

WORKING PAPER

Volume **2009** Number **327**

Spanning Citizenship Spaces Through Transnational Coalitions: The Case of the Global Campaign for Education

John Gaventa and Marjorie Mayo
June 2009



Citizenship DRC



Institute of
Development Studies

About IDS

The Institute of Development Studies is one of the world's leading organisations for research, teaching and communications on international development. Founded in 1966, the Institute enjoys an international reputation based on the quality of its work and the rigour with which it applies academic skills to real world challenges. Its purpose is to understand and explain the world, and to try to change it – to influence as well as to inform.

IDS hosts five dynamic research programmes, five popular postgraduate courses, and a family of world-class web-based knowledge services. These three spheres are integrated in a unique combination – as a development knowledge hub, IDS is connected into and is a convenor of networks throughout the world.

The Institute is home to approximately 80 researchers, 50 knowledge services staff, 50 support staff and about 150 students at any one time. But the IDS community extends far beyond, encompassing an extensive network of partners, former staff and students across the development community worldwide.



For further information on IDS publications and for a free catalogue, contact:
IDS Communication Unit
Institute of Development Studies
at the University of Sussex
Brighton BN1 9RE, UK

Tel: +44 (0) 1273 915637
Fax: +44 (0) 1273 621202
E-mail: bookshop@ids.ac.uk
Web: www.ids.ac.uk/ids/bookshop

IDS is a charitable company, limited by guarantee and registered in England (No. 877338).

IDS WORKING PAPER 327

Spanning Citizenship Spaces Through Transnational Coalitions: The Case of the Global Campaign for Education

John Gaventa and Marjorie Mayo

June 2009

Spanning Citizenship Spaces Through Transnational Coalitions: The Case of the Global Campaign for Education
John Gaventa and Marjorie Mayo
IDS Working Paper 327

First published by the Institute of Development Studies in June 2009
© Institute of Development Studies 2009
ISSN: 2040-0209 ISBN: 978 1 85864 765 7

A catalogue record for this publication is available from the British Library.

All rights reserved. Reproduction, copy, transmission, or translation of any part of this publication may be made only under the following conditions:

- with the prior permission of the publisher; or
- with a licence from the Copyright Licensing Agency Ltd., 90 Tottenham Court Road, London W1P 9HE, UK, or from another national licensing agency; or
- under the terms set out below.

This publication is copyright, but may be reproduced by any method without fee for teaching or non-profit purposes, but not for resale. Formal permission is required for all such uses, but normally will be granted immediately. For copying in any other circumstances, or for re-use in other publications, or for translation or adaptation, prior written permission must be obtained from the publisher and a fee may be payable.

Available from:
Communication Unit
Institute of Development Studies
at the University of Sussex
Brighton BN1 9RE, UK
Tel: +44 (0) 1273 915637
Fax: +44 (0) 1273 621202
E-mail: bookshop@ids.ac.uk
Web: www.ids.ac.uk/ids/bookshop

Typeset by IDS, Brighton UK. Printed by Nexus, Brighton, UK.
IDS is a charitable company limited by guarantee and registered in England (No. 877338).

Spanning Citizenship Spaces Through Transnational Coalitions: The Case of the Global Campaign for Education

John Gaventa and Marjorie Mayo

Summary

How do changing patterns of power and governance affect how and where citizens mobilise collectively to claim their rights? This paper presents a case study of the Global Campaign for Education (GCE), a civil society coalition that came together in 1999 to mobilise people across the world in a campaign for the right to quality, free education for all. The paper interrogates the experience of the GCE to better understand how advocacy movements meet the inherent difficulties of mobilising across different levels of governance to achieve globally recognised rights. The GCE is widely perceived as a successful example of a campaign coalition. Its deep, pre-existing roots in collective organisation in the global South were the foundation for this success. Inclusive and representative formal structures, collective framing of campaign issues and careful recognition of the different roles played by actors in different locations were key factors in building the campaign coalition. The case study discussed the way that involvement in a global campaign affects the citizenship identities of those involved. A sense of global citizenship amongst activists added to rather than replacing a sense of local and national citizenship; as governance is multiscaled, so citizenship can therefore be multidimensional. The challenge is how to continue to build and sustain inclusive and democratic coalitions which span multiple sites and spaces of citizenship.

Keywords: education; right to education; global citizenship; campaigning; Global Campaign on Education; transnational social movements; global governance; NGOs; MDGs; citizen action.

John Gaventa is a Professor at the Institute of Development Studies, with over 25 years experience of research, training and practice in participation and development in both North and South. He is currently a member of the Power, Participation and Social Change Team at IDS, and Director of the Development Research Centre on Citizenship, Participation and Accountability. He has written widely on issues of power, citizen action and participation.

Marjorie Mayo is Professor in Community Development at Goldsmiths College, University of London. She has worked in the community sector, local government and internationally. Her publications include *Imagining Tomorrow: Adult Education for Transformation* (1997), *Cultures, Communities and Identities* (2000), *Global Citizens* (2005) and *The Dilemmas of Development Work* (2008, with Paul Hoggett and Chris Miller).

Contents

Summary, keywords	3
Author notes	4
Preface	6
Acknowledgements	7
Acronyms	7
1 Introduction	9
2 The conceptual context: the challenges of linking across citizenship spaces	12
2.1 The challenges of transnational coalition building	14
2.2 Emerging global citizenship?	15
3 Who governs education? Power across boundaries	16
4 The dynamics of mobilising across spaces: the Global Campaign for Education	19
4.1 The GCE in action in India and Nigeria	21
4.2 Exploring the complexity of change – ‘up-down, down-up and sideways’	23
5 Confronting the challenges of building transnational coalitions	25
5.1 Roots of the Campaign	26
5.2 Representative structures	28
5.3 Inclusive framing of issues and messages	29
5.4 Seeing the value across levels: complementarities and synergies	31
5.5 The material base of the issue and the campaign	32
5.6 Key lessons in spanning the global, national and local	34
6 Implications for citizenship	35
7 Conclusions	37
References	41

Local Global Working Group preface

Working paper series on Citizen Engagements in a Globalising World

Around the world, globalisation, changes in governance and emerging transnational social movements are creating new spaces and opportunities for citizen engagement. Indeed, some would argue that citizenship itself is being de-linked from territorial boundaries, as power is becoming more multi-layered and multi-scaled, and governance increasingly involves both state and non-state actors, which often are transnational.

One of the research programmes of the Development Research Centre on Citizenship, Participation and Accountability, the Working Group on Citizen Engagements in a Globalising World explores the significance of these changes to poor and disenfranchised citizens. In particular, the group's work explores how the diffusion of power and governance resulting from globalisation gives rise to new meanings and identities of citizenship and new forms and formations of citizen action. The research programme is asking questions across local-national-regional scales related to

- The dynamics of mobilisation, paying particular attention to new forms and tensions of alliance-building and claim-making;
- The politics of intermediation around representation, legitimacy, accountability;
- The politics of knowledge around framing issues, the power to frame, dynamics of contestation across forms of expertise and ways of knowing; and
- The dynamics and processes of inclusion and exclusion to examine who gains and who loses.

The group's work is a unique contribution to a vast literature on transnational citizen action in the way in which each project examines the vertical links from the local to the global from a citizen's perspective, looking up and out from the site of everyday struggles. And while much normative and conceptual literature examines the concept of global citizenship, few studies of the theme are actually grounded in empirical study of concrete cases that illustrate how global reconfigurations of power affect citizens' own perceptions of their rights and how to claim them.

The group is made up of 15 researchers carrying out field projects in India, South Africa, Nigeria, Philippines, Kenya, The Gambia, Brazil and South Africa, as well as other cross-national projects in Latin America and Africa. The projects examine new forms of citizen engagement across a number of sectors, including the environment, trade, education, livelihoods, health and HIV/AIDS work and occupational disease, agriculture and land – and across different types of engagement, ranging from transnational campaigns and social movements, to participation of citizens in new institutionally designed fora.

The working papers in this series on Citizen Engagements in a Globalising World will be available on the Citizenship DRC website www.drc-citizenship.org, as they are completed. The Citizenship DRC is funded by the UK's Department for International Development.

Acknowledgements

The authors wish to thank members of the Global Citizen Engagements Working Group of the DRC on Citizenship, Participation and Accountability for their comments on earlier drafts, as well as comments received from Rajesh Tandon, Linda Waldman, David Archer, and members of the writer's circle in the Participation, Power and Social Change Team. Thanks to Karen Brock for editorial assistance. Many thanks to Kate Newman for her background report on Nigeria, and also to the many civil society activists and others who gave their time in the UK, India and Nigeria. The findings and conclusions here represent those of the authors alone.

Acronyms

ANCEFA	Africa Network Campaign on Education for All
CEF	Commonwealth Education Fund
CSACEFA	Civil Society Action Coalition on Education for All
EFA	Education for All
FTI	Fast Track Initiative
GCE	Global Campaign for Education
ILO	International Labour Organisation
IMF	International Monetary Fund
INGO	International Non-Governmental Organisation
MDG	Millennium Development Goal
NCE	National Coalition for Education

1 Introduction

Globalisation ... has introduced a new space and framework for acting: politics is no longer subject to the same boundaries as before, and is no longer tied solely to state actors and institutions, the result being that additional players, new roles, new resources, unfamiliar rules and new contradictions and conflicts appear on the scene. In the old game, each playing piece made one move only. This is no longer true of the new nameless game for power and domination.

Ulrich Beck, *Power in the Global Age* (2005: 3–4)

Millions of parents, teachers and children around the world are calling on their governments to provide free, good quality, basic education for all the world's children. They are part of the Global Campaign for Education; we add our voice to their call.

Nelson Mandela and Graca Machel, www.campaignforeducation.org/en/about/about-gce (accessed February 2009)

How do changing patterns of power and governance affect how and where citizens mobilise collectively to claim their rights? In recent years, as Ulrich Beck's words indicate, a number of changes related to globalisation and governance have challenged our assumptions about where power resides, and how and where civil society organisations can best engage to bring about significant policy changes.

On one hand, globalisation has created new opportunities and entry points for change at supra-national levels, be they regional or international. This has led to a growing focus on transnational citizen action, global advocacy and global social movements as the most effective way to achieve universally recognised human rights. On the other hand, some argue that the only way to challenge global power is through a focus at the national and local levels of governance, with an emphasis on national policies or grassroots citizen action.

This paper argues that in the current reality neither view is sufficient by itself. The impact of globalisation on citizen action can be seen as the need for social movements and advocacy coalitions to work either globally, nationally or locally. Rather than taking this view, we argue that the greater challenge is how to build effective and inclusive advocacy coalitions that cut across the multiple levels or spaces of change brought on by shifting patterns of governance in a global context. We suggest that vertical models of change which move along a linear local–global continuum do not capture the complex reality that advocacy movements must face in order to bring about effective change. Yet tensions arise as advocacy campaigns and social movements attempt to link their voices and build their legitimacy across the multiple centres of power and spaces of engagement which characterise new patterns of globalisation. When advocacy movements are able to manage these tensions and mobilise effectively and across spaces, new – more multidimensional – identities and understandings of citizenship may emerge than are found in any single space alone.

One very striking example of the multiple levels of policy formation – and therefore the need to campaign at many different levels for effective change – is found in the area of education. The field of education is replete with global policy statements. The UN Declaration of Human Rights declares the right to education; similar calls came from global conferences in Jomtien and Dakar; and the second Millennium Development Goal (MDG) is ‘Education for All’ (EFA). This MDG is centrally important in its own right, but also, through increasing girls’ access to schooling, has an impact on the third MDG of promoting gender equality and empowering women. Education provides the knowledge and skills for development, and most importantly, ‘it is education that creates the “voice” through which rights can be claimed and protected’ more generally (Watkins 2000: 63).

Despite the global proclamations and targets, the goal of education for all remains elusive. According to recent reports, at current rates 75 countries will fail to get enough children through primary school to meet the 2015 target by the end of this century, let alone in the next six years. Nearly 80 million children remain out of school and 800 million adults are unable to read and write.

In response to this long-standing gap, four large NGOs came together in 1999 to establish the Global Campaign for Education (GCE) and to promote the realisation of the right to quality, free and compulsory education for all. Two of these founding organisations – ActionAid and Oxfam International – are international NGOs (INGOs). The third, Education International, is an international association of teachers’ unions formed in 1993, which brought resources from international trade union organisations to the campaign. The fourth founder member, the Global March Against Child Labour, is an international movement concerned with children’s rights, based in the global South. By 2007, the GCE had involved over 18 million people and thousands of organisations in over 100 countries under the EFA banner. It has emerged as one of the longest-lasting, and by many counts, most effective transnational campaigns, attempting to bring together local, national, regional and international voices for change.

This is not, of course, to imply that the GCE provides any simplistic or unproblematic model of how to bring about change. On the contrary, building any such advocacy coalition involves multiple challenges and contestations. Global actions may be perceived as unrepresentative or even undermining to the efforts of those engaging at national and local levels of governance. The question of ‘who legitimately speaks for whom’ constitutes a continuing issue within civil society organisations and social movements locally as well as internationally, across both global South and global North. Further, trade unions organise in very different ways from NGOs and social movements, leading to mutual suspicions and potential conflicts. And yet, as subsequent sections illustrate, the GCE has faced and survived precisely such challenges and provides evidence therefore of how differences may be negotiated, and how trust may be built across a diversity of interests, experiences and organisational cultures.

Using the GCE as a case study, this paper interrogates how advocacy movements meet the inherent difficulties of mobilising across multiple levels of governance to achieve globally recognised rights. We explore the following questions:

- How has the changing landscape of global governance affected how citizens mobilise collectively to achieve the right to education?
- What have been the dynamics of mobilisation across spaces of engagement, from local to global, and their interaction?
- How has the GCE worked as an alliance? Which structures and approaches have enabled voices of its various actors to be heard most effectively across levels and spaces of engagement?
- How did the involvement of activists in the GCE change their views of themselves as citizens?
- Does engagement in campaigns which are relatively successfully linked across borders contribute to the emergence of new forms of global citizenship?

The research began in 2006 with interviews with a number of INGO and trade union activists, primarily in the UK, to explore the general challenge of building campaigns that cut across local, national and international arenas. Focusing then on the GCE as a relatively 'successful' case, stakeholders in international NGOs and trade union organisations involved in the coalition were interviewed in the UK as well as in India and Nigeria, both of which had national coalitions active in the GCE.¹ In addition to these interviews and local visits, there were also opportunities to participate in GCE campaign events in UK, including one in Parliament, and several organised around the 2007 Global Week of Action.

Findings were fed back to stakeholders to check for accuracy, and were presented at a workshop. Participants included stakeholders involved in the GCE as well as those involved in other forms of global citizen advocacy. They explored research findings and conclusions, and discussed potential policy implications.

Before focusing upon the case study findings, the first section of this paper provides a brief overview of the key theoretical debates that set the context for the research. The second section discusses the changing governance landscape of education policies, which has given rise to the need for integrated advocacy movements aiming to bring about mutually re-enforcing change at all levels of governance. The third section then summarises key background information about the GCE itself, and its work in and across multiple spaces of governance, arguing that how it has worked challenges a linear or vertical local–national–global model of change. Section four analyses key factors which enabled the GCE's relative success at building and sustaining its coalition, including its strong national and local roots, governance structures, inclusive framing of the campaign messages, mutual synergy of actors and actions across spaces and long term resources for

1 In each country, interviews were carried out with a range of stakeholders at national level, including CSOs participating in the GCE either directly or via its constituent member organisations. Most of the interviews were focused on stakeholders working at the national level, but a few interviews were also carried out during visits to rural areas in Andhra Pradesh, India and northern and western Nigeria, where there was also the opportunity to meet local teachers, parents and children, and to observe village meetings.

sustainability.² Section five explores how such mobilisation across levels and spaces contributes to a changing sense of citizenship amongst those involved. Finally, the conclusion explores implications of this case for broader conceptual debates about how citizens mobilise to express their citizenship and claim their rights in light of the changing global landscape.

2 The conceptual context: the challenges of linking across citizenship spaces

Earlier work related to the DRC on Citizenship, Participation and Accountability has used the concept of 'spaces' to understand the sites in which citizens mobilise to express their voice and claim their rights (Cornwall 2002; Cornwall and Coelho 2006). While much of the earlier work focused on spaces of engagement at the local level, increasingly our work began to explore how national and international actors and policies also constrained spaces for local engagement, or opened up new spaces for citizen mobilisation. Our research began with the question of how to build links across local, national and global spaces and forms of citizen action.

While words like 'local', 'national' and 'global' are widely used in the discourses of the activists we interviewed, they are hotly contested in a variety of academic fields. For many anthropologists, all actions are local, whether they take place in a village or in the corridors of the World Bank. In the field of international relations, on the other hand, there is much discussion about the multi-layered or multi-scaled nature of local, national and global governance, and the relationships of power between them. For some, the nation–state remains pivotal, as the strategic site for weaving together the multiple channels of influence in global governance (Held 2002) while for others transnational structures and institutions of governance have effectively diminished the role of the nation state (Rosenau 2002). Others, especially coming from the field of critical geography, challenge such vertical conceptions of scale and the notion of a 'nested hierarchy' that the local–national–global continuum implies (Marston, Jones and Woodward 2005). Whilst aware of these academic debates, we have nevertheless used the terms 'local', 'national' and 'global' ourselves; and they are generally used by those we interviewed. Typically, they are used as shorthand for the different levels of policy formulation and policy implementation that are involved in education, and the different levels of governance.

For the purposes of this paper, we are interested in the spaces for new forms of citizen action which globalisation is opening up, and how they overlay or inter-relate with traditionally understood local, national and international levels of decision-making. Many argue that globalisation produces the possibilities and

² The term 'framing' refers to the ways in which issues, including campaign demands, are conceptualised and presented.

openings for new kinds of action, delinked from concepts of territory. In her work on denationalised citizenship practices and networks, for instance, Sassen argues that the 'cracking' of 'the national as container of social process and power (...) facilitates the ascendancy of sub and transnational spaces and actors in politico-civic processes' (2002: 217). Scholte argues that globalisation has produced a new kind of social space which he calls a 'globality (...) a realm that transcends the confines of territorial place, territorial distance and territorial borders.' He insists nevertheless that territoriality is still important: 'the point is not that globality has taken over from territoriality but that territoriality no longer has a monopoly on social geography that it exercised fifty years ago (...) territorial spaces now coexist and interrelate with global spaces' (2002: 326).

What seems common in much of this literature is that globalisation gives rise to new types of spaces in which citizens can mobilise to claim their rights – what scholars of collective action have thought of as new political opportunities (Tarrow 2005) – contributing in turn to new forms of transnational activism. For Tarrow, the emergence of transnational forms of action marks a scale shift in contentious politics, 'a change in the number and level of coordinated contentious actions to a different focal point, involving a new range of actors, different objects and broadening claims' (2005: 121). Scale shift can operate to two directions – upward or downward. Tarrow continues,

today's international system offers a special challenge for activists because it opens conduits for upward shift and can empower national, regional and local contention with international models of collective action. But by the same token, as new forms of contention move downward, their original meanings may diffuse and the forms of contention they produce may domesticate.

(2005: 121)

Tarrow goes on to offer a typology of forms of transnational activisms, a typology ranging from short-term instrumental and event-based coalitions to enduring federations and campaign coalitions. He argues that

campaign coalitions may be the wave of the transnational future. Their focus on a specific policy issue, their minimal institutionalisation, their capacity to shift venues in response to changing opportunities and threats, and their ability to make short-term tactical alliances according to the current focus of interest make them among the most fruitful strategies for transnational collaboration.

(2005: 179)

In many ways, as we shall argue, the GCE is a very good example of Tarrow's campaign coalition. While creating and entering new spaces of 'globality', it carries with it, as do many such coalitions, territorial and vertically understood forms of organisation. How coalitions navigate the challenges that Tarrow and others have identified, when attempting to build sustainable and democratically accountable coalitions for effective change, is a further focus of this study.

2.1 The challenges of transnational coalition building

Tarrow argues that to be enduring, transnational coalitions must take into account a series of factors. These include mutually acceptable ways of framing issues, the establishment of trust and credible commitments. It is also important to have ways of managing differences – including power differences – between coalition partners, and to have selective incentives which motivate coalition partners with short-term local gains as well as longer-term strategic goals.

Other writers have pointed to similar challenges in building successful transnational coalitions. Florini writes of the importance of ‘rootedness’, arguing that ‘transnational civil society cannot float free in a global ether. It must be firmly connected to local reality’ (Florini 2000: 217). That connection to local reality can give international campaigns legitimacy, and it can provide them with a representative base. Grass roots local groups can also benefit from the vertical links to global campaigns, finding solidarity with others fighting for the same issues. With international and outsider support, they can have an added weight in their efforts to pressurise their governments. Working together in a strong local–global coalition can determine success of campaigns. For example, Khagram (2004) compares transnational movements against dam projects, noting that reform or cessation of the projects was less likely in China and Lesotho, where local civil society has a relatively weak base, than in India or the United States.

Even proponents of a global civil society agree that this rootedness in local reality is essential to transnational citizen mobilisation. Nonetheless, troubling questions remain about the challenges which INGOs and global civil society organisations face in spanning the local, national and global levels of change.

One set of issues involves the extent to which access to global structures and spaces is effectively limited to the ‘acceptable’ faces of civil society, typically represented by professional advocates from Northern NGOs. In international advocacy campaigns, who is actually being empowered to speak for whom – and who might be effectively disempowered in the process? Might the political economy of global advocacy coalitions be conceptualised in terms of differences in access to resources, knowledge and decision-making structures, North and South (Clark 2003; Keane 2003)?

The problems of representation and accountability in North–South coalitions have also been the subject of ongoing debate (Brown and Fox 2000; Batliwala and Brown 2006). Grass roots groups from the global South can feel used or abused when they consider that powerful outsiders are coming in with ‘superficial understandings’ of their reality (Bandy and Smith 2005: 11). ‘How credible,’ Giffen and Wright-Revollo ask, ‘is an organisation which aims to provide voice for issues which concern the South (...) if its headquarters is in New York or Brussels?’ (2007: 4). Even campaigns that succeed in mobilising millions, such as Make Poverty History and the Global Campaign Against Poverty, still raise questions as to who is speaking for whom (Clark 2003). If Southern voices are not heard, Clark argues, then people ‘often feel like second-class citizens among their Northern partners. They feel welcomed as sources of information and legitimisation but not as equals’ (2003: 24). The question of who legitimately

speaks for whom also resonates amongst elite and non-elite groups within campaign movements in the South, which have their own internal hierarchies of voice and representation (Batliwala 2002).

While much of the literature points to the tensions involved for transnational campaigns when they try to span local and global, other literatures begin to point to the structures or relations that can help to overcome some of these tensions. In NGO and civil society circles, a growing attention is paid to ways in which NGOs and other international actors structure greater accountability to those with whom they work and for whom they often speak (Jordan and Van Tuijl 2006). Earlier work by Covey focuses on processes and relationships, such as 'inclusion in decision-making; access to alliance resources (especially information); and division of roles and responsibilities (for example, who the spokespersons are)' (1995: 86). Using these indicators, she describes the Mount Apo Geothermal Plant Project, a very downwardly accountable campaign which tried to persuade the World Bank not to invest in a plant in the Philippines:

[The campaign] was structured so that the regional, national and international task forces and networks supported the goals defined by the indigenous people and farmers. Where alliance members held different institutional priorities (for example, environmental protection versus indigenous people's rights) they resolved conflicts (...) in an agenda set by indigenous people's and farmers' concerns.

(1995: 86)

Far more empirical research is needed on how and under what conditions these challenges of developing linkages and trust across multiple spaces for action can be overcome. As we suggest subsequently, the GCE faced similar tensions and challenges in addressing educational rights.

2.2 Emerging global citizenship?

How do attempts to link diverse spaces of citizen action contribute to changes in citizenship identities? When citizens mobilise across international borders, does it broaden their sense of being a citizen, with the potential for exercising active citizenship beyond the local or the national? Scholars have long debated the extent to which globalisation is resulting in the development of global citizenship, whether in terms of the development of global rights and responsibilities, or of citizens' definitions of themselves as active. Some argue normatively for the importance of global citizenship, and describe an inevitable historical trajectory from the city via the nation–state to the regional to the global (Falk 1994). Others argue that such notions of global citizenship are idealistic, in the current context, representing aspirations for the future rather than present realities (Fox 2005). And as Van Rooy has suggested, whatever its potential merits, 'global citizenship is a bit of a hard sell (...) in the world outside activist circles (...) the ranks of idealists identifying themselves as global citizens are not rising' (2004: 80).

Others focus on the contradictions between understandings of citizenship across levels of governance. Hickey and Mohan argue that global citizen action

'bypasses national governments in favour of applying direct pressure to global institutions and may thus undermine national citizenship in favour of a form of "global citizenship" that remains unattainable to most people in poor countries' (2005: 247). Clark adds that global participation can enhance local participation or distract from it, as international activity can be 'more glamorous' (2003: 25–6). Others focus on issues of framing, arguing that globally framed demands may be perceived as actually being detrimental to local interests and vice versa, bypassing the poor and undermining their livelihoods and cultural identities (Waldman 2005). However there are examples where local, national and international mobilisations have been mutually reinforcing (Chapman and Fisher 2000); there are also examples where precisely the reverse has been the case.

Tarrow reflects on how the expansion of transnational activism changes the 'actors, the connections among them, the forms of claim making and the prevailing strategies in contentious politics' (2005: 3). While he recognises the importance of 'rooted cosmopolitans', who mobilise internationally, they remain, he argues, 'rooted in specific national contexts' (2005: 29). And even if the attitudes of ordinary citizens are becoming more 'global', 'these attachments coexist with national identities' (2005: 72). He concludes that 'transnational activism does not resemble a swelling tide of history but is more like a series of waves that lap on an international beach, retreating repeatedly into domestic seas but leaving incremental changes on the shore' (2005: 219).

The GCE offers an example of a campaign coalition which can be used to explore further themes of how new opportunity structures brought on by globalisation contribute to a scale shift in citizen action. Through looking at this campaign, we can explore further how changing international spaces affect the scale and strategies of citizen mobilisations, the factors that affect the success and durability of coalitions, and the consequent impacts on the citizenship identities of the actors involved. But first we must turn to the question of how globalisation has changed the landscape of power and decision-making in the field of education.

3 Who governs education? Power across boundaries

Though the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights established the right to education in a global arena in 1948, the responsibility for ensuring the right to education has often been considered that of national and local governments. National governments sign international treaties, and they also often define education policies, implement programmes, provide finance and set standards that determine the reality of education at the local level.

Further down the governance chain, educational rights are the responsibilities of state and local governments as well. It is at these levels, depending upon the legal frameworks and practices in different contexts, that local funds are allocated, teachers are hired and fired, citizen parent–teacher councils may be established, and more. As one experienced education activist told us, 'in many places, education is the last outpost of the state' (GCE campaigner and INGO

professional, UK). The school, in his view, could be seen as an institution that wide sections of the population experience.

While education has often been thought of as the responsibility of states and localities, education scholars increasingly argue that national education systems have been conditioned or affected by the international institutional context. Examining this trend, McNeeley and Cha argue that with 'an increasingly integrated global system, individual nation-states within the system became subject to world-level ideological prescriptions and structural properties and influences'. In the field of education, this consolidation of the system gave rise to a variety of international organisations through which 'the principles, norms, rules and procedures of the wider system are enshrined (...) and they have become the carriers of the culture of the world polity' (1994: 2). They conclude

All in all we can argue that international organisations can set and impose similar perceptions of reality, interests, policies and structures through various means, such as the setting of agendas based on their constitutions and charters, standard-setting instruments such as recommendations and conventions, organisational operations, the collection and exchange of information, and the provision of resources.

(1994: 6–7)

Each of these instruments has contributed to a shift in global governance in the field of education. Beyond the UN Declaration on Human Rights, the right to education has been enshrined in multiple constitutions and charters, including the UNESCO Convention against Discrimination in Education (1960), the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (1966), the Convention on the Rights of the Child (1989).

International agreements such as these can provide related benchmarks too, standards against which to measure progress nationally and locally on issues that affect children's education, such as child labour. For example, the Global March Against Child Labour cited the importance of pressurising the International Labour Organisation (ILO) to adopt Convention 182, ruling against the worst excesses of child labour. Convention 182 represented an important campaigning step, providing the backdrop for further activities, just as the *Fédération Internationale de Football Association* International Code of Conduct on the production of footballs represented an important step forward for the 2002 campaign on the use of child labour in football manufacture. In interviews, both the ILO standards and the MDGs emerged as useful international benchmarks against which to monitor local actions.

A bewildering array of international agencies – including UNESCO, the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development, the World Bank and UNICEF – are mandated in formal international architectures to gather, monitor and support how the various rights to education are being realised, to exchange information, and to set global standards. It has only been relatively recently that these intergovernmental agencies have come together in a more coordinated way, joined increasingly frequently by non-governmental agencies. The late 1980s was a turning point (Mundy and Murphy 2001), when four major international

organisations – UNICEF, UNESCO, the World Bank, and the United Nations Development Programme – began to work together towards hosting the World Conference on EFA (WCEFA) in 1990 in Jomtien. The WCEFA ‘harnessed together a relatively uncoordinated group of education specialists across these agencies in an effort to expose the deterioration of worldwide access to education in the poorest of development countries’ (Mundy and Murphy 2001: 98). It reaffirmed the importance of education as a priority for development, with the goals of universal access to primary education by the year 2000 and the reduction of adult illiteracy, particularly female illiteracy, by half. Following Jomtien, an interagency EFA commission was established ‘charged with formulating a decade of EFA activities and overseeing the realisation of central WCEFA goals’ (Mundy and Murphy 2001: 99).

At this stage the role of NGOs was relatively limited, focusing primarily on their contributions as providers of educational services, rather than as global advocates for the achievement of rights to education. The role of NGOs in Jomtien and follow-up activities, according to Mundy and Murphy, was ‘peripheral.’ There were ‘no clear structures for NGO participation in post-Jomtien activities and there was no NGO representative on the EFA Inter-Agency Steering Committee until 1997’ (2001: 101). On the other hand, the growing coordination of international agencies, and the development of international structures of deliberation, provided a political opportunity for many NGOs who were looking for a new role in global governance debates, based more firmly on advocacy. These new international opportunities led to the establishment of the GCE in 1999.

Once established, however, the GCE had to contend with the complex structures through which the right to education was mediated. Many poor countries rely on international aid to finance education. While the Dakar Framework for Action on EFA, signed by 160 countries in 2000, pledged that no countries seriously committed to education for all would be thwarted in their achievement of that goal by a lack of resources, the lack of finance for education in poor countries continues to be a serious issue. To deal with this problem a mechanism known as the Fast Track Initiative (FTI) was established in 2002. It was overseen by the World Bank and designed to coordinate education aid from over 30 agencies and banks for approved national educational plans.

Key decisions about who receives funding are made by the donors sitting on the FTI Trust Fund committees. Pressure to deliver is maintained on the FTI in a range of ways, including via the Global Monitoring Report, an annual ‘report card’ on progress towards achieving the Dakar EFA goals. Housed in UNESCO, the report is drafted by an international team of education experts, under the advice of an international advisory board. Several international NGOs, including the Global March Against Child Labour, Education International and ActionAid hold seats on that board, whose annual reports have become crucial for influencing the global discourse and debate.

While the UNESCO-based Global Monitoring Report and the World Bank-coordinated FTI Report serve to monitor progress on international goals, and to ensure funds for education reach national budgets, decisions made in these global policy spaces can be trumped by another global actor, the International Monetary Fund (IMF). Though national education budgets are set by Ministries of

Education in most countries, it is usually the Ministry of Finance which actually determines expenditures. In many countries, especially those with international loan agreements, IMF power to influence macroeconomic policy has led in practice to establishing caps on public sector wages, which in turn limits the numbers and wages of teachers. This leads to an ironic outcome: in order to meet the MDG target of getting children into classes with 40 or fewer pupils, 18 million new teachers are needed, but caps are preventing these new teachers from being recruited (GCE 2005; ActionAid 2007). The World Bank has also promoted the use of para-teachers³ as a way of increasing school places at the same time as holding public expenditure down in the context of restricted budgets – at the expense, critics argue, of the quality of education. Concerns about quality have been associated with the school absenteeism, with poorer parents effectively deciding that schooling is not worth pursuing for their children. Alternatively, those parents who can afford to do so may move to private schooling to ensure better quality provision.

It is beyond the scope of this paper to give a full account of these various international factors in the governance of education. But the short account above helps to make the broad point: increasingly over the last two decades, the field of educational policy, like other sectors, has become increasingly crowded with international policy actors and networks, both formal and informal, which affect whether and how the right to education will be achieved. Often, power is diffuse and opaque: as one international activist commented, ‘there are lots of dotted lines across all these spaces’. The emergence of the apparatus of global education governance has both created ‘opportunity spaces’ for civil society engagement at the global level, as well as pointed to the absolute necessity for action on the international as well as the national and local stages. How the GCE and its members navigate through and across this complex landscape will be the theme of the next section.

4 The dynamics of mobilising across spaces: the Global Campaign for Education

The GCE describes itself on its website as ‘a civil society movement that aims to end the global education crisis. Together we hold governments to account for their promises repeatedly made to provide Education for All. The GCE’s mission is to make sure that governments act now to deliver the right of every girl, boy, woman and man to a free quality public education. Since our formation in 1999, millions of people and thousands of organizations in over 100 countries have united to demanding Education for All. Civil society organizations, trade unions, child rights campaigners, teachers, parents and students have joined together to demand

³ Para-teachers are minimally qualified, low-waged and employed by local governments on contract. They are often local; in some countries they are called community or volunteer teachers.

universal education' (www.campaignforeducation.org/en/about/about-gce, accessed February 2009).

The GCE is now one of the longest-standing global campaigns on a poverty-related issue and has a positive reputation for the ways in which it has been able to build and maintain a strong, diverse, inclusive coalition across many countries. Yet it does so in a changing landscape, in which the governance of education – and the power to ensure education as a right – provides an illustration of the challenges of responding to the multi-level, diffuse nature of global governance today.

By the latter part of the 1990s, it was becoming increasingly clear that the targets set at Jomtien were not going to be achieved on either count. More than 125 million children of primary school age were not in school at all. For those who were, classes of up to 80 were not uncommon, while text books and pencils were luxury items (Watkins 2000).

In 1999, NGOs and trade unions concerned with EFA were meeting regularly to prepare their contributions to the World Education Forum in Dakar in 2000. Between them they identified a number of reasons for the lack of progress to date, together with the requirements for more effective governmental and intergovernmental action in future. In addition to the provision of financial resources for education, it was argued, there needed to be greater public transparency to facilitate democratic accountability, and active citizen participation to hold governments to account. This was essential, if resources for education were to reach the schools for which they were intended, with continuing involvement from CSOs, including children and their parents, to ensure effective spending for the longer term.

These NGOs and trade union organisations formed the GCE to take the campaign for EFA forward beyond Dakar, campaigning for lifelong learning up to and if necessary beyond 2015, the target date for the MDGs. Commenting on their potential role, the then UN Secretary General Kofi Annan affirmed that NGOs had made remarkable contributions to education in many countries, 'and they have now joined in a Global Campaign for Education. Today I say to the NGO community: we cannot win the battle (...) without your expertise, your energy, and your capacity for action' (GCE website, cited in Mayo 2005: 159).

The final communiqué adopted by governments in Dakar included a number of the GCE's demands. There was a commitment to free, compulsory and good quality primary education by 2015 and, as noted above, there was commitment to the principle that no country should be allowed to fail because of a lack of resources. Neither of these commitments would have been made so explicitly, it has been argued, without pressure from the GCE (Watkins 2000: 335). The *Elimu Newsletter* notes that

NGOs and trade unions walked away from the World Education Forum in a much stronger position, having won recognition as legitimate policy actors and having carved out space for civil society participation in a time-bound process of developing national action plans.

(2000: 1)

Since its inception, the GCE has continued to operate in the international arena, monitoring and researching the role of international agencies, putting pressure on G8 and other donors to maintain their commitments to the EFA and MDG commitments, organising the Global Week on Education and compiling international reports from the field. And yet, perhaps unusually, the small international secretariat sees its role not only, or even primarily, to advocate in global spaces, but also to support national and local voices.

4.1 The GCE in action in India and Nigeria

The GCE is a broad based coalition, which itself includes not only other international and regional networks, but also 65 national coalitions in both South and North. Supporting and building up from national level work is critical to the character of the campaign. Over 80 per cent of GCE funds go to support national coalitions. In some countries, organised civil society action on education issues at the national level has a long history, pre-dating the GCE and the Dakar Conference. In other countries, the emergence of the GCE campaign became an important opportunity for the development of national level coalitions. For many of the international founders, supporting or helping to create these national level organisations became an important task, even from the earliest moment of the campaign.⁴ Fieldwork in India and Nigeria shows the importance of spaces for campaigning on education at the national level.

In Nigeria, a federation of 36 states, the return of civilian government in 1999 heralded the passage of federal legislation promoting basic education for all. This provided the framework within which states could access resources. Although this represented a major step forward, effective implementation of federal legislation depended upon state engagement, as well as on lower levels of decentralised government. The Civil Society Action Coalition on EFA (CSACEFA) was formed in 2000 with some 40 groups across the country collaborating. Although formation was in response to the opening of international spaces at Dakar and beyond, a key participant explained that CSACEFA 'was born out of national needs, rather than being created from the top down, internationally' (interview with CSACEFA participant, Abuja, Nigeria).

The coalition has grown over recent years and now has a membership of over 350 CSOs. It works on the one hand to influence education policy in Nigeria, and on the other hand to mobilise and strengthen citizens to demand their rights to quality education. It sits on the National Council on Education, the Presidential Advisory Committee on the MDGs, and is a member of the Universal Basic Education Commission. It is also a Board member of Africa Network Campaign on Education (ANCEFA), is linked to the GCE, and involved in other sub-regional networks and coalitions. The CSACEFA has also been developing its links with National Union of Teachers, which represents over a million members.

4 For a more complete report on the emergence and contribution of the national education coalitions, see Tomlinson and MacPherson (2007).

While the emergence of a strong national coalition in Nigeria has occurred over the last decade in Nigeria, struggles for the right to education in India have much longer domestic roots, dating back to Independence. Many of these were led by teachers unions, who today have over five million members, but other efforts were rooted in concerns to end child labour. Many of those already campaigning for education came together in 2000, again prompted by the Dakar agreements, forming the National Coalition for Education (NCE), directly affiliated to the GCE. The density of CSOs working on education issues in India has raised questions about who legitimately represents Indian efforts globally, rather than the more frequently raised concerns on the representation of global players in national arenas.

The Global March Against Child Labour, itself an international organisation based in India, helped to organise and lead a 20,000 kilometre march across India in support of a constitutional amendment for the right to education. NCE members came together for the successful campaign for the 93rd Constitutional Amendment, passed into law in 2006, which affirmed the right of every child to receive free and compulsory education up to the age of 14. However, as one of the educational experts who had been involved in exploring the economic implications of the 93rd Constitutional Amendment reflected, ‘passing a constitutional amendment is only the beginning of the process’ (interview with education researcher and GCE supporter, New Delhi, India). Legislation also needed to be both passed and enacted at national and state government levels. Once the right to education for all, at least at primary level, had been agreed in principle in India, there were continuing concerns about making this a reality, largely in terms of resources to ensure the quantity and quality of education on offer. There was also a need to tackle the barriers that continued to prevent children from enrolling, and then staying, in school.

Both Indian and Nigerian experiences illustrate the importance of national level work on achieving the right to education. But national level campaigners were quick to emphasise the importance of links with regional organisations and networks. Participants pointed to the scope for applying pressure on national governments, for example, by challenging them to meet the standards that were being achieved in neighbouring countries. And there were other strengths, it was argued, to be derived from being part of a wider coalition. As an activist in India reflected ‘it becomes so much safer when you have a regional network to critique government’, adding that it was safer ‘to do daring things’ at the global level too (interview with GCE participant, New Delhi, India). Nigerian respondents also pointed to some of the benefits to be gained from sharing experiences regionally. CSACEFA and ANCEFA, the Africa region organisation of GCE, have worked together to prepare evidence for regional and international advocacy, including the Global Weeks of Action and a meeting of the G8 group of nations.

While international, regional, national and even state level policies and resources are critical, education is still a service that is typically delivered locally via local government authorities. Throughout the fieldwork, in both India and Nigeria, we encountered numerous examples where local organisations, often with support from national and international organisations – but clearly not only because of them – were working to tackle the challenges of making EFA a reality. In Andhra

Pradesh, for instance, the state government had been persuaded to make procedures for admitting children to school more flexible, to take account of the needs of children who had not been formally enrolled at the start of the school year. Similarly, bottom-up pressures had been applied to resolve problems associated with the non-payment of para-teachers' salaries and to pressurise for prompter payment in future.

In northern Nigeria, ActionAid has worked on different initiatives such as support for building school management committees and support to promote girls' education. The girls' education programme has worked closely with Child to Child, a small NGO which also received support from UNICEF and Save the Children. The programme has worked with communities to increase the proportion of girls enrolled in schools and has established Early Child Care Centres located in local markets to maximise their accessibility for poor women and their children. As part of an international organisation itself, and through partnership with ActionAid, Child to Child is very well aware of CSACEFA and the impact it has not just locally, but internationally. 'We do see ourselves as international campaigners', explained another respondent, going on to outline some of the remaining international challenges to be addressed, including the impact of IMF policies that were resulting in restrictions on the recruitment of teachers, together with the need to persuade UNICEF to provide more support via adult education for those who had missed on or dropped out of school (interview with CSACEFA professional, Nigeria).

4.2 Exploring the complexity of change – 'up-down, down-up and sideways'

While it is possible to see the importance of citizen engagement at each level, in the global, regional, national, and local spaces, by looking more closely one begins to understand the complexity of what is occurring. The nature of the GCE is that it is simultaneously linking across all levels of action. This challenges assumptions about a simplistic vertical or layered model of change, and gives credence to Scholte's new space of 'globality', discussed above. One veteran campaigner put it this way:

Now anything which is just local is not going to solve the problem (...) The sites of authority and power have changed, and when the sites of authority and power have changed, the sites of struggle will have to be changed (...) The struggle for a just and democratic governance is not a linear struggle, it means being local, it also means being global ... it's a simultaneous thing.

(Interview with Indian INGO professional, based in Bangkok)

A powerful example of the simultaneity of action is found in the GCE's annual Global Week of Action. This global event is made up of a series of simultaneous local actions – during the 2008 Global Week of Action, some seven and a half million activists participated in mobilisations in 120 countries. Operating under a broad theme, local campaigners mobilise children, parents and teachers, while at the same time, media and actions aimed at UN or G8 leaders help to deliver campaign messages to international players. While thus involving action aimed at

global targets, it is based upon coordinated actions situated nationally and locally. An annual 'Big Book' published by the GCE highlights a summary of the actions taken across the world, giving the sense of a global movement. For activists we talked to at every level, the Global Week of Action was a crucial moment – a created space which gave their voices visibility, and provided a sense of solidarity with others, and simultaneously linked the local, national and international in joint action.

While the Global Week of Action helps to provide a moment for simultaneous action across global and local spaces, other examples also challenge a linear and vertical notion of change across levels. In Delhi, for instance, an INGO professional narrated the story of St Columba's School, where one of the teachers was concerned about what could be done to address problems in the neighbouring slum area. He found the Make Poverty History website and, as a result, began to involve his pupils in local activities, including painting murals about the campaign on the school walls. Through discussions with the pupils around the issues of the Make Poverty History campaign, they came up with the idea of tracking government spending on the key areas of health and education, with the target of six per cent for education and three per cent for health – nine per cent in total. Out of these initiatives came the idea for the 'Nine is Mine' campaign, which was developed and shared with international campaigners at Oxfam in the UK, gaining international support in the process. 'Nine is Mine' has become a vibrant campaign in India and links with the South Asian regional *Wada Na Todo* (keep your promises) campaign, itself a regional manifestation of MDG campaigning.

The example is a powerful one, as it shows the interaction of multiple levels of engagement to create space for action, linking local initiatives and international support across countries and regions. It would be hard to locate the impetus for action in at any one level; it was the interaction between levels that was important.

In reading and commenting on earlier drafts of this paper, other experienced activists also challenged a simplistic vertical view of local–global linkages. One focused more on the importance of global campaigns for opening up spaces horizontally – that is, with other governments:

One additional benefit of campaigning on the same thing at the same time in lots of countries ... is that national governments are influenced by the countries around them and elsewhere, and so if you can get (say) the Indian, Bangladeshi and Afghan governments to increase spending on education, then (for different reasons) the Nepali and Pakistani governments will notice that and be affected by it. This is rather different from campaigning globally to influence a global institution like the World Bank – it is campaigning globally to move countries forward together, either through inspiration or competition, to change the temperature of the neighbourhood, to change the paradigm, to change common sense. This may be the most useful part of global campaigning.

(E-mail 2 March 2007, from INGO professional based in India)

Another advocate from an international NGO made a similar argument about the importance of parallel changes at different levels:

I think the focus on the local needs to be balanced with what actually happens in the global arena. For example when I go lobbying in Japan for more budget support in their aid program, I make a strong case that Japanese ODA is failing if it builds schools which remain empty for lack of salaries for teachers because governments do not have the budget capacity to cover these (...) While they are cautious and somewhat sceptical of budget support – potential corruption concerns – they are sensitive to international trends and pressure (...) So the officials are responding to the political ambience of a changed debate on these issues – hard to quantify and even harder to attribute – but real nevertheless. All of this happens in parallel with what is happening in the villages – not linked in a linear way at all.

(E-mail 13 April 2007 from INGO professional based in UK)

Whether simultaneous, lateral or parallel change, another Indian-based activist described the challenge: ‘campaigns need to allow and encourage ways to link up-down, down-up and sideways’ (interview with GCE participant and INGO professional, New Delhi, India). We argue that successful transnational coalitions do all three, and in so doing challenge traditional notions of vertical hierarchies of power, nested from global to the local, while supporting a more complex and robust understanding of how change happens across levels and spaces of power.⁵

5 Confronting the challenges of building transnational coalitions

Despite the importance of working in and across many levels and spaces, while not privileging any one space as the primary source of change, transnational coalitions often reflect traditional, hierarchical, vertically-nested forms of organisational structure. One experienced NGO activist observed:

whatever is happening in the global gets reflected in the local. But unfortunately, this is organised vertically. The funds happen vertically and the institutions and negotiations are vertical. Our thinking and organising models still remain vertical.

(Interview with Indian INGO professional, based in Bangkok)

In many campaigns, as the literature reviewed earlier suggests, even though actors at different levels and spaces may appreciate each other’s importance, tensions about legitimacy, voice and representation can lead to a breakdown of coordinated and effective action. Inevitably, any global advocacy coalition faces

5 This argument echoes that put forward in academic debates on scale. Brenner, for instance, argues that ‘the meaning, function, history and dynamics of any one geographical scale can only be grasped relationally, in terms of upwards, downward and sideways links to other geographical scales situated within tangled scalar hierarchies and dispersed interscalar networks’ (quoted in Marston *et al.* 2005: 418).

potential tensions, too, between the need to take action speedily and the need to consult and maintain inclusive democratic processes, and between the need for short-term achievements and the need to maintain longer-term horizons for the achievement of development goals. Many coalitions struggle over branding and visibility – ‘logos and egos’. There are differences of ideology and organisational culture within diverse coalitions which span civil society from NGOs to trade unions, North and South. Concerns have often been expressed in other campaign coalitions about large Northern NGOs squeezing out the space for voices from the South, or about mobilisation around a Northern agenda.

Given the discussion of these tensions in the literature about global campaigns, we expected in this research to find similar views expressed within the GCE. However, though there have been disagreements around framing and resources, we found remarkably constructive approaches to addressing and resolving tensions. There were few challenges from activists at one level about the legitimacy of actions at the other. What accounts for such a very different picture? What explains this apparent success in building legitimacy across multiple levels and diverse members?

One campaigner described the importance of trust, as the glue across levels that allowed the campaign to function effectively.

Trust is key. Having trust means that GCE can respond quickly, when this is needed, knowing that the membership will be supportive, having confidence that the board is really rooted in the South. Trust takes time to build though and so do coalitions, as these need to be built upon trust. In addition, there have to be real pay-offs locally and globally, if people are to stay involved.

(Interview with GCE campaigner and INGO staff member, New Delhi)

While trust is clearly important, much more needs to be understood about how it is built, and how trust relates to the other key factors that were identified as being involved in building successful campaign coalitions. In interviews with GCE activists at various levels in India, Nigeria and the UK, five factors seemed to be particularly important. These were:

- Strong national and local roots of the campaign
- Carefully built governance structures which reflect these identities
- Inclusive framing of the messages
- Recognition and attention to the contributions and value added at each level
- Long-term resources for sustainability.

5.1 Roots of the Campaign

Part of the rootedness of the GCE is based in the nature of the issue it campaigns about. The need for education is a widely-shared value; most people have direct experience with schools or their lack; mobilisation on education is perhaps not as difficult as mobilising on issues like trade justice or debt, which are more abstract

in character. Significantly too, EFA is not a campaign that directly challenges the most powerful economic interests – even if the private sector does have increasing interests in the provision of schooling. This again stands in contrast with trade justice and debt, which have a far more direct impact on the interests of powerful international economic actors.

Equally important, the global campaign did not start from a blank slate. There was already a long history of national campaigns around related issues, often led by teachers and their unions. This was important for at least two reasons. First, as pointed out by a trade union official in the UK deeply involved in the international work, trade union organisations have a history of national membership and organisation: ‘trade union organisations cannot and do not claim to speak for anyone in the global South because it is up to sister trade union organisations to speak for themselves or their members’ (interview with trade union official, UK).

Secondly, in the same respondent’s view, teachers themselves are often relatively well-equipped to speak out.

Education trade unions exist virtually everywhere and they are typically well organised as a sector. Teachers are a relatively well educated section of the population, professionals, and they have much in common with their counterparts across national borders. By and large, despite all the national differences, there are strong similarities between the jobs that teachers do in different countries. Teachers are also groups of people with relatively high standing in so many countries (...) this makes teachers a particularly powerful section of civil society, relatively well able to engage in campaigning at the global levels as well as the local and national levels. They are used to expressing views and expect to be heard. They are often amongst the strongest part of the trade union movement in the global South.

(Interview with trade union official, UK)

As we have seen already, one of the GCE’s founding members was Education International, which represents education trade unions internationally and also provided key resources for the Global March against Child Labour, which itself had a wide membership in Asia, Africa and Latin America. And as we have also seen in both Nigeria and India, the teachers unions represented a formidable base, comprising millions of members with deep links to their communities.

Beyond teachers and their unions, other organisations brought their experiences of education campaigning to the GCE. The international NGOs and networks were joined by other already existing national organisations, including the Campaign for Popular Education in Bangladesh, the South African NGO Coalition, and the Brazilian National Campaign for the Rights to Education. Other groups, such as the Asian South Pacific Bureau of Adult Education, founded in 1964, were also present to play key roles. The *Elimu* (education) campaign, launched in Zimbabwe in 1999, also emerged quickly to take the campaign forward in the African region. These national and regional alliances had already developed the capacity to lobby their own governments, key donors and UN agencies, further building the GCE’s wider credibility.

For many activists, especially in the South, such deep roots grounded in local and

national experience and organisation were important. They contrasted with experience in some earlier international campaigns. As a child rights activist in India said,

The best campaigns are not led by anyone from the outside. The issues of child labour and child exploitation are really Southern issues, although there are of course issues in the North, but to a different extent. So this issue gets ownership. It is a stark and visual issue in India for instance.

(Interview with child rights activist, New Delhi, India)

Throughout our interviews – in both North and South – we found echoes of these themes. Common organisational experiences at local and national levels clearly provide important building blocks for building such a global campaign.

5.2 Representative structures

Local and national roots and identities can be overshadowed by other factors. Predictably perhaps, when the GCE first came together, there were fears that Northern NGOs might predominate, using their Southern partners to provide legitimacy for what would be in practice a Northern-led campaign. The international NGOs involved were clear that this was not to be the case. The campaign structures that were developed were designed to ensure that Southern voices would be effectively represented.

Although initially based with Education International in Brussels, the GCE swiftly moved to a base in South Africa. The GCE president, Kailash Satyarthi, emerged from an Indian social movement. More recently, following 2008 World Congress in Brazil, the chair has been held by an Education International representative from Togo, with vice chairs from Brazil and from the Philippines (based in a regional association). A sense of genuine Southern ownership of the GCE was widely expressed in interviews.

Unlike many campaigns, the GCE is not organised around a central structure with local branches. Rather it built from national coalitions which are GCE members; each of these is organised with its own name and its own agenda. In addition, international organisations and regional organisations are also members. Every three years, all the members come together in a World Assembly to debate issues and priorities and to elect a Board of 13 members. Two seats reserved for members from INGOs, two from the Global March Against Child Labour, two from Education International and the rest from national coalitions. Thus, while linking national, international and regional voices, the structure of the campaign reflects its Southern roots and gives predominant weighting towards nationally-based coalitions.

In addition to structure, however, we would emphasise the importance of the contributions of specific individuals, based upon their personal values and their attitudes to issues of power, ownership and control. While they themselves would not have chosen to be identified in such ways, it seemed clear to us as outside observers at GCE events, including the 2008 World Congress, that key individuals were exercising democratic leadership qualities in significant ways. They were

putting the needs of the GCE above the needs of any particular organisation or interest, including their own, and facilitating and enabling Southern voices, including those of women from the global South, to be represented effectively. There were a number of appreciative public reflections about how the Board functioned, echoing those expressed during interviews in India and Nigeria. There was widely seen to be extensive consultation before reaching positions on strategies and tactics. When asked whether they had a voice in international decisions, a group of Indian teachers union activists said clearly that they had their ways of getting their views across, employing informal as well as formal ties. Another national coalition member was adamant that 'we have a voice in GCE. It is a two way process, with information flowing up and down' (interview with national education coalition member, New Delhi, India).

5.3 Inclusive framing of issues and messages

While the rootedness of the GCE and its inclusive governance structure are important to GCE's achievements, a third factor concerns the process of framing the issues. As discussed above, framing is widely recognised in social movement literature as a critical factor for determining the legitimacy of a campaign, and who enrolls their support within it. The ability to define the frame is a source of power. For global campaigns around poverty related issues, there is often a deep frustration among Southern activists that the framing grows from a Northern perspective and that Northern organisations have the ability to define what is relevant for the rest of the world. As one Southern NGO leader observed from his experience in other campaigns,

What is global? In the locational politics, global becomes Washington, New York, the cosmopolitan media hubs of the North. So when you organise something in New York, it becomes global. When you organise something in New Delhi, it becomes local (...) global as an identity category is a very deceptive category. Theoretically speaking, London is as local as New Delhi. Edinburgh [the Make Poverty History demonstration] was a local mobilisation. There was nothing global about it.

(Interview with Indian INGO leader, UK)

Another Indian activist asked 'what is a global campaign? Does it mean you get a lot of people together in UK, have a Bono concert and ask us here in India to get together and shout? That is not locally relevant' (interview with GCE campaigner and INGO staff member, New Delhi, India).

Choosing and framing the themes in global campaigns is critical for ownership. One of the biggest challenges, said one activist, is 'how to choose campaigns with local and national relevance. You can use global campaigns to strengthen local groups but they can backfire if they are not locally relevant. The greatest challenge is to aggregate something that is relevant' (interview with GCE campaigner and INGO staff member, New Delhi).

This framing challenge is seen most clearly in choosing the themes for the Global Week on Education, the annual event which has become the global moment in

which national coalitions carry out actions on a key theme around the rest of the world. Here, somewhat to the researchers' surprise given the kinds of frustrations documented in other campaigns, the Global Week was seen as one of the processes in which local and national activists felt that they had a voice. The themes for the Global Weeks of Action were discussed at length, with lots of views expressed before reaching consensus. In both India and Nigeria, time and again, activists expressed the feeling that the Global Weeks of Action were addressing themes that had been chosen for their relevance locally as well as internationally. In Nigeria, for instance, the member of CSACEFA argued that

this was a two way process. CSACEFA provides suggestions and ideas rather than GCE sending orders down from the centre. For example, last year Nigeria came up with three or four suggestions. The themes for the week of action are negotiated well in advance. There were meetings in Nigeria, for instance, to agree suggestions to put forward. So this was genuinely an iterative process.

(Interview with CSACEFA participant, Abuja, Nigeria)

There are also important lessons here about the value of framing the campaign as a long-term commitment. The GCE is committed to campaigning until 2015 or even longer, if necessary. This extended timeframe has been contrasted with the inherent limitations of many short term campaigns in the past, which have caused some frustration and resentment in the South.

While the structures and rootedness of the GCE thus allow it to develop locally relevant themes for global action, this is not to say that there are not other tensions in the framing process. While EFA is now a widely recognised issue, and the right to education holds huge universal appeal and support in international discourse and agreements, how the issue of education is understood may quickly lead to conflicting opinions between differently positioned actors. This is particularly true of the degree to which some of the systemic reasons for the failure to achieve EFA are addressed.

For instance, defining poor quality of education as part of the problem was potentially difficult for teachers, who felt that they were being blamed, rather than being defined as part of the solution. And there was a legacy of potential suspicion on the part of some teachers' organisations, towards NGOs which had provided education in the past, provoking criticism that they were undermining the case for state provision.

There were differences, too, over some of the issues associated with child labour and its underlying causes. Some employers, under pressure to compete internationally, undercut wages and conditions, part of processes that have been described as the globalisation of poverty (Chossudovsky 1997). Additionally, in India especially, there had been debates over the World Bank promotion of schemes leading to the development of private education, a position many activists in the coalition felt needed to be challenged. These themes took the subject of education into controversial political debates on international trade, trade justice and state service provision in the context of neoliberal economic policies.

There were tensions too when particular organisations pushed their own organisation's profiles and agendas, causing resentment amongst their coalition partners. Conversely, there were tensions for NGOs striving to balance their commitment to the collective interest with their own need for profile. As one NGO respondent explained, it was essential to keep their 'brand' from slipping, in order to maintain their fund-raising amongst their own supporters (interview with INGO professional, UK).

While these tensions were present, what was notable in our fieldwork was that they were discussed and negotiated within the coalition. In other international campaigns, such disagreements over framing of issues have either been less effectively addressed and negotiated, or even contributed to the demise of the coalition.

5.4 Seeing the value across levels: complementarities and synergies

A further lesson that emerges from the GCE experience is the importance of promoting the value of action at every level of campaigning, and recognition by actors in each space of the complementarities and value of those working in the other. While there are power differences across actors in different spaces, there was a surprising tendency amongst actors at every level to see action in local, national, regional and global spaces as re-enforcing rather than replacing or competing.

To some extent, this grew from conscious recognition by key campaign organisers and affiliates of the need not to gloss over differences in roles and power inequities. A GCE guide for practitioners and activists working on education rights, for instance, sends this message very clearly. While affirming the importance of local level action, it also

locates this in relation to national and international policy influencing and campaigning (...) Working across all levels requires respect for different perspective, clear roles and space for all to play to their strengths. It requires recognition of the different knowledge and skills that each person or organisation brings. It needs collaboration, not competition, and a constant awareness of and strategies to minimise potential conflicts and unequal power relations.

(GCE 2007:11)

While the goal is an important one, a GCE veteran in ActionAid pointed out the delicate balance between supporting and resourcing global campaigning, including drawing out the global dimensions of the local and national issues, without effectively running the campaign from the global North. ActionAid, he argued, 'is clearly very conscious of these tensions and committed to avoiding substituting itself for global campaigning in the South' (interview with INGO professional, UK).

Expressing the goal is one thing, but the way it is experienced by actors at different levels across the campaign is another. In both India and Nigeria, it was clear that activists at both national and even local levels identified the significance

of being part of an international campaign. Being part of the GCE opened up spaces for advocacy in ways that were potentially re-enforcing and re-affirming for campaigning at national and local levels of governance, consequently enhancing the impact at every level. For instance, campaigning at international levels was recognised as being essential to press for the necessary resources to enable national governments to meet their targets as well as to resisting regressive international policies, such as IMF pressures on public funding and pressures to promote privatisation. In addition, as a national level activist pointed out, when government bureaucrats go the international gatherings where education is high on the agenda, it can have an impact on how they see the issue at home. National level organisations also benefit from being part of a coalition with other national groups, and horizontal linkages can be as important as vertical ones.

More generally, global mobilisations were seen as relevant too, in terms of re-enforcing the value and legitimacy of local mobilisations, and strengthening their cases for social change. There were two-way relationships at work here. While recognising the skills and resources that international organisations could bring, including sound research and global level monitoring, national and local campaigners were also often quite clear about their own contributions. 'We brought legitimacy on the national issues,' said one campaigner in Nigeria, 'while the partnership with INGOs brought profile regarding the progress of the MDGs' (interview with GCE participant, Abuja, Nigeria).

5.5 The material base of the issue and the campaign

Perceptions of complementarity are important; how they translate into the allocation of resources for action is another question. Clearly, there are enormous differences in access to resources and in the material bases of campaigning across actors in the GCE. These differences affect those campaigning for the right to education locally, nationally and globally, in many ways reflecting the differences in access to resources for educational provision within and between countries in the global North and the global South.

While both Nigeria and India have considerable potential for mobilising resources to address the challenges of education provision via the benefits of economic growth and profits from exploitation of natural resources such as oil and gas, field visits to local communities provided direct evidence of increasing inequalities and the impact of poverty and material shortages. Poverty was often identified as the key factor in explaining why parents failed to send their children to school. Even when schooling was free, there were expenses to be met for items such as school uniforms, and in some cases, parental levies for the school.

Shortage of materials was also a key factor in the provision of education. In India, for example, some of the schools that were visited lacked basic furniture such as desks and chairs. Some of the Nigerian schools visited were unable to use classrooms due to lack of basic maintenance, such as classroom roofs falling in during storms and not being repaired. Shortages of text books seemed endemic. And even when new learning resources such as computers were provided, these could not necessarily be used because of unreliable electricity supplies.

In such a context of immense poverty locally, the availability and distribution of material resources for the campaigns themselves were also key issues. As a report called 'Driving the Bus: the journey of national education coalitions' finds,

who pays for the journey is a delicate subject, as debates about money often are. It is clear that coalition buses cannot survive on members' payment for tickets alone, even where they do contribute. But international funding can, if not carefully managed, influence the coalition's agenda, creating dependency and even distorting the purpose of the coalition by making it into a grant-manager goods truck rather than a bus travelling towards a destination that its members have agreed upon.

(Tomlinson and MacPherson 2007: 6)

In India, the contrast of office settings between national and international NGOs symbolises differences in resources. The national campaign for education, representing millions of members, and including the heads of the teachers unions and even a Member of Parliament, had funds only for a small office with one or two staff in the basement of a home. This was in sharp contrast to the far larger and better equipped offices of the INGOs and other international organisations involved.

Differences in material base also affect capacity for international engagement. However carefully issues and campaign materials were negotiated to ensure maximum involvement when it came to global advocacy events like the Week of Action, international organisations tended to have greater access to resources. Proportionately, for example, the cost of international flights to attend meetings in Geneva, New York or Washington was far greater for Southern organisations. Such differences affect trade union organisations as well as NGOs, despite the fact that trade union organisations are generally characterised by clearly defined structures to ensure democratic accountability. Whatever equality of representation enshrined in formal structures, international campaigning can still slide into becoming hierarchical. As one respondent pointed out, 'rich countries find it far easier to send delegates to international meetings than poor countries' (interview with trade union official, UK). This emphasises the importance of having structures and processes which do all they can to counterbalance these potential biases and power imbalances.

Partly to deal with such issues, a special mechanism was established to make resources available for capacity-building that emphasises supporting national coalitions, enabling them to provide key links between the local and the global levels, as well as maintaining pressures on their own national governments. This Commonwealth Education Fund (CEF), announced by Gordon Brown and administered by ActionAid, Oxfam and Save the Children Fund, has had a significant impact on the development and sustainability of work on education. As well as this external financial support, one of the key factors underpinning the GCE's international achievements has been the provision of resources from within the coalition itself, particularly from the international trade union movement via Education International.

The importance of such support emerged from a number of the discussions. Even the need for resources to travel to attend national, regional and international

meetings poses serious financial challenges for so many organisations in the South, let alone the resources required to provide high quality research and campaign materials and to campaign within and across national boundaries. As one commentator reflected on the situation in India, ‘even meetings with MPs require resources’ (interview with GCE participant, New Delhi, India). Similar points were made in Nigeria, where the sheer size of the country posed comparable challenges in terms of the costs of travel to meetings. Without such resources, participation in international advocacy becomes logistically beyond the reach of CSOs at national level, never mind at the local level.

There were expressions of appreciation at the ways in which the international NGOs centrally involved in supporting the development of the GCE were respecting the importance of ensuring that this was genuinely a Southern-led campaign. But, whilst there was similarly widespread appreciation of the resources provided by the CEF, there were also reflections on the problems associated with the fact that this was time limited, running out in 2008.

The CEF itself has engaged in a number of studies to examine the challenge of ongoing sustainability, especially for national level coalitions, and has been seeking support for ‘National Civil Society Education Funds’ to address these concerns in some 50 countries in coming years (Tomlinson and MacPherson 2007).

5.6 Key lessons in spanning the global, national and local

As earlier sections have identified, there has been widespread recognition of the potential tensions inherent in linking local, national and global citizen advocacy, just as there has been widespread recognition of the potential challenges involved in building coalitions between different types of organisations and agencies with complex power relationships, working in very varying social, economic, political and cultural contexts. Whilst the research provided evidence of the extent to which these challenges were being recognised, there was considerable optimism about the GCE, in terms of the ways in which structures and approaches had been developed to working towards building more equal partnerships based upon mutual respect and solidarity.

The GCE’s relative success in building legitimacy across levels and actors has been attributed to its well-developed roots in the South, and its development of structures that have ensured Southern representation and ownership. These structures were considered to have enabled differences of interest and perspective to be negotiated transparently, so that campaigns and campaign materials could be framed in ways that genuinely represented the priority concerns of activists in the South as well as the North. Over time, recognition has emerged to activists at every level of the added value of their links through the GCE – of the complementarity rather than competitiveness of their actions and voices. Such complementarity has been supported with special attention to the allocation of material resources. All of these are factors which have enabled the GCE to develop trust, and to be sustainable over time. The long-term nature of its work – now operating as an international campaign for almost a decade – has also distinguished it from other campaigns. As one Indian activist commented, ‘the

same thing being said over and over again (...) this makes a big difference' (interview with GCE participant, New Delhi, India).

This then brings our discussion to the final question: how might engagement in local–global advocacy coalitions impact upon the identities of participants themselves as active citizens?

6 Implications for citizenship

Citizenship is a sense of belonging. Citizenship is a marker of identity. Citizenship is also a bridge, a sense of solidarity with the rest of the people, a sense of belonging to the world. So I call myself an Indian citizen, a citizen of Kerala, a citizen of my village, at the same time. I strongly feel about my village – I participated [in decision-making] in my village this morning. In India [as a national citizen] I sent another email about a friend of ours who is being jailed by the government. And then I am a global citizen. Today I was also talking about the world. Because I am a citizen when I am committed, when I have a claim, when I think I have a space, and then I think I have a sense of belonging. When I am concerned about the world, not my own country, then I am a global citizen. When I am committed to challenging it, I am global citizen.

(Interview with Indian INGO professional, based in Bangkok)

As this quote indicates, in a world with multiple centres of power and authority, citizenship itself may become a multidimensional, multilayered concept, no longer considered only in the relationship of citizens to nation states. In the final part of this paper, we are interested in asking what happens to participants' perceptions of themselves as citizens when they engage together across borders?

The question is not an easy one to explore. Social movements have long been identified as sites for learning, both learning about the issues in question and wider learning about civil society and active citizenship. Getting involved can change actors' perceptions about active citizenship (Foley 1999; Roper, Pettit and Eade 2003). Previous work suggests that citizenship education can emerge from practice, from everyday and lived experience (Merrifield 2002) at least as much as from formal teaching *per se*. Therefore, when people do participate in a global campaign – particularly in a case such as the GCE, which has been relatively successful and linking actions across spaces and levels of action – do they change their sense of what citizenship is about? Does it contribute to the emergence of a sense of global citizenship?

Across the board, activists expressed the feeling that being engaged did give them a sense of commonality and connection with a broader movement, which in turn they found to be important. Reflecting on her experiences of becoming involved in global advocacy, an Indian activist based in an INGO summarised her feelings about international advocacy, contrasting these with her previous experiences working for a multi-national company.

Before [this] I worked for a multi-national (...) I was connected with a global network but didn't feel very good about it. This [global advocacy] has given me another way to be connected, where I feel much better about what I am doing (...) You feel part of all this – you could influence this. That's very empowering.

(Interview with INGO professional, New Delhi, India)

A Nigerian activist reflected similarly: participating in a global campaign 'increases my confidence that there are people somewhere struggling with the same issues'. This was about 'solidarity (...) recognising that part of the solution lies outside my shore' (interview with INGO professional, Abuja, Nigeria).

Whilst many international NGOs and trade union activists had long histories of global advocacy and campaigning, there was also evidence to illustrate the impact of participation in some of the more recent transnational campaigns. Interviews time and again echoed the theme that getting involved in campaigning itself builds interest, understanding and commitment amongst activists. The

very fact of being involved in GCE joint endeavours does change perceptions and increases members' sense of involvement. You do get a sense that you are actually part of something. This activity helps produce the 'glue' that builds the representation and accountability structures. This builds solidarity – giving the role of agency and active engagement to activists.

(Interview with trade union official, UK)

It was suggested widely that when people see others engaging they get a sense of community and find it empowering. One international campaigner argued that these campaigns were creating 'genuine educational experiences which have changed people's understanding of power and of themselves as actors. It will also change their understandings of North and South' (interview with INGO professional, UK).

But while connectedness across borders can provide a sense of solidarity, which contributes to more engagement, does this connectivity contribute to a sense of being a 'global' citizen, re-enforcing or replacing a sense of local or national citizenship? Here views varied a great deal, especially across more globally located and more locally grounded actors. For some internationally located actors, being involved in global campaigns gave a sense of citizenship which they perhaps did not experience locally. One UK-based professional in an INGO reflected that 'I've changed (...) I've completely changed my sense of global community'. In this person's view, a lot of people had 'learned a sense of global citizenship. We experienced a particular kind of feeling when we were all around the world talking together on the global teleconferences' (interview with INGO professional, UK). For another similarly positioned respondent, 'global citizenship is about looking into your own community, then linking issues to the outside world, finding commonality based on your issues. This is the direction' (interview with INGO professional, UK).

While one could thus find evidence for a growing sense of connection globally amongst those involved in the campaign, this was not necessarily separate from

their local identities, especially for the activists with roots in local campaigns as well. In Nigeria, an activist emphasised, repeating an oft-used phrase, that ‘yes, ok, we are global citizens [but] we are global citizens who act locally’ (interview with GCE participant, Nigeria). But another added, ‘we’ve run global campaigns in Nigeria (...) and we’ve contributed to global decisions, but I still see myself as very local’ (interview with GCE participant, Nigeria). Another added that although the international context does ‘broaden your views and understanding – it fires your zeal,’ it was important not to lose one’s local roots (interview with GCE participant, Nigeria).

At the march for the Global Week of Action in Birmingham in 2007, similar themes were heard. A local councillor, responsible for lifelong learning, observed that as a very diverse city, people in Birmingham are already ‘linked to so many parts of the world.’ So he felt that there was ‘a duty to influence those with power and resources,’ so that people elsewhere could have the same opportunities. For him, ‘citizenship is global’, but demonstrating solidarity with others was also the basis for building greater social cohesion locally (interview with local councillor, UK).

Another participant in the Birmingham march, a teacher and union activist, argued that ‘citizenship education is about gaining the skills and the knowledge to make a difference, locally and beyond. This is how you become a global citizen’ (interview with teacher, UK). Clearly, then, while engagement in global spaces changed participants’ senses of belonging and solidarity, this could actually strengthen, and be grounded in, local identities as well. As Tarrow puts it in his discussion of ‘rooted cosmopolitanism’, ‘what is new in our era is the increased number of people and groups whose relations place them beyond their local or national settings without detaching them from locality’ (2005: 42).

There were, however, some potentially disturbing comments on global citizenship from the South. Although involvement in global campaigning was described as being about solidarity, as people elsewhere struggle with the same issues, there were contrasting comments that raised questions about the very notion of global citizenship. ‘I can’t say that I feel like a global citizen’ reflected one participant (interview with GCE participant, Abuja, Nigeria). Despite having extensive experience of international campaigning, the respondent explained that ‘I feel like a second class citizen outside Nigeria (...) you are made to feel that, if you come from a developing country.’ This feeling was perhaps compounded by some of the negative stereotypes that had been associated with Nigeria under military rule. Global citizenship based upon notions of solidarity, equality and respect still seemed a long way off here, implying important challenges for activists and for those concerned with development education and citizenship education more generally in the global North.

7 Conclusions

What then does the study of the GCE tell us about how citizens might most effectively mobilise to claim rights in the changing international context?

Reviewing the landscape of education policy illustrates that change on an issue

like education must come at multiple levels – the local and national spaces of education governance are deeply affected and interact with the global polity. Though long considered the responsibility of states and localities, educational policies and realities are deeply affected by international institutions through which the ‘principles, norms, rules and procedures of the world system are enshrined’ (McNeeley and Cha 1994: 6). Changing governance regimes, as Beck has observed, give rise to ‘a new space and framework for acting’ (2005: 3), in which new approaches to challenging and changing power need to be used.

Such a shift in the structures of governance has enormous consequences for how universally agreed rights, such as the right to education, are achieved. As the GCE illustrates, rather than being realised through duty bearers alone, citizen action and mobilisation can be an important force in the struggle to ensure that formal governance institutions are held to account to delivering the rights to which they have formally subscribed. Support for such efforts will be very important in the efforts of international donors and INGOs to realise the MDGs related to EFA. Citizen pressure is no guarantee that such goals will be realised, but the chances seem much higher with effective citizen action than without it.

But to be effective, strategies of citizen action and mobilisation must also change. Rather than being understood as needing to occur at only the local, national or international level, this case suggests the importance of simultaneous pressure at multiple levels which operate as potentially mutually re-enforcing spheres. Such a view would be consistent with Scholte’s perspective on the importance of understanding the interactions between the local, the national, the regional and the global (Scholte 2002) as the basis for effective advocacy.

As Tarrow (2005) suggests, the new political opportunities offered by the changing global landscape imply the need for transnational activists to shift the scale of contention. Yet the case adds further complexity to Tarrow’s view of such shifts occurring along a vertical axis of upward or downward change. Rather, events in the GCE provide examples of spaces and strategies which transcend the vertical, which are moments simultaneously created by local and global action. And in a variation of the Keck and Sikkink (1998) ‘boomerang thesis’ which argues that citizens who are blocked in one country may use international pressure to bring about change at home, we also saw examples of how pressure in one country can also affect change in another, along a horizontal axis. Models of change are needed which take into account the multiple directions and spaces through which such changes can occur.

Despite this notion of simultaneity and non-linearity of the global to the local, campaigns are often organised along very vertical lines. Global campaigns have been critiqued for reflecting hierarchies of power, in which larger international organisations may fail to be accountable to those ‘below’, or may squeeze out local voices. Important questions have been raised about the legitimacy of global social movements, in terms of who they speak for, and how they are internally organised. New models are also needed of how voices may be linked across these levels, in more inclusive ways.

Relative to other examples of transnational campaigns, the GCE would seem to offer some clues for how efforts for intentional change might be organised.

Although of course there are tensions within the GCE, our interviews with actors at every level in the UK, India and Nigeria revealed a surprising amount of internal trust and legitimacy between actors at all levels, and a sense of inclusion and voice that is not always the case in transnational citizen mobilisations.

Could the GCE be considered a somewhat special case? This was the view of a number of those interviewed. Whilst there were differences of interest and perspective within the GCE, these were less significant, it was suggested, than the differences involved in a number of other campaigns. As previously mentioned, education is a relatively non-contentious issue, with which people across many settings can readily identify. The GCE was also seen as somewhat atypical in the nature and breadth of its supporters. In contrast, other campaigns were cited as raising far more problematic differences of ideology, interest and perspective.

The GCE offers an example of what Tarrow (2005) has defined as a campaign coalition. Campaign coalitions differ from event coalitions because of their duration, and also from shorter term instrumental coalitions, or longer term international federations, due to the higher degree of involvement of participants.

Campaign coalitions combine high intensity of involvement with long-term cooperation (...) They emerge and endure successfully for three reasons: a) through seizing and making new opportunities b) through institutionalisation, but with 'cooperative differentiation', and through c) 'socialisation': the combination of discovery and solidarity that is experienced when people with very different backgrounds, languages and goals encounter one another around a broad global theme.

(2005: 168–78)

The GCE provides illustrations of all three. It has been flexible enough to take on new issues or themes – as reflected in the changing themes of each of its global weeks of action – and to raise challenges in different spaces – from the IMF to regional level institutions and beyond to the local level. While it has developed an institutional structure, that structure recognises the differing roles played by INGOs, trade unions, and national members. And, as has been seen, this involvement has contributed to a widely-felt sense of solidarity with others, giving a collective identity to the emerging movement.

This case study of the GCE also revealed several other factors which contribute to its relative legitimacy and durability. In summary, these included firstly, deep pre-existing roots and forms of collective organisation at the national level, particularly in the South, before the global campaign was formed. Secondly, once formed, the GCE was highly sensitive to building upon these existing organisations, especially in its inclusive and representative formal structures. Third, a great deal of attention was been paid to the collective framing of issues, across actors and levels of the coalition. Fourth, there is wide recognition of the differential roles that can be played by activists at each level in the campaign, with a high value placed on local actors, and ensuring complementarity rather than competition. Finally, there was attention paid to the material base of the campaign, especially in the distribution of the resources. The formation and

existence of a global funding mechanism, the CEF, was particularly important in helping to ensure that national level organisations were able to access the funds which they needed.⁶

The case study also gives some interesting insights into the question of how involvement in a global campaign affects the identities of citizenship of those involved. We have very mixed answers to the question of whether transnational campaigns help to produce global citizens. Certainly, interviews with actors reveal that the development of a strong sense of connectedness and solidarity with those across borders working on similar issues. While for many scholars, global citizenship is but a normative ideal, to the degree that citizens see global institutions as helping to shape their rights, and are raising voices in the global arena to claim their rights, then one can argue that a sense of global citizenship may be emerging. Yet, for most activists, this was not replacing a sense of national or local citizenship, but was adding to it. As governance is increasingly multi-scaled, so citizenship can therefore also be multi-dimensional. The challenge is how to continue to build and sustain inclusive and democratic coalitions which span these multiple sites and spaces of citizenship in the pursuit of universally declared human rights, such as the right to education.

6 These factors are somewhat similar to those named by Tarrow, which include framing, trust, credibility, management of difference and incentives for cooperation. However, they place more emphasis perhaps on the roots and identities of campaign actors, and on the material base needed to sustain campaign activities.

References

- ActionAid (2007) *Confronting the Contradictions: The IMF, Wage Bill Caps and the Case for Teachers*, London: ActionAid
- Bandy, J. and Smith, J. (2005) *Coalitions Across Borders: Transnational Protest and the Neoliberal Order*, Oxford: Rowman and Littlefield
- Batliwala, S. (2002) 'Grassroots Movements as Transnational Actors: Implications for Global Civil Society', *Voluntas* 13.4: 393–409
- Batliwala, S. and Brown, D. (eds) (2006) *Transnational Civil Society*, Bloomfield CT: Kumarian Press
- Beck, U. (2005) *Power in the Global Age: A New Global Political Economy*, Cambridge: Polity Press
- Brown, D. and Fox, J. (2000) 'Accountability Within Transnational Coalitions', in J. Fox and D. Brown (eds), *The Struggle for Accountability*, Cambridge, MA and London: MIT Press
- Chapman, J. and Fisher, T. (2000) 'The Effectiveness of NGO Campaigning: Lessons from Practice', *Development in Practice* 10.2: 151–65
- Chossudovsky, M. (1997) *The Globalisation of Poverty*, London: Zed
- Clark, J. (2003) 'Introduction: Civil Society and Transnational Action', in J. Clark (ed.), *Globalizing Civic Engagement: Civil Society and Transnational Action*, London: Earthscan
- Cornwall, A. (2002) *Making Spaces, Changing Places: Situating Participation in Development*, IDS Working Paper 170, Brighton: IDS
- Cornwall, A. and Coelho, V. (eds) (2006) *Spaces for Change? The Politics of Citizen Participation in New Democratic Arenas*, London: Zed Books
- Covey, J.G. (1995) 'Accountability and Effectiveness in NGO Policy Alliances', *Journal of International Development* 7.6: 857–68
- Elimu Newsletter* (2000) *Elimu Update: Newsletter of the Elimu Campaign*, www.elimu.org (accessed July 2000)
- Falk, R. (1994) 'The Making of Global Citizenship', in B. van Steenberg (ed.), *The Condition of Citizenship*, London: Sage
- Florini, A. (2000) *The Third Force: The Rise of Transnational Civil Society*, Washington DC: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace
- Foley, G. (1999) *Learning in Social Action*, Leicester: National Institute of Adult Continuing Education (NIACE)
- Fox, J. (2005) 'Unpacking "Transnational Citizenship"', *Annual Review of Political Science* 8: 171–201
- Giffen, J. and Wright-Revollo, K. (2007) *Global Civil Society Organisations: Location North or South?*, Oxford: Intrac

- Global Campaign for Education (2007) *Education Rights: A Guide for Practitioners and Activists*, London: Global Campaign for Education and ActionAid International
- (2005) *Missing the Mark: A School Report on Rich Countries' Contributions to Universal Primary Education by 2015*, GCE: Brussels
- Held, D. (2002) 'Introduction', in D. Held and A. McGrew (eds) *Governing Globalization: Power, Authority and Global Governance*, Cambridge: Polity Press
- Hickey, S. and Mohan, G. (2005) 'Relocating Participation Within a Radical Politics of Development', *Development and Change* 36.2: 237–62
- Jordan, J. and Van Tuijl, P. (2006) *NGO Accountability: Politics, Principles and Innovation*, London: Earthscan
- Keane, J. (2003) *Global Civil Society?*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Keck, M. and Sikkink, K. (1998) *Activists Beyond Borders*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press
- Khagram, S. (2004) *Dams and Development*, Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press
- Marston, S.; Jones, J. and Woodward, K. (2005) 'Human Geography Without Scale', *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 30.4: 416–32
- Mayo, M. (2005) *Global Citizens*, London: Zed Press
- McNeely, C. and Cha, Y. (1994) 'Worldwide Educational Convergence Through International Organisations: Avenues for Research', *Education Policy Analysis Archives* 2.14: 1–11
- Merrifield, J. (2002) *Learning Citizenship*, IDS Working Paper 158, Brighton: IDS
- Mundy, K. and Murphy, L. (2001) 'Transnational Advocacy, Global Civil Society? Emerging Evidence from the Field of Education', *Comparative Education Review* 45.1: 85–126
- Roper, L.; Pettit, J. and Eade, D. (2003) *Development and the Learning Organisation*, Oxford: Oxfam
- Rosenau, J. (2002) 'Governance in the Twenty-First Century', in R. Wilkinson (ed.), *The Global Governance Reader*, London: Routledge
- Sassen, S. (2002) 'Global Cities and Diasporic Networks: Microsites in Global Civil Society', in H. Anheier, M. Glasius and M. Kaldor (eds) *Global Civil Society*, Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Scholte, J.A. (2002) 'Civil Society and Democracy in Global Governance' in R. Wilkinson (ed.), *The Global Governance Reader*, London: Routledge
- Tarrow, S. (2005) *The New Transnational Activism*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Tomlinson, K. and MacPherson, I. (2007) *Driving the Bus: The Journey of National Education Coalitions*, London: Commonwealth Education Fund

Van Rooy, A. (2004) *The Global Legitimacy Game: Civil Society, Globalization and Protest*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan

Waldman, L. (2005) *When Social Movements Bypass the Poor: Asbestos Pollution, International Litigation and Griqua Cultural Identity*, IDS Working Paper 246, Brighton: IDS

Watkins, K. (2000) *The Oxfam Education Report*, Oxford: Oxfam