

The Power of Dialogue: Rebuilding the Global Education System for Local Impact

Corresponding author

Email: fahmadi@gse.harvard.edu

Submitted to: UNICEF Education Section

November 10, 2025

Given the internationalization of problems and resources, educational research and policymaking must transcend national borders (Solesin, 2020). For this reason, the global education architecture, as a complex system of financial, governmental, technical, and civil actors shaping policymaking, planning, and managing educational resources internationally, has emerged as a collective capacity (Burnett, 2019).

In this system, leadership and coordination operate at three interconnected levels. Globally, organizations like UNESCO, UNICEF, the World Bank, and private foundations act as financial providers and knowledge brokers, setting policies, providing funding, and establishing goals. National governments negotiate with donors to define frameworks and priorities, though influential funders and technical experts often shape these decisions (Shields & Menashy, 2019; Carvalho et al., 2022). Locally, schools, NGOs, and community associations implement educational policies but are often excluded from policy design, even though policy success depends on alignment with local realities (Carvalho et al., 2022). Sector plans, which are country-led, data-driven, and coordinated through multilateral partnerships, bridge global agendas, national policies, and local practice by connecting standards to realities (Carvalho et al., 2022; Jenkins, 2024). Yet, the architecture faces challenges: limited coordination, exclusion of local voices, and donor dominance, resulting in fragmentation and reduced impact (Elfert & Ydesen, 2023; Beeharry, 2021).

The global education architecture is grappling with a set of interconnected challenges that undermine its effectiveness. At a structural level, issues of limited coordination, the exclusion of local voices, and the dominance of donor priorities result in a fragmented landscape and diminished impact (Elfert & Ydesen, 2023; Beeharry, 2021). Operationally, education systems often prioritize monitoring inputs rather than the actual quality of learning or equitable outcomes.

Furthermore, educational interventions frequently overlook how learning is distributed across different student groups. This oversight hides deep-seated inequalities and prevents decision-makers from effectively targeting support to struggling students (Rodriguez Segura et al., 2021).

Compounding these issues is a crisis in education financing, which remains unstable, underfunded, and disproportionately focused on recurrent costs (Yao & Haskell, 2022; World Bank & UNESCO, 2024) rather than on measurable learning outcomes (York, et al., 2022). Even innovative approaches like Results-Based Financing (RBF) risk prioritizing superficial or easily quantifiable indicators at the expense of authentic, sustainable improvement. Consequently, linking financial investments to genuine gains in learning remains a persistent challenge (Lee & Medina, 2019). Finally, the prevalence of centralized planning—particularly in emergency contexts—frequently disconnects educational projects from the specific needs of local communities. This disconnect erodes local ownership, diminishes the cultural relevance of interventions, and ultimately weakens their long-term sustainability (York, et al., 2022).

These systemic limitations call for a model of cooperation grounded in authentic dialogue—one that restores balance between global coordination and local agency. True transformation of the complex global education system requires a paradigm shift rooted in authentic local participation. International education cooperation needs a radical overhaul, moving decisively beyond failed, top-down, input-focused models. Dialogue Education (DE) provides a coherent framework for this transformation by centering learning, rather than teacher or learner, and by ensuring that all interventions are grounded in the realities and aspirations of key stakeholders (Global Learning Partners, n.d.).

A dynamic cycle of three interdependent elements of DE—Rigorous Preparation, Principle-Driven Decision-Making, and Proof of Learning—addresses global educational challenges, ensuring that learning is both intentional and demonstrable.

1. **Rigorous Preparation: Grounding Design in Context**

Preparation in DE begins long before any formal intervention. It involves:

- The Learning Needs and Resources Assessment (LNRA): This is the initial, vital dialogue that explores the Who (the key stakeholders) and the Why (the situation that calls for this intervention). It ensures the entire educational process is grounded in the realities, needs, and existing resources of the stakeholders. LNRA engages stakeholders collaboratively to identify learning gaps and resources, ensuring local voices are included and goals are co-created with communities.
- The Eight Design Steps: Informed directly by the insights from the LNRA, these eight steps—from defining the Who and Why to crafting the So That (The ultimate change to be seen), What, What For (Objectives, the immediate change to be seen), When, Where, How (the learning tasks)—provide a rigorous roadmap for creating structured, inclusive learning experiences focused on meaningful outcomes.

2. **Principle-Driven Decision-Making: The Guiding Compass**

The second core element is the active and continuous application of the principles and practices of Dialogue Education. These principles are not abstract ideas; they form a dynamic framework for principle-driven decision-making throughout the entire learning journey. They serve as a compass, ensuring that every choice—from curriculum sequencing to facilitating a single learning task—is guided by values such as Respect, Safety, Engagement, Relevance, and Accountability. Throughout implementation, the twelve principles of DE guide decisions to ensure that every choice—whether about content, sequencing, or facilitation—supports meaningful learning. For example, principles such as **Accountability** and **Role Clarity** reinforce that success is defined through demonstrable learning outcomes, and that all stakeholders clearly understand their responsibilities in achieving these outcomes.

3. **Proof of Learning: The Evidence of Impact**

DE measures success through observable and verifiable outcomes, rather than mere delivery of inputs. Indicators of learning, transfer, and systemic impact provide evidence that interventions generate authentic, sustainable, and culturally relevant change. Financial resources are linked directly to measurable outcomes, reframing funding from a logistical cost to a strategic investment in human capability.

The transformative potential of DE is not merely theoretical. DE has demonstrated measurable impact across diverse contexts—from community-based programs to national teacher education reforms. In a maternal health initiative, the first author facilitated in Mawundo Village, Uganda (2011), the respectful dialogue structure of DE led to immediate behavioral change: within hours of the first session, 80% of participants voluntarily sought HIV testing. This experience demonstrated how rigorous preparation, respect, and dialogue can rapidly translate knowledge into sustainable action — even in resource-limited settings (First author’s field experience, Uganda, 2011).

Building on this experience, the principles of Dialogue Education guided the design of a national dialogic health literacy program for pre-service teachers in Iran, demonstrating that DE principles can be successfully localized and applied across diverse contexts. Pre-service teachers not only improved their ability to access, evaluate, and use health information but also applied these competencies effectively in classroom practice.

These experiences demonstrate how rigorous preparation, principle-driven decision-making, and proof of learning can bridge the gap between theory and practice, offering valuable lessons for international education cooperation.

Through this integrated cycle—**Preparation → Principle-Driven Decision-Making → Proof of Learning**—DE directly addresses the core challenges of global education: limited coordination, exclusion of local voices, donor dominance, input-focused monitoring, inequitable learning distribution, unstable financing, and centralized planning disconnected from local realities. By placing dialogue and participation at the center, DE strengthens collaboration across global, national, and local actors, ensures equity in learning, fosters local ownership, and links funding to authentic outcomes, providing a practical pathway to enhance both the quality and impact of education worldwide.

The evidence from contexts as diverse as Uganda and Iran confirms that the transformative potential of DE is not merely theoretical; it is operational and scalable. By embedding the rigorous cycle of Preparation, Principle-Driven Decision-Making, and Proof of Learning, DE offers a vital blueprint for reform. It provides global actors, national governments, and local communities with the practical means to move decisively beyond fragmented, top-down models. Ultimately, true

international cooperation requires more than just pooled resources; it demands a shared methodology centered on human dialogue, ensuring that every financial investment translates transparently and sustainably into genuine, measurable learning gains for the learners the system exists to serve.

Global Education Challenge	DE Response
Limited coordination among global, national, and local actors	Continuous LNRA engages stakeholders from the outset, fostering collaboration, alignment, and local ownership.
Exclusion of local voices in policy design	LNRA and participatory design ensure educational goals and strategies are co-created with communities, enhancing cultural relevance and sustainability.
Donor dominance shaping priorities	DE reframes funding as strategic investment linked to measurable Achievement-Based Objectives (ABOs), ensuring transparency, equity, and learning-centered accountability.
Input-focused monitoring rather than learning outcomes	Clear, verifiable ABOs and the Proof of Learning framework measure actual learning, transfer, and impact, shifting focus from inputs to authentic outcomes.
Inequitable distribution of learning across student groups	WHO and WHY steps in LNRA identify diverse learner needs, enabling tailored interventions that target struggling students and reduce inequities.
Unstable and underfunded education financing	DE links resources directly to measurable outcomes, improving efficiency, transparency, and alignment with real learning gains.
Centralized planning disconnecting initiatives from local realities	Principle-driven design and stakeholder engagement ensure programs are responsive to local needs while maintaining accountability and effectiveness.

By making dialogue the engine of change, DE offers not just a critique of a broken system, but a practical and principled pathway to rebuild it for the learners it ultimately exists to serve. Embedding DE in international education cooperation would require rethinking donor accountability frameworks, shifting from financial reporting to demonstrated learning outcomes co-defined with communities.

References

Ahmadi, F. (2011). Community-Based Maternal Health Education through Dialogue Education: Field Report from Mawundo Village, Uganda. Unpublished field documentation.

Ahmadi, F. Z., Mehrmohammadi, M., Vella, J., & Montazeri, A. (2017). Implementation and greenhouse trial of a dialogic health literacy curriculum for pre-service teachers: A narrative inquiry. *Payesh*, 16(4), 431–443.

Ahmadi, F. Z., Mehrmohammadi, M., Montazeri, A., & Vella, J. (2020). Dialogic health literacy curriculum development for Iranian pre-service teachers: A qualitative inquiry. *Curriculum Studies in Health and Physical Education*, 11(3), 265–281. <https://doi.org/10.1080/25742981.2020.1826332>

Beeharry, G. (2021). The pathway to progress on SDG 4 requires the global education architecture to focus on foundational learning and to hold ourselves accountable for achieving it. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 82, 102375. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedudev.2021.102375>

Burnett, N. (2019). Invited essay: It's past time to fix the broken international architecture for education. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 68, 15–19. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedudev.2019.04.005>

Carvalho, S., Asgedom, A., & Rose, P. (2022). Whose voice counts? Examining government-donor negotiations in the design of Ethiopia's large-scale education reforms for equitable learning. *Development Policy Review*, 40(5), e12634. <https://doi.org/10.1111/dpr.12634>

Elfert, M., & Ydesen, C. (2023). *Global governance of education: The historical and contemporary entanglements of UNESCO, the OECD and the World Bank*. Springer.

Global Learning Partners. (n.d.). *Home*. Global Learning Partners. Retrieved from <https://www.globallearningpartners.com>

Jenkins, R. (2024). *Stronger together: Strengthening global cooperation to accelerate action on foundational learning*. UNESCO SDG4 Education 2030.

Lee, J., & Medina, O. (2019). *Learning from what works: Results-based financing in education*. World Bank. <https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/handle/10986/32133>

Rodriguez-Segura, D., Campton, C., Crouch, L., & Slade, T. S. (2021). Looking beyond changes in averages in evaluating foundational learning: Some inequality measures. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 84, 102411.

Shields, R., & Menashy, F. (2019). The network of bilateral aid to education 2005–2015. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 64, 74–80. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedudev.2017.07.00>

Solesin, L. (2020). The global governance of Education 2030: Challenges in a changing landscape. Education Research and Foresight Working Paper, 26. UNESCO.

Vella, J. (2008). *On Teaching and Learning: Putting the Principles and Practices of Dialogue Education into Action*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

World Bank & UNESCO. (2024). *Education Finance Watch 2024*. World Bank. <https://www.worldbank.org/education-finance-watch-2024>

Yao, H., & Haskell, M. J. (2022). Financing education recovery: A piece of cake?. UNICEF.

Yorke, L., Asegdom, A., Hailu, B. H., & Rose, P. (2022). Is the Programme for Results approach fit for purpose? Evidence from a large-scale education reform in Ethiopia. *Third World Quarterly*, 43(5), 1016–1037. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01436597.2022.2047920>