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Since its inception as an academic field, comparative education has been enamored with research on educational transfer. Whether we consider an old, albeit practical question, “What can we learn from the study of foreign systems?” (Sadler, 1900; reprinted in Bereday, 1964) or move on to a current topic of great academic concern such as, “Are national educational systems increasingly becoming similar as a result of borrowing?” — the range of questions dealing with educational transfer appears genuinely comparative. A few years ago, Robert Coven (2000) revisited Sadler’s hundred-year-old question and illustrated that, in practice, the comparative study of education has fueled a cargo-cult, that is, export and import of education across national boundaries.

Most introductory texts in comparative education treat educational transfer as a key research area of the field. There is no doubt that the study of transfer has helped to legitimize and sustain the comparative study of education. It is important to recall, however, that in addition to a long history of research on educational transfer, we also look back on a strong tradition of skepticism. Numerous warnings have been issued about borrowing and lending, whether wholesale, selective, or eclectic. Educational transfer implies isolating education from its political, economic, and cultural context. Given this particular concern with de-contextualization, it is not surprising that most research published thus far has focused on what has been transplanted from one context to another. However, there is much...
more to be explored in this area than simply mapping the trajectories of educational knowledge, policies, and reform strategies originating in one context, subsequently transferred to another, and, in some cases, disseminated globally.

The studies presented in this book depart from the traditional focus on the content of borrowing or lending, and draw attention to a host of unresolved mysteries and contradictions. Why was something borrowed never implemented? Why did policy makers refer to lessons from elsewhere, when similar experiences already existed in their own country? Why are controversial educational policies exported to other countries? In addition to scrutinizing the politics underlying policy borrowing and lending, several authors of this book also examined why the copy of a borrowed policy differed from the original, and analyzed how a policy, once borrowed, was locally adapted and re-contextualized.

In the Introduction I addressed some of the features of our interpretive framework and reflected on its application for globalization studies. The authors of the first two chapters take up the theme of globalization. Tilly (Chapter 1) refutes the myth of globalization as a twenty-first-century phenomenon. He does so by illustrating several waves of globalization over the course of human history that were triggered by commerce, commitment, or coercion. Schriewer and Martinez (Chapter 2) take account of the most recent wave of globalization and confront the problematic assumption that globalization inevitably leads to an international convergence of knowledge. The findings from their comparative study of education journals in the Soviet Union/Russia, China, and Spain go against the grain of convergence theorists: Judging from what educational researchers read and to which authors they refer as their sources of educational knowledge, “internationality” in education scored highest during Dewey’s time, in the 1920s and 1930s. Against all expectations of convergence theorists, educational knowledge in the three countries did not become internationalized after the mid-1980s, the period when all three countries opened their ideological boundaries and increased their international cooperation efforts. Dismissing globalization as the driving force for policy borrowing and lending invariably carries wider implications. One of them is to privilege an investigation of local policy tensions that, at a particular time, allow global pressure to become meaningful and powerful. The disproportion of case studies dealing with borrowing (Chapters 4–10) and lending (Chapters 11 and 12), respectively, mirrors our preoccupation with local policy contexts.

Several case studies in the book examined the local policy constellations at the time of borrowing and found a plethora of political and economic reasons why policies were imported from elsewhere. Educational transfer from one context to another not only occurs for different reasons, but also plays out differently. For instance, economic pressure on low-income countries to raise standards in education, imported reforms with differing effects, that is, they do not lead to a

**IMPORT FOR POLICY MAKERS**

This is perhaps a good moment to review the analysis mentioned several times throughout this book. Educational borrowing, in particular, is not an act of externalization of national education systems, reforming as a source of external authority from which would have been resisted. Or, perhaps, learning often used as an effective policy borrowing. The words certification and de-certification of transnational policy borrowing, in this book. These terms were coined by Stein, to describe transnational interactions of political struggle. This is how the validation of actors, their policies or authorities. Decertification is the depriving agents” (p. 12).

Witnessing a boom in cross-cultural study about policy makers’ genuine intent, we were curious to know what the references were for policy borrowing. Several authors refined and found it to be especially the role of political leadership in this process. It is precisely during times of political change. The references, that is, references to the past, are by necessity suspended. Decertification and borrowed from elsewhere. The process of reticent are not viable policy. For instance, socialists Latvia (Chapter 4) and policies that, for example, revamping the educational system were perceived as “internationalization of a new ‘educational space’,” one that...
simply mapping the trajectories of reform strategies originating in one another, and, in some cases, disseminating ideas from one region to another. Why was something borrowed or adapted refer to lessons from elsewhere, which had never existed in their own country? Why then did they adopt, instead of borrowing, and how was it possible to borrow, once borrowed or adapted?

One of the features of our interpretation for globalization studies is to take up the theme of globalization. Globalization as a twentieth-century phenomenon is a product of several waves of globalization over the last century, triggered by commerce, commitment (Chapter 2) and Spain. The grain of the confrontation and the problematic assumptions of an international convergence of comparative study of education journals and books on education researchers read and discuss of educational knowledge, "inherently more interesting during Dewey’s time, in the tradition of convergence theorists. Education did not become internationalized in the three countries opened their ideological international cooperation efforts, for example. One of them is to privilege an equation, at a particular time, allow globalization. The disproportion of cases (4-10) and lending (Chapters 11) should not be treated with local policy contexts. Examined the local policy constellation and a plethora of political and economic interact and cite. Educational policy only occurs for different reasons, but also plays out differently. For example, despite all the political and economic pressure on low-income countries to comply with "international standards" in education, imported policies do not have homogenizing effects, that is, they do not lead to a convergence of educational systems.

**IMPORT FOR CERTIFICATION**

This is perhaps a good moment to recapitulate the externalization thesis mentioned several times throughout the book. Schriewer (1990) frames educational borrowing, in particular, the references to lessons from elsewhere, as an act of externalization, in which either an imaginary international community ("international standards") or a concrete other (e.g., national education systems, reform models, reform strategies, etc.) is evoked as a source of external authority for implementing reforms that otherwise would have been resisted. Or, phrased differently, the act of lesson drawing often is used as an effective policy strategy to certify contentious policies at home (Steiner-Khamsi, 2002).

The words certification and decertification best capture the mechanism of transnational policy borrowing and lending that we examined in this book. These terms were coined by McAdam, Tarrow, and Tilly (2001) to describe transnational interactions in social movements and other forms of political struggle. This is how they define them: "Certification entails the validation of actors, their performances, and their claims by external authorities. Decertification is the withdrawal of such validation by certifying agents" (p. 12).

Witnessing a boom in cross-national policy attraction and skeptical about policy makers’ genuine interest in other people’s educational reforms, we were curious to know what the political reasons and the policy impact were for policy borrowing. Several authors delved into the externalization thesis and found it to be especially applicable for analyzing policy borrowing in times of political change. This makes perfect sense given that all changes in political leadership imply a reorientation and recertification process. It is precisely during times of political change that retrospective references, that is, references to one’s positive experiences from the past, are by necessity suspended. Instead, reform experiences are sought and borrowed from elsewhere. In times of political change, intro- and retrospection are not viable policy solutions, but externalization is. In post-socialist Latvia (Chapter 4) and post-apartheid South Africa (Chapter 6), for example, revamping the educational system in compliance with (what were perceived as) "international standards" led to the creation of a new "educational space," one that was within the radius of other market
economies and simultaneously far removed from the previous space that the country inhabited (Novoa & Lawn, 2002).

It would be misleading to assume that the announcement of new, fundamental reforms, and the simultaneous decertification of previous reforms, occur only in countries that have undergone revolutions of sorts. For example, Smith, Heinecke, and Noble (1999) examine the “political spectacle” in Arizona, when the new state leadership signaled the beginning of a new political era by discrediting and abandoning the previous student assessment system. Similarly, Luschei (Chapter 10) sheds light on a planned side-effect of policy borrowing in Brazil: the disempowerment of local experts from the previous government, and their replacement with newly appointed experts and bureaucrats. Policy borrowing always goes hand in hand with a grand proclamation of fundamental reform, and yet, as Cuban (1998) has demonstrated convincingly, every fundamental reform is implemented gradually or incrementally, that is, if it is implemented at all.

In addition, for more than 10 years we have witnessed a policy transfer of a special kind: cross-sectoral policy transfer, specifically from the economic sector to the education sector. Given the amount written on the impact of neoliberal thought in current school reforms, there is no need to reiterate the evidence that the education sector is soaked in language and concepts borrowed from the economic sector (e.g., supply/demand, accountability, cost-effectiveness, etc.; see Henig, 1994). We also learn from Tyack and Cuban (1995) that the penetration of the education sector with principles typically applied to the market and the economic sector has been a recurring phenomenon, emerging cyclically every couple of years. Nevertheless, this phenomenon is striking from a sociology-of-knowledge perspective because it entails an interaction between two sectors that, by virtue of being different subsectors of society, manifest different epistemologies and regulation mechanisms. From a policy theory perspective, it is a case of externalization that deserves greater attention. Most studies either examine the politics of cross-rational attraction or scrutinize “globalization as an argument” but, thus far, little has been written on the politics of “the economy as an argument” for fundamental reform.

**EXPORT FOR SURVIVAL**

Keeping in mind that the raison d’être for externalization is the existence of a legitimacy crisis in an educational system, we also suggest that the practice of policy lending should be seen in a new light. What do international organizations gain from exporting their experiences to elsewhere? The obvious will be addressed first.

There is no doubt that there is a significant trade. The education export industry especially to knowledge-driven countries deals with all economic activities dealt with Bonal & Dale (2002). Drawing on luxury goods and services, the education and training services from other economic gains than the export of higher education are not just the global or the local. The profit is, in fact, driven by educational institutions and educational institutions.

What is the profit from transferring an existing program? How cheaply a borrowed model is effective? Rich or additional, noneconomic factors that are included. By now, virtually every international organization (Chapter 11) or loans (Chapter 12) has developed “evidence-based education,” as well as a corresponding model of dissemination and supervision of transfer and local adaptation, I call it international organizations to engage.

First, international organizations demonstrate to their own constituencies the impact. They are concerned with the increasingly crowded with other international organizations: The Secretariat; the United Nations Development Program; the World Bank, private-sector involvement.

Second, the transfer cost for might, after all, not be that high international organizations: The staff and evaluate, and those in the field and local staff (frequently more educationally equipped) for adapting and implementing a combination of (best) practices from the “economy as an argument.”
There is no doubt that there are economic gains associated with educational trade. The education export business is a lucrative one. This applies especially to knowledge-driven economies, where typically two-thirds of all economic activities deal with the provision of services (Robertson, Bonal, & Dale, 2002). Drawing on the example of New Zealand’s education industry, Robertson and colleagues contend that the export of education and training services from New Zealand to Asia generated larger economic gains than the export of New Zealand wines. This is not surprising for observers of transnational educational transfer who closely followed the global sojourn of the New Zealand outcomes-based education (OBE) reform. The profiteers are consulting firms, the textbook industry, and tuition-driven educational institutions.

What is the profit from transfer for nonprofits and international NGOs? Transferring an existing program from one context to another is not necessarily cheap. The high cost of local adaptation and implementation to make a borrowed model effective (Richardson, 1993) urges us to search for additional, noneconomic factors that account for dissemination and transfer. By now, virtually every international organization giving grants (Chapter 11) or loans (Chapter 12) has developed a portfolio with their “best practices,” as well as a corresponding management structure that serves the dissemination and supervision of these practices. Given the high cost of transfer and local adaptation, I can offer three organizational reasons for international institutions to engage in educational lending.

First, international organizations need to mark their presence and demonstrate to their own constituents and donor(s) that their projects have an impact. They are concerned with survival in a policy environment that is increasingly crowded with other international organizations, each one seeking to exert the greatest influence on governments and education authorities. Having specific trademarks (best practices) enhances the visibility of an organization within the donor community. The trademarks undoubtedly differ. For example, Save the Children U.S. prioritizes community-based education; the Open Society Institute/Soros Foundation, critical thinking; DANIDA (Danish bilateral aid agency), student-centered learning; the United Nations Development Programme, micro-credits; and the World Bank, private-sector involvement in higher education.

Second, the transfer cost for North–South and West–East transfer might, after all, not be that high if we consider the division of labor in international organizations: The staff at the headquarters design, supervise, and evaluate, and those in the field offices adapt and implement. Hiring local staff (frequently more educated and experienced than headquarters staff) for adapting and implementing projects is cheap. The transplantation of (best) practices from the “center” to the “peripheries” needs to be
added to the long list of practices in educational development that are, perhaps not in intent but certainly in effect, neocolonialist.

Third, prepackaged, modularized, and checklisted programs developed at the headquarters of international organizations and subsequently transferred to their field offices are easier to manage than locally developed programs. The design of best practices evokes associations with principles of efficiency, calculability, predictability, control, and "irrationality of rationality" that McDonalds and other commercial chains follow religiously (see Ritzer, 1996). One of the irrationalities of rationality in educational development is epitomized in the tireless insistence on the sustainability of funded projects and reforms on the one hand, and the exclusion of local experts on the other. The dependency on international experts and consultants who recycle and transfer educational reforms from one context to another is considerable, absorbing on the average one-third of all funds allocated to international cooperation projects (McGinn, 1996). One is no doubt curious how the great dependency on international consultants or the irrationality of rationality is rationalized. The explanation that international consultants are guarantors for "professionalism" (see Escobar, 1995) reflects a mind-set of redemption, which Popkewitz (1998) has demystified for other contexts. Popkewitz (1998) deconstructs the redemptive discourse of schools and characterizes the teacher as an individual who, in an attempt to "rescue" the child, pursues a mission of "pastoral care" (pp. 59–78; also see Popkewitz & Brennan, 1998). The mission of pastoral care provides schools with a much-needed justification for disciplining and normalizing the individual child. For our context, Popkewitz's concept of pastoral care brilliantly captures the redemptive relationship between the center (headquarters) and the periphery (field offices) in international organizations. On a larger scale, the concept is also suitable to describe the interaction between donors that are big-footed (e.g., World Bank, regional banks, and, to some degree, UN organizations) and the others that do the footwork (e.g., governments, international NGOs, and local NGOs).

What about governments? Why do they provide grants for researchers and bureaucrats to disseminate their reforms elsewhere? In high-income countries, there is competition over effective school reform strategies. Very often, the survival of a policy depends on whether it is borrowed by other educational systems. For example, the busy transatlantic trade of quasi-market school reform strategies between the United States and the United Kingdom in the 1990s was used politically to demonstrate international support for the reforms and to appease critics in the two countries (Halpin & Trowin, 1995). In a historical study, we analyzed why the Hampton-Tuskegee model of industrial and agricultural education was transferred from the segregated South in the United States to Achimota, British colonial Ghana (Steiner-Khamsi & Quist, 2000). We were intrigued by the fact that the U.S. export initiative of the "adapted education" to the British colonies failed.

The timing for export coincided with the Hampton-Tuskegee model was un-theorized as a leading African American school system. For reasons we interpreted the export (Steiner-Khamsi & Quist, 2000): The need for authorities (in this case, the British colonial authorities) to control the wholesale export of the Hampton-Tuskegee model. Interestingly, after only a few years, Ahampton education in Western colonial Africa, in turn, depended on whether the nation's adapted education curriculum.

THE POLITICS OF THE POLITICS

Perhaps more than any other tables that rank educational systems in terms of reading literacy, and so forth, have pushed educational reform upside down. The International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA), generated tremendous interest in the United Kingdom (Gorard, 1992), earned by students both in U.S. and the UK and stated in the media, but nevertheless "certifying" the educational system as "good" and served ongoing debates of the accountability measures, and high-stakes testing. The IEA-type studies have contributed to the "certifying agencies" (McAdam et al., 1997) in their methodology and international in-ternationality, these studies give impetus to the outcomes-based education reform from an international pool of educational "comparative advantage" or "comparative disadvantage" to be determined and politically driven.

Let us speculate about two possible situations. The first one is that rankings, and then interject a third level of rankings, and then inevitably initiate a process of criticism and ongoing reform, enhance reform.
that the U.S. export initiative of the Hampton–Tuskegee model (labeled "adapted education") to the British colonial empire was busiest in the 1920s. The timing for export coincided with the historical period, a time when the Hampton–Tuskegee model was under serious attack by W. E. DuBois and other leading African American scholars in the United States. For a variety of reasons, we interpreted the export of the model as follows (Steiner-Khamsi & Quist, 2000): The need for a stamp of approval by external authorities (in this case, the British colonial government) accounts for the wholesale export of the Hampton–Tuskegee model to colonial Africa. Interestingly, after only a few years, Achimota, the flagship school for adapted education in Western colonial Africa, was criticized by local elites; its survival, in turn, depended on whether other schools were willing to borrow its adapted education curriculum.

THE POLITICS OF LEAGUE TABLES AND THE POLITICS OF COMPARISON

Perhaps more than any other two-column Excel spreadsheet, league tables that rank educational systems with regard to mathematics, science, reading literacy, and so forth, have the potential of turning ongoing educational reform upside down. The IEA-sponsored Third International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS), for example, which was sponsored by the International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA), generated tremendous reform pressure in the United States and in the United Kingdom (Corard, 2001; Rust, 2000). The poor results earned by students both in U.S. and U.K. schools were dramatically overstated in the media, but nevertheless it worked: The public "scandalization" of the educational system established tremendous reform pressure and served ongoing debates of the time to introduce standards, clearer accountability measures, and high-stakes testing. There are two features of OECD- and IEA-type studies that turn them into credible and respected "certifying agencies" (McAdam et al., 2001, p. 12): They are meticulous in methodology and international in scope. Having the clout of scientific rationality, these studies give impetus to the trend of evidence-based and outcomes-based education reform (Chatterji, 2002). Furthermore, drawing from an international pool of educational systems implies that the "comparative advantage" or "comparative disadvantage" of each system can be determined and politically and economically utilized.

Let us speculate about two possible political and economic implications of rankings, and then interject a third: Does a comparative disadvantage inevitably initiate a process of critical self-reflection and scandalization of an ongoing reform, enhance reform pressure, and eventually increase the
likelihood of transnational policy borrowing? Alternatively, does a comparative advantage cause self-affirmation and glorification of an ongoing reform, relieve reform pressure, and eventually boost educational export and lending to other educational systems? These causal chains make sense, but the assumptions are incomplete. To complicate matters, we need to acknowledge that self-slanderization and self-glorification constitute only the more extreme policy responses to league tables. The most frequent policy response to OECD- and IEA-type studies is indifference. In fact, in most countries, international comparative studies pass unnoticed by politicians and the general public, and cause little excitement, either positive or negative.

A more convincing narrative is needed, one that accounts for the various policy responses to international comparative studies. David Phillips’s theory of cross-national policy attraction (Chapter 3) is key for understanding the politics of league tables. In short, the potential of influencing educational reform depends on whether a controversy over educational reforms in a particular country already exists. In such instances, international league tables indeed are utilized as a policy tool to certify the demands of reform proponents. Thus, international comparisons are attractive to politicians and policy makers only if they are, at that particular moment, in need of additional, external support for their reform agenda. Two cases might help to clarify this argument.

The first case deals with the policy and media responses in Germany with respect to the following three studies: (1) Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA), conducted by the OECD, (2) Civic Education (CivEd), conducted by the IEA, and (3) Progress in International Reading Literacy Study (PIRLS), also conducted by the IEA. The results from PISA were released first, made the headlines of all major German newspapers in December 2001, and continued almost on a daily basis to attract public attention in the German press, television, and radio, and on the Internet. The below-average performance of German secondary school students not only was surprising, but was publicly framed as a scandal for the German educational system. Particular attention was given to the low performance in reading literacy. Not only did German students score significantly below the average of other OECD educational systems, but the distance between students performing in the top and bottom 5% was greater than in all the other 31 participating countries (Baunert et al., 2001). The great variation in reading literacy among students of the German educational system stimulated a major public debate on the need for fundamental educational reform demanding the introduction of standards, close and continuous quality monitoring, and a thorough reconsideration of the current highly selective educational structure, which tracks secondary school students into different performance levels.

A few months later, the released. CivEd was yet another study with comparable results. Similarly, with students in Oesterreich, when Toney-Pu media response? They were not worse with regard to xenophobia about their below-average explanation for the silence about the could argue that civic education media and policy reaction. PIRLS, released 2 years later, as did.

The PIRLS report (Bos et al.), the fourth graders in Germany scored above the average scor positive results from PIRLS we to good news. German politicians absorbed with finalizing the re the German educational system below-average reading literacy scores (PISA) 2 years earlier, nobody the idea of incremental school reform that, for the past few years, was almost nonexistent due to skepticism and “Timing is everything” (Lusch, 2001) of international comparative studies or “policy tourism” to countries like Finland, blossomed in Germany.

The second case deals with TIMSS, which was released. These are few signs that media celebrated or glorified, in mathematics and science in the heightening concerns over the one little news in Japan that the school. Nevertheless, TIMSS did have a impact in the international donor community. foreign aid history, the Japan Foundation, published a policy paper that focuses on. The JICA report, entitled “Towards Development and Education...
borrowing? Alternatively, does a compar- on and glorification of an ongoing reform, actually boost educational export and lend- chains make sense, but the complicate matters, we need to acknowledge glorification constitute only the more tables. The most frequent policy response is indifference. In fact, in most countries, pass unnoticed by politicians and the general public, either positive or negative.

We need one that accounts for the international comparative studies. David policy attraction (Chapter 3) is key for comparative tables. In short, the potential of inten- sions on whether a controversy over edu- country already exists. In such instances, a are utilized as a policy tool to certify the. Thus, international comparisons are at- makers only if they are, at that particular external support for their reform agenda.

his argument.

policy and media responses in Germany studies: (1) Programme for International conducted by the OECD, (2) Civic Education and (3) Progress in International Reading conducted by the IEA. The results from PISA studies of all major German newspapers are utilized as a daily basis to attract public attention, and radio, and on the Internet. of German secondary school students not likely framed as a scandal for the German was given to the low performance and German students score significantly different educational systems, but the distance the top and bottom 5% was greater than countries (Baumert et al., 2001). The great students of the German educational debate on the need for fundamental education introduction of standards, close and careful reconsideration of the current structure, which tracks secondary school stu- levels.

A few months later, the results from the IEA CivEd study were released. CivEd was yet another prophet of doom. German 14-year-old students ranked lowest with regard to positive attitudes toward immigrants as compared with students from the other 27 participating countries (Oesterreich, 2002; Torney-Purta, Lehmann, Oswald, & Schulz, 2001). The media response? Virtually none. Given that the German students did far worse with regard to xenophobia in CivEd, why was there such a political fuss about their below-average reading literacy scores in PISA? Also, what explains the silence about the scandalous results in civic education? One could argue that civic education is not a core subject, and therefore draws less media and policy reaction. But why did the next reading literacy study, PIRLS, released 2 years later, elicit the same indifferent response as CivEd did?

The PIRLS report (Bos et al., 2003) was published in April 2003, and the fourth graders in German schools did relatively well, that is, they performed above the average score of other OECD countries. By the time the positive results from PIRLS were released, nobody seemed to be receptive to good news. German politicians and policy makers were already fully absorbed with finalizing the remaining details for a fundamental reform of the German educational system. After all the bad tidings regarding the below-average reading literacy scores of German secondary school students (PISA) 2 years earlier, nobody was prepared to turn the clock back and continue with incremental school reform. Politically speaking, PISA served as a much-needed certificate for accelerating a standards-based school reform that, for the past few years, had been in debate, but had little chance of passing due to skepticism and resistance among political stakeholders. “Timing is everything” (Luschei, Chapter 10) when it comes to the release of international comparative studies. Shortly after the release, study tours or “policy tourism” to countries that ranked top, especially to the league leader Finland, blossomed in Germany.

The second case deals with the policy response in Japan after TIMSS was released. There are few signs that would suggest that the Japanese media celebrated or glorified, in any manner, its second international rank in mathematics and science in the third- and fourth-grade levels. Despite heightening concerns over the declining quality of education, it came as little news in Japan that the schools were performing well in these subjects. Nevertheless, TIMSS did have an impact on how Japan resituated herself in the international donor community. In 1994, for the first time in Japan’s foreign aid history, the Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA) published a policy paper that focused on the importance of basic education. The JICA report, entitled “Study on Japan’s Development Assistance for Development and Education” (1994), suggested both a new aid focus
(basic education) and a new aid approach (cooperation with other donors, community participation, etc.). Building on this historical cornerstone representing a stronger commitment to the education sector, Japan has been expanding foreign assistance in basic education. In 1994, the first basic education project, the Science and Mathematics Education Manpower Development Project, was launched in the Philippines. This is the first basic education project administered by JICA to provide technical assistance by dispatching education specialists and volunteers as well as conducting in-country training. It incorporated both “soft-type” aid and traditional “hard-type” assistance such as school construction and equipment. The project had a specific objective and audience: building the capacity of teachers in math and science at the level of upper elementary and secondary education (JICA, 2003; Osumi, 1999). Since this kind of project first began in 1994, Japan has been delivering similar projects in math and science education in numerous developing countries (see Kijima, 2003). In 1997, a smaller-scaled project that dispatched Japanese experts in math and science was administered in Egypt. In 1998, two math and science projects were implemented in Kenya and Indonesia. In 1999, another math and science project was launched in South Africa. In 2000, Ghana and Cambodia were sites for Japan’s education in projects in math and science.

The story is complex and there is no doubt that several factors account for Japan’s reorientation toward external assistance (Kijima & Steiner-Khamsi, 2003). Nevertheless, TIMSS demonstrated to the rest of the world, and, in particular, to the international donor community, that Japanese experts do indeed have something to offer in mathematics and science education reform. TIMSS was released 4 years after the Education for All Declaration, when Japan agreed to coordinate its international development efforts more closely in line with the international donor community. Again, TIMSS was released at the right time, that is, when the reorientation in Japan’s foreign assistance needed to be certified.

In this section, I drew from Phillips’s theory of attraction (Chapter 3) and made a case for scrutinizing the local policy context so as to better understand the various policy responses that international comparative studies have evoked. Beginning in the 1990s, ranking and league tables in fact became such important policy tools to accelerate change and innovation in educational organizations (Kellaghan, 1996; Lowe, 2001; Robinson, 1999) that several researchers felt compelled to study the politics of comparison (see Steiner-Khamsi, 2003). Moreover, Phillips’s theory lends itself to other cases of borrowing. For example, Vavrus’s marked observations on the “referential web” in the Tanzanian policy context (Chapter 9) and Yariv-Mashal’s fascinating study of the Israeli Black Panthers (Chapter 5) make it clear that any transferred discourse or policy needs to resonate with local groups. For the protagonists benefiting from, believing in, and agenda are indispensable.

Attention to reasons for cross-cultural processes and issues should not be approached at the dichotomy. It is important to acknowledge the manner in which the policies from elsewhere, and the elite exerting tremendous power over, etc. (see Streitwieser’s analysis of the West and East German educators in the post-World War II East German educators in the post-World War II period) represent perhaps two extreme cases of the majorities of scientists or communities of beliefs and reforms partially adopt or, the power of postcolonial, policy of education.

LESS THAN 512

THE MARIS O’ROURKE

There are only a few research articles or books than studies dealing with the small fact that we all live in the same world (Mongolia) within six degrees of separation. This is how I am connected to him: His grandfather was a pupil of the school of the only man who knew of the world. After exchanging in the calculation, we realized that we know the same people in far-flung places, and cannot help but share the same world. The calculation is simple. If the person of 10 has friends with 10,000 (100 x 100) individual friends, and so on, one can reach out to 9 billion people in six steps to be connected to anyone.

Actually, there are far less than six steps for professional networks. Conferences, publications, so on, make the world appear so...
of Educational Borrowing and Lending

In Japan, the Education Ministry has taken the lead in fostering cooperation with other donors, particularly those from the United States, to improve education sector, Japan has been an active participant. In 1994, the first basic education theme, "Education for Manpower Development in the Philippines," was launched. This is the first basic education theme to provide technical assistance by volunteers as part of the "hardship and equipment" aid and traditional "hardship and equipment" project. The project built the capacity of teachers in elementary and secondary education. The project that first began in 1994, focusing on math and science education (Kijima, 2003). In 1997, a smaller-scale project was implemented, focusing on another math and science project in Ghana and Cambodia were sites.

I doubt that several factors account for the success of the Kijima & Steinman (1996) project. These factors include: donor community, that Japanese expertise in mathematics and science education is needed. Over the years after the Education for All (EFA) campaign, Japan has continued its international development activities through bilateral and multilateral aid agencies. The Kijima & Steinman project is an example of how this development can be achieved.

Our theory of attraction (Chapter 3) in the local policy context so as to better understand international comparative research in education, ranking and league tables are tools to accelerate change and progress (Kellaghan, 1996; Lowe, 2001; and others who felt compelled to study the policy context). Moreover, Phillips’s (1992) theory of the Maris O’Rourke Effect in Education (1998) shows that within six degrees of separation is at first mind-blowing. This is how I am connected to him: His daughter has a teacher whose sister works for an organization in Ulaanbaatar that is headed by the divorced husband of a former student of mine. Every now and then, we actually do meet those individuals whom we know within two, three, or more degrees of separation. After exchanging information about our acquaintances, we realize that we know the same people from totally different contexts and in far-flung places, and cannot help but be mesmerized by how small our world is. The calculation is simple. If everyone has on average 100 friends, and each of these friends has in turn 100 friends, one already is connected with 10,000 (100 x 100) individuals within two degrees. In five degrees, finally, one can reach out to 9 billion people. In other words, it only takes six steps to be connected to anyone in this world.

Actually, there are far less than six degrees of separation within professional networks. Conferences, publications, meetings, listservs, and so on, make the world appear smaller for individuals within the same context.
innovation to be diffused, was a matter also of great concern for diffusionists (Rogers, 1947). The greatest concern was that for diffusionists, Rogers (1995) refers, for example, to the case of American who compared the diffusion of driver's education (and car dealers) with the idea of home ownership. Rogers (1995) summarizes the findings of earlier studies, which indicated that only 19 years were needed for the idea to reach 90% adoption (p. 41).

Rogers (1995) provides an excellent overview of a new tradition, which emerged first in agricultural education. At the core of diffusion theory is the concept of “inductive research” to determine whether ideas were independently discovered and not invented elsewhere. Rogers believes that the diffusion of an idea is influenced by factors such as personal communication, media, and other influences on an individual's decision to adopt the idea (p. 24).

One may wonder whether this diffusion in disguise, recycled, or revisited, has contributed to the diffusion of innovation research within the 1970s. It operated within a problematic framework of modernization theory—advocating the diffusion of innovations and the diffusion of institutions. It was the diffusion of innovation theory that evolved from the 1960s to the 1970s, and the research field was becoming more focused on the diffusion of innovations within a particular context. One of the strengths of diffusion theory is that it is able to model the diffusion of innovations and diffusion of innovations. In the 1970s, social network theory developed as a way of studying the processes of social structure. It was the diffusion of innovation research that evolved from the 1960s to the 1970s, and the research field was becoming more focused on the diffusion of innovations within a particular context. One of the strengths of diffusion theory is that it is able to model the diffusion of innovations and diffusion of innovations.
innovation to be diffused, was a matter not only of great fascination, but also of great concern for diffusion of innovation researchers (e.g., Mort, 1947). The greatest concern was that innovations do not spread fast enough. Rogers (1995) refers, for example, to a study conducted by Allen (1956), who compared the diffusion of driver training (promoted by safety groups and car dealers) with the idea of having students study their community. Rogers (1995) summarizes the findings of the study: “Sixty years were required for this idea to reach 90% adoption among 168 United States schools while only 18 years were needed for driver training to reach this level of adoption” (p. 41).

Rogers (1995) provides an excellent overview of this particular research tradition, which emerged first in anthropology, and then in sociology and education. At the core of diffusion studies were research questions related to “whether ideas were independently invented in two different cultures, or whether an idea was invented in one culture and diffused to the other, and how individuals and institutions ‘adapt’ or cope with innovations” (p. 24).

One may wonder whether this book is diffusion of innovation research in disguise, recycled, or revisited. Actually, it is not. The major bulk of diffusion of innovation research was published between the 1920s and the 1970s. It operated within a problematic research paradigm—modernization theory—advocating the diffusion of innovations made in metropolitan areas and in the Western hemisphere.

Publications on diffusion of innovation dramatically dropped in the 1970s, and the research field was buried a couple of years later. Elements of the research tradition, however, lived on in new research paradigms. One of the great strengths of diffusion of innovation research was its attention to “innovators” and “adopters” of new ideas. This important focus on agency became one of the core characteristics of social network theory. In the 1970s, social network theory dropped the ideological baggage of modernization theory and developed a sophisticated approach to the study of dissemination processes.

Contemporary research on borrowing and lending, reception and diffusion, or import and export, draws directly from social network analysis. As a corollary, our research field is also, within two degrees of separation, related to diffusion of innovation research. Our kinship to social network analysis is defined in terms of theory and methodology. At the theoretical level, research on educational transfer also views the social structure reflected in the interactions of individuals, organizations, and nations (Watts, 1999). Since social constraints, hierarchies, and inequalities characterize a social structure, they also are manifested in interactions. Shifting “attention away from seeing the world as composed of egalitarian, voluntarily
chosen, two-person ties," and concentrating instead "on seeing it as composed of asymmetric ties bound up in hierarchical structures" (Wellman, 1983, p. 156), has important implications for studying interaction and transfer processes. In his succinct summary of the theory of social networks, Wellman (1983) reflects on some of these consequences.

This shift has important consequences at all analytical scales. In studying communities, for example, it abandons spatial determinism and does not assume automatically that all communities are bound up in local solidarities. In studying world systems, it moves away from sorting countries into traditional or modern categories on the basis of their internal characteristics (such as level of industrialization) and leads to the categorization of units on the basis of their structural relationships with each other. (p. 156)

Along with cultural anthropologists (e.g., Appadurai, 1994; Comaroff & Comaroff, 2001; Hannerz, 1989), social network analysts invite us to abandon the concept of "spatial determinism" (Wellman, 1983, p. 156) of communities and networks, and replace it with spatial concepts that are more fluid and hybrid. As a consequence, the distinctions into two separate spaces—in particular, between local and global, internal and external—perpetuate erroneous dichotomies and need to be dismissed altogether in research on educational transfer.

Methodologically, research on educational transfer lags behind network analysis. Thus far, we can only speak of the importance of networks for disseminating educational reform, but we have not provided concrete empirical evidence. In an attempt to formulate the tacit network assumptions commonly held in research on educational transfer, I suggest that we address the phenomenon explicitly and label it the "Maris O'Rourke effect." In case you do not know a friend of a colleague of a former employee of Maris O'Rourke, the affirmation is the following: She is for real. O'Rourke was instrumental in the development of outcomes-based education reform in New Zealand in the 1980s, and she became instrumental for disseminating OBE in the 1990s to other parts of the world. In fact, some scholars would say that O'Rourke embodied OBE: with her move from New Zealand to the United States in 1995, OBE moved along with her. It spread like wildfire in all high-income countries as well as in countries receiving loans from the World Bank. In sum, OBE experienced a "global career" (Dale, 2001, p. 498). The tipping point for the "New Zealand model" going global coincided with Maris O'Rourke's tenure at the World Bank. Coincidence, or the power of global networks?

In network analysis, the dissemination of ideas and innovations is compared to the spread of rumors or epidemics (Watts, 1999, 2003). In more ways than one, we can think of policy borrowing and lending in terms of epidemics. As I mentioned in the introduction, a few scholars; simple, lasting explanations for epidemics are then generated; after a while, we have on explaining why, from a few simple cases, the rapid global dissemination of school reform (see Levin, 1998). But it is novel designs that have borrowed a model from elsewhere. (p. 156)

De-territorialization helps. And therein the period of a policy epidemic begins. When several systems have de-territorialized, the source of the contagion becomes evident, and we can account for the fact that with time we have borrowed a model from elsewhere. For example, the New Zealand school reform of the 1980s became widespread, and discussion of the reform spread to other countries. (p. 156)

Networks count, both for more or less critical mass of educational systems (Mintrom & Vergari, 1998, p. 5) and policy entrepreneurs: the adoption of their reform is not to be belittled. Mintrom (1997) has emphasized the importance of networking strategies of policy entrepreneurs: the adoption of educational policy can be explained by the role of "policy entrepreneurs." Mintrom (1997) has identified a number of ways in which policy entrepreneurs can influence policy decisions, including the creation of new policy networks and the mobilization of existing networks. (p. 156)

Furthermore, exposure is key. Schools that hold professional positions that maintain "weak ties" to different clusters of interest groups throughout the globe (Granovetter, 1973) have a higher likelihood of being exposed to new ideas and innovations. Social networks play a crucial role in the dissemination of educational policies and reforms.
Blazing a Trail for Policy Theory and Practice

of epidemics. As I mentioned in the Introduction, epidemics start out with a few scholars; simple, lasting explanations designed to resonate over time are then generated; after a while, they burn out. The idea of comparing the rapid global dissemination of school reform models to epidemics is not new (see Levin, 1998). But it is novel to reflect on the profound impact it may have on explaining why, from a sea of school reform models, only a few (e.g., choice, vouchers, outcomes-based education, and standards) surface, with a time lag, in different corners of the world. In other words, which features enhance exportability, or account for the contagion of a specific school reform? Several factors come to mind.

De-territorialization helps. As with epidemics, there is a tipping point wherein the period of a policy epidemic spreads exponentially. Beyond that point, when several systems have already borrowed a particular policy, the source of the contagion becomes difficult to trace. The domino effect accounts for the fact that with time, when a substantial number of systems have borrowed a model from elsewhere, the reform model becomes de-territorialized. For example, OBE is no longer associated with the New Zealand school reform of the 1980s. A few reforms claim to be twins, triplets, or even quadruplets of the original reform idea. Most of them, however, are likely to claim to be improved versions of the original (see Spreen, Chapter 6). At such a stage of a policy epidemic, the model comes across as transnational and is in fact traded as a global model.

Numbers count, both for mobilization and for survival. As soon as a critical mass of educational systems has adopted a policy, “issue networks” (Mintrom & Vergari, 1998, p. 5) enter the scene. They share the same interest: the adoption of their reform by more educational systems. In educational policy, these issue networks are institutionalized in the form of associations, journals, newsletters, list-serves, and conferences. They export and expand the “issue,” that is, a particular policy, for their own survival. The role of “policy entrepreneurs” brokering a particular reform is not to be belittled. Mintrom (1997), for example, investigated the sophisticated networking strategies of policy entrepreneurs who lobbied for school choice in 26 U.S. states. The pressure to continuously extend one’s sphere of influence by generating new “markets” follows the logic of a (capitalist) world-economy, a process that Wallerstein (1990) refers to as “incorporation” (p. 96).

Furthermore, exposure is key. Some individuals (e.g., Maris O’Rourke) hold professional positions that make them exposed. Their ability to maintain “weak ties” to different clusters of stakeholders that are spread throughout the globe (Granovetter, 1973, 1983) elevates them to global players in school reform. Social network theory helps us to understand the role of institutions in disseminating educational policies. Institutional
backing is an asset for the lending of education reform ideas, as it dramatically increases the number of stakeholders in other countries willing to hoist their “flag of convenience” (Lynch, 1998, p. 9) or engage in “phony borrowing” (Phillips, Chapter 3) or “policy mimicry” (Ganderton, 1996) mainly to attain international support and secure the financial resources attached to borrowed policy discourse. Policy network analysis, briefly illustrated above, has the potential of invigorating education policy studies. How global networks exert influence is as important a question as how educational policy makers and stakeholders are positioned in them.

In the beginning of this Conclusion, I pointed to the comparative nature of studies dealing with borrowing and lending, and convergence processes. Naturally, comparative education research is not alone in elaborating on these matters. In fact, it would be hard to imagine how comparative education could intellectually absorb matters of such complexity. For the past 2 decades or so, comparative sociology, comparative politics, and, in particular comparative policy studies, have theorized policy convergence (e.g., Dierkes, Weller, & Berthoin Antal, 1987). Our common ground becomes immediately apparent when we consider how policy convergence is explained in comparative policy studies. For example, in his review of the literature on policy convergence, Bennett (1991) distinguishes among four different processes that may account for convergence: emulation (state officials copying actions taken elsewhere), elite networking (convergence resulting from transnational policy communities), harmonization (advanced by international regimes), and penetration (initiated by external actors and interests).

These distinctions made in comparative policy studies are very much in concert with what this book has attempted to illustrate. Several comparative studies of education presented in this book focused on the process of emulation and found, in line with theories in comparative policy studies, that references to lessons from elsewhere usually have a salutary effect in a climate of protracted policy conflict. A few studies also examined the processes of networking, harmonization, and penetration. They paid special attention to the role of the World Bank, international NGOs, and other international organizations that function as global networks in education or, more precisely, as transnational policy communities, international regimes, and external actors. In particular moments, policy makers and stakeholders refer to these networks as quasi-external authorities and use them to either generate or relieve reform pressure on the education sector.

In conclusion, I have two propositions to offer, each directed to a different audience. My first proposition is that research on education policy borrowing and lending could move beyond the narrow focus of educational research and pay more attention to research in adjacent fields, in particu-

lar sociology of knowledge, policy studies. My final proposition is to state that practitioners in education policy studies should not try to avoid by looking into “globalization” of policy convergence, but to study policy strategies that increasingly need for fundamental educational reforms.

1. Zymek (1975) coined the expression “...countries as an argument” to describe the research that was published in German educational journals of the 1970s. The editors and researchers provided all kinds of information about school curricula and all other matters deemed important to education and did not publish the positive experiences with segregation or equal rights in other countries, notably the United States.
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NOTE

1. Zymek (1975) coined the expression "Das Ausland als Argument" [foreign
countries as an argument] to describe the politics of transnational references made
in German educational journals of the Nazi period. In the late 1930s, Nazi educa-
tors and researchers provided all kinds of justifications as to why Jews, Roma,
and all other groups deemed inferior should be removed from schools and later
on deported to concentration camps. A popular justification strategy was to pub-
lish the positive experiences with segregation that educators and researchers from
other countries, notably the United States, were reporting.
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