standardization, as they not only set and diffuse standards, but also largely abide by and are defined by them as well (Meyer, 1997). People have always coped with crises and emergencies, events that are by definition frenetic. It is only recently that the new phenomenon of standardization has been applied to these inherently chaotic situations in an attempt to bring some order.

The Minimum Standards for Education in Emergencies (MSEE) provide a case study through which to examine the process of standardization, the influence of professionals as well as the rationalizations that occur. Analysis of both regional and global level documents, and the discourses used within them, highlights the influence of global norms on the creation of the MSEE. For the MSEE to be considered legitimate, adherence to these norms is necessary.

The prevalence of the discourses of human rights and human capital within the MSEE is one reflection of global society's regard for the ideals of progress and justice. Human rights discourse refers to language within the organization's documents that implies a belief in fundamental human rights. Human capital discourse, on the other hand, is language that implies a need to plan for future development. This development is not concerned so much with physical capital, but rather with the capacities of a population or group of persons. As each is a framework through which people organize and express thoughts and ideas, both types of discourse can be viewed as a means of rationalization. Although very different from each other, they are not necessarily mutually exclusive. By aligning the discourse with existing global standards, the legitimacy of the document is enhanced.

Additionally, in the larger field of international development, many practices have become standardized over the past few decades, including health care and humanitarian relief. In education in particular, which deals largely with long-term effects that are difficult to measure,

organizations may be unable to effectively demonstrate the outcomes of their programs. Therefore, to instill confidence in stakeholders and the world at large, they arrange themselves along the lines of other groups that are considered to be effective. In time, this leads to standardizations of procedures, through a process of rationalization.

Using a process of emergent coding, I conducted a quantitative study examining the documents that emerged from the four regional consultations—in Africa, Asia, Latin America and the Caribbean, and the Middle East—as well as the final Minimum Standards. Examination of these five documents allows for a comparison of discourse from the regional to the global level. After an initial review of the documents two primary codes were established: invoking global standards and invoking global principles. Invoking global standards implies reference to specific documents, treaties or agreements as a means of increasing legitimacy and placing the issues within an established framework. The idea of invoking global principles is less explicit and involves references to both the discourse of human rights and that of human capital. Key words were identified, which represented each type of discourse. For example, terms such as "diversity", "tolerance" and "equity" were coded as part of human rights discourse. On the other hand, phrases such as "future needs of learners" and "relevant education" were coded as part of human capital discourse. Throughout this analysis the occurrences of each code were recorded to allow for analysis of the variety of ways the standards are rationalized. In addition, key words were counted to determine any changes in frequency of certain types of discourse across the documents. Finally, a qualitative review of the surrounding documentation of the events and processes was performed. This allows the results of the document analysis to be put in context. All documents were garnered from the Interagency Network for Education in Emergencies (INEE) website, as well as from the INEE focal point for MSEE in early 2005.

The Right to Education
Refugees' right to education was originally identified in the 1951 Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees and was reaffirmed in 1989 by the Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC) and again in 2000 in the Dakar Framework for Action from the Second World Conference on Education for All. The CRC is highlighted as being particularly influential as it goes beyond expressing merely a right to education but rather a right to free and compulsory education for all children (Retamal *et al.*, 1998; Sinclair, 1998). The Dakar Framework, while setting the goal of universal primary education by 2015, clearly emphasizes that additional efforts must be made to reach particular groups, including children in areas of conflict or crisis. This reinforces the goals set out in the 1990 World Conference on Education for All (WCEFA), which included education for refugees and children affected by war with other marginalized groups. The WCEFA is identified as a significant event in calling attention to the plight of those not currently receiving education as well as providing a framework for action (Aguilar & Richmond, 1998).

However, as education has traditionally been viewed as a development initiative, there is skepticism on the part of donors as to the necessity of educational programming during humanitarian relief work, and therefore a lack of funding. Some of the primary concerns are that education requires a long-term commitment and that by providing schools, refugees will not want to return home. Past experiences show that this is not the case and that refugees will return to their country of origin at the first available opportunity, regardless of the presence of schools in the camps (Sinclair, 2002). In addition, an argument is made that lack of education in crisis situations can lead to further destabilization (Davies, 2004).

Furthermore, questions have been raised regarding international organizations' involvement in education. One of the contexts in which such involvement has been deemed appropriate is when conflicts are long term, leaving refugees exiled for years (Davies, 2004). The argument for intervention states that education is a necessity for reconstruction (Retamal et al., 1998) by providing the foundation upon which future development, both social and economic, can occur (Retamal & Aedo-Richmond, 1998).

The two justifications for education – education as a human right and education for the creation of human capital – while novel ideas at the time they were introduced, are now both fully accepted by the global community. Furthermore, these two strands of thought are not mutually exclusive. On the contrary, the human rights and human capital perspectives appear to bolster each other by providing supplementary arguments from entirely different perspectives.

Rationalization, Standardization and the Influence of Professionals

The belief that any event or procedure can be planned for and rationalized is pervasive in current world culture. In the case of emergency situations, such as natural disaster or war, this planning is now being extended from food and shelter to education. It is a move from basic relief to development, where the concern is to provide educational opportunities deemed necessary for the affected population's capacity after the emergency has passed (Retamal et al., 1998).

To legitimate themselves, organizations adopt "universalistic models" within which a consensus is achieved on such issues as human rights and education and it is assumed that these models have "universal world applicability" (Meyer *et al.*, 1997). The procedures used are modeled on what is deemed to be effective by the field at large and not necessarily because the methods themselves are the most effective. The neo-institutionalists[2] argue that bureaucracies spread because rationalized bureaucracy is seen as a social good, not because of efficiency, as there is often much decoupling of policy and practice (Finnemore, 1996). In addition to social merit, organizations have the desire to be seen as modern. For Meyer et al. (1997), the diffusion of ideas of modernity occurs largely due to international level organizations, and the professionals who work within them. International organizations, such as the United Nations (UN), provide not only an opportunity for "ideological discussion" (Meyer et al., 1997) on any topic, but are also a means of legitimizing such discourse.

DiMaggio and Powell (1983) discuss mimesis as one of the processes through which isomorphism [3] occurs. However, following along the lines of Meyer et al (1997), their primary argument states that structures are defined by a need for legitimacy rather than efficiency. Fields that are highly structured are often so due to a level of ambiguity. This uncertainty in how to operate promotes imitation, which leads to homogeneity (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983). Another aspect of rationalization concerns the definition of the field in which the standardization is occurring: for a field to exist it must be defined. This process of "structuration" involves an increase in interaction of relevant organizations as well as "the development of a mutual awareness among participants in a set of organizations that they are involved in a common enterprise" (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983, p. 148). By this definition, education in emergencies only emerged as an institutional field with the creation of INEE. As such, the processes of standardization that took place can be seen as a natural evolution.

In reviewing the work of neo-institutionalists, Finnemore (1996) highlights rationality as an inherent factor in modern bureaucracies, as well as a cultural value, structured in terms of means and ends. In western society, those ends are progress and justice (Finnemore, 1996). Although

progress and justice may be the ends of rational thought, they can also provide the means for rationalization by highlighting the two types of discourse prevalent in much educational work. Progress is most often thought of in economic terms and can be seen to fit with ideas of education for the development of human capital, while notions of justice are synonymous with equality, and conjured in discussions of education as a human right (Finnemore, 1996). These norms are reflected both in the process used to create the MSEE and within the organization's discourse, which follows two main threads: human rights discourse and human capital discourse.

Standardization can occur in one of three ways: through influence and authority gained by a large market share; through government regulation; or, as the MSEE were created, through voluntary consensus. Consensus standards value the multiple interests that created them and therefore attempt to avoid any undue influence by certain parties (Mendel, 2001). They can be specific rules defining the proper tool for a job or may define a broader "socially constructed product" (Meyer, 1997, p. 1). In either case attempts are being made to create a formula to define and regulate activities (Mendel, 2001). In addition, Meyer (1997) proposes the idea of "content-free standardization" (p. 10), which looks at processes and procedures rather than outcomes and goals. In essence "they tell organizations, regardless of substantive mission, how to manage, account, evaluate and regulate" (Meyer, 1997, p. 10).

Neo-institutionalists believe standardization arises from two main causes: homogenization and rationalization (Meyer, 1997). Accordingly, standardization occurs when there is perceived to be a "right way" to do things. Diverse situations have underlying commonalities and have arisen due to similar reasons. As such there is presumably one correct way of analyzing those situations. Meyer argues that standardization happens at a gentler pace in the human and social domains because of people's resistance to non-universalistic ideas. In the aftermath of World War II, scientific rationalization provided a framework through which to see similarities across all people. As an organization, the UN embodied theses ideas and principles within a "common rationalized frame" (Meyer, 1997, p. 8), which in turn created an epidemic of standardization, which can be viewed as "a cultural phenomenon" (Meyer, 1997, p. 9). In the field of education, practices have become standardized under the influence of the West/North and the formal model of education has been copied and spread throughout the world. Much of this is due to not only the rationalization of education but also the increasing professionalization of practitioners (Meyer & Ramirez, 2003).

With this increasing professionalization, as well as the increasing importance of professionals, an argument has been put forward that standardization is not due to world models of influence alone, but rather to "organizational variables" (Chabbott, 1998, p.207). It is the processes within the field of international development organizations that drive worldwide educational change, and the key carriers of that information are the professionals. Professionals, whether in the field of international development as discussed by Chabbott, or in humanitarian work, live within their own society, defined by the norms and values they deem important, rather than being tied exclusively to their state. These norms and values essentially stem from a global or world culture that exists above the state level. As the participants in conferences such as the WCEFA or the creation of the MSEE, a varied group is able to develop professional consensus and generate political commitment, two aspects crucial to the success of the MSEE.

Established global norms, stemming largely from Western ideas of justice and progress influence and are, in turn, influenced by prevalent discourses in the fields of international development and education (Chabbott, 2003; Meyer, 1997). The presence of both a human rights and a human

capital based discourse has effected the creation of the MSEE, both directly and indirectly. The direct influence occurs in the actual presence of the two types of language in the documents themselves. However, it is through the processes of rationalization, standardization and professionalization that the MSEE have emerged as a coherent and accepted set of guidelines, abiding by the discourses mentioned as well as the larger norms of world society.

Creation of the MSEE
The creation of the Minimum Standards occurred quite rapidly. Only 18 months passed between the first meeting of the Working Group on MSEE (WGMSEE) and the launch of the MSEE in December 2004. The process used, and the speed at which it took place, shows a strong connection to global norms in the fields of education and humanitarian relief. In addition, it is apparent that there existed a large degree of consensus at the beginning of the project for it to have occurred so rapidly.

The process of developing the MSEE began with the creation of a working group, followed by regional consultations, then input from the INEE electronic mailing list and was concluded with a peer-review. The final document was launched in December 2004 at the Second Global Inter-Agency Consultation on Education in Emergencies and Early Recovery in Cape Town, South Africa, a conference organized by INEE.

Within the following two years, the working group was constituted, developed a framework for the standards, following guidelines of the Sphere Project, held four regional consultations, completed a peer-review and launched the MSEE. Within the space of five months, from January to May 2004, the WGMSEE was organized and held all four regional consultations. In addition, by the end of 2004 the group was ready to launch the standards, showing both a large amount of organization and coordination among all the parties involved as well as a clear vision of the final standards from the beginning.

Once the working group was established, the following step was to involve as broad a base as possible in the creation of the minimum standards. According to the INEE website, over 2,200 people were involved in some capacity over the course of the entire project. A large portion of these participants came through prior meetings that the delegates to the regional consultations conducted. At the regional consultations, a total of 137 delegates from 51 countries convened to develop minimum standards based on their own expertise and the information gathered at the local meetings. While not representative of every country, there was a fairly large base present at the consultations.

With the regional consultations complete, the documents were passed on, as planned, for final writing and a peer-review. The peer-review group was made up of representatives with expertise in the areas of education, child protection, health and humanitarian issues (INEE, 2005) and the review was conducted via email under the coordination of a hired consultant (INEE WGMSEE, 2004) [4]. Of particular concern to the members of the WGMSEE was that the thoughts that emerged during the regional consultations not be omitted in the drafting of the final document. As such, there was an awareness of the need for the reviewers to "represent a diverse group, not just experts from the West/North" (INEE WGMSEE, 2004, p. 7).

The process of creating the MSEE, as described above, fits well with globally accepted practices and norms regarding education and humanitarian assistance. Chabbott (2003), in her analysis of the WCEFA, describes how conferences follow a script developed over 50 years of various

international gatherings. This script entails problematizing an issue, having professionals develop a report, statement or declaration, gathering a diverse and representative group of people to discuss, and releasing the final document. By following this script, conferences gain support and legitimacy rapidly as they invoke "ideals that [are] … taken for granted in international discourse." While the WCEFA and the creation of the MSEE are different enterprises, they are comparable as they both have as their final outcome a document that is to be used both for practice and advocacy. Although not a conference, the creation of the MSEE followed a path similar to that of preparation for the WCEFA, where the regional consultations and professionals essentially created the draft of the final EFA declaration.

Following the type of script set out by international education conferences could happen for one of two reasons. The first is that the script is so internalized that it isn't even questioned and all those involved believed that this was how the process should happen. The other possibility is that the script is known and consciously followed so as to avoid future reprimand or decreases in the legitimacy of the final product. It was most likely a combination of these two factors at work, with participants believing that this method was correct and knowing that the project could suffer from a lack of legitimacy in the future if it were not done this way.

The similarities extend also to the ways in which participants were invited to attend as efforts were made to include a diverse group, both in geographic and professional terms. This idea of inclusiveness is one way in which INEE attempts to legitimate the standards that were created. Having a broad based consultative process is certainly considered the appropriate thing to do according to world culture. This is due to the debate in global society having shifted from one of exclusion to one of inclusion (Ramirez, 2001). For example, in many countries today all persons are considered citizens regardless of race or gender, rather than being excluded based on these characteristics.

Not only did the process of creating the MSEE follow the same script as conferences such as the WCEFA, the process of voluntary consensus used in standardization suggests the dominant role of global norms. According to Mendel (2001) there are three ways in which standardization occurs: large market share; government regulation; or voluntary consensus, as was used in the creation of the MSEE. This fits within the framework of current world culture, where authoritarian, top-down rule is frowned upon by global culture and participatory group processes are seen as the best way to do things. The consensus model must include a broad base of stakeholders and is, by nature, a highly rationalized process.

In the case of the MSEE, the two-year time frame provides further support for the premise that consensus existed before the process began, as there would have been little room or time for fundamental disagreements. Certainly, the existing standards within the fields of humanitarian relief and education, such as the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) and the Education for All (EFA) declaration, helped create a base off of which to develop the standards. It is possible that the rapid timeframe only shows that there was an effective leader in place who kept the process on track, or that potentially disruptive political forces were uninterested or unwilling to get involved. However, a closer analysis of the regional documents and the MSEE reveals that existing standards and principles were relied on heavily and are likely to have created the consensus around which the MSEE were formed. In essence, the members of the working group knew beforehand what the final product would look like since to be accepted by the field and to have any effect, it would need to use language and espouse ideas acceptable to global society.

The analysis of the process above shows that the creation of the Minimum Standards followed a script accepted within the international community and answers the question of how the MSEE came about. To examine how the document is rationalized, the following sections present and discuss findings based on two ideas: invoking global standards and invoking global principles. These sections also allow for an analysis of how the discourses of human rights and human capital are incorporated into the documents. Furthermore, by analyzing both the regional documents and the MSEE, I am able to evaluate how the regional and international influences were reconciled. While the process of creating the Minimum Standards supports the notion that global principles are influential, further evidence can be found in an analysis of the content of the MSEE.

Global Standards in the MSEE
One of the ways in which the creation of MSEE is rationalized is through invoking pre-existing standards. This ranges from simply referencing "international standards" in general to specifically citing articles of conventions. For example, the MSEE refer to article 13 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC), which addresses children's right to have a say in matters that affect them. In addition, the sub-heading to the first section of the document is entitled "Links to International Legal Instruments" and standard 2 in the Education Policy and Coordination section states that "Emergency education activities take into account national and international educational policies and standards and the learning needs of affected populations" (INEE, 2004, p. 73). Invoking existing global standards both places the MSEE within an existing framework, which in turn provides legitimacy for the standards.

Other than the CRC, some of the standards mentioned include international human rights and humanitarian law, the Sphere Project, EFA and the UDHR. The frequency with which these instruments are mentioned varies across the documents, with more occurrences in the MSEE. However, it is hard to know if this is due to an increased desire to have references to the instruments included or merely because the MSEE are much longer than the regional documents. Table 1 (next page), shows that any standard mentioned in the regional document appears in the MSEE. In addition, the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights appears in the MSEE, but none of the regional documents, showing that the MSEE was not simply a compilation of the regional documents.

One possible explanation for the increases in references to existing global standards is that those writing the final MSEE, as opposed to the regional documents, were very aware of the need to have the standards accepted by the field and the larger international community. In an effort to make sure that the MSEE were marketable, the links to other international instruments were made clear. The first sentence of the introduction to the MSEE begins by stating that the right to education is "articulated in many international conventions and documents…" The text then goes on to mention six different documents. This establishes the MSEE as working within the frame of the established right to education, a right that is not forfeited in situations of crisis or emergency.

The regional documents, on the other hand, are far less explicit. As can be seen in Table 1, the Africa document mentions only EFA and the Geneva Convention as specific references. The reference to the Geneva Convention appears in a discussion of the distance of schools from borders and is mentioned as a source of a possible pre-existing standard. The exception to the regional documents is the Latin America one, as it begins with a legal framework section that clearly states that the minimum standards are based on the Sphere Project, UDHR and the CRC.

Beyond that, however, as with the other regions, the majority of references are to international standards or international human rights law in general.

Table 1: Invoking Global Standards: Key Word Count by Document

Key Word	Document				
	Africa	Asia	Latin America	Middle East, North Africa & Europe	MSEE
International standards	2	5	2	1	4
International human rights law	0	1	0	1	4
International humanitarian law / Geneva Convention	1	0	3	4	4
UDHR	0	1	2	0	3
CRC	0	3	4	4	8
EFA / Dakar Framework for Action	5	5	0	4	14
CEDAW	0	1	1	0	1
Sphere Project	3	1	1	2	18
Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees	0	1	0	0	2
MDG	0	2	0	0	3
International Convenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights	0	0	0	0	1
World Food Program	0	0	0	1	1

Table 1 also highlights that EFA or the Dakar Framework for Action is mentioned more frequently than any other convention across all five documents, a total of 14 times in the MSEE alone. However, there is no mention of this framework, or the movement as a whole, in the Latin America document. This is a striking omission as the sense from the other documents is that the MSEE are built off of the Dakar Framework. It does, however, reinforce the idea that the writers of the MSEE were more influenced by the need to place the MSEE within the existing global culture than were those at the regional level. Mentions of the Sphere Project show a similar trend. At the regional level it is hardly referenced, however it appears 18 times in the MSEE, showing a clear effort by the writers to make the MSEE relevant to the field of humanitarian relief.

This multitude of references to other standards shows a desire to be in line with global norms. In conjunction with this desire, such references provide a means of increasing the legitimacy of the MSEE. Another means of both increasing the legitimacy of the document and embracing global norms is through the type of discourse employed.

Invoking Global Principles: Human Rights Discourse
Human rights discourse is present throughout the five documents, yet is more pervasive in the MSEE than the regional documents. An initial key word count, presented in Table 2 below, reveals

that the word "rights" appears only 6 times in the Africa document compared to 74 times in the MSEE. In other words, it appears approximately once every three pages in the Africa document compared to once a page in the MSEE. This implies a greater influence of norms at the global level, norms that dictate what language is considered appropriate as a means of presenting ideas. In contrast, words such as charity and religious obligation are not present.

Table 2: Invoking Global Principles: Human Rights - Key Word Count by Document

Key Word	Document				
	Africa	Asia	Latin America	Middle East, North Africa & Europe	MSEE
Rights	6	7	11	24	74
Dignity	3	1	1	0	10
Equity / equitable	10	6	8	7	3
Tolerance	1	0	1	2	3
Equal / equally / equality	2	3	0	2	7
Diversity	1	2	5	8	10
Peace	3	2	1	5	9

In contemporary culture, one way of presenting ideas at the global level is to frame them in terms of human rights. According to Suarez and Ramirez (2005), human rights discourse has become increasingly influential as the expansion of education has advanced the empowerment of individuals and allowed persons to see themselves as members of a world society as opposed to citizens of nation-states. This stems from predominantly Western ideals, where the individual is paramount, yet represents another shift from language of exclusion to inclusion. In this case, although each person is still a citizen of a particular nation, the understanding exists that all persons are human beings and members of a larger global society that is increasingly interconnected.

If the MSEE were simply a combination of the regional documents, one would expect the references to specific words to be somewhat proportional. However, this does not happen because of the greater prevalence of norms at the global level. Those writing the final Minimum Standards for Education in Emergencies were clearly aware of the environment into which the document would be released. For the MSEE to be accepted and adopted, they would need to be consistent with the language used to market such ideas within the fields of education, development and humanitarian relief. In today's culture, it is not sufficient to have a brilliant idea; it must be packaged and presented in a manner that will make it acceptable and understandable to as many people as possible. Using the language of human rights, to which everyone can relate, creates a broad appeal for the ideas and practices proposed in the Minimum Standards.

It is interesting to note that the number of times "rights" is used in the Middle East, Europe and North Africa document is proportional to its use in the MSEE. As this was the final consultation before the writing of the MSEE there may have been a greater sense on the part of the consultation delegates that the document they were creating needed to be globally acceptable, as opposed to just

being concerned with the region. On the other hand, perhaps the participants at this consultation were simply more in-touch with world culture and global norms. Given that much of human rights language and discourse stems from the West, the European participants in particular would have been in a position to inject such language into the consultation deliberations.

Other terms related to human rights, such as dignity and diversity, also appear frequently. The use of such language makes a clear statement that those who created the MSEE are embedded within the global society of the 21st century, as human rights language has become a part of world culture. As Suarez and Ramirez (2005) have shown, human rights discourse is part of today's world culture. Therefore the use of such discourse helps to legitimate the document. Had the MSEE been created 100 years ago, the language would have been remarkably different with little to no reference to rights and much discussion of god and religion, language that is strikingly absent from these sources.

Invoking Global Principles: Human Capital Discourse
Another type of global discourse that is present is that of human capital. As described above, human capital discourse is not necessarily explicitly economic in nature. What it does imply is a concern for future development of the capacities and capabilities of the learners. This implies an understanding by those creating the MSEE that education in emergencies is not being done simply because there is a global right to education but because education has a real purpose in creating a society that has potential and capacity. This type of discourse appears in the form of more practical concerns, whereas the human rights discourse can be viewed as the overarching framework through which to legitimate the standards.

The following excerpt from the MSEE shows the concern of the writers that any education provided be useful not only during the emergency, but afterwards as well.

Communities want to know that governments will recognize their children's education, and that their children will be able to use their education to gain access to higher education and employment. The main concern is whether governments, educational institutions and employers recognize the curricula and resulting certificates. Aside from legitimating student test performance, graduation certificates recognize student achievements and motivate them to attend school. In refugee situations, certification typically involves substantial negotiations with both the asylum and home countries. Ideally, in longer-term refugee situations, the curricula need to 'face both ways' and be acceptable in both the country of origin and the host country. This requires significant regional and inter-agency coordination to harmonize educational activities and refugee caseloads in different countries. (INEE, 2004, p. 54)

There is a sense from this excerpt that a great deal of concern is placed on the future of those participating in emergency education activities. The standards dictate that an effort is to be made to provide an education that can serve the learners, regardless of where they end up in the future.

Another aspect of the human capital discourse is that the education to be provided during emergencies be a "relevant education". The terms of reference for the MSEE define relevant education as taking local customs, practices and beliefs into consideration while also integrating "the long-term needs children will have in society in the future, possibly beyond the immediate community"(INEE, 2004, p. 82). Throughout the documents, there are references to education being relevant to the future needs of the learners. This is apt because one of the main concerns in

education in emergencies is that it be education that is valuable both to the learners and to their community and society.

One argument for providing education in emergencies revolves around the need to preserve human capital, as children who are living in an emergency or crisis situation today will, hopefully, in the future be citizens of a country where they are needed as active contributors. This is especially important when reconstruction must take place as it relies greatly on a population that is willing and educated to do so. For example, the MSEE state that "the curricula adopted should be relevant to the present and anticipated future needs of the learners" (p. 53), a view that incorporates the changing climate of emergency situations.

Table 3: Invoking Global Principles: Human Capital - Key Word Count by Document

Key Word	Document				
	Africa	Asia	Latin America	Middle East, North Africa & Europe	MSEE
Relevant education / learning opportunities	1	2	0	3	5
Relevant curricula	0	0	1	1	2
Future	2	5	0	3	12
Hope for the future	0	0	0	0	2
Future need	0	1	0	2	1
Life skills	11	5	0	4	6
Capacity building	1	1	0	2	12

While the discourse of human capital is prevalent in the MSEE, it is not as strong in the regional documents. Table 3, above, shows that while each regional document does contain various terms implying a thought to the future, it is only in the final standards that all these terms are included and some language is added. In particular, the phrase "hope for the future" appears on the first page of the MSEE and again in the introduction to the section on teaching and learning. However, this phrase is not present in any of the regional documents. The use of "hope for the future", right from the start of the document shows that the writers are rationalizing the standards by showing that education in emergencies can have long-term implications. In addition, they are using discourse accepted by the larger education community to argue that education is not simply a right, but also has economic and political implications.

Conclusion
The research presented provides a case study of how global level forces influence and shape processes and discourse. The fact that the MSEE were created at all shows that standardization has spread to new areas. The standards analyzed provide an orderly framework from which to approach an inherently chaotic situation. Examination of the process reveals that a script was followed in keeping with global norms associated with the international development

community, and the discourse used follows along the lines of two primary justifications for providing educational services: human rights and human capital.

From an academic standpoint, this research reveals that disparate situations, even ones that are highly disorganized, can be rationalized under similar terms. A script that works in the creation of a global declaration or conference can also be used to create a set of standards. The consensus model, as described by Mendel (2001), provides legitimacy to the process.

In addition, a global level document will lose some regional and local relevance. For practitioners, understanding the influence of global norms on the creation of such standards and the language used within them allows those practitioners to contextualize the standards and be aware of adaptations that may be necessary given their own local context. This is not to say that having a global document serves no purpose. On the contrary, the existence of the INEE and the creation of the MSEE provide both international organizations and individual professionals a network and tool through which to lobby for increased attention to the educational needs of displaced populations. Regional documents could never hold the same sway in a world that values universalism.

Conflict and natural disasters can, and do, occur in all countries. When they take place in the industrialized world there are typically sufficient internal resources, infrastructure and mechanisms in place to cope with them. In developing countries, resources and infrastructure are often unavailable or nonexistent, while the need for and right to education remain. Global level influences have helped shape the discourses of the field, and education, once considered the domain of development, has now become a part of humanitarian assistance.

Notes
[1]. In this context, to rationalize a situation is to make it understandable in terms of similar situations (Meyer, 1997)
[2]. Neo-institutionalist refers to scholars who "proposed that formal organizational structure reflected not only technical demands and resource dependencies, but was also shaped by institutional forces, including rational myths, knowledge legitimated through the educational system and the professions, public opinion, and the law." (Powell, 2007)
[3]. "… isomorphism is a constraining process that forces one unit in a population to resemble other units that face the same set of environmental conditions"(DiMaggio & Powell, 1983, p. 149).
[4]. Further details on the peer-reviewers were not available in the documents I obtained as they date from before the group was put in place

References
Aguilar, P., & Richmond, M. (1998). Emergency educational response in the Rwandan crisis. In G. Retamal & R. Aedo-Richmond (Eds.), *Education as a humanitarian response*. London: Cassell.

Chabbott, C. (1998). Constructing educational consensus: International development professionals and the World Conference on Education for All. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 18(3), 207-218.

Chabbott, C. (2003). *Constructing education for development: International organizations and education for all*. New York: RoutledgeFalmer.

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

DiMaggio, P. J., & Powell, W. D. (1983). The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields. *American Sociological Review*, 48(2), 147-160.

Finnemore, M. (1996). Norms, culture, and world politics: Insights from sociology's institutionalism. *International Organization*, 50(2), 325-347.

INEE. (2004). Minimum standards for education in emergencies, chronic crisis and early reconstruction. Paris, France.

INEE. (2005). Working group on minimum standards for education in emergencies. Retrieved January 6, 2005, from http://www.ineesite.org/standards/default.asp

INEE WGMSEE. (2004). WGMSEE Meeting Minutes, March 2004, INEE Working Group on Minimum Standards for Education in Emergencies. Geneva, Switzerland: INEE.

Mendel, P. J. (2001). Global models of organization: International management standards, reforms, and movements. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Department of Sociology. Stanford University, Stanford, CA.

Meyer, J. W. (1997). Cultural conditions of standardization. Department of Sociology, Stanford University.

Meyer, J. W., Boli, J., Thomas, G. M., & Ramirez, F. O. (1997). World society and the nation-state. *The American Journal of Sociology*, 103(1), 144-181.

Meyer, J. W., & Ramirez, F. O. (2003). The world institutionalization of education. In J. Schriewer (Ed.), *Discourse formation in comparative education* (2nd rev. ed., pp. xi, 366 p.). Frankfurt am Main; New York: P. Lang.

Powell, Walter W. (2007) The new institutionalism. To appear in *The International encyclopedia of organization studies*. Sage Publishers

Ramirez, F. (2001). World society and the political incorporation of women. Special Issue on Gender Studies of the *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie*(October), 356-374.

Retamal, G., & Aedo-Richmond, R. (Eds.). (1998). *Education as a humanitarian response*. London: Cassell.

Retamal, G., Devadoss, M., & Richmond, M. (1998). UNESCO-PEER: Lessons learned in eastern Africa. In G. Retamal & R. Aedo-Richmond (Eds.), *Education as a humanitarian response*. London: Cassell.

Sinclair, M. (1998). Refugee Education in the mid-1990s. In G. Retamal & R. Aedo-Richmond (Eds.), *Education as a humanitarian response*. London: Cassell.

Sinclair, M. (2002). Planning education in and after emergencies. Paris: UNESCO, International Institute for Educational Planning.

Suarez, D., & Ramirez, F. (2005). Human rights and the emergence of human rights education. In C. A. Torres & A. Teodoro (Eds.), *Critique and utopia: New developments in the sociology of education*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.