

科学研究費助成事業 研究成果報告書

平成 27 年 6 月 26 日現在

機関番号：32615

研究種目：基盤研究(C) (一般)

研究期間：2012～2014

課題番号：24531075

研究課題名(和文) アジアと欧米の二国間援助機関の比較 教育機会拡大の運動にみる相似と相違

研究課題名(英文) Comparing Asian and "Western" Bilateral Aid Institutions: Convergence and Divergence in the Global Movement for Educational Expansion

研究代表者

DAWSON Walter (DAWSON, Walter)

国際基督教大学・教養学部・准教授

研究者番号：70586445

交付決定額(研究期間全体)：(直接経費) 2,500,000円

研究成果の概要(和文)：アジアと西欧のODA機関を比較した結果、JICAやKOICAのような援助機関はEFA(万人のための教育)政策課題に関心を持つが、中国は独自の政策課題を追求していることが判明した。韓国の援助国としての発達は、KOICAの組織体制から教育開発への取り組み方に至るまで日本を手本としている一方、中国では教育への比重は少なく、インフラ整備事業にODAを集中させている。政策基盤の面で、中国は、開発や投資事業の影響を受ける途上国の地元の人々の人権を尊重しておらず、透明性に欠けると批判されているが、日本と韓国は国際的な人権保護を基本とした開発方法を十分に遵守している。

研究成果の概要(英文)：In comparing Asian bilateral donor agencies with Western agencies, it was found that agencies such as JICA or KOICA are more likely to follow the global EFA policy agenda, with Korea learning much from Japan, while China pursues its own separate policy agenda. Korea's development as an ODA donor is modeled on that of Japan from the organization of KOICA to the approaches it takes to educational development. China in comparison is less involved in the education sector and chooses to focus its ODA on infrastructure projects. In terms of policy foundations, both Japan and Korea adhere largely to international standards of human rights-based approaches to development while China has been criticized for lacking transparency and not protecting the human rights of local peoples affected by its development and investment projects in developing countries.

研究分野：社会科学

キーワード：Development Education ODA Cambodia JICA KOICA China EU

1 . 研究開始当初の背景

Will Japan and other Asian nations lead the global expansion of education? This study will compare government institutions from Asia (e.g., JICA) and “The West” (e.g., USAID) in their roles to promote educational expansion or “Education for All” (EFA) around the world with a focus on a single nation case-study: Cambodia. The researcher will attempt to determine whether “Asian” institutions are following the development policies of “Western” institutions or establishing new “Asian” or “Japanese” models for education and national development.

Sufficient attention has not been given to bilateral aid organizations in their efforts to promote global education expansion. In comparison, there have been a number of studies done on the role of international organizations such as UNESCO and the World Bank for the promotion of Education for All globally (Mundy, 1999; Heyneman, 2003). A few studies have focused on the role of multilateral agencies in Cambodia such as the World Bank and UNICEF (Hattori 2009) and UNESCO (Dy & Ninomiya 2003) promoting education in Cambodia. Some other studies have examined the bilateral aid of Japan (Kamibeppu 2002, King and McGrath 2002) or China (Gillespie 2002) for education globally. However, there is a dire need to investigate the historical development of bilateral aid agencies in Asia and “The West” and the future direction of aid to education. The researcher’s previous JSPS Research Grant focused on the role of Japan, South Korea, and China in the development of education in Cambodia. This study will expand on that study to compare EFA Policy of “emerging donors” in Asia such as Japan, South Korea, and China with “traditional donors” such as the US, the UK, and Germany (See extensive list of case studies under Sampling Sections in Research Methods). While it is recognized that Japan has a long history as an ODA donor, its ODA policy has often diverged from the policies followed by other members of the OECD’s Development Assistance Committee (DAC).

This study will situate the research on Asian and Western bilateral aid institutions within the central debate about globalization of education in the fields of educational sociology and comparative education today. On the one hand, Neo-Institutionalist scholars contend that a “world culture” represented by international organizations promotes convergence of common values of “progress” and “justice” to expand education in nations across the globe (Meyer & Rowan: 1977). On the other hand, Systems Theorists argue that the “policy talk” of education policy exists as discourse which displays divergence in the way it is translated into different education practices in each national and cultural context (Schriewer, 2003; Steiner-Khamsi, 2004).

Researchers in Anthropology and Cultural Studies insist that we must focus on processes of “indigenization” or “creolization” of global discourse and practice at the local level (Anderson-Levitt, 2003; Appadurai, 1990).

Previous studies led by Neo-Institutionalist researchers have examined the presence of ministries of education around the world as evidence of institutional isomorphism (i.e., convergence). Other studies have focused on the role that international organizations play in the process of globalization and convergence of world culture (Chabbot, 2009). However, there have not been any comparative studies of government institutions which promote education in foreign nations and their role in educational expansion. It will be the purpose of this study to compare those institutions in the “emerging” and “traditional” donor nations of Asia and “The West” to investigate the degree to which the newer “emerging” donor agencies pursue policies which “converge” with the policies of the “traditional” donor agencies. The comparison will focus on three nations in Asia (Japan, South Korea, China) and “The West” (US, UK, Germany) while also including other nations in Asia (India, Thailand, Vietnam) and “The West” (Holland, France, Denmark, Brazil) in order to broaden the examination of convergence or divergence of educational development policy through the use of extensive cases. The single-nation case-study of Cambodia will be used to examine how these global policies and practices are experienced by local stakeholders in education.

2 . 研究の目的

The purpose of this study is to examine a greater question at the center of the current debate in the fields of educational sociology and comparative education as reflected in the research question below.

Research Question:

Do government institutions (JICA, USAID, etc.) in Asia and “The West” converge or diverge in their policies for the global expansion of education?

Research Sub-questions:

-Do Asian institutions converge with Western institutions?

-Are Asian institutions creating a new “Asian Model” for education in developing nations?

-Is each Asian nation creating its own unique models (i.e., a “Japanese Model”, “Chinese Model”) for education in developing nations?

The study will seek to reveal the following:

*The historical origins of these institutions

*The influence of global and local forces on their creation

*The degree of EFA policy consensus between traditional Western donors

*Identifying which emerging bilateral aid

agencies converge with this consensus

*Identifying which emerging bilateral aid agencies diverge from this consensus

*Defining new models for education policy as “Asian”, “Japanese”, “Chinese”, etc.

The study will be a unique contribution to global society for the following two reasons:

Use of Neo-Institutionalist and Systems Theory to compare Bilateral Aid Agencies.

It is important that this study have a firm grounding in the current sociological theory debate in the fields of educational sociology and comparative education. Too little comparative education research uses theory from sociology in order to explain phenomena related to globalization of education or the implications which those phenomena might have for equality of access to education (i.e., Education for All). Thereby, this study will avoid this pitfall and prove its worth to a broad audience.

Focus on Future Role of Asian Governments for Educational Expansion and Education Models

The study will be of great importance to researchers, policy-makers, and citizens who all have a stake in, not only education but, the greater effort toward development and progress in society. In the 21st Century it appears inevitable that Asian nations will represent important models for the development of less-developed nations. Thus with the rise of these Asian nations it will be vital to understand the roles of bilateral aid agencies in promoting these Asian models for national development. It will also be important to re-examine the role of international organizations such as the United Nations and the World Bank vis-à-vis the bilateral agencies to envision how multilateral and bilateral aid agencies can coordinate aid for sustainable development of education and society in the generations to come.

References

Anderson-Levitt (2003), *Local Meanings, Global Schooling: Anthropology and World Culture Theory*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Appadurai, A. (1990). Disjuncture and Difference in the Global Cultural Economy. In *Public Culture*, 2, 2.

Chabbott, C. (2009). *Constructing Education for Development: International Organizations and Education for All*. New York: Routledge.

Dy, S.S. & Ninomiya, A. (2003). Basic Education in Cambodia: The impact of UNESCO on policies in the 1990s. In *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 11, 48.

Gillespie, S. (2002). *South-South Transfer: A Study of Sino-African Exchanges*. New York: Routledge.

Hattori, H. (2009). Enhancing aid effectiveness in education through a sector-wide approach in Cambodia. In *Prospects*, 39, 185-199.

Heyneman, S.P. (2003). The history and problems in the making of education policy at the World Bank 1960-2000. In *International Journal of Educational Development*, 23, 315-337.

Kamibepu, T. (2002). *History of Japanese Policies in Education Aid to Developing Countries, 1950s-1990s: The Role of Subgovernmental Processes*. New York: Routledge.

King, K. & McGrath, S. (2004). *Knowledge for Development?: Comparing British, Japanese, Swedish and World Bank Aid*. New York: Zed Books.

Meyer, J. & Rowan, B. (1977). Institutionalized Organizations: Formal Structure as Myth and Ceremony. In *The American Journal of Sociology*, 83, 2.

Mundy, K. (1999). Educational multilateralism in a changing world order: Unesco and the limits of the possible. In *International Journal of Educational Development*, 19, 27-52.

Schriewer, J. (Ed.) (2003) *Discourse Formation in Comparative Education*. Berlin: Peter Lang.

Steiner-Khamsi, G. (2004). *The Global Politics of Educational Borrowing and Lending*. New York: Teachers College Press.

3 . 研究の方法

This study will focus on three aspects of bilateral education aid for educational expansion: institutions, policies, and human resources (practitioners and stakeholders). During Stage I (2012-2013), the researcher will examine the historical origins of the bilateral aid institutions (e.g., JICA or USAID) and their policies for “Education for All” (EFA). During Stage II (2013-2014), the researcher will examine the human element by analyzing the understanding of recent EFA policies by both agency officers (i.e., practitioners) and stakeholders. Stage III (2014-2015) will be used to present the findings at academic conferences, publish in academic journals and books, and share important findings with local and global communities.

STAGE I (2012-2013) INSTITUTIONS AND POLICIES

Sampling of Bilateral Aid Institutions:

Western: USAID (US), DFID (UK), GIZ (Germany), AFD (France), DANIDA (Denmark), Dutch MOFA, AUSAID

(Australia), and ABC (Brazil).

Asian: JICA (Japan), KOICA (South Korea), Chinese Ministry of Commerce, India, TICA (Thailand), and Vietnam.

(1) STEP 1—History of Institutions: Comparison of Asian and Western Bilateral ODA Agencies (2012)

The researcher will collect first and second-hand resources to describe the origins of the bilateral agencies. These documents should be accessible through the researcher's contacts with bilateral agencies in Asia, the US, and Europe. The documents will be subjected to a historiographic analysis to determine whether institutions have global origins, local origins, or some combination of the two.

(2) STEP 2—Policy Analysis: Comparison of Policies for Education for All (2013)

(1) Policy Analysis focusing on Education for All

The researcher will collect all policy documents relevant to ODA for Education for All from the bilateral agencies. These documents should be accessible through the researcher's contacts or in Policy Document Archives such as those found in UNESCO's Institute of International Education Planning. The documents will be subjected first to a policy analysis according to the principles laid out in Bardach (2008). This policy analysis will focus on the policy as it benefits both the donor and the stakeholders as an element of the country-wide movement for education for all.

(2) Discourse Analysis

The researcher will subject the policy documents to further analysis to discuss the policies as the exhibit convergence or divergence of policy priorities related to Education for All.

STAGE II (2013-2014) PRACTITIONERS AND STAKEHOLDERS

Sampling of Institutions:

Western: USAID (US), DFID (UK), GIZ (Germany).

Asian: JICA (Japan), KOICA (South Korea), Chinese Ministry of Commerce.

(1) STEP 1—Practitioner Interviews

Interviews will be conducted with bilateral agency experts both in the headquarters of the agencies and in their field offices in Cambodia. Experts will be interviewed to ascertain their knowledge of policy priorities both in relation to education policies and projects and the overall mission of their agency in developing nations globally and particularly for the Cambodian case.

(2) STEP 2—Stakeholder Interviews

Interviews will be conducted with local partners of education development experts.

Respondents will be asked to list the policy priorities of the bilateral aid agency with which they have worked. Responses will be compared with those of practitioners to examine cases of coordination versus disconnect or miscommunicated policy priorities.

STAGE III—Presentation and Publication of Results

(1) STEP 1—Data Analysis

The researcher will analyze all historical documents, policy documents, and interview transcripts, according to the following process. A comprehensive conceptually-clustered data matrix will be used to compile and organize data as themes emerge (Miles & Huberman 1994). "Data reduction" will be performed to identify emerging themes and "constant comparison" will check the validity of those themes (Marshall & Rossman 1989; Lecomte & Preissle 1993). Thereby, a theoretical framework can be chosen to describe the findings per "theory implications selection" (Lecomte & Preissle 1993). As such, the discourse will be deconstructed as it relates to the wider EFA movement versus donor-specific political priorities.

(2) STEP 2—Professional and Academic Presentations

The findings and results of this study will be presented for the benefit of both education and development practitioners as well as academic researchers in Japan and abroad. The researcher will make every effort to present the research findings at forums in multilateral and bilateral agencies, NGO forums, and for public forums in Japan. After synthesis of research findings and preparation for publication journal manuscripts will be prepared for presentation at the Japan Society of Educational Sociology, the Japan Comparative Education Society (JCES), and the Comparative and International Education Society (CIES) conferences for the Japanese and American/European research communities.

(3) STEP 3—Publications

The researcher will prepare the data and findings for publication in both domestic and international journals related to international relations, development studies, Asian studies, and comparative education. Once published the researcher will distribute these publications to any government or NGO actors who might be interested or benefit from the content contained therein.

REFERENCES

Bardach, E. (2008). *A Practical Guide for Policy Analysis: The Eightfold Path to More Effective Problem Solving*. New York: CQ Press.

LeCompte, M. D. & Preissle, J. (1993). *Ethnography and Qualitative Design in Educational Research*. New York: Academic Press, Inc.

Marshall, C. & Rossman, G. B. (1989). *Designing qualitative research*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Miles, M. B. & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: an expanded sourcebook*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

4 . 研究成果

In comparing Asian bilateral donor agencies with Western agencies, it was found that agencies such as JICA or KOICA are more likely to follow the global EFA policy agenda, with Korea learning much from Japan, while China pursues its own separate policy agenda. Korea's development as an ODA donor is modeled on that of Japan from the organization of KOICA to the approaches it takes to educational development. China in comparison is less involved in the education sector and chooses to focus its ODA on infrastructure projects. In terms of policy foundations, both Japan and Korea adhere largely to international standards of human rights-based approaches to development while China has been criticized for lacking transparency and not protecting the human rights of local peoples affected by its development and investment projects in developing countries.

5 . 主な発表論文等

(研究代表者、研究分担者及び連携研究者には下線)

〔論文発表〕(計 1 件)

ドーソン、ウォルター, カンボジアの少数民族の教育機会のための NGO と大学のグローバル・パートナーシップ, グローバル化の中の大学 教育は社会を再生する力をはぐくむか, 査読有, pp.75-86, 2013

〔学会発表〕(計 3 件)

DAWSON, Walter “The Gods Drop Money from Above: Globalization and

convergence/divergence between JICA, KOICA and China in Approaches to EFA for Cambodia,” paper presented at the Comparative and International Education Society in New Orleans, March 2013.

DAWSON, Walter “Globalization, Bilateral Education Aid Agencies, and the OECD: Convergence and Divergence among Japanese, South Korean, and Chinese Institutions., Japan Education Research Association (Special English Panel Session), 一橋大学, 2013 年 8 月 30 日

DAWSON, Walter “East-East Transfer: A Comparison of Japanese, Korean, and Chinese Bilateral Aid to the Education Sector in Cambodia,” paper presented at the Comparative and International Education Society in Puerto Rico, April 2012.

6 . 研究組織

(1)研究代表者

DAWSON, Walter (DAWSON, Walter P)
国際基督教大学・教養学部・准教授
研究者番号：24531075