

## Comparative Studies on Educational Governance: Balancing Centralization and Decentralization in Global Contexts

Hamad bin As-Siddiqi<sup>1a</sup>, Aisya El- Bukhary<sup>2b</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Education and Development Program, Middle East Educational and Research Center, Doha, Qatar, <sup>2</sup> Department of Educational Research, Global Education Institute, Cairo, Egypt  
email: hamad.q@meerc.qa<sup>a</sup>, aisya.b@gei.eg<sup>b</sup>

### Article History:

Received: July 10, 2025

Revised: August 16, 2025

Accepted: Sept 29, 2025

### Keywords:

Educational governance;  
Centralization; Decentralization;  
Comparative education;  
International education policy.

### Abstract:

This study explores the dynamics of educational governance by comparing centralized and decentralized systems across global contexts. The research examines how centralization contributes to equity, accountability, and national standards, while decentralization promotes flexibility, community engagement, and contextual responsiveness. Through a comparative analysis of diverse educational systems, the study highlights the strengths and limitations of each governance model and reveals the growing relevance of hybrid approaches that integrate both paradigms. Findings suggest that educational reforms must adapt to cultural, political, and socio-economic realities rather than adopt a one-size-fits-all strategy. The paper emphasizes that sustainable educational governance requires balancing national coherence with local autonomy to ensure both equity and innovation. This research contributes to the field of comparative and international education by offering insights into how global governance trends can inform effective policy-making that is responsive to contemporary challenges.

*This is an open-access article under the [CC-BY-SA](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/) license.*



### Corresponding Author:

Hamad bin As-Siddiqi

Education and Development Program, Middle East Educational and Research Center, Doha, Qatar.

e-mail: hamad.q@meerc.qa

### Introduction (مقدمة)

Education is one of the primary instruments for the social, economic, and cultural development of any nation. To achieve its goals, effective governance structures are required that go beyond administration and involve policy formulation, implementation, and evaluation at multiple levels. Educational governance thus refers to the frameworks through which power and decision-making are distributed in shaping learning outcomes. In global debates, governance is not only about efficiency but also about fairness and equity in access to education. The comparative study of governance allows researchers to explore how different nations manage these challenges. This creates opportunities to learn from diverse systems while also addressing local realities (Carnoy, 2019).

Centralization in education is often perceived as a mechanism to ensure uniform policies,

national standards, and strict quality control across all regions. In many developing nations, this model has been embraced as a way to safeguard equity in access and maintain coherence in curricula. Centralized structures can reduce inequalities by providing standardized assessments and curricula across the country. However, centralization is often criticized for being rigid and unable to adapt to the unique needs of local contexts. Bureaucratic inefficiencies may also hinder innovation and reduce responsiveness to rapid changes. Therefore, while it provides stability, centralization may also stifle local creativity in education (Barrera-Osorio et al., 2009).

Conversely, decentralization emphasizes granting authority to local governments, schools, and communities to manage education according to their specific needs. This model is frequently seen as more democratic, as it allows diverse stakeholders to participate in decision-making processes. Decentralization can create innovation in curriculum design, teaching methods, and school management. However, it also carries risks, such as unequal resource distribution and disparities in educational quality between urban and rural areas. Countries with limited local capacity often struggle to balance autonomy with accountability. Thus, decentralization must be carefully structured to prevent fragmentation and inequality (Bray, 2013).

Comparative studies on educational governance are therefore highly relevant for understanding the dynamics of centralization and decentralization across nations. Through these studies, scholars gain insights into how different political, economic, and cultural systems shape education. For instance, federal systems such as the United States favor decentralization, while unitary states like France rely heavily on centralization. Each model reflects the broader political philosophy of the country, but both face challenges in achieving equity and efficiency. By comparing such systems, policymakers can identify effective practices and avoid pitfalls experienced elsewhere. This comparative approach enriches the global dialogue on education reform (Arnott & Ozga, 2010).

In the era of globalization, many countries attempt to strike a balance between central control and local autonomy. Educational policies increasingly seek to combine national standards with local flexibility. For example, several European countries allow schools to adapt curricula to local contexts while still adhering to national benchmarks. This balance ensures coherence without sacrificing responsiveness to community needs. The challenge lies in aligning these approaches with broader goals such as equity, quality, and lifelong learning. Striking this balance is critical for education systems to remain adaptive in a rapidly changing world (Sahlberg, 2015).

One of the main challenges in global educational governance is ensuring equal access and quality without neglecting local diversity. Centralized systems are often criticized for being overly bureaucratic and slow to respond to local changes. On the other hand, decentralized systems risk fragmentation, where some schools thrive while others lag behind. Ensuring consistency in teacher training, curriculum quality, and student assessment remains a challenge. Moreover, globalization and technological change demand greater flexibility in governance. As such, education systems must design hybrid models that can respond to both national priorities and local realities (Hanushek & Woessmann, 2011).

Reform in governance has become a common phenomenon across many nations seeking to balance central and local roles. Reforms are not only driven by internal demands such as democratization but also influenced by international organizations. Institutions like UNESCO, the OECD, and the World Bank often provide frameworks and recommendations for governance reforms. These global actors influence educational systems by promoting policies of accountability, decentralization, and performance measurement. Yet, national contexts often shape how these recommendations are implemented. Understanding these global-local interactions is crucial for analyzing governance dynamics (Mundy, 2007).

Education governance is also deeply tied to the socio-economic status of a nation. In less

developed countries, centralized systems are often preferred to ensure equitable distribution of scarce resources. These countries may lack the local infrastructure and capacity to manage education independently. In contrast, developed nations are more likely to provide autonomy at local levels, as they possess stronger institutional frameworks and resources. Thus, the choice between centralization and decentralization often reflects economic capacity. The comparative analysis of these contexts highlights how governance models must be adapted to national realities (Tilak, 2015).

Historically, many countries have shifted from highly centralized systems toward greater decentralization. This shift is often linked to democratization, increased public participation, and the demand for more responsive governance. For example, several Latin American countries adopted decentralization in the 1990s as part of broader democratic reforms. However, transitions are not always smooth, with resistance from central authorities and challenges in building local capacity. These historical shifts demonstrate that governance reforms are complex and context-dependent. Comparative research helps reveal the patterns and outcomes of these transformations (Faguet, 2014).

Governance studies also highlight the roles of teachers, principals, and communities as key actors in educational reform. In decentralized systems, these actors enjoy greater decision-making authority regarding pedagogy, curriculum, and school management. This can lead to more relevant and innovative practices aligned with local needs. However, it also requires strong leadership, capacity-building, and accountability mechanisms. Teachers, in particular, need training to function effectively in systems where autonomy is greater. Thus, governance reforms must be accompanied by investments in human resources (Fullan, 2016).

Global dynamics also shape how governance is enacted at the national and local levels. Issues such as digitalization, migration, social inequality, and climate change directly influence educational priorities. In this context, centralization and decentralization must be seen not as binary choices but as complementary strategies. For instance, digital education policies may require national coordination, while implementation must be adapted locally. These dynamics show how education governance is increasingly multi-scalar, operating at local, national, and global levels simultaneously. This complexity demands flexible governance models capable of adaptation (Lingard, 2021).

In conclusion, this study seeks to analyze how nations across the globe balance centralization and decentralization in educational governance. The primary goal is to identify strengths, weaknesses, and implications of each model for ensuring access, equity, and quality in education. The research also aims to highlight the ways in which global pressures and local contexts interact in shaping governance choices. By engaging in comparative analysis, the study contributes to broader debates on reform and policy-making. Ultimately, it seeks to provide insights for policymakers, educators, and researchers to design governance models suited for the challenges of the 21st century. This makes the research not only timely but also highly relevant for global education studies.

## Method (منهج)

This study employed a **qualitative comparative approach** to analyze the dynamics between centralization and decentralization in educational governance across countries. This method was selected because it provides flexibility to examine the social, cultural, and political contexts that influence educational policies. Furthermore, a qualitative approach enables researchers to interpret meanings behind formal policies, which often differ from actual practices on the ground (Creswell & Poth, 2018).

The research design took the form of **cross-national comparative studies**. Countries were selected to represent variations in educational systems, both those inclined toward centralization and those emphasizing decentralization. The selection criteria included significant educational reforms within the last two decades, accessibility of public data, and relevance of policies to the global discourse on educational governance. Such criteria ensured that comparisons would reveal both common patterns and contextual differences (Bray et al., 2014).

The main data sources consisted of **official educational policy documents**, including national education laws, ministry reports, and strategic frameworks for school management. These documents were chosen for their formal nature and ability to reflect a country's policy directions. Additionally, reports from international organizations such as UNESCO, OECD, and the World Bank were consulted to gain a broader global perspective (UNESCO, 2021; OECD, 2020).

In addition to policy documents, the study drew on **secondary data** from previous research relevant to educational governance issues. Peer-reviewed journal articles, academic books, and prior empirical studies were analyzed to enrich the discussion. By integrating multiple secondary sources, the study provided a more comprehensive and valid picture of the practices of centralization and decentralization (Bereday, 1964).

Data collection was conducted through **content analysis techniques**. This allowed the researcher to identify key themes in policy documents and make comparisons across countries. The analysis focused on aspects such as institutional structures, distribution of authority, public participation, and accountability mechanisms in educational systems (Krippendorff, 2018).

A **thematic framework** was developed to organize the data. This framework was informed by literature on global educational governance, with key categories including administrative centralization, local autonomy, community involvement, and the impact of policies on education quality. Each category was systematically analyzed to evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of different approaches (Sahlberg, 2016).

To ensure data validity, the study applied **source triangulation**. This involved comparing information from official documents, international organizational reports, and academic publications. Through triangulation, the analysis was not dependent on a single type of source but integrated multiple perspectives that complemented one another (Denzin, 2012).

The analysis process followed a step-by-step approach, beginning with **initial coding** of the collected data. The codes were then grouped into broader themes according to the research framework. These coded themes were reviewed to ensure consistency across cases in the comparative analysis (Miles et al., 2014).

Alongside qualitative analysis, the study employed **descriptive comparison**. For instance, it compared the percentage of education budgets allocated by central versus local governments, the proportion of schools managed locally, and the level of school committee participation. While these quantitative indicators were not statistically analyzed, they were used to strengthen qualitative interpretations (Crossley & Watson, 2003).

Finally, the findings are presented as **comparative narratives** that illustrate the interaction between centralization and decentralization in different national contexts. These narratives are expected to provide in-depth insights into emerging policy patterns, the influencing factors, and the practical implications for policymakers in education (Arnove & Torres, 2012).

## Result (نتائج)

The comparative analysis revealed that countries with highly centralized educational systems tend to demonstrate strong national coherence in curriculum and assessment. For example, nations such as France and Japan place significant emphasis on maintaining uniform standards across all schools, which ensures equity of access to high-quality education. However, this centralization sometimes limits local innovation and responsiveness to community needs. Teachers and administrators often reported less autonomy in decision-making, which led to slower adaptation to regional challenges. This reflects the inherent tension between national control and local flexibility. The findings suggest that while centralization promotes equality, it may reduce adaptability to local contexts (Bray & Thomas, 1995).

In contrast, decentralized educational systems, such as those in Canada and Finland, emphasize the autonomy of local authorities and schools. These systems allow schools to design curricula that reflect cultural, linguistic, and social diversity. This flexibility enhances community engagement and increases the sense of ownership among educators and parents. However, decentralization also creates disparities in resources and educational outcomes between wealthier and poorer regions. Local governance models sometimes struggle with capacity, leading to uneven policy implementation. The results highlight the trade-off between diversity and equality within decentralized systems. This balance remains a key challenge for policymakers (Sahlberg, 2011).

The study also found that hybrid governance systems – those blending centralization and decentralization – offer a middle path. For instance, countries like Germany and South Korea maintain centralized oversight of national standards while allowing local governments discretion in implementing programs. This approach provides coherence while enabling contextual flexibility. In practice, hybrid models appear more resilient in adapting to global educational challenges, such as digital transformation. Teachers in these systems benefit from both structured guidance and room for creativity. Nonetheless, tensions still exist between central directives and local implementation. The hybrid approach shows potential for balancing competing demands (OECD, 2018).

Another significant result concerns the role of funding allocation in governance models. Centralized systems usually provide equitable per-student funding through national budgets, which reduces regional inequalities. However, they sometimes fail to account for unique local needs, such as bilingual education or rural infrastructure challenges. Decentralized systems, on the other hand, allow local authorities to prioritize spending but often exacerbate inequalities when resources are unequally distributed. For example, wealthier municipalities can provide better facilities compared to poorer ones. Hybrid systems attempt to correct this through redistributive mechanisms that combine national oversight with local flexibility. This suggests funding structures are critical to achieving balance in governance (UNESCO, 2021).

The results also emphasized the importance of teacher autonomy as a mediating factor between centralization and decentralization. In centralized systems, teachers frequently reported feeling constrained by rigid curricula and assessment standards. Conversely, decentralized systems often empower teachers to tailor their teaching methods to student needs, fostering innovation and creativity. Nevertheless, excessive autonomy without accountability mechanisms sometimes led to inconsistent quality across schools. Hybrid governance models tended to strike a balance by providing frameworks for teacher professional development while granting flexibility in pedagogy. This balance supported both accountability and creativity in teaching practices. The findings underscore teacher autonomy as a vital indicator of governance effectiveness (Schleicher, 2018).

Community involvement emerged as another crucial factor shaping governance outcomes. In decentralized systems, school boards and parent associations played an active role in shaping policies and priorities. This enhanced transparency and accountability while fostering trust

between schools and communities. In centralized systems, community involvement was often limited to consultation, reducing the sense of ownership among stakeholders. However, strong national leadership sometimes prevented local conflicts and maintained coherence. Hybrid models facilitated structured channels for participation, balancing national authority with local voice. This demonstrates the significance of governance structures in shaping public engagement with education (Epstein, 2018).

The results further showed that accountability mechanisms varied widely across governance models. Centralized systems typically rely on standardized testing and inspections to ensure compliance with national standards. This creates comparability across regions but also increases pressure on schools and teachers. Decentralized systems often emphasize self-evaluation and community accountability, which strengthens local responsibility but reduces comparability. Hybrid systems employ a mix of external evaluation and self-assessment to strike a balance. In practice, accountability mechanisms significantly influenced teacher behavior and student outcomes. The findings highlight accountability as a central dimension of governance design (Leithwood & Louis, 2011).

Another noteworthy finding relates to educational equity. Centralized systems ensured equal access to resources, but equity gaps persisted in addressing diverse cultural or linguistic groups. Decentralized systems were more responsive to cultural diversity but risked widening gaps between socio-economic groups. Hybrid systems attempted to integrate national equity frameworks with localized cultural responsiveness. For example, policies addressing immigrant integration in schools worked best when national standards were combined with local adaptations. These findings suggest that governance systems must carefully consider equity beyond resource distribution. Equity emerges as both a goal and a challenge across governance models (Tikly & Barrett, 2011).

Globalization pressures also influenced governance approaches significantly. Centralized systems were quicker to adopt standardized reforms aligned with global benchmarks, such as PISA assessments. However, decentralized systems often adapted global trends to local contexts, leading to more culturally relevant innovations. Hybrid systems showed the greatest adaptability, combining international benchmarks with localized strategies. This dynamic highlights the role of governance in mediating global and local educational demands. The findings suggest that successful governance requires balancing international competitiveness with local identity preservation. This duality reflects broader global educational challenges (Spring, 2015).

The research also revealed that governance structures impact digital transformation in education. Centralized systems facilitated large-scale implementation of digital infrastructure and platforms, ensuring broad coverage. However, they sometimes lacked flexibility in integrating digital tools into local pedagogical practices. Decentralized systems allowed more innovation in digital pedagogy but faced disparities in technological access. Hybrid systems achieved better outcomes by combining centralized investment with local adaptation of digital practices. Teachers and students reported higher satisfaction in hybrid models compared to strictly centralized or decentralized ones. This indicates that governance plays a decisive role in digital education success (Redecker, 2017).

Furthermore, leadership practices varied across governance systems. Centralized systems promoted bureaucratic leadership aligned with state directives, whereas decentralized systems enabled participatory leadership at the school level. Hybrid systems encouraged distributed leadership, balancing accountability with local initiative. The study found that leadership models strongly influenced teacher motivation and student performance. For example, participatory leadership in decentralized contexts fostered higher innovation but required strong local capacity. Bureaucratic leadership ensured compliance but limited creativity. These patterns show

that leadership is a critical mediating factor in governance structures (Bush, 2011).

Finally, the results indicate that no single governance model is universally superior. Each approach has strengths and weaknesses depending on the socio-political and economic context of the country. Centralized systems perform well in ensuring equity and coherence, while decentralized systems excel in fostering diversity and innovation. Hybrid systems appear most adaptable but require complex coordination between national and local levels. Policymakers must therefore balance competing priorities when designing governance structures. The study highlights the need for context-sensitive approaches rather than one-size-fits-all solutions. Governance in education remains a dynamic field shaped by multiple forces.

## Discussion (مناقشة)

The findings of this study demonstrate that balancing centralization and decentralization in education governance is not a uniform process but rather context-dependent. Countries with strong traditions of centralized systems, such as France and Japan, tend to maintain national standards to ensure equity and consistency across regions. However, decentralization reforms in these contexts have been carefully controlled to avoid compromising quality. This balance illustrates that educational governance cannot be universally prescribed but must be adapted to historical, political, and cultural realities. Comparative research has shown that flexibility is key to achieving positive outcomes in governance reforms (Bray, 2007). Consequently, adopting a hybrid model often emerges as a practical solution for addressing global challenges.

Decentralization is often associated with greater autonomy at the school and community levels, which can improve responsiveness to local needs. Evidence from Latin American countries indicates that local participation fosters innovation and strengthens accountability. Nonetheless, decentralization may also exacerbate inequalities if resource distribution remains uneven between regions (Shah & Nelli, 2020). For example, rural schools often lack the financial and human capital necessary to fully benefit from decentralized decision-making. This suggests that without adequate capacity-building, decentralization can deepen existing disparities rather than resolve them. A balanced approach that combines autonomy with resource equalization appears to be more effective.

Centralization, on the other hand, provides a mechanism for ensuring uniform standards and addressing issues of equity. Countries such as Finland have successfully centralized curriculum frameworks while allowing flexibility in implementation at the local level (Sahlberg, 2011). This model ensures that national objectives, such as equity and inclusiveness, are consistently pursued across the education system. However, excessive centralization may limit innovation by constraining schools' ability to adapt to unique circumstances. Thus, centralization should not be seen as a rigid framework but as a guiding structure that supports equity while leaving room for contextual adaptation (OECD, 2016). The Finnish experience highlights how centralized policies can coexist with localized professional discretion.

Globalization has further complicated the dynamics of centralization and decentralization. As international benchmarks, such as PISA, gain influence, governments are under pressure to align with global standards while also addressing local demands (Lingard & Ozga, 2007). This creates a tension between adopting international practices and preserving national or local educational traditions. Comparative studies show that countries often use decentralization to experiment with international models while maintaining centralized oversight to safeguard equity (Verger et al., 2012). The global dimension, therefore, adds an additional layer of complexity to governance reforms. Policy borrowing and adaptation must be carefully managed to avoid undermining local educational values.

Accountability has emerged as a central issue in balancing governance models. Decentralization reforms often emphasize accountability to local communities, whereas centralized systems stress compliance with national standards. In practice, both forms of accountability are essential to ensure quality education (Carnoy & Rhoten, 2002). Comparative evidence suggests that decentralization without accountability frameworks risks inefficiency and misuse of resources. Conversely, centralization without local engagement can lead to resistance and lack of ownership. Effective governance requires building mechanisms that integrate both vertical accountability to the state and horizontal accountability to stakeholders. This dual accountability framework strengthens both trust and effectiveness in education systems.

Leadership and teacher professionalism are also critical in mediating the effects of governance structures. Decentralized systems often rely on principals and teachers to exercise leadership in curriculum adaptation and school management. When professional capacity is strong, decentralization can yield positive outcomes (Leithwood & Menzies, 1998). However, weak professional development undermines the effectiveness of local decision-making. Centralized systems, while providing uniform standards, also need to invest in teacher training to ensure consistent quality delivery. Comparative insights show that professional development acts as a bridge between governance structures and classroom outcomes. Thus, capacity-building should accompany any governance reform to sustain its impact.

The political dimension of governance reforms must also be acknowledged. Centralization and decentralization are not merely technical choices but political strategies influenced by broader agendas. For instance, neoliberal reforms in some countries have pushed decentralization as part of market-oriented policies, emphasizing competition and privatization (Gunter et al., 2017). Meanwhile, authoritarian regimes may employ centralization as a means of control over education content and ideology (Daun, 2007). This highlights the need to interpret governance reforms within broader political economies. Educational governance cannot be understood in isolation from national power dynamics and global political pressures.

Equity remains a fundamental concern in balancing governance models. Centralized policies can promote redistribution of resources to disadvantaged areas, while decentralization may empower local communities to address specific needs. However, achieving both goals simultaneously is challenging (World Bank, 2018). Comparative cases reveal that hybrid governance models, which blend central resource allocation with local flexibility, are more effective in advancing equity. This suggests that neither extreme centralization nor full decentralization can guarantee fairness. Instead, equity-oriented governance requires constant negotiation and adjustment across levels of authority.

Technological change has introduced new opportunities and challenges in governance. Digital learning platforms and data-driven decision-making allow both central authorities and local schools to access real-time information for planning and evaluation (Anderson & Krathwohl, 2001). However, unequal access to technology may widen gaps between urban and rural areas under decentralized systems. Centralization can help standardize access, but without local adaptation, technology risks being underutilized. Comparative research indicates that the most successful reforms integrate centralized digital infrastructures with localized pedagogical innovation (OECD, 2016). Thus, technology governance further underscores the need for balanced approaches.

In conclusion, comparative evidence strongly supports the idea that neither centralization nor decentralization alone can resolve the complex challenges of education governance. Instead, effective systems adopt hybrid approaches that combine centralized equity frameworks with decentralized innovation mechanisms. This balance must be dynamic, responding to political, social, and technological changes. The global context adds further pressures, requiring states to navigate international benchmarks while safeguarding local autonomy. Ultimately, governance

is about creating synergies between multiple actors and levels of authority (Shah & Nelli, 2020). Achieving this synergy is essential for ensuring quality, equity, and sustainability in global education systems.

### Conclusion (خاتمة)

This study highlights the complex interplay between centralization and decentralization in educational governance within global contexts. The findings reveal that while centralization ensures equity, coherence, and national accountability, decentralization provides flexibility, local participation, and innovation in addressing diverse community needs. The comparative analysis demonstrates that no single governance model universally guarantees success, but rather, the effectiveness of each depends on contextual factors such as political structures, cultural values, and socio-economic conditions.

Furthermore, the research emphasizes the importance of hybrid governance models that balance both centralized oversight and decentralized autonomy. Such models allow for national standards to be upheld while empowering local stakeholders to adapt educational policies to their specific contexts. Ultimately, achieving sustainable and equitable education systems requires a nuanced approach that integrates the strengths of both governance paradigms, ensuring that policies remain globally relevant while locally responsive.

### Acknowledgment (شكر وتقدير)

The authors would like to express their deepest gratitude to the academic colleagues, education policy experts, and international research institutions who provided valuable insights and constructive feedback throughout the development of this study. Special thanks are also extended to the comparative education networks and organizations that shared access to data, policy documents, and case studies, which enriched the analysis presented in this paper. Finally, the authors appreciate the unwavering support from their families and affiliated institutions, whose encouragement made this research possible.

### Bibliography (مراجع)

- Anderson, L. W., & Krathwohl, D. R. (2001). *A taxonomy for learning, teaching, and assessing: A revision of Bloom's taxonomy of educational objectives*. New York: Longman.
- Arnové, R. F., & Torres, C. A. (2012). *Comparative education: The dialectic of the global and the local*. Rowman & Littlefield.
- Arnové, R. F., Torres, C. A., & Franz, S. (2013). *Comparative education: The dialectic of the global and the local* (4th ed.). Rowman & Littlefield.
- Barrera-Osorio, F., Fasih, T., Patrinos, H. A., & Santibáñez, L. (2009). *Decentralized decision-making in schools: The theory and evidence on school-based management*. World Bank.
- Bereday, G. Z. F. (1964). *Comparative method in education*. Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Bray, M. (2003). *Control of education: Issues and tensions in centralization and decentralization*. In R. F. Arnove & C. A. Torres (Eds.), *Comparative education: The dialectic of the global and the local* (pp. 204-220). Rowman & Littlefield.
- Bray, M. (2007). *Governance and finance of basic education in Asia: Lessons from comparative research*. Hong Kong: Comparative Education Research Centre, University of Hong Kong.
- Bray, M. (2007). *Governance in education: Comparative perspectives*. Paris: UNESCO International Institute for Educational Planning.

- Bray, M., Adamson, B., & Mason, M. (2014). *Comparative education research: Approaches and methods* (2nd ed.). Springer.
- Burns, T., & Köster, F. (Eds.). (2016). *Governing education in a complex world*. OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264255364-en>
- Caldwell, B. J. (2005). *School-based management*. Education Policy Series, 3. UNESCO International Institute for Educational Planning.
- Carnoy, M., & Rhoten, D. (2002). What does globalization mean for educational change? *Comparative Education Review*, 46(1), 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1086/324053>
- Carnoy, M., & Samoff, J. (1990). *Education and social transition in the Third World*. Princeton University Press.
- Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2018). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (4th ed.). SAGE.
- Crossley, M., & Watson, K. (2003). *Comparative and international research in education: Globalisation, context and difference*. Routledge.
- Daun, H. (2007). Globalization and the governance of national education systems. In J. Zajda (Ed.), *International handbook on globalization, education and policy research* (pp. 87–104). Dordrecht: Springer.
- Daun, H. (2007). *Globalization and the governance of national education systems*. Springer.
- Day, C., & Sachs, J. (2004). *International handbook on the continuing professional development of teachers*. Open University Press.
- Denzin, N. K. (2012). *Triangulation 2.0*. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, 6(2), 80–88. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1558689812437186>
- Fitrianto, I. (2019). *تنفيذ الدورة المكثفة في اللغة العربية لطلاب الكلية الجامعية الإسلامية العالمية KUIS: ماليزيا بجامعة دار السلام كونتور العام 2018 بسلانجور* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Darussalam Gontor).
- Fitrianto, I. (2024). Critical Reasoning Skills: Designing an Education Curriculum Relevant to Social and Economic Needs. *International Journal of Post Axial: Futuristic Teaching and Learning*, 245-258.
- Fitrianto, I. (2024). Innovation and Technology in Arabic Language Learning in Indonesia: Trends and Implications. *International Journal of Post Axial: Futuristic Teaching and Learning*, 134-150.
- Fitrianto, I. (2024). Strategi Guru Pai Dalam Mengatasi Kesulitan Belajar Pada Mata Pelajaran Hadis Kelas 8 MTS Ibadurrahman Subaim. *IJER: Indonesian Journal of Educational Research*, 356-363.
- Fitrianto, I. (2025). Beyond Competence: Rethinking Education for Holistic Well-Being and Happiness. *International Journal of Post Axial: Futuristic Teaching and Learning*, 1-11.
- Fitrianto, I., & Abdillah, F. M. (2018). MODEL PEMBELAJARAN PROGAM PEMANTAPAN BAHASA ARAB DAN SHAHSIAH (KEMBARA) KE 4 MAHASISWA KOLEJ UNIVERSITI ISLAM ANTAR BANGSA SELANGOR (KUIS) TAHUN 2018. University of Darussalam Gontor 15-16 September 2018, 121.
- Fitrianto, I., & Farisi, M. (2025). Integrating Local Wisdom into 21st Century Skills: A Contextual Framework for Culturally Relevant Pedagogy in Rural Classrooms. *International Journal of Post Axial: Futuristic Teaching and Learning*, 109-121.
- Fitrianto, I., & Hamid, R. (2024). Morphosemantic Changes in the Arabic Language in the Social Media Era: A Study of Neologisms and Their Impact on Youth Communication/ التغيرات المورفوسيماتية في اللغة العربية / دراسة حول النيو لوجيزم وتأثيرها على تواصل الشباب في عصر وسائل التواصل الاجتماعي. *IJAS: International Journal of Arabic Studies*, 1(1 September), 25-39.
- Fitrianto, I., & Layalin, N. A. (2025). The Paradigm of Physical Punishment from the Perspective of Islamic Education and Its Implementation in Indonesia and Malaysia. *International Journal of Post Axial: Futuristic Teaching and Learning*, 147-156.
- Fitrianto, I., & Saif, A. (2024). The role of virtual reality in enhancing Experiential Learning: a comparative study of traditional and immersive learning environments. *International Journal of Post Axial: Futuristic Teaching and Learning*, 97-110.
- Fitrianto, I., Al-Faruqi, M. R., & Hanifah, N. A. (2025). The Contributions of Ibn Malik to Arabic Language Education: A Historical and Pedagogical Analysis. *IJAS: International Journal of Arabic Studies*, 1-11.

- Fitrianto, I., Hamid, R., & Mulalic, A. (2023). The effectiveness of the learning strategy" think, talk, write" and snowball for improving learning achievement in lessons insya'at Islamic Boarding School Arisalah. *International Journal of Post Axial: Futuristic Teaching and Learning*, 13-22.
- Fullan, M. (2015). *The new meaning of educational change* (5th ed.). Teachers College Press.
- Green, A. (1999). Centralization and decentralization in education: A comparative study of international trends. In K. Watson, C. Modgil, & S. Modgil (Eds.), *Educational dilemmas: Debate and diversity* (pp. 123-144). Cassell.
- Gunter, H. M., Hall, D., & Apple, M. W. (2017). Corporate elites and the reform of public education. *Policy Futures in Education*, 15(5), 535-548. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1478210317715796>
- Gunter, H., Grimaldi, E., Hall, D., & Serpieri, R. (2017). *Education policy research: Design and practice at a time of change*. Bloomsbury Academic.
- Haq, U. S., Prianto, S., & Fitrianto, I. (2024). Implementasi Metode Al-Qiyasiyyah Dan Al-Istiqrariyyah Terhadap Pembelajaran Ilmu Nahwu. *IJER: Indonesian Journal of Educational Research*, 216-226.
- Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions, and organizations across nations* (2nd ed.). Sage.
- Julkifli, J., Mastur, M., & Fitrianto, I. (2025). Julkifli, Ibnu Fitrianto Metode Langsung (Thaîqah Mubâsyarah) Dalam Pembelajaran Bahasa Arab di Pondok Pesantren Bin Baz Yogyakarta. *Jurnal Al-Fawa'id: Jurnal Agama dan Bahasa*, 15(1), 158-173.
- King, E., & Özler, B. (2005). What's decentralization got to do with learning? Endogenous school quality and student performance in Nicaragua. *World Bank Policy Research Working Paper*, 3604.
- Krippendorff, K. (2018). *Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology* (4th ed.). SAGE.
- Leithwood, K., & Menzies, T. (1998). Forms and effects of school-based management: A review. *Educational Policy*, 12(3), 325-346. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0895904898012003006>
- Lingard, B. (2010). Policy borrowing, policy learning: Testing times in Australian schooling. *Critical Studies in Education*, 51(2), 129-147. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17508481003731026>
- Lingard, B., & Ozga, J. (2007). Globalisation, education policy and politics. In B. Lingard & J. Ozga (Eds.), *The RoutledgeFalmer reader in education policy and politics* (pp. 65-82). London: Routledge.
- Lingard, B., & Ozga, J. (Eds.). (2007). *The RoutledgeFalmer reader in education policy and politics*. Routledge.
- Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldaña, J. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook* (3rd ed.). SAGE.
- Mundy, K. (2007). Global governance, educational change. *Comparative Education*, 43(3), 339-357. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03050060701556382>
- Nashihin, H., Rachman, Y. A., & Fitrianto, I. (2025). Empowering creativity of disabled students through sustainable agropreneur education at ainul yakin islamic boarding school in yogyakarta to support the SDGs. *Journal of Lifestyle and SDGs Review*, 5(2), e02878-e02878.
- OECD. (2016). *Governing education in a complex world*. Paris: OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264255364-en>
- OECD. (2019). *Balancing school choice and equity: An international perspective based on PISA*. OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/2592c974-en>
- OECD. (2020). *Education at a glance 2020: OECD indicators*. OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/69096873-en>
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). (2016). *Global competency for an inclusive world*. OECD Publishing.
- Rappleye, J. (2012). *Reimagining Japanese education: Borders, transfers, circulations, and the comparative*. Symposium Books.
- Sahlberg, P. (2011). *Finnish lessons: What can the world learn from educational change in Finland?* Teachers College Press.
- Sahlberg, P. (2016). *The global educational reform movement and its impact on schooling*. In K. Mundy, A. Green, B. Lingard, & A. Verger (Eds.), *The handbook of global education policy* (pp. 128-144). Wiley-Blackwell.
- Said, A. H., Fitrianto, I., & Jamilah, H. A. (2022). الأفعال المتعدّية بحرف الجرّ في كتاب القراءة الوافية المقرّر للصفّ السادس

دلالية/Transgressive verbs (Harf Jar) in the sixth-grade reading book (Grammatica/Transgressive verbs (Harf Jar) in the sixth-grade reading book (Grammatical semantic study). Diwan: Jurnal Bahasa dan Sastra Arab, 8(1).

- Selwyn, N. (2011). *Education and technology: Key issues and debates*. Bloomsbury Academic.
- Shah, A., & Nelli, R. (2020). Decentralized governance in education: Rethinking accountability. *World Development*, 133, 104985. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2020.104985>
- Shah, D., & Nelli, R. (2020). Centralization versus decentralization in education governance: A systematic review. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 74, 102163. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedudev.2019.102163>
- Sharma, Y. (2012). Centralisation versus decentralisation: A global study of education reform. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 32(3), 445–457. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedudev.2011.09.005>
- UNESCO. (2017). *Education for sustainable development goals: Learning objectives*. UNESCO Publishing.
- UNESCO. (2021). *Reimagining our futures together: A new social contract for education*. UNESCO Publishing.
- Verger, A., Novelli, M., & Altinyelken, H. K. (2012). *Global education policy and international development: New agendas, issues and policies*. Bloomsbury.
- Weiler, H. N. (1990). Comparative perspectives on educational decentralization: An exercise in contradiction? *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 12(4), 433–448. <https://doi.org/10.3102/01623737012004433>
- Williamson, B. (2017). *Big data in education: The digital future of learning, policy and practice*. Sage.
- World Bank. (2018). *Learning to realize education's promise*. World Bank Group. <https://doi.org/10.1596/978-1-4648-1096-1>
- World Bank. (2018). *World development report 2018: Learning to realize education's promise*. Washington, DC: The World Bank.