universities and colleges, it would be meaningful to have the perspectives and reflections of this group of professionals regarding their experiences of border crossing into the teaching culture in China. By including the voices of this group of teacher educators, a broader picture and more thorough understanding of the strengths and weaknesses of Western and Eastern teacher education programs could be obtained. Second, as the title of the book indicates, there should be more studies related to major subject areas in the field of teacher preparation, i.e., literacy, math, science. How can the experiences and knowledge of the teacher educators with a profound Chinese background be further valued and used in reflecting on the practices of teacher education in the US so that a better middle ground can be reached? It seems that further in-depth analysis is needed to address this.

Overall, this is an important book that addresses a significant topic in teacher education in an increasingly global setting. I believe the argument for the need to “strive for a more inclusive pedagogical framework” made by the editor of the book will inspire more studies in this line of research that critically examine how to enhance the capacity of pre- and in-service teachers by using a range of pedagogies in this framework, and that serve to maximize the learning of the diverse student population in the US and China, as well as elsewhere.

CHENG Qiang

The University of Mississippi

E-mail: qcheng@olemiss.edu

DOI 10.3868/s110-004-015-0013-4

移植与创新：国际学校认证制度在中国的建立过程 [*Transplantation and innovation: Establishing an international school accreditation system in China*]. 莫景祺 [Mo, J. Q.]. 北京, 中国: 教育科学出版社 [Beijing, China: Educational Science Publishing House], 2013. 275pp., (paperback), ¥41, ISBN: 978-7-50-418047-6.

Against the backdrop of the increasing global mobility of people and educational services, Mo's book reflects China's expanding encounters with international schools within its territory. Mo's book is a timely response to the scarcity of research on

China's practices of accrediting international schools. It adds to the existent literature by delineating detailed causes, processes, and impacts of re-contextualizing the international school accreditation systems to Chinese mainland.

In the book, Mo captures the nuances of how the National Center for School Curriculum and Textbook Development of the Ministry of Education of China (NCCT), local international schools, and three other international school accreditation institutions (i.e., Council of International Schools (CIS); New England Association of Schools And Colleges (NEASC); Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) creatively forged an alliance to re-calibrate internationalized systems of accrediting international schools in Chinese mainland. Mo effectively depicted the dynamics of the re-calibration processes within the alliance, particularly, the negotiations around the local responsiveness of the established international accreditation standards and the addition of Category E "China Context" (p. 130) in the cooperative accreditation model. Mo justifiably attributes the tensions among the cooperative stakeholders to the diverging institutional logics of international schools, the NCCT as a local government- approved agency, and the international accreditation institutions (i.e., CIS, NEASC, and WASC).

The "China Context" reads like an ecological response to the Chinese government's requests to adjust international accreditation standards to the contexts in Chinese mainland, for instance the standards that request international schools to incorporate "local cultures into the curriculum in appropriate ways," to comply with local laws and regulations, and to promote "intercultural and international awareness" (p. 131). However, in my view, to better address the local-global interactions inherent in the process of transplanting international school accreditation systems into China, it would be worthwhile to examine the power relations of various actors and institutions and their political discourses/ preferences in terms of ideological control or political socialization. For example, the "China Context" to a certain extent intimates a type of protectionism that Chinese authorities imposed to regulate what international schools should teach, particularly if readers take a closer look at the standards about restricting religious education and teaching around sensitive political issues. Such standards exemplify forms of local resistance that seek to "recover local control over local life" that might potentially succumb to the combined forces of internationalization and westernization¹. In line with Mo's

¹ D. G. Smith (2006). *Trying to teach in a season of great untruth: Globalization, empire and the crises of pedagogy*. Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Sense Publishers, p. 22.

adopted theoretical framework of neo-institutionalism, it would be equally interesting to see how the involved agencies “shape those preferences”².

With a focus on institutional transfer, Mo reiterates the tensions and dilemmas that the NCCT had to face when integrating accreditation standards from various parties. For example, in Chapter 6, Mo discusses the divergent accreditation rationales of the NCCT and the Chinese government. The NCCT foregrounded the necessity to assist international schools’ development in Chinese mainland, while the governmental authorities emphasized the importance of “regulating and managing” international schools in China (p. 13). I understand that with his various hats as researcher, author and the division head of the NCCT, Mo is concerned about the stakeholders’ interests and thus deals with sensitive issues diplomatically in the book. However, it would be a worthwhile effort to explore in depth the institution-environment relationships³ that might have stabilized the local but interrogated the international order. For instance, the cultural and historical roots in Chinese mainland that might have legitimated the regulating and managing agenda could have been considered further.

Mo is successful in showing the joint involvement of various human actors and institutions which enabled the institutional transfer of international school accreditation to Chinese mainland. But data do not seem to relate that the NCCT’s re-contextualized model of international school accreditation is “bottom-up” or “grass-roots” (p. 224). Despite brief accounts of parents’ participation in schools’ self-assessment processes (see p. 180), there are few examples to support the “bottom-up” processes which might have involved the lower levels of a hierarchy. Also, the dichotomy of “bottom-up” or “top-down” might be an oversimplified approach to account for the complicated web of values, habits, interests, and relations of the cooperative agencies. That said, for interested readers, I would suggest Actor-Network Theory (ANT)⁴ as an alternative lens to view the uncertainty, fluidity, and ambivalences that Mo

² R. O. Koehane (1988). International institutions: Two approaches. *International Studies Quarterly*, 32(4), 379–396, p. 382.

³ See P. J. DiMaggio & W. W. Powell (1991). Introduction. In W. W. Powell & P. J. DiMaggio (Eds.), *The new institutionalism in organizational analysis* (pp. 1–38). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

⁴ E.g., T. Fenwick (2011). Reading educational reform with actor-network theory: Fluid spaces, otherings, and ambivalences. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 43(S1), 114–134. doi: 10.1111/j.1469-5812.2009.00609.x; J. Law (2009). Actor network theory and material semiotics. In B. S. Turner (Ed.), *The new Blackwell companion to social theory* (3rd ed., pp. 141–158). Oxford, England: Blackwell.

depicts about re-contextualizing international school accreditation systems to Chinese mainland. ANT could hopefully help trace not only the connections among human and non-human actors but also what was absent or escaped the networks in the transfer process.

Mo's book provides novel lenses through which to view the re-calibration of international school accreditation systems in the Chinese mainland. Mo also suggests ways to mobilize the relevant stakeholders and facilitate institutional transfers. Readers who are educational policy makers, international school administrators, and researchers who are interested in international education might find the book an informative read.

ZHANG Zheng
The Chinese University of Hong Kong
E-mail: evangeline9898@gmail.com