

Up Front

Keyword Search

This section focuses on the two sets of keywords “global and world” and “school and education,” and provides outlines of recent think tank reports and brief papers related to these two topics.

Level of Globalization and the World's Long-term Growth Prospects

The Globalization Index

A team at the **Carnegie Endowment for International Peace** (CEIP, USA) evaluates and compares the level of globalization of 62 countries in the Nov/Dec issue of *Foreign Policy*. Countries are examined with respect to economic, personal, technological and political dimensions, using four major categories: political engagement, technological connectivity, personal contact and economic integration. Singapore maintained first place in the Globalization Index. Australia showed one of the highest increases in ranking, jumping from eighth to fourth place. Switzerland ranked second, its score boosted by increased financial contributions to U.N.-sponsored peacekeeping missions and the activities of its citizens in terms of engaging in tourism and sending remittances. The United States climbed one place to third. Japan ranked twenty-eighth. In political and technological dimensions Japan ranked 13 and 15 respectively, in the middle of the rankings.

Foreign Policy & A.T. Kearney “The Globalization Index,” *Foreign Policy*, Nov/Dec 2006, pp.74-81, <http://www.foreignpolicy.com/>

The World Economy in 2050 - China, Korea and India Join the G7

What will the world economy look like in the year 2050? A *Working Paper* published by the **Centre for International Prospective Studies** (CEPII, France) analyzes data for approximately one hundred nations and provides long-term forecasts for world economic growth.

In the next 45 years, there may be considerable change in the membership of the world's top-ranking economies. China could potentially grow from the world's fourth largest economy (in 2005) to its second largest. Korea may move from tenth place to fourth, and India from thirteenth place to fifth. China's GDP could represent 22 percent of the world economy in 2050. India may overtake France in 2025 and Germany in 2039, but projections indicate that its GDP will only reach 18 percent of that of the US. Among the countries forming the current Group of Seven (G7), the CEPII predicts that the US, Japan, Germany and the UK will remain in the group, but China, Korea and India may take the places of France, Italy and Canada. Although the GDP of Germany, France and Japan could double and that of the US triple, today's advanced economies might become a shrinking part of the world economy. China and India are expected to maintain their economic dynamism up to 2050. In this period, their average annual growth is projected to be about 4.5%, with their total GDP in 2050 corresponding to 27% of the world total, almost equivalent to that of the US. However, the largest economies in GDP terms may no longer be the richest in terms of income per capita.

Sandra Poncet, *The Long Term Growth Prospects of the World Economy: Horizon 2050*, CEPII Working Papers, Oct 2006, n2006-16, pp.1-84, <http://www.cepii.fr/anglaisgraph/workpap/summaries/2006/wp06-16.htm>

The Educational Agenda in the US: The NAEP, School Choice, Comprehensive School Reform

Happiness Factor and Student Achievement

The *2006 Brown Center Report* of the **Brookings Institution** analyzes recent data from the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) to determine how students are performing in the US, the relevance of the “happiness factor” in education and the ways in which the states have responded to the No Child Left Behind Act. The analysis examines the results of the NAEP tests to consider the progress of US students in reading and mathematics; analyzes international data to determine whether student self-confidence and enjoyment of a subject equate to higher achievement; and considers discrepancies between state test scores and NAEP scores. With regard to the “happiness factor,” the report looks at five Asian countries in which student achievement is higher than in the US, but in which the “happiness factor” is lower. This indicates that the relationship between achievement and happiness is not a simple one.

School Choice

A *Policy Analysis* by the **Cato Institute** indicates that higher-quality teachers can considerably improve student achievement. In districts where the school choice program has been launched, schools have become more competitive. Public school administrators seek good teachers and strive to keep them. Under a school choice system, public school administrators have a strong incentive to enhance the quality of their teachers. “Competition raises teacher quality,” the report states.

School Choice: 2006 Progress Report, released by the **Heritage Foundation**, reports that the school choice program is expanding among the American states. Only a few school choice programs existed a decade ago, but today more than ten states have private school choice programs, and eight states established new programs or expanded their programs in 2006. New systems such as a taxpayer-funded scholarship to help students to attend private elementary or secondary schools, and tax credits or deductions for education expenses, have been introduced in several states. Evidence suggests that parents are happier with their children’s schools where a school choice program is available.

Comprehensive School Reform: CSR

A monograph published by the **Rand Corporation** analyzes comprehensive school reform (CSR) by quantitative measurement of its level of implementation. More than 8,000 elementary and secondary schools have adopted a CSR model and over \$2 billion in federal funds have been used in the past 20 years to implement CSR strategies. Various CSR models have been developed, sharing the common objective of changing the entire school, but they differ in philosophy and method. The study selected four models of CSR which have been implemented throughout the US: Accelerated Schools (AS), Core Knowledge (CK), Direct Instruction (DI) and Success for ALL (SFA). The report emphasizes that schools and their principals should ensure that teachers are committed to implementing the CSR model and that they receive the necessary training.

Tom Loveless, “The 2006 Brown Center Report on American Education: How Well are American Students Learning?”
The 2006 Brown Center Report on American Education, 200610, pp.1-34
http://www.brookings.edu/gs/brown/bc_report/2006/2006report.htm

Marie Gryphon, “Giving Kids the Chaff: How to Find and Keep the Teachers We Need”, *Policy Analysis*, 200609, n579, p.1-16,
http://www.cato.org/pub_display.php?pub_id=6700

Dan Lips, Evan Feinberg, “School Choice: 2006 Progress Report”, *Backgrounder*, 200609, #1970, pp.1-11
http://www.heritage.org/Research/Education/upload/bg_1970.pdf

Georges Vernez, et al., “Evaluating Comprehensive School Reform Models at Scale” *Monograph Report*, 200611, MG-546,
pp.1-300, http://www.rand.org/pubs/monographs/2006/RAND_MG546.pdf

Policy Proposals by Japanese Think Tanks

Guidelines for Fiscal Reform in an Aging Society

“An Optimal Rate of the National Burden in an Aging Japan”
Akira Okamoto, Research Institute of Economy, Trade and Industry (RIETI), Japan, *Discussion Papers*, 200612, 06-E-036, pp.1-32 <http://www.rieti.go.jp/en/publications/summary/06120004.html>

Japan’s society is aging rapidly. This paper published by RIETI analyzes the Japanese tax and social security systems to establish guidelines for fiscal reform in an aging society. It applies an extended life-cycle general equilibrium simulation model and three benchmarks for 2005, 2025, and 2050, and considers the benefits that the government provides to households, in order to enable comprehensive evaluation of the balance between benefits and burdens. Based on the assumption that public services improve households’ welfare, analysis of the simulation results suggests that if government expenditure takes on more of the character of public goods, the optimal rate of the national burden is low. The results also suggest that the optimal rate of the national burden will rise as Japan ages and may exceed 50% over the course of the period of rapid aging of the population.

Service Trade in China, Japan and Korea

“Sector Analysis toward a CJK FTA: Logistics Sector”
Mitsuhiko Kataoka, National Institute for Research Advancement (NIRA), Japan, *NIRA Working Paper Series*, 200611, 2006-2, pp.1-20 <http://www.nira.go.jp/newse/wp/300/303/2006-2.pdf>

This paper reviews the competitiveness of the logistics sector (a subsector of the service sector) in China, Japan and Korea, and also compares the industrial structure and regulations of these nations’ respective logistics sectors. The shares of world total service trade held by the three nations are relatively low, and they record service trade deficits, indicating that their service sectors display comparative disadvantage. However, the results of the study show that the competitiveness of services in each country differs depending on the product. In terms of trade competitiveness, China is strong in travel services, and Japan and Korea in transport services. China and Korea are more competitive than Japan in transport infrastructure costs, Korea is twice as efficient as Japan and China in terms of cost, and government intervention in the logistics sector is lower in China and Korea than Japan. This analysis implies policy recommendations for the governments of the three nations. China should increase productivity by applying new techniques in the logistics sector and its government should open the door to investment, including investment from foreign countries. Facing challenges of high infrastructure costs and over-regulation, the Japanese government should promote further deregulation in the logistics sector. The logistics sector in Korea is the most competitive of those of the three nations, and this competitiveness may be due to the fact that the nation has fewer sectoral regulations; however, Korea seems less actively committed to trade liberalization than Japan. The government of Korea should be more active in terms of trade liberalization in the logistics sector.

Focus Topic: Energy Security

“Energy Security” appears to be a hot topic among world think tanks. A report published in October by the Institute of Defence and Strategic Studies (IDSS, Singapore) analyzed energy security and related strategies based on the perception of a recent vast increase in geopolitical tensions, while in November the Heritage Foundation (USA) proposed US strategies for energy security with regard to countries in Central Asia.

“Energy and Security—The Geopolitics of Energy in the Asia-Pacific”

Manjeet Singh Pardesi, et al., Institute of Defence and Strategic Studies, October 2006
http://www.idss.edu.sg/publications/conference_reports/E%20&%20S%20book.pdf

Recent events have led to an increased global focus on energy security. However, misjudgment by the major powers in terms of energy security strategies could have severe worldwide repercussions. This report outlines energy and security issues in six major Asia-Pacific countries: the US, Russia, China, India, Japan and Korea. The paper indicates that, in contrast to the OECD, Asia does not have an oil stockpiling facility. It suggests that Asian countries should imitate the EU in designing a mutual energy security strategy for the region.

From a global perspective, Russia and other non-OPEC countries such as Canada, Kazakhstan and Brazil have emerged as notable suppliers of oil and gas, and huge Asian nations like China and India have become major energy consuming states. The Middle East remains the most important source of oil and gas, and the US has maintained a military presence in the region. The report indicates that increasing Chinese dependence on Middle Eastern oil supplies may generate security rivalry between China and the US in the region. The Caspian Basin is a potential major supplier of oil and gas, but five nations – Iran, Turkmenistan, Kazakhstan, Russia and Azerbaijan – have territorial rights in the basin, and various conflicts remain to be overcome. The report suggests that a new “great game” may commence in Central Asia, with the formation of the Shanghai Cooperation Organization increasing Russian and Chinese influence in the region, while the US is apparently seeking to increase India’s regional involvement.

The report also indicates that while all nations seek to avoid conflict over energy, if conflicts arise over other issues, “it is likely that antagonistic states will attack their adversaries’ energy sources/supplies.”

“U.S. Interests and Central Asia Energy Security”

Ariel Cohen, Heritage Foundation, *Backgrounder*, No. 1984, November 15, 2006
<http://www.heritage.org/Research/RussiaandEurasia/bg1984.cfm>

The diversification of energy sources is a basic US security concern, and the Central Asian region represents a significant alternative source of fossil fuels. The region is not the world’s largest source of oil and gas, and is not easily accessible, but is important in geopolitical and geoeconomic terms. This report suggests that in order to achieve its objectives in the region, the US should: support projects to increase non-Russian energy transit routes, further develop its ties with Central Asian states, continue to encourage reform in the region, and adopt a “nuanced approach” to regional states with which it is not presently on good terms.

Articles and Papers Relating to this Issue's Keywords

(Please also refer URL addresses in the above texts.)

< Global and World >

Dealing with uncertainties / Responding to climate change in an uncertain world
Fabian Wagner, et al., International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis (IIASA), Austria
Options, 200611, Winter, 2006, pp.12-15
<http://www.iiasa.ac.at/Admin/INF/OPT/Winter06/opt-06wint.pdf>

Homeland Security Technology, Global Partnerships, and Winning the Long War
Jay Carafano, et al., The Heritage Foundation, USA
Backgrounder, 200610, #1977, pp.1-10
<http://www.heritage.org/Research/HomelandDefense/bg1977.cfm>

Telecommunications Reform and Performance: A Global View
Antonio Estache, et al., Ifo Institute for Economic Research, Germany
CESifo DICE Report, 200610, n200603, pp.16-21
http://www.cesifo-group.de/portal/page?_pageid=36.34692&_dad=portal&_schema=PORTAL

The new global division of labour / How is the world economy affected by outsourcing and off shoring? / Panel 1
Europe's answer to the global changes in the division of labour / Panel 2
John Whalley, Gunther Verheugen, Richard Baldwin, Ifo Institute for Economic Research, Germany
CESifo Forum, 200610, v7 n3, pp.18-23
<http://www.cesifo-group.de/pls/guestsci/download/CESifo%20Forum%202006/CESifo%20Forum%203/2006/forum3-06-gesamt.pdf>

Complex Systems? New Conceptual Tools for International Relations
Ion Cindea, Institute of International Relations Prague (IIR), Czech Republic
Perspectives, 200609, 26 Summer 2006, pp.46-68

EU Global Power? / Reflections on the European Security and Defence Policy after the Failure of the 2004 Draft
Constitutional Treaty
Niels Aadal Rasmussen, Danish Institute for International Studies (DIIS), Denmark
DIIS Report, 200609, 2006: 8, pp.1-34
<http://www.diis.dk/sw28511.asp>

< School and education >

Evaluating Comprehensive School Reform Models at Scale / Focus on Implementation
Georges Vernez, et al., The RAND Corporation, USA
Monograph Report, 200611, MG-546, pp.1-300
<http://www.rand.org/pubs/monographs/MG546/>

Governing Urban School Districts / Efforts in Los Angeles to Effect Change
Catherine H. Augustine, Diana Epstein, Mirka Vuollo, The RAND Corporation, USA
Technical Reports, 200611, TR-428, pp.1-120
http://www.rand.org/pubs/technical_reports/TR428/

Teacher Quality in Grades PK-3: Challenges and Options
Justin King, Lindsey Luebchow, New America Foundation, USA
Issue Brief, 200610, #4, pp.1-19
http://www.newamerica.net/publications/policy/teacher_quality_in_grades_pk_3_challenges_and_options

Are Public or Private Schools Doing Better? How the NCEES Study Is Being Misinterpreted
Shanea Watkins, The Heritage Foundation, USA
Backgrounder, 200609, #1968, pp.1-4
<http://www.heritage.org/Research/Education/bg1968.cfm>

Policy Tools and Institutional Change: Comparing education policies in Norway, Sweden and England
Ingrid Helgoy, Anne Homme, Centre for the Study of Public Policy (CSPP), UK
Journal of Public Policy, 200608, v26 n2 August 2006, pp.141-165
<http://journals.cambridge.org/action/displayJournal?jid=PUP>

Does School Choice Work? Effects on Student Integration and Achievement
Julian R. Betts, Lorien A. Rice, et al., Public Policy Institute of California (PPIC), USA
PPIC Report, 200608, pp.1-221
http://www.ppic.org/content/pubs/report/R_806JBR.pdf

Impacts of a Summer Learning Program: A Random Assignment Study of Building Educated Leaders for Life (BELL)
Duncan Chaplin, Jeffrey Capizzano, The Urban Institute, USA
Research Report, 200608, pp.1-77
http://www.urban.org/UploadedPDF/411350_bell_impacts.pdf

Does Aid for Education Educate Children? Evidence from Panel Data
Axel Dreher, Peter Nunnenkamp, Rainer Thiele, Kiel Institute of World Economics (IfW), Germany
Kiel Working Papers, 200608, 1290, pp.1-38
<http://www.ifw-kiel.de/pub/kap/2006/kap1290.htm>

* Data listed -----

Article or paper title / Name of think tank / Series title or journal name, publishing data, vol. no., pages; URL, (when full text or abstract available) indicates that the paper is available on the Internet

.....
: Policy Research Watch (PRW), a bibliographic :
: database of the publications of think tanks :
: worldwide, is a web-based project that has grown :
: out of NIRA's *World Directory of Think Tanks*. One :
: of NIRA's missions is to contribute as a "clearing :
: house" for information on policy analysis and :
: research conducted by policy research institutes. :
: The 'Policy Research Index' is designed to be a :
: fundamental tool for policy researchers, :
: particularly those with a global perspective. :
:.....

NIRA 総合研究開発機構
National Institute for Research Advancement

National Institute for Research Advancement
Center for Policy Research Information
Toshihiro Sato, Director
Madoka Nakamura, Editor
YGP Tower 34F, 4-20-3, Ebisu, Shibuya-ku
Tokyo, 150-6034, Japan
Tel: 03-5448-1740 Fax: 03-5448-1746
E-mail: PRWinfo@nira.go.jp <http://www.nira.go.jp>