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Abstract

This thesis assesses the structural vulnerability of German Schools Abroad that offer the International Baccalaureate Diploma Programme (collectively referred to as GIB DAS). The assessment takes the form of an evaluation of GIB DAS’ utility to Germany’s foreign policy goals. Until now, German politicians and researchers in general have paid little attention to GIB DAS. As a consequence, no reliable assessments of GIB DAS’ utility as a soft-power tool exist.

To provide a general overview of GIB DAS and raise awareness of political decision makers to issues afflicting these schools, this study looks into GIB DAS’ organizational structure and uncovers its weak points. First, it analyzes stakeholders in terms of their interests, constraints, and responsibilities with regard to GIB DAS, their communications with one another, and their motives for working in favor of or against the consolidation of GIB DAS. Then it assesses the susceptibility of the organizational structure through twelve proxy drivers associated with the weak points.

The study concludes that the root causes of GIB DAS’ susceptibility include Germany’s pivot toward specific world regions, educational federalism, incoherent adjustment policies, market imperfections in the provision of teachers and principals, lack of accountability of principals to their school community, principals’ unfamiliarity with the Diploma Programme and lack of incentives to engage in it, and fear of creative destruction. To avert a disaster, the study formulates suggestions for preventive measures that could effectively strengthen GIB DAS’ organizational structure in the short term.
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The acronyms and abbreviations considered in this study or in supporting evidence mostly derive from the corresponding German names. To facilitate understanding of all German terms and lexemes employed here, I have organized the relevant pieces of information in a table of three columns. The first column features the acronyms/abbreviations/terms used throughout the study, the second presents the corresponding name in the German language, and the third one includes a translation into English of the German term listed in the second column.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>German</th>
<th>English translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AA</td>
<td>Auswärtiges Amt</td>
<td>Federal Foreign Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abi</td>
<td>Abitur</td>
<td>German university-track K12-program that finalizes with the award of a certificate which enables its holder to take up university studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADLK</td>
<td>Auslandsdienstlehrkraft</td>
<td>Foreign service teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AKPB</td>
<td>Auswärtige Kultur- und Bildungspolitik</td>
<td>Cultural Relations and Education Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASchulG</td>
<td>Auslandsschulgesetz</td>
<td>German Schools Abroad Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLASchA</td>
<td>Bund-Länder-Ausschuss für schulische Arbeit im Ausland</td>
<td>Committee of educational representatives of the Federation and the Länder tasked with the coordination of school activity abroad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Full Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLI</td>
<td>Bund-Länder-Inspektion</td>
<td>Inspection by the federal and state authorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPLK</td>
<td>Bundesprogrammlehrkraft</td>
<td>Federal program teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BT</td>
<td>Bundestag</td>
<td>National parliament. One of 5 German federal organs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BVA</td>
<td>Bundesverwaltungsamt</td>
<td>Federal Office of Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAS</td>
<td>Creativity, Action, Service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDU</td>
<td>Christlich Demokratische Union Deutschlands</td>
<td>Christian Democratic Union of Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU</td>
<td>Christlich Soziale Union</td>
<td>Christian Social Union in Bavaria in Bayern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAAD</td>
<td>Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst</td>
<td>German Academic Exchange Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAS</td>
<td>Deutsche Auslandsschule</td>
<td>German School Abroad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIA</td>
<td>Deutsches Internationales Abitur</td>
<td>German International Abitur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP</td>
<td>Diplomprogramm</td>
<td>Diploma Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSD</td>
<td>Deutsches Sprachdiplom</td>
<td>German Language Certificate of the Standing Conference of the Ministers of Education and Cultural Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPS</td>
<td>Deutsche Profilschule</td>
<td>German Profile School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE</td>
<td>Extended Essay</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GI</td>
<td>Goethe Institut</td>
<td>Goethe Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIB</td>
<td>Gemischtsprachiges Internationales Baccalaureate</td>
<td>Bilingual International Baccalaureate, <em>here:</em> International Baccalaureate in the context of the DAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIB DP</td>
<td>Gemischtsprachiges IB-Diplomprogramm</td>
<td>German-style Diploma Programme of the International Baccalaureate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IB</td>
<td>International Baccalaureate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Full Name</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IB DP</td>
<td>International Baccalaureate Diploma Programme</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IBO</td>
<td>International Baccalaureate Organization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KMK</td>
<td>Kultusministerkonferenz</td>
<td>Standing Conference of the Ministers of Education and Cultural Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OLK</td>
<td>Ortslehrkraft</td>
<td>Local teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PASCH</td>
<td>Initiative “Schulen: Partner für die Zukunft”</td>
<td>“Schools: Partners for the Future” Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PISA</td>
<td>Programme for International Student Assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPP</td>
<td>Public-Private Partnerships</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PQM</td>
<td>Pädagogisches Qualitätsmanagement</td>
<td>Pedagogical Quality Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPD</td>
<td>Sozialdemokratische Partei Deutschlands</td>
<td>Social Democratic Party of Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOK</td>
<td>Theory of Knowledge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WDA</td>
<td>Weltverband Deutscher Auslandsschulen</td>
<td>World Federation of German Schools Abroad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZfA</td>
<td>Zentralstelle für Auslandsschulwesen</td>
<td>Central Agency for Schools Abroad</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 1

Introduction

Over the last forty years, demand for international curricula and programs, and consequently the number of schools carrying the label “international” in their names, have soared.¹ One of the international programs that has seen a particularly steep rise in demand is the International Baccalaureate Diploma Programme (IB DP).

Introduced in 1968 at twelve schools in ten different countries, the IB DP is offered today at 3,182 schools in 153 different countries worldwide.² Its curriculum is designed by independent scholars from different regions of the world who operate under the auspices of a private, Europe-based organization: The International Baccalaureate Organization (IBO). The IB DP offers a great variety of subjects, its final exams are conceived and evaluated by International Baccalaureate (IB) practitioners who have no allegiance to any one nation’s particular educational scheme, and no national government determines the design of the IB curricula and the corresponding Programme standards and practices. True to its mission to “promote intercultural understanding and respect, not

---


as an alternative to a sense of cultural and national identity, but as an essential part of life in the 21st century, 3 the IBO seeks to make the world a better place through education. Last but not least, IBO’s school-leaving certificate—the Diploma Programme diploma (DP diploma)—enables its holders to take up higher education studies at universities around the world. 4 Given the international character of the IB DP, the nobility of ideals emanating from its philosophical precepts, and the perceived high value of the DP diploma, it is easy to see why the IB DP enjoys great popularity. Its annual growth rate of almost 40% is a telling indicator of its popularity. 5

Thirty-three of the 3,182 schools that offer the IB DP are officially recognized German Schools Abroad, with 19 of them located in Latin America. The remaining 14 German Schools Abroad that offer the IB DP (referred to as GIB DAS) are scattered around the globe: Turkey has four, 6 while Australia, Vietnam, Philippines, Taiwan, India, Ethiopia, Lebanon, Saudi Arabia, Qatar, and the UAE each host one GIB DAS. 7 All GIB DAS offer curricula at the intermediary, lower, and upper secondary levels, which follow the guidelines of their host country’s educational authorities, have incorporated German

---

3 IBO, 2018p. “Key Facts.”


5 IBO, 2018p. “Key Facts.”

6 The German School in Ankara has a local branch in Izmir, which I have counted as a school in its own right. However, this school’s future is uncertain as it was shut down by the Turkish authorities in late June 2018, which could reduce the number of the GIB DAS in Turkey to three. <https://www.dw.com/de/türkische-behörden-schließen-deutsche-schule-izmir/a-44472813>. (Accessed June 30, 2018).

courses for foreign learners into their schedules, and also teach a small number of additional subjects in the German language. Students at the upper secondary level may then choose, or are selected by the school, to join the German version of the IB DP (referred to as GIB DP) for the last two years of their schooling. Upon successful completion of this two-year program, they are awarded both the school-leaving certificate of their host country and the GIB DP school-leaving certificate called GIB diploma. Students attending the upper secondary level at a GIB DAS who do not join the GIB DP receive the national school-leaving certificate and the DSD II certificate, the German equivalent of the TOEFL certificate. In a few cases, the GIB DAS also offers alternative international curricula at the upper secondary level.

In addition to the 33 GIB DAS, Germany has 109 other officially recognized German Schools Abroad (Deutsche Auslandsschulen, referred to as DAS). The DAS are considered “genuine German” schools as they offer education schemes that follow common core curricula designed especially for the lower and upper secondary education levels at the DAS (Sekundarstufen I and II). These curricula are mainly oriented to the German education system and the German culture. Also, they abide by a unified set of examination requirements constituted and overseen by the German authority responsible for supervising the quality of education at the DAS. This authority is called the Standing Conference of the Ministers of Education and Cultural Affairs of the Länder in the Federal Republic of Germany (Kultusministerkonferenz, referred to as KMK). Moreover, all schools holding the DAS status regularly undergo inspections of quality in education conducted by a group of federal and state officials from the education sector and 16 process consultants of the Central Agency for Schools Abroad (Zentralstelle für
Auslandsschulwesen, referred to as ZfA). Upon completion of DAS’ upper secondary level, students are awarded either the German school-leaving certificate called Abitur, or the international version of it called the Deutsches Internationales Abitur (DIA), or the vocational school-leaving certificate called Fachhochschulreife. All three are considered German high school-leaving certificates in the strict sense of the word. However, only the Abitur and the DIA certificates give their holders the liberty to apply to any program at any German university on the same terms that govern graduates from high schools in Germany. Holders of the Fachhochschulreife certificate may enter any university of applied sciences. As universities in Germany are well acquainted with the three certificates awarded by the DAS, applicants who hold either one of them experience no setbacks on account of recognition and validation procedures. On the other hand, students holding a GIB diploma often face a time-consuming diploma validation and recognition procedure before they may continue with their application process, as most German universities consider the GIB diploma a “non-German” school-leaving certificate and treat it accordingly.8

Regardless of the disparities between the GIB DAS and the DAS, the German Schools Abroad Act (Auslandsschulgesetz, referred to as ASchulG) recognizes both the “genuine German” DAS and the GIB DAS as official German schools abroad and a soft-power tool of Germany’s foreign policy.9 Both school types operate under the umbrella of Germany’s Federal Foreign Office (Auswärtiges Amt, referred to as AA) which,


pursuant to Section 3, clause 2 of the ASchulG,\textsuperscript{10} may revoke any school’s DAS status at AA’s discretion. Also, both school types are entitled to federal funding and provision of some human capital and pedagogical resources from Germany, although neither funding, manpower, nor resources are provided for in a non-discriminatory manner.\textsuperscript{11}

Each DAS is eligible to receive funds amounting to a maximum of €1.6 million per year, and the services of up to 15 German teachers who hold the status of foreign service officials (\textit{Auslandsdienstlehr-kräfte}, referred to as ADLK), for whom they do not have to pay. Moreover, each DAS has access to teaching materials in the German language, and their staff may participate in a variety of professional training events specifically designed for their particular needs. The GIB DAS, on the other hand, may cash in up to €300,000 and are officially authorized for one ADLK free of charge. In both cases, the amount receivable depends on the average number of class hours the ADLKs teach and the number of school-leaving certificates each school produces in a three-year period. Most GIB DAS end up collecting no more than €200,000 per year, while the average value collected by the DAS is around €1.36 million.\textsuperscript{12} Last but not least, resources and professional development for teachers working in the GIB DP are generally not available in the German language.\textsuperscript{13}

\textsuperscript{10}Deutscher Bundestag, \textit{Drucksache}, 2013a, 5.


AA’s support of competing school programs that pursue the same goal—to award school-leaving certificates that enable their holders free admission to universities in Germany—gives rise to political economy issues related to the allocation of scarce resources. However, as German education authorities are not permitted to oversee one of these programs, the schools that offer the program whose design they cannot control is put at a disadvantage relative to their competitors. Just how large these disadvantages are, what consequences they may have for the affected schools in the future, and how effective the GIB DAS are in the attainment of Germany’s foreign policy goals no one really knows as the GIB DAS have largely remained outside the focus of German scrutiny. None of the three utility studies that have so far been conducted on the DAS (which I discuss in Chapter 2) has treated the GIB DAS separately.

To address this issue from the bottom up, I conducted an exploratory case study of the GIB DAS. The purpose of my study is to shed light on the organizational structure of the GIB DAS. The goal is to assess the vulnerability of the GIB DAS when their utility is evaluated. My study provides a blueprint for further research and aims to motivate scholars and researchers to gather useful data on the GIB DAS that will enable more refined structural vulnerability assessments in the future. This study combines observation methods, document analysis, and interviews with strategic and operational stakeholders. It seeks to establish GIB DAS’ susceptibility\(^{14}\) to an evaluation of their utility as a foreign policy tool. The objective is to identify weak points in GIB DAS’

---

\(^{14}\) The change of terms from “vulnerable” to “susceptible” is owing to my considerations as discussed in Chapter 2. From this point onward, susceptibility denotes pre-event vulnerability, whereas vulnerability refers to a concept that encompasses susceptibility + damaging event + resilience. All these concepts are explained in Chapter 2.
organizational structure and to propose appropriate preventive measures that the DAS can adopt in the short and medium term to reduce their susceptibility.

The evaluation is based on the assumption that a tool must be useful to justify its existence. A tool is considered useful if it serves the purpose it was designed for, there is demand for it, its handling is easy, and it is not costly. If any one of these four criteria is not met, the tool may be considered unnecessary and be replaced by another tool that does fulfill all four criteria. These criteria frame my analysis of the organizational structure of GIB DAS.

The thesis has seven chapters. Chapter 2 begins by stating the research problem and research questions, including formulating the research objectives and the significance of the research, its limitations and possible biases. Definition of key terms, and conceptualization and operationalization of the structural vulnerability concept for purposes of this study, complete the first chapter.

Chapter 3 discusses methodology. It begins by listing a number of established vulnerability assessment tools and briefly presents two vulnerability assessment models that are common in social sciences. Then it presents the design of my research, including the process of data collection, selection of indicators, their operationalization through associated prompts and closed-end questions, definition of the prompts, interpretation of findings, scoring and scaling.

Chapter 4 provides background information on the DAS, the antecedents of the GIB DP at the DAS, the composition of the DP curriculum and its prescribed GIB DP version, and the institutional assessments that every GIB DAS has to undergo on a regular basis. Chapter 5 analyzes all members of GIB DAS organizational structure in
terms of their respective interests, responsibilities, constraints, and communication in the context of the GIB DAS. Chapter 6 assesses GIB DAS’ susceptibility to a negative evaluation of its role as AA’s foreign policy tool on the basis of the indicators specified in my research design.

The final Chapter 7 provides answers to my research questions, highlights the findings produced in this investigation, and includes three policy recommendations. Also, it makes a recommendation for future research on the GIB DAS and describes how the assessment tool employed in this study can be expanded to capture all aspects of relevance to the assessment of GIB DAS’ vulnerability. It finishes with my conclusion.
Chapter 2
Research Problem and Basic Concepts

This chapter introduces the research problem and the basic concepts that inform my study. It lays the theoretical groundwork for the analysis and assessment of GIB DAS’ organizational structure.

Research Problem and Questions

When German authorities are excluded from overseeing the conception of the GIB DP curriculum and the final exams in the GIB DP, and from the corresponding grading procedures, the conundrum arises that these restrictions provide detractors of the GIB DP (such as Schumann\textsuperscript{15}) with powerful reasons to bash the GIB DAS and lobby the AA to invoke Section 3, clause 2 of the ASchulG,\textsuperscript{16} that is, to strip the GIB DAS of their DAS status. The logic of the detractors is straightforward and uses arguments of international political economy.

Education is crucial to the development of human capital. In line with the Hecksher-Ohlin theorem,\textsuperscript{17} for a research-and-development-based, export-oriented economy to thrive in international trade, the country’s most abundant factor of production should be “human capital,” and its economy should be based on it. Germany is one such


\textsuperscript{16} Deutscher Bundestag, \textit{Drucksache}, 2013a, 5.

\textsuperscript{17} J. A. Frieden, and D. Lake, \textit{International Political Economy} (London: Routledge, 2000).
country and education “made in Germany” is one of its hallmarks. However, Germany has for years suffered from a shortage of well-trained human capital. To reverse this trend and ensure Germany’s uninterrupted economic growth, the federal authorities utilize the DAS. The AA sees in the DAS one of the most sustainable and decisive soft-power instruments the federal authorities have to effectively pursue Germany’s cultural relations and education policy goals (Auswärtige Kultur und Bildungspolitik, referred to as AKBP). The DAS propagate the German language and culture, project a positive image of Germany abroad, and are geared toward attracting human capital to German universities. Hence, having a foreign player, the IBO, oversee the quality of a tool that is key to Germany’s foreign interests, without any possibility for the AA to participate in this process, is an argument that critics of the GIB DAS use to allege that GIB DAS poses a threat to national security.

To this day, the AA has not evaluated GIB DAS’ contribution to Germany’s foreign policy. Were they to conduct such an evaluation any time soon, the results could support the arguments of GIB DAS’ detractors. Guided by my motivation to prepare the GIB DAS for such an evaluation by uncovering their structural weak points, my investigation seeks an answer to the following research question:

How susceptible are the GIB DAS to AA’s evaluation of their utility as a foreign policy tool?

---


During my investigation, three questions related to the core research question kept emerging and are answered here as well. They are:

1. Are all GIB DAS equally susceptible?
2. What are the structural root causes of their susceptibility?
3. What can the GIB DAS do to minimize their susceptibility?

Research Objectives

The objectives of this study are the following:

- analyze the organizational structure of the GIB DAS,
- identify weak points in GIB DAS’ organizational structure, and
- specify measures to be taken to address the weak points in GIB DAS’ organizational structure.

Justification for the Research

Despite existing for almost 450 years and being a tool of Germany’s foreign policy, there has been very little research on the DAS scheme, and there is no empirical research on GIB DAS. If considered at all, DAS-related knowledge generation usually falls under the direction of state bureaucracies that are responsible for handling these schools. Hence, literature on DAS, beyond official documents or self-assessments, is thin. Only three scientific studies have been conducted on the DAS, and I will discuss them
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here. They specifically mention that the realm of the GIB DAS is a case in its own right, and they suggest it is worth addressing these schools separately through scientific research in order to reliably assess their contribution to the interests of German foreign policy. My investigation takes a first step in this direction.

Public Value Study

The World Federation of German Schools Abroad (Weltverband Deutscher Auslandsschulen, referred to as WDA) asked the Center for Leadership and Values in Society at the University of St. Gallen\textsuperscript{23} to develop the Public Value Study, a mixed-method study that focuses on a critical assessment of DAS with regard to their value contribution to society. The Public Value Study approaches the topic from two different perspectives: an inside view and the outside perception.

The inside view reflects the opinion of 21 stakeholders from the AA, the national parliament (Bundestag, referred to as BT), the ZfA, the German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD), and the WDA on key aspects of DAS’ value contribution to society. In addition to expressing their opinions, the respondents were asked to propose alternative action plans to enhance DAS’ societal standing.

The outside perception summarizes replies from the management of 285 senior schools in all 140 German schools abroad. Participants engaged in an online survey aimed at identifying challenges to the DAS and establishing degrees of attainment of 70 items associated with DAS’ successful operation. Relating to observed phenomena of the past, the Public Value Study identifies DAS’ opportunities and challenges, threats to their

\textsuperscript{23} Weltverband Deutscher Auslandsschulen & University of St. Gallen, \textit{Public Value Study}. 
standing in society, and measures to be taken to enable the DAS to consolidate their role as key instrument in German foreign policy. The opportunities list specifies aspects of an ideological nature that ought to be further pursued (e.g., “controlled spread of democratic values and social standards in the target country,” “self-confident presentation as an agent of AKBP,” “contribution to international understanding”), while singled-out threats identify the root causes of threats.

The threats list features the following:

- The German public and German politicians know little about the DAS and take hardly any interest in them.
- Rivalry between DAS and competing agents of the AKBP generate tensions.
- Universities do not recognize the GIB diploma as equivalent to Abitur.
- German state authorities are reluctant to create the conditions necessary for the DAS to reconcile rigid German educational norms with the schools’ struggle for international orientation.
- The situation of the DAS depends heavily on political stability in Germany.
- International competition for human talent is strong.
- Individual schools do not live up to their role as ambassadors of Germany.

Among the challenges, those ranking highest include:

- ignorance of the DAS and prejudices against them;
- nonexistent publicity in the media;
- an elitist image;
- pressure by German authorities for accountability;
- limited career opportunities for DAS staff;
little transparency in decision-making processes in Germany regarding the DAS;

little appreciation of the GIB diploma’s high rank.

The list of recommendations is the product of integrating inside views with the outside perspective. Key recommendations include:

- more marketing of the DAS;
- strengthening of DAS’ corporate identity;
- transparency in accountability;
- systematic collection of data on ex-students;
- consolidation of lobbying and networking activity in the political and economic sectors in favor of the DAS.

In addition to the discriminatory treatment of the GIB diploma, the GIB DAS merited only a marginal note in the Study that stated that not much information could be collected on these schools as they had just begun to operate; also that future studies should consider the GIB DAS separately from the DAS. The Study was flawed because it failed to recognize the following:

- The GIB DAS had been operating for over ten years at the time the Public Value Study was conducted.
- The Study did not acknowledge that the GIB DAS feature a distinctly different organizational structure than the DAS.
- Its results were interpreted as applicable to all DAS across the board.
- The sample included only political decision makers.
Triple Win Study

Titled *Deutsche Schulen, Globale Bildung: Beitrag der Deutschen Auslandsschulen zum Triple Win* (German Schools, Global Education: Contribution of the German Schools Abroad to the Triple Win”), the Triple Win Study was conducted by the WDA in collaboration with the Bertelsmann Foundation between January and March, 2017.\(^{24}\) The study explored what role the DAS play in shaping Germany’s attractiveness to foreign human talent; and under what conditions foreign students, their home countries, and Germany could benefit from foreign students studying at German universities.

Presented as an online survey that included the participation of 135 honorary and full-time senior management staff from 96 DAS, 908 ex-students, and interviews with six ex-students and experts, the study recognized that it was flawed and not representative of all DAS, not least because response rates were low. Missing is a more differentiated statement specifying that the study was not representative because the GIB DAS have not been addressed at all. Still, the study settled for these results as no other empirical research had been conducted on post-school careers of DAS’ ex-students.

The Triple Win Study’s main insights were:

- One of three non-German DAS graduates takes up university studies in Germany.
- Around 30% of DAS’ ex-students maintain business ties with German enterprises in their home countries.
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• The most popular university programs among DAS’ foreign ex-students are technology and engineering (25%), medicine and caring (12%), and natural sciences and mathematics (12%)

• The quality of German educational institutions (67%), bonds with Germany (49%), expectation of steep careers (45%), and no or low tuition fees, were the most compelling reasons for foreign DAS graduates to pursue a university degree in Germany.

• When asked about their experience regarding the recognition of their school-leaving certificate, those who hold a degree other than the Abitur stated they had experienced difficulties when they applied to a German university, as German universities are wary of foreign school diplomas.

Recommendations that might ensure the attractiveness of German universities to foreign DAS graduates included:

• not requiring DAS graduates to pay tuition fees;
• easing visa-related consular procedures for DAS graduates;
• establishing educational control by the German authorities.

The study suggested that measurements of DAS’ contribution to Triple Win should:

• include numbers on DAS graduates who take up university studies in Germany;
• compare the number of DAS graduates who actually finish their university degree and stay for work in Germany versus those who return to their home country after finishing their programs; and
• specify the academic degrees and professional qualifications that ex-students of the DAS are awarded in Germany.
Except for the problem of recognition of non-German school-leaving certificates, the GIB DAS were not mentioned at all in the Triple Win Study.

Worldwide Value-Creation Study

This recently presented scientific research on the DAS stresses again the need to promote further studies on the DAS. The WDA asked the private economic research company WifOR GmbH to undertake the Worldwide Value-Creation Study (Weltweite Wertschöpfung: Quantifizierung des Wertbeitrags der Deutschen Auslandsschulen), as a follow-up investigation to the Triple Win Study. The objective of this study was to quantify DAS’ contribution to the German education system as well as these schools’ effectiveness. Also, WifOR’s investigation was meant to raise awareness of political and economic sectors to DAS’ contribution to the German foreign policy goals and to propose a prototype procedure for future research on the DAS. As comprehensive as this study may be, however, it disregards the particularities of the GIB DAS, once again treating them as if they were regular DAS.

WifOR’s findings include the following:

- Overall, each DAS caters to students from 13 nations.
- 25% of all students are German citizens.
- 58% of all classes are conducted in the German language.
- On average, 50% of all degree holders obtain a leaving certificate that enables direct entry to a German university.
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None of these findings hold true for the GIB DAS, as I will discuss in Chapter 4. The composition of the student body at the GIB DAS is very homogenous, their German student population is at times nil, and classes are imparted mostly in the language of the host country.

The facts that the DAS have become an object of interest to political pressure groups, that none of the existing studies on the DAS specifically address GIB DAS-related issues, and that political representatives allegedly favoring the GIB DP veil themselves in mystery when it comes to sharing information, provides powerful justifications for my research. Among others, the following are pertinent:

- It is the first study to focus exclusively on the GIB DAS. As such, it will sensitize students, parents, faculty, school management, and German political decision makers to the particular challenges these schools face as they try to live up to AA’s expectation that they will act as Germany’s soft-power instrument. After presenting the events that led to the inception of the GIB DAS, describing the setup of the GIB DP at the DAS, discussing the organizational structure of these schools, and its weak points, this study specifies measures the schools should take to strengthen their institutional stability. More importantly, this study provides a blueprint of recommended policies to be adopted in order to enhance accountability of key stakeholders to their communities and sponsors.

- Focusing solely on the GIB DAS means positioning these schools as an interest group in its own right. If the GIB DAS do not pervade the academic discourse, their future looks bleak. Then they will likely continue to be surrounded by myths, described through biased data and platitudes, and assessed on the basis of
information that only a few German bureaucrats command. Ultimately, disinformation is likely to produce a skewed image of the GIB DAS and then be used to question their utility. To counter this tendency, my study seeks to empower faculty at the GIB DAS to undertake more refined scientific research on their schools and engage in discussions on the utility of the GIB DAS based on valid arguments.

- The assessment tool presented in this study is expandable and allows for adjustments to the individual character of each GIB. It may be employed by individual GIB DAS to aid the development of their own individual monitoring and early warning systems.

Limitations of the Research

The scarcity of relevant quantifiable data and publicly accessible documents on the GIB DAS has been a noteworthy challenge. To this day, no scientific research has been conducted on the GIB DAS. As a consequence, I could not link my investigation to hypotheses, insights, or unaddressed issues of previous studies. Also, I could not engage in any scholarly discussion on the GIB DAS or undergo any peer review process.

Reluctance of some stakeholders within the schools to supply updated data on their schools’ capabilities also proved to be a challenge. Until April 2017, I worked as a GIB coordinator for a number of years at one of the 18 GIB DAS in the IB Americas.
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26 I was aware of the conflicts of interest I would face when analyzing the GIB DAS. So, to ensure the highest degree of impartiality, I resigned in April 2017 from this particular GIB DAS, which I shall henceforth refer to as GSDS.
region. I visited a number of peer schools and maintained good relationships with my GIB coordinator peers. Nevertheless, delivery of quantitative data reflecting a school’s performance was declined on the grounds of confidentiality. My invitation to collaborate orally in the form of unstructured interviews, however, was gladly accepted, including by five principals. The information I extracted from these interviews, as well as my own field observations, informed the setup of the semi-structured interviews I conducted with a number of decision makers from the ZfA, the PASCH initiative, and the KMK, who also gave me a few topic-relevant internal documents while requesting that I not disclose my sources. To protect all silent collaborators from possible reprisal, their identities will remain anonymous.

Another limitation derives from the fact that I adhere to one particular definition of vulnerability, which is made of the elements “susceptibility”, “capacity to respond,” and “ability to adapt.” Given that there are various types of DAS, and that all DAS operate in private-public partnerships, each DAS’ individual capabilities and assets vary. Hence, establishing their collective “capacity to respond” and “ability to adapt” in a valid manner is not possible as long as good data on individual capabilities and assets are not available. Accordingly, my study limits itself to assessing the susceptibility of the GIB DAS rather than their vulnerability. However, as the term “vulnerability” is much more common in everyday use and in scholarly discussions, and because one of my goals is to

---


28 The PASCH (Schools: Partners for the Future) initiative is a global network of some 1,800 schools that place a high value on German. It is an initiative of the AA in cooperation with the ZfA, the Goethe-Institut, the German Academic Exchange Service, and the KMK. PASCH, “What is PASCH?” 2018b. <http://www.pasch-net.de/en/udi.html>. (Accessed July 20, 2018.)
inspire further research on the GIB DAS, I decided to keep the catchy and engaging term “vulnerability” in the title of this thesis.

A related limitation arose as a consequence of the fact that there is no established, commonly accepted structural vulnerability assessment tool that can be adapted to my research without making tradeoffs. As I discuss in Chapter 3, each vulnerability assessment is linked to a specific hazard and specific conditions, but these two factors usually do not unfold multiple times in the same manner. Therefore, practitioners of vulnerability assessments see themselves obliged to develop their own assessment tools. This invariably raises questions about the validity and reliability of the results produced, questions that likely will be raised in critiques of this study, too. Still, I embrace constructive criticism as it benefits quality in research, which is why I decided to move ahead with my investigation despite possible methodological shortcomings.

The uncertainty of Germany’s political environment posed a major challenge as well. After the general elections of September 2017, it took the established political parties—CDU (Christian Democratic Union of Germany), CSU (Christian Social Union in Bavaria), and SPD (Social Democratic Party of Germany)—eight months to form a coalition strong enough to elect a government. These three parties were in power when the ASchulG was passed by the German parliament in 2013, so their continuation in government was key to the validity of my arguments. Had any other party joined the coalition, chances were that detractors of the GIB DAS would gain momentum and insist on revising the established government policy regarding the DAS system.
Biases in the Research

As a German who enjoyed a German school education and worked at a GIB DAS as coordinator, I will have to pass the bar of scrutiny of cultural and convenience biases. A sign of these biases could be, for instance, if I consistently interpreted evidence in favor of or against one particular side without considering any plausible alternative, in spite of data suggesting it. Although I do not categorically preclude the possibility of that happening, I believe that my professional and academic ethics are well anchored and will be my moral judge. My allegiance is foremost to evidence and plausibility.

My focus on the 19 GIB DAS in Latin America may be informed by a bias of convenience. However, the 19 GIB DAS of the IB Americas region constitute a sub-group within the DAS that offer the GIB DP whose distinct characteristics make them stand out from the remaining 14 DAS that offer the GIB DAS, a point to be discussed in Chapter 4. Moreover, the 19 GIB DAS of the IB Americas region represent 58% of all 33 GIB DAS worldwide in terms of school numbers. When numbers of students at these schools are considered, the percentage rises to 85% (see Table 3 in Chapter 4). Although not perfect, both these percentages are statistically significant and allow for making inferences with general application to all GIB DAS.

Another bias that may possibly pervade this study derives from the readiness, or not, of some of my German state informants to collaborate. Being aware of their institutions’ official position on nondisclosure of internally classified information, these informants must be considered against the background of the benefits they may perceive from collaborating or not collaborating, or the damage they may intend to cause by engaging or not engaging with me. The fact that two of my informants participated in a
recently constituted Round Table GIB (discussed further in Chapter 4) and withheld information from me despite my explicit inquiry about the existence of a pressure group working in favor of the GIB DP, is a case in point.

Definitions of Key Terms

This study takes a first step toward assessing the structural vulnerability of the GIB DAS to an evaluation of these schools’ utility as a foreign policy tool. To ensure unequivocal understanding of the terms that are key to this investigation, I first define them and then, if applicable, explain their use in the present research. The central concept in this research, vulnerability, will be discussed extensively, for it is important to capture all its subtleties in order to define meaningful indicators of it.

Disaster is a cross-cutting combination of vulnerability and hazard. Wisner, et al. describe it as “the intersection of two opposing forces: those processes generating vulnerability on one side, and the natural hazard event (or sometimes a slowly unfolding natural process) on the other.”\(^{29}\) If vulnerability is nil, a hazard will most likely not lead to any disaster. Conversely, if vulnerability is high, the occurrence of a hazard is likely to produce huge losses and result in a disaster. According to Makoka and Kaplan,\(^{30}\) the difference between disasters and risks is that the former gauge outcomes of an event in terms of the loss suffered; the latter do so by generating probabilistic estimates of the
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occurrence of adverse consequences. In the present study, disaster would be GIB DAS’ forfeiture of their DAS status.

*Exposure* describes a setting in which a number of subjects/assets are present in a defined area where a hazard occurs and who/which are thereby subject to potential loss.  
It differs from vulnerability inasmuch as a subject/element can be exposed but not vulnerable, but not vice versa. For example, when adequate preventive measures have been taken to protect a subject or an element from a specified hazard, it may still be exposed, but it is less vulnerable. In this study, the exposed group comprehends the 19 GIB DAS of the IB Americas region.

*Hazards:* The UNISDR defines a hazard as a “dangerous phenomenon, substance, human activity or condition that may cause loss of life, injury or other health impacts, property damage, loss of livelihoods and services, social and economic disruption, or environmental damage.” In that sense, hazards are, as Lauire puts it, external factors that adversely affect exposed societies or elements and have the potential to cause social and economic disruption. They can originate in nature or be the result of an intentional act, negligence, an error, or international externalities.

In the context of the present study, the only hazard to be examined is the evaluation of GIB DAS’ utility as a foreign policy tool. I consider this possibility to be a potential hazard for the GIB DAS because a possibly unfavorable appreciation of the GIB
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DAS by the AA or its associated authorities may have far-reaching negative
consequences for these schools. The GIB DAS retain their DAS status only because they
enjoy AA’s recognition as a key instrument to Germany’s foreign interests. Were the AA
to conclude that the GIB DAS do not perform as they are expected to, that there is no
demand for them, that they are difficult to be handled or that the cost of sustaining them
does not justify the benefits they produce, it could strip the GIB DAS of their DAS status.
This way an initially inoffensive action—the evaluation—could turn into a disaster.

Resilience stands for a system’s ability to recover from the impact of a hazard.
Alwang, Siegel and Jorgensen describe it as combination of an effective response to a
damaging event and a person’s ability to adapt himself/herself to the new situation
created by the shock of the hazard.\footnote{J. Alwang, P. Siegel, S. Jorgensen, 
Vulnerability: A View From Different Disciplines (Washington, DC: World Bank, 2001).}
To assess the capabilities and assets that an exposed subject/group has and can use to quickly respond to a damaging event and his/her/its
ability to bounce back into the baseline condition or above it, De Silva follows Chambers
and Conway’s oft-cited proposition\footnote{R Chambers, and G. Conway, Sustainable Rural Livelihoods: Practical Concepts for the 21st Century (England: University of Sussex, 1992), 5.} to consider livelihoods as “the capabilities, assets

Going back once again to my comment on the feasibility of a vulnerability study
that is not based on reliable data related to an exposed subject’s capacity to respond and
its ability to adapt, I remind the reader that my study does not consider the resilience part
and focuses exclusively on GIB DAS’ susceptibility.
Risk is the product of exposure, hazard, and vulnerability. It denotes the combination of the possibility of a hazard impacting exposed elements in a determined context and the consequences of the impact. It differs from vulnerability because vulnerability describes the relative size of the consequences of damage while risk is about the probability of occurrence of adverse consequences.\textsuperscript{37} Arithmetically, risk can be represented through the following formula:

\[
\text{Risk} = \text{number of exposed elements} \times \text{chance of hazard} \times \text{vulnerability}
\]

\textit{Structural Vulnerability Assessment:} The process in which the form of a structure and the quality of connectivity of the elements composing the structure are examined. Lu, et al.\textsuperscript{38} propose using this term when referring to a specific type of assessment that evaluates the well-formedness of a given structure. As those authors put it, any one structure is made up of different members that are grouped together into clusters and that may or may not be connected to members of other clusters. Hence, a proper structural vulnerability assessment should evaluate the tightness of members of the same cluster and their connection to members of other clusters. Also, it should seek to identify possible weak points between clusters and explore possible instances of failure. The objective of such a process is to predict failure scenarios sparked by loose connectivity of members of the same cluster as well as among clusters, where the consequences of damage to the structure are great compared to the damage triggering the failure scenario.


Structure, in this study, denotes the organizational setup of the GIB DAS. It is composed of three clusters of members whose connectivity is determined by the regimes that govern them.

Cluster 1 incorporates the Foreign Office (AA), the Central Agency for Schools Abroad (ZfA), the Standing Conference of the Ministers of Education and Cultural Affairs (KMK),\(^{39}\) and the Bund-Länder-Ausschuss für schulische Arbeit im Ausland\(^ {40}\) (Committee of Educational Representatives of the Federation and the Länder tasked with coordinating school activity abroad, referred to as BLASchA). The ADLKs and school principals are agents of this Cluster 1, too, as they all act on behalf of the German federal authorities.

Cluster 2 includes the board of directors, school management (excluding the principal) and faculty, where faculty is composed of three distinct sub-groups: (1) personnel whose mother language is not German (referred to as non-German speaking OLKs); (2) individuals whose mother language is not German but who have attained some level of proficiency in German (referred to as German-speaking OLKs); and (3) German native speakers (referred to as German OLKs). All members of Cluster 2 are governed by three documents: IB’s Programme standards and practices,\(^ {41}\) the Handbook

---


of Procedures for the IB DP,\textsuperscript{42} and the KMK-IBO Agreement.\textsuperscript{43} In addition to these three documents, all members of Cluster 2 must abide by the education norms, standards, and laws applicable in the country where their school is located as well as follow their school’s rules and regulations.

Cluster 3 is limited to students and their parents. Their legal framework of reference includes their country’s educational norms, standards and laws; IB’s program standards and practices, and their school’s rules and regulations.

The WDA is a case in its own right. It is a pressure group composed of businessmen and practitioners of the education sector who have a vested interest in the DAS. The WDA constituted itself with the objective of representing the interests of the associations that run the DAS before the politics and is close to the boards of directors and principals.\textsuperscript{44} Therefore, it is considered a nexus between select members of Cluster 1 and Cluster 2.

\textit{Susceptibility} is a term often used in disaster risk management interchangeably with fragility and sensitivity. It denotes the lack of inherent capacity of an exposed structure to preserve its physical integrity after the impact of a damaging event and its proneness to suffer loss. Schneiderbauer and Ehrlich use “vulnerability” in the pre-event

\begin{itemize}
\end{itemize}
phase. The post-event phase they call “resilience.” To illustrate the components of vulnerability and a timeline of occurrence, I include Schneiderbauer and Ehrlich’s graphic representation of vulnerability in the following Figure 1.

![Figure 1. Timeline of Occurrence of Phases Associated with Vulnerability.](Image)

Source: Schneiderbauer and Ehrlich, 20.

*Vulnerability* as a concept is traditionally used in the context of risk and disaster management, development, economics, humanitarian aid, climate change adaptation, anthropology, and sociology. Given such diverse uses, Schneiderbauer and Ehrlich remark that “misunderstandings [arise] when the definitions [are] transferred from physical sciences to engineering into the realm of social sciences, which [wish] or [include] social, political and economic conditions.” Birkmann notes that specialized literature includes a large number of different definitions of this concept, and methods to


systematize it, and that the variety of conceptions has ultimately produced a paradox: “We aim to measure vulnerability, yet we cannot define it precisely.”

A generic definition of vulnerability is provided in the United Nations International Strategy for Disaster Reduction report of 2009. There vulnerability is described in terms of human, physical, economic, natural, or social loss as a consequence of a dangerous event. It highlights the fact that it is the characteristics per se of a subject/system/element that make the subject/system/element susceptible to the effects of a damaging event, thus stressing that vulnerability is determined by the exposed subject/system/element’s internal factors rather than external events.

There are numerous definitions of vulnerability across disciplines: Adger (2000); Blaikie, Cannon, Davis, and Wisner (1996); Cutter (1996); Cutter, Boruff, Boruff, and Pollnitz (2008).
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and Shirley (2003)\textsuperscript{54}; Gallopin (2006)\textsuperscript{55}; and Kasperson, et al. (2005).\textsuperscript{56} All agree that the widespread definition of vulnerability—the sum of a damaging event hitting a structure and the affected structure’s capacity to resist the hit—is too simplistic and should be broadened. They propose to break vulnerability down into components: hazard, exposure, sensitivity, and coping/adaptive capacities.

Cannon (2006)\textsuperscript{57} and Cutter, et al. (2008)\textsuperscript{58} bring situational specificity into the discussion of the determinants of vulnerability. They argue that, depending on the place and time of occurrence of a damaging event, an exposed subject/system/element may be better or worse prepared to cope with the impact and able to adapt to the consequences of it. To express the scope of vulnerability, they propose to estimate the consequences of damage relative to the effort undertaken to avert it, no matter the chances of it happening. With the introduction of the relativity concept into the discussion, they also suggest that previously defined baseline conditions must be considered. How vulnerable a structure really is can be determined only if it is established in what condition it was prior to the impact of a damaging event.


\textsuperscript{59} G. Bankoff, \textit{The Historical Geography of Disaster: “Vulnerability” and “Local Knowledge” in Western Discourse} (London: Earthscan, 2004).


\textsuperscript{61} P. Blaikie, T. Cannon, and I. Davis, \textit{At Risk: Natural Hazards, People’s Vulnerability and Disasters} (London: Routledge, 1994).


vulnerability." In their view, people are not vulnerable because they are exposed to a damaging event, but rather because they are subject to certain patterns of social organization in their everyday life and as a consequence of scarce resources. Correspondingly, these scholars propose to conceptualize vulnerability of a social group through indicators such as population growth, financial pressures, socioeconomic inequalities, and trends and failures in governance.

In Boyce’s (2000) discussion of social vulnerability, limited access to political power and representation, beliefs and customs play a central role. According to him, social vulnerability is a classic political economy problem that flows from the issue of allocation of scarce resources to competing individuals, groups, and classes. Thus, just how vulnerable someone is depends on his/her place and conditions of work and living.

Schneiderbauer and Ehrlich suggest that the overall vulnerability of an individual is connected to different social levels to which he/she belongs. They identify six social levels: the individual, household, administrative, cultural community, national, sub-national. Also, they distinguish between hazard-dependent and hazard-independent vulnerability. The former relates to specific hazards of a physical or social nature, whereas the latter is limited to natural phenomena. To assess vulnerability to a specific hazard, both Schneiderbauer and Ehrlich and Cardona, et al. propose to define at least one characteristic and a corresponding measurable indicator for each level. Cutter and
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74 Schneiderbauer and Ehrlich, Risk, Hazard and People’s Vulnerability, 24.

Emrich follow Boyce’s line of logic and refer to vulnerability as a by-product of social inequalities whose dimensions are determined by the economic susceptibility of social groups to damaging events as well as their capacity to withstand.\textsuperscript{76}

Drawing on the social vulnerability concept considered in previous studies cited earlier, Birkmann and Fernando, Bohle and Glade, Cutter et al., Cardona et al., Castaneda, and Thompson-Lastad, et al., all point to the importance of considering the deficits in communication, knowledge, and technological resources as features of vulnerability. These deficits often lead to skewed risk perceptions and determine people’s coping capacity and ability to respond. If people are aware of the existence of a possible hazard, if communication between all stakeholders flows timely and is accurate, and if people have access to resources to avert undesirable outcomes, their capacity to prevent, mitigate, prepare for, respond to, and recover from a damaging event increases considerably. The above-cited authors also broadly agree with Boyce, and Cutter and Emrich in that social vulnerability is largely conditioned by social status and poverty, that is, the poorer an exposed person is, the more limited are his/her means of communication, access to information and training, and availability of resources and therefore the higher is his/her propensity to suffer adverse effects of a damaging event. Hence, resource-rich people with proper means of communication who are well informed and know what to do in the event of a damaging event are likely to be less affected by the impact of a damaging event than their poor, non-communicative, ill-informed, and untrained neighbors.

\textsuperscript{76} Cutter and Emrich, “Moral hazards, social catastrophe,” 102-112.
To describe social vulnerability through common features, Kuhlicke, et al. looked into a number of case studies on the subject and found that it is impossible to establish a universally valid set of socioeconomic-demographic indicators to explain this concept. According to them, social vulnerability is a product of specific spatial, socioeconomic–demographic, cultural, and institutional contexts. Hence, they agree with Cutter, Boruff and Shirley’s argument that it makes sense for every scholar delving into the field of vulnerability assessments to produce their own definition of vulnerability and to operationalize this concept accordingly. As long as the proper conceptualization follows the insights gained in earlier academic endeavors, observes the specificities of the field of specialization in which the assessment is to be conducted, defines meaningful indicators for measurement, and operationalizes them in a valid manner, then any objections to one’s own definitions of vulnerability are void of substance. Against the background of this postulate, I have developed my own definition of vulnerability, which I will present in the following section.

Conceptualization and Operationalization of Structural Vulnerability

Taking into account the insights of the aforementioned scholars who have studied the concept of vulnerability, and understanding susceptibility as pre-event vulnerability, I propose to deconstruct susceptibility into the following indicators: situational specificity, social organization, access to resources, access to political power, technical knowledge of


the GIB DP and communication. Expressed in arithmetic terms, susceptibility is a sum of
the following factors:

\[
\text{Situational specificity} + \text{Social organization} + \text{Access to resources} + \text{Access to political power} \\
+ \text{Technical Knowledge of the GIB DP} + \text{Communication} = \text{Susceptibility}
\]

To establish the degree of GIB DAS’ susceptibility, I examine the proposed six
indicators through two proxies each. The selected proxies reflect the significance of the
factors that scholars of vulnerability assessments have identified as drivers of social
vulnerability. To grasp the reality of the GIB DAS, I have adapted these proxies to the
context of these schools. To operationalize the proxies, I first formulate a closed-end
question related to the proxy. Then I define the proxy and explain its purpose and the
calculation method employed. Next I specify the data required for the calculation and the
sources from where the data are extracted. The interpretation part means to ensure
unequivocal understanding of how the data will be understood. Findings, conclusion, and
rating complete the assessment. The exact assessment procedure is explained in detail in
Chapter 3.
Multiple tools have been developed to assess the vulnerability of structures in social systems. However, there is no interdisciplinary consensus on what vulnerability actually is, so it is virtually impossible to conceptualize and quantify this term in a generally valid manner. Assessment tools mostly tend to be tailored to a particular hazard and a specific unit of analysis. Regarding this issue, Schneiderbauer and Ehrlich observe that such a practice may eventually turn into a major problem as assessments of vulnerabilities end up being conducted without external references. Without the possibility of setting a benchmark with tangible values, the quality or accuracy of a model approach cannot be assessed reliably. However, this observation does not unsettle me as my study does not seek to examine the condition(s) the GIB DAS structure was in at any previous point in time, other than to establish the current baseline conditions that should be taken into account in future vulnerability studies.

To provide an overview of tried and proven vulnerability assessment tools and models typically employed in social sciences, including the dependent variable they assess, I mention first a select number of vulnerability assessment tools that were discussed in Professor Douglas Bond’s 2017 Harvard course on early warning systems and preventive measures. I also briefly present two models that are most commonly used in social sciences as a blueprint for the design of context-sensitive and hazard-specific
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The chapter concludes with a presentation of my own research design that I specifically developed for this study. This design includes the ideas of several previously mentioned scholars of vulnerability assessment tools on indicator selection and operationalization of proxies.

Vulnerability Assessment Tools in Social Sciences

In Table 1 below provides a synopsis I developed showing the various vulnerability assessment tools currently being used in social sciences.

Table 1. Vulnerability Assessment Tools in Social Sciences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOOL NAME</th>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>USE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vulnerability as Expected Poverty(^{80})</td>
<td>VEP</td>
<td>These tools use an econometric method for analyzing vulnerability to expected poverty, to poverty as expected utility, or to poverty as uninsured exposure to risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vulnerability as Expected Low Utility(^{81})</td>
<td>VEU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vulnerability as Uninsured Exposure to Risk(^{82})</td>
<td>VER</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---


\(^{82}\) Hoddinott and Quisumbing, “Methods for microeconometric risk.”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tool Name</th>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Progress out of Poverty Index</td>
<td>PPI</td>
<td>Instruments that measure poverty on the basis of country-specific, ten-question surveys or the percentage of population below national poverty line.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty Assessment Tools</td>
<td>PAT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participatory Wealth Ranking tool</td>
<td>PWR</td>
<td>An instrument to define community poverty through participatory assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participatory Rapid Appraisal tool</td>
<td>PRA</td>
<td>Collects information needed to define concepts and select indicators for quantitative assessments of vulnerability through community participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House-Economy-Approach</td>
<td>HEA</td>
<td>A livelihoods-based analytical method designed to collect information on how people access food, cash, and all other things they need to survive and prosper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household Livelihood Security Analysis</td>
<td>HLSA</td>
<td>Identifies households that are vulnerable to loss of livelihoods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict Assessment System Tool</td>
<td>CAST</td>
<td>Provides a conceptual framework and a data gathering technique for measuring states’ vulnerability to conflict.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


When considering vulnerability assessments, the Risk-Hazard model is a proven generic proposal as it allows for adjustments to specific contexts and hazards. It seeks to understand the ways that specific hazards impact a community, seeing the impact as a function of the community’s exposure to the hazard and its sensitivity. When assessing physical structures, it uses quantitative methods; when applied to communities, mixed methods are its preference.

Figure 2 depicts this model’s setup and shows, through the dotted lines, the deconstruction of vulnerability into three linearly dependent factors.

![Diagram of the Risk-Hazard Model](image)

Figure 2. Risk-Hazard Model

Source: Turner, et al., 2003

The Pressure-and-Release (PAR) model, developed by Blaikie, Cannon, and Davis,\(^8^9\) grasps the vulnerability of communities and subnational groups of people as composed of root causes, dynamic pressures, and unsafe conditions. Root causes are explained as limited access to power, structures and resources as well as political ideologies and economic systems. Dynamic pressures include press freedom, ethical standards, and local investments. Unsafe conditions encompass dangerous locations,

livelihoods at risk, lack of local institutions, and lack of disaster preparedness. Describing vulnerability as a progression of socioeconomic, political, and institutional forces—the pressure part—the PAR model captures vulnerability as a social construct *par excellence*. Its release part refers to the reduction of disaster, which can be achieved by taking off pressure from people exposed to a hazard through changes on the vulnerability side. Use of mixed methods is proper for the PAR model, too. Figure 3 illustrates this model’s emphasis on the interaction of economic, demographic, and political drivers that generate vulnerability and its understanding of disasters as a “nutcracker.”

![Figure 3: Pressure and Release (PAR) Model](source: Turner, et al., 2003)

The PAR model expands on the R-H model and is adjustable to different scenarios and units of analysis. Therefore, I will use it as template for the design of my assessment instrument.
Research Design for the Assessment of the GIB DAS

In my assessment of the susceptibility of GIB DAS’ organizational structure, I considered the contributions of Bankoff,90 Birkmann and Fernando,91 Blaikie, Cannon, and Davis,92 Bohle and Glade,93 Boyce,94 Cannon,95 Cardona, et al.,96 Cutter, Boruff and Shirley,97 Cutter and Emrich,98 Cutter, et al.,99 Lu, et al.,100 Morrow,101 Schneiderbauer and Ehrlich,102 and Watts and Bohle.103 I adjusted their insights to the specific context of the GIB DAS and used quantitative data extracted from documents of federal authorities and agencies in Germany. This enabled me to produce a case study that combines document analysis with observations and interviews.

90 Bankoff, *Historical Geography of Disaster.*
91 Birkmann and Fernando, “Measuring revealed and emergent vulnerabilities.”
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93 Bohle and Glade, “Vulnerabilitätskonzepte in Sozial-und Naturwissenschaften.”
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95 Cannon, “Vulnerability analysis.”
97 Cutter, Boruff, and Shirley, “Social Vulnerability.”
98 Cutter and Emrich, “Moral hazards.”
101 Morrow, “Identifying and mapping community vulnerability.”
102 Schneiderbauer and Ehrlich, *Risk, Hazard and People’s Vulnerability.*
103 Watts and Bohle, “The space of vulnerability.”
My interviews with GIB coordinators and principals took place between 2015 and 2016. I interviewed political decision makers in Germany between October 2017 and March 2018. My field observations covered the period from July 2013 to to April 2017.

The documents analyzed in my study include:

- the ASchulG and corresponding administrative regulations;

- AA’s annual reports on Germany’s foreign cultural and education policy since 2000;

- BVA’s regulations on the DAS and the BLI evaluation;

- the German parliament’s minor and major inquiries on the GIB DP at the DAS;

- IB’s Programme standards and practices, Handbook of Procedures, five-year self-evaluation guide and topic-related surveys and studies on outcomes of DP students;

- KMK’s reports and communiques on the (GIB) DAS and internal documents;

- WDA’s policy documents referring to the (GIB) DAS, surveys on the GIB DAS and investigations on the DAS;

- e-mails sent by the ZfA to principals of the GIB DAS; and

- minutes of GIB coordinator conventions.

To contrast the publicly available body of literature on the (GIB) DAS and the pieces of information that collaborators within the GIB DAS leaked to me, with official documents of the German authorities, I requested permission for entry to the library of the German Parliament to scour for primary-source evidence on the GIB DAS. Unfortunately, my request was declined, arguing that the body of literature on the GIB DAS is entirely available online.
To contrast the publicly available body of literature on the (GIB) DAS and the pieces of information that collaborators within the GIB DAS have leaked to me with the information that the IBO commands on the GIB DAS, I contacted the person in charge of coordinating GIB DP-related activity at the IBO. At the time of this writing, I have not heard anything from that person.

To engage other major stakeholders relevant to this study, I also contacted the AA and the WDA. However, my requests for information on communication flows between these stakeholders and the GIB DAS regarding the GIB DP, as well as the sources of information they consider when they collect information on the GIB-DAS, have had no response.

A select number of decision makers at the ZfA in Cologne, the PASCH initiative in Berlin, and the KMK in Berlin were more collaborative. The interviews I conducted with their representatives sought to learn these authorities’ stance on the courses of action adopted in determined situations by GIB DAS principals. Also, I inquired specifically about the antecedents of the GIB DP at the DAS, political representation of the GIB DAS before the German authorities and the IBO, clashes of power between political decision makers, and the German authorities’ outlook on the future of the GIB DAS.

The parties that collaborated with me helped fill gaps in my understanding of the complexities that characterize GIB DAS’ operations. Specifically, they described the history of the GIB DP at the DAS, explained to me important causal relations between principals’ courses of action and official German policies, commented on my inquiries as to clashes of power between competing federal agents involved in GIB DAS’ operation, delivered to me internal documents on the GIB DAS, and readily pointed out to me
misrepresentations of information they found in the drafts I sent them prior to our interviews. However, as I stated in Chapter 2, they were not always forthcoming, such as when they chose to not mention anything about the Round Table GIB.

By 2014, I had already decided to write my thesis on the GIB DAS. To understand how other GIB DAS operate, and to contrast my observations from the GSDS and two other GIB DAS I had visited in my capacity as GIB coordinator, I reinitiated the annual GIB coordinator conventions that had been held in Latin America through 2011. The subsequent convention took place at the GSDS from September 23-25, 2015 and welcomed 12 GIB coordinators from the IB Americas region and one principal. Attendees represented 53% of all GIB DAS students worldwide and 63% of all GIB DAS students in Latin America. The second convention was held near GSDS, from November 23-25, 2016, with attendance by 11 GIB coordinators who represented 48% of all GIB DAS students worldwide and 57% of all GIB DAS students in Latin America.

Both conventions gave me a unique opportunity to engage in face-to-face interviews and group discussions on the weak points of the GIB DP and on possible courses of action to be taken to address these weak points. The topics treated in the first convention are summarized in the “Report from GIB Coordinators Meeting – Core Topic Mathematics” dated October 1, 2015 (Appendix 1). This report was sent to Mrs. S., ZfA’s regional consultant for the GSDS at that time, in early October 2015. Mrs. S. was asked to forward this report to ZfA’s headquarters in Cologne and to request a reply from the authority addressed in the report. The requested reply never arrived. The minutes of

104 Please contact the author for all supporting materials, including all Appendices, by email to: <martin.slawek@gmail.com>. 
the second coordinators’ meetings (Appendix 2) were also forwarded to Mrs. S, and again there was no reply.

In February 2016 I visited the headquarters of the IB Americas region in Bethesda, Maryland, for purposes of professional development training. While there, I reached out to the research department to inquire about the availability of research studies on the GIB DAS. Also, I specifically inquired about possible representatives of the GIB DAS before the IBO. The answer to both inquiries was that the IBO has no records of any political representation of the GIB DAS at their headquarters and no research studies on the GIB DAS. IBO’s research website supports the latter statement.105

Once I analyzed all available topic-relevant sources and familiarized myself with the most common procedures followed in the field of vulnerability assessments, I designed a context-specific assessment tool. That tool includes indicators of relevance to the purpose of this study, telling proxy drivers, associated closed-end questions, and scaled rating.

Borrowing Schneiderbauer and Ehrlich’s proposal to assess vulnerability at six different levels,106 I decided to capture GIB DAS’ susceptibility in six different categories. These include (1) situational specificity, (2) social organization, (3) access to resources, (4) access to political power, (5) technical knowledge of GIB DP, and (6) communication. Selection of these indicators was determined by the findings of scholars who have engaged in studies on determinants of vulnerability, whom I presented in Chapter 2. The corresponding proxies have been adapted to the context of the GIB DAS.

---


106 Schneiderbauer and Ehrlich, Risk, Hazard, and People’s Vulnerability.
Framing of closed-end questions associated with the selected proxies follows the methodology of the Household Economy Approach. The answers to these questions are based on data extracted from official documents. Wherever there are no official documents to support an answer with hard data, I have resorted to my observations from the field study.

The assessment method is largely oriented along the lines of UNESCO’s calculation procedure of attainment of goals in education.\footnote{UNESCO, \textit{Education Indicators: Technical Guidelines}. Institute for Statistics. 2009. <http://uis.unesco.org/sites/default/files/documents/education-indicators-technical-guidelines-en_0.pdf>. (Accessed March 5, 2018.)} First, I specify the indicator and formulate a phrase related to the indicator that indicates the significance of that indicator to the assessment of GIB DAS’ utility as a tool of the German foreign policy. The next step is to enunciate the corresponding proxy and proxy question. Then I define the proxy, explain its purpose and the calculation method employed. Next I specify the data required for the calculation and the sources from which the data were extracted. The interpretation part means to ensure unequivocal understanding of how the findings are to be understood. Conclusion and rating complete the assessment part.

Each indicator is explained through two proxies, and each proxy is operationalized through a closed-end question. The answer to each question is based on available documented evidence. Where documented evidence is not available, I resort to my observations from the field study. The number of pieces of evidence varies from indicator to indicator. To establish the final answer to each question, I consider all pieces of evidence, rate them from 2 to 0, and count the values. For example, if an overwhelming majority of pieces of evidence considered for the question used to
operationalize the proxy “AA’s interest in world regions” points in the direction of YES, the proxy will be rated (2). The value (1) will be assigned to proxies that are supported by as many pieces of evidence pointing in the direction of YES as there are pointing in the opposite direction. If an overwhelming majority of pieces of evidence points to NO, the corresponding value is (0). However, if there is one single piece of evidence whose weight and reach trumps all other pieces of evidence, the answer to the proxy question will be (2) or (0), respectively. This is in recognition of the impact that the dynamic factor “human behavior of decision makers” may have on the stability of a social structure. The behavior of the AA, the ZfA, and principals is one such dynamic factor, and it has a magnifying effect on the organizational structure of the GIB DAS. Therefore, evidence related to their contribution to the (de)stabilization of the GIB DAS trumps other pieces of evidence considered for any given proxy.

Calculation of the overall susceptibility is oriented in the formula proposed by Schneiderbauer and Ehrlich\textsuperscript{108} to calculate susceptibility. The overall result is a compound of the individual values assigned to each proxy on the basis of available evidence and my observations from the field study. As susceptibility is assessed by means of six indicators and each indicator is operationalized through two proxies, the maximum value susceptibility can earn is 24. Inversely, the minimum value is 0.

To define just how susceptible the GIB DAS are, the scale ranging from 0 to 24 is divided into four approximately equal portions. If the overall value lies somewhere between 0 and 5, the GIB DAS structure will be considered extremely susceptible or “corrupted.” Values between 6 and 12 will be considered considerably susceptible and

\textsuperscript{108} Schneiderbauer and Ehrlich, \textit{Risk, Hazard, and People’s Vulnerability}. 
earn the GIB DAS structure a tag of “unstable.” If the assessment produces a value between 13 and 18, the GIB DAS structure will be rated as moderately susceptible and tagged “stable.” The tag “robust” and the qualification normally susceptible will be pegged to the GIB DAS structure if the overall assessment score is at 19 or above. Table 2 illustrates the selected indicators with their associated social levels of susceptibility and proxies, the corresponding closed-end questions, the pieces of evidence to be employed for rating, and the score column.
## Table 2. Matrix of Indicators and Proxies Used to Assess GIB DAS’ Susceptibility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDICATOR</th>
<th>PROXY</th>
<th>QUESTION</th>
<th>EVIDENCE</th>
<th>SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Situational specificity</td>
<td>AA’s interest in world regions</td>
<td>Does the AA pay more attention to some regions of the world than to others?</td>
<td>AA’s foreign policy goals statement, AA’s list of regional foci, population of German offspring at the GIB DAS, population of ADLKs at the GIB DAS</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>German public’s interest in the GIB DAS</td>
<td>Is German public interested in consolidating the GIB DP at the DAS?</td>
<td>Surveys and research conducted on GIB DAS, BT’s list of recommended works on DAS, minor and major inquiries in BT, IBO’s list of universities that recognize the GIB diploma</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social organization (cultural level)</td>
<td>Promotion of the GIB DP by strategic stakeholders</td>
<td>Do the KMK, the ZfA, boards of directors have incentives to promote the GIB DP?</td>
<td>Websites, e-mails, internal documents, public statements, interviewees</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Promotion of the GIB DP by operational stakeholders</td>
<td>Do principals, school management and faculty have incentives to promote the GIB DP?</td>
<td>Websites, internal documents, interviewees</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susceptibility</td>
<td>Provision of human capital</td>
<td>Is GIB DAS’ pool of properly trained teachers large enough to cover all classes in the GIB DP and ensure good results?</td>
<td>Table 3, Handbook of Procedures. BVA’s administrative agreement. WDA’s survey on education outcomes. IBO’s statistical bulletin. Field observations</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to resources (administrative level)</td>
<td>Local demand</td>
<td>Is the GIB DP in demand in the local markets?</td>
<td>WDA’s survey of 2017 on the GIB DAS</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Political representation before the German authorities</td>
<td>Are GIB DAS legitimately and effectively represented before the German politics?</td>
<td>Accounts of stakeholders, public announcements on WDA websites, e-mails, meeting records.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to political power (national level)</td>
<td>Political representation before the IBO</td>
<td>Are GIB DAS legitimately and effectively represented before the IBO?</td>
<td>Announcements on websites of the KMK, IBO, WDA, interviews at the KMK and IBO</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical knowledge of GIB DP (household level)</td>
<td>Principals and boards’ technical knowledge of the GIB DP</td>
<td>Do principals and members of the boards of directors receive technical instruction in the field of the GIB DP at the DAS?</td>
<td>Principals’ accounts, WDA websites</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coordinators’ technical knowledge of the GIB DP</td>
<td>Are GIB DP coordinators knowledgeable about all matters relevant to ensure sustained continuation of the GIB DP?</td>
<td>GIB DP coordinators, IBO website, minutes of coordinator meetings</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication (individual level)</td>
<td>Information-sharing</td>
<td>Do communication flows in the organizational structure of the GIB DAS promote this structure’s stability?</td>
<td>E-mails, articles, websites, minutes of meetings</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unintentional communication</td>
<td>Do administrators of the GIB DAS support the GIB DP?</td>
<td>Websites of all V-GIB DAS</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This chapter provides background information on the DAS, the antecedents of the GIB DP at the DAS, the composition of the DP curriculum and of its prescribed GIB DP version, and the institutional assessments that every GIB DAS must undergo on a regular basis. The objective of this chapter is to establish the reasons that led German authorities to embrace the GIB DP in the first place. Also, this chapter analyzes the regimes that govern the organizational structure of the GIB DAS, and identify weak points in the original setup of the GIB DAS, especially since these “congenital defects” largely influence today’s stability of the GIB DAS.

German Schools Abroad as a Foreign Policy Tool

The cornerstone of Germany’s foreign policy is its commitment to the European Union. This cornerstone is supported by three pillars: (1) participation in a multilateral world underwritten by America, (2) political and economic relations, and (3) cultural relations and education policy (AKBP).  

109 AA’s primary instruments in the field of the AKBP are “academic exchange and cooperation between universities, schools abroad,

---

cultural programs, promoting German as a foreign language, and intercultural
dialogue.\textsuperscript{110}

AA’s most important partners are expected to use these instruments to contribute
to the best possible attainment of goals set forth in the AKBP. AA’s partners include the
Goethe-Institute (GI), the German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD), the Alexander
von Humboldt Foundation, the Institute for Foreign Cultural Relations (IFA), the Federal
Office of Administration (BVA) represented through the Central Agency for Schools
Abroad (ZfA), the Educational Exchange Service (PAD), the International Youth Service
of the Federal Republic of Germany (IJAB), the German Commission for UNESCO, the
German Archaeological Institute, the Federal Institute for Vocational Education and
Training, and the \textit{Haus der Kulturen der Welt}.

The goals these partners are expected to pursue include:

a) creation of stable foundations for international relations with the synergy of
knowledge and culture and the dialogue between people;

b) promotion of the German language in Europe and around the world;

c) contribution to worldwide crisis and conflict prevention;

d) promotion of European integration;

e) preservation of cultural diversity in the world;

f) presentation of Germany as a modern and attractive location for education,
science, research and professional development;

\textsuperscript{110} Auswärtiges Amt, “Cultural relations and education policy,” 2018b. <https://www.auswaertiges-
g) showcasing of Germany as a country with a world-renowned, creative and diverse cultural scene, and

h) communication of a realistic and vibrant image of Germany.

Germany’s particular interest in the DAS was clearly expressed in the bill on the ASchulG of April 13, 2013. The bill was passed as proposed by the German parliament (Bundestag, referred to as BT) and sanctioned by Angela Merkel, chancellor of Germany.

On the first page of the bill, Parliament stated that being an export-oriented country, the German economy depends on tightly knit distribution and information-gathering networks composed of highly qualified, committed, and trustworthy professionals of either German or foreign origin who are favorably disposed toward German culture and Germany’s political and economic interests. To establish long-lasting and reliable networks, the AA must ensure that the German professional workforce migrate, work abroad, and win over their peers to whatever is important to the AA. However, to entice German professionals to work abroad, high-quality education that is fully consistent with German standards must be made available to German experts who have children for them to even consider taking a job in another country when asked to do so by German institutions. This is where the DAS come in, and from where they derive their primary mandate: offer a German education to German expatriates.

By opening their doors to the local population, German schools abroad also offer children and adolescents living in the host countries an outstanding opportunity to familiarize themselves with Germany and German culture. In this way, the DAS promote dialogue and academic exchange between Germany and the host country and generate trust in Germany’s policies. By extension, the DAS convey a positive image of Germany
and slowly but steadily bring students and their parents to support Germany’s interests. As students get closer to finalizing their school program at the DAS, they are encouraged to study in Germany. Thus, the DAS also fulfill the task of recruiting brainpower.

Another positive side effect of involving local clientele is that the DAS also contribute to Germany’s compliance with Goal 4 of the UN’s 17 Sustainable Development Goals, which are part of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development: to ensure inclusive and equitable quality of education and promote lifelong learning opportunities for all.\footnote{United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (UNSDG), “SDGS - Progress and Info 2017.” https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/sdg4. (Accessed May 3, 2018.)}

As the DAS enter into different kinds of partnerships with the local schools, educational standards of these schools rise, and at the same time local students are presented with academic and professional options for the future that many local schools abroad cannot offer.

Typology of School-Leaving Certificates and German Schools Abroad

All 140 DAS operate in the form of private-public partnerships (PPP). The private part is supported by local school associations; the public part is promoted by the ZfA under the supervision of the AA.\footnote{WifOR, Weltweite Wertschöpfung, 8.} Pursuant to Section 2, Clause 1 of the ASchulG, any school of particular interest to German foreign interests can be awarded the “German School Abroad” status with no obligation to meet any further requirements. Likewise,
Section 3, Clause 2 of the ASchulG stipulates that the AA can strip any German school abroad from its DAS status at its own discretion.\textsuperscript{113}

Most DAS are located in Europe (47), followed by Latin America (37), Asia (31), Africa (16), North America (7) and Oceania (2).\textsuperscript{114} As of 2016, 83,380 students went to a DAS and 25% of all students were German citizens.\textsuperscript{115} Teaching these students are 8,450 teachers, of whom 1,100 hold the ADLK status, or 13% of all teachers employed at the DAS. German-speaking OLKs account for 41% of all teachers, while the non-German-speaking percentage of the OLK is at 45%. The 150 BPLK employed at the DAS constitute 2\%, the smallest share of teachers at the DAS.

The school-leaving certificates offered by the DAS can be grouped in three categories:

1. German certificates awarded upon completion of the upper secondary level. These include \textit{Abitur}, DIA, and Fachhochschulreife (also known as \textit{Fachabitur}). The first two were explained in Chapter 1. The third certificate is awarded to students who have completed a vocational high school program. In all three cases, holders are entitled to attend an institution of higher education in Germany without delay: holders of certificates from the former two can attend a university, and holders of the latter certificate can attend a university of applied sciences.

2. German certificates awarded after finishing the lower secondary level known as \textit{Sekundarstufe I} (secondary level I, referred to as Sek. I). These include


\textsuperscript{114} WifOR, \textit{Weltweite Wertschöpfung.} 13.

\textsuperscript{115} WifOR, \textit{Weltweite Wertschöpfung.} 10.
Hauptschulabschluss (principal school) and the Realschulabschluss (secondary school). Provided they have attained a certain GPA, holders of these certificates may apply for the upper secondary level and work to obtain any one certificate of the above-mentioned category 1. Otherwise, they may attend a technical college or start an apprenticeship to become a skilled worker.

3. The German version of the International Baccalaureate Diploma GIB.

In addition to certificates from these three categories, students at the DAS more often than not have the possibility or obligation to take language proficiency examinations. If they pass them, they are awarded the DSD I and DSD II certificates. The DSD I certificate is awarded to students of the ninth or tenth grade in recognition of their attainment of the A2/B1 level, based on CEFR standards. DAS who make it mandatory for their students to take this exam make a student’s continuation in the school contingent on obtaining the DSD I certificate. The DSD II certificate, on the other hand, certifies the holder’s proficiency at the B2/C1 level. It is awarded in the eleventh or twelfth grade, and schools that insist on their students’ obtaining this certificate will not graduate them in an official ceremony until they do so, although students are allowed to fail the exam one time prior to achieving the certificate. This is how the GIB DAS in Latin America handle this matter.

---

Based on the school-leaving certificates, the school’s award, and AA’s interest in the region the DAS are located in, the ZfA distinguishes between four distinct types of DAS and deals with them accordingly:  

1) German-speaking schools abroad (Deutschsprachige Auslandsschulen): These schools are dubbed D-DAS and cater predominantly to children from German expatriates who live abroad for as long as they work there. The D-DAS are entitled to a total of 15 ADLKs. Mostly conceived as embassy schools, instruction at the D-DAS follows German curricula, examinations are delivered exclusively in the German language, and both the language of instruction and the language of communication are German. There are 50 of these schools (36% of all DAS) scattered around the world. Most are located in Asia (24), followed by Europe (12), North America (7), Africa (5), and Oceania (2). Latin America does not have any D-DAS. The D-DAS award school-leaving certificates for all three previously mentioned categories. On average, each D-DAS sees 17.6 students per class group. The exact scope of financial assistance they receive from the German authorities is determined by the number of ADLKs they employ and the number of hours these ADLK actually teach. The aggregate number of teaching hours is then multiplied by 0.5 and the result is multiplied by €230.  

2) Dual-system schools with a bicultural school objective (Begegnungsschulen mit bikulturelem Schulziel): Commonly known as the B-DAS, these 66 schools

---

117 The data on school and student numbers presented in here have been extracted from the WifORstudy of 2018. See: WifOR, Weltweite Wertschöpfung.

constitute 47%, the largest share of the DAS. They are located in Europe (33), Latin America (18), Africa (11) and Asia (4); while none are located in North America or Oceania. The B-DAS receive up to 15 ADLKs, provide their education services to both German clientele and host country students, while ensuring that the German share is significant. In the German education tracks, German is taught as a mother language and students are awarded the DIA certificate, the Sek. I certificate, and, if applicable, the corresponding national school-leaving certificate. Students whose mother language is not German also have the possibility of obtaining the DSD I and DSD II certificates. On average, a class group at a B-DAS accommodates 21.2 students. The language of communication at the B-DAS is German. Calculation of the funds receivable from the German authorities follows the same formula as the D-DAS.

3) Schools with intensified German classes (Schulen mit verstärktem Deutschunterricht): Known as the V-DAS, these 22 schools (16% of all DAS) cater predominantly to children of the host countries. Nineteen of the existing 22 V-DAS are located in Latin America, the other three in Asia and North America (Beirut, Ho Chi Minh City, and NYC). In these schools, German is taught as a foreign language, and the language of communication is the host country’s language. Students completing the upper secondary education receive either the GIB diploma, the corresponding national certificate, or both. In any case, students at the V-DAS are expected to obtain the DSD I and DSD II certificates. This self-imposed provision of the V-DAS is motivated by the incentive stipulated in point 18.3 of the administrative regulation of the ASchulG: the V-DAS receive an additional funding of 10% for producing at least 20 DSD II certificates
per year.\textsuperscript{119} With 22.7 students per class group, the V-DAS feature the highest teacher-student ratio. As the V-DAS receive one ADLK free of charge for producing at least 12 GIB diplomas per year, calculated as an average over a three-year period, they are ZfA’s least-favored beneficiary of qualified German manpower. However, if they produce 25.1 GIB diplomas, they are assigned a second ADLK whose costs are only partially attributed to the V-DAS. Calculation of the exact amount of their financial assistance is the same as applies to the D-DAS, but the 0.5 factor is replaced by 0.3. Moreover, if they produce at least 20 DSD II per year, they receive an additional 10%, that is, the multiplying factor of 0.5 in the abovementioned formula is replaced by 0.4. Thus, GIB DAS producing at least 25.1 GIB diplomas and 20 DSD II certificates per year may significantly increase the amount of the federal funding they receive. They are assigned a second ADLK, which boosts the base number of ADLKs’ teaching hours in the formula, and the overall number of ADLKs’ teaching hours is multiplied by the factor 0.4.

4) Vocational German schools (Reine berufsbildende Schulen): Referred to as BS-DAS, the only two vocational German schools that exist offer vocational training in the German language, and both of them are located in Europe. In addition to these two schools, the DAS of Villa Ballester in Buenos Aires and the DAS of London offer a vocational secondary-level track that complements their regular upper secondary programs.

The type of school, type of school-leaving certificates, and number of class groups being prepared for final examinations that lead to a school-leaving certificate that grants free admission to a German university, determine the number of ADLKs and

\textsuperscript{119} Bundesverwaltungsamt, 2014b, \textit{Verwaltungsvorschriften des Auswärtigen}, 5.
BPLKs a school is entitled to receive.\textsuperscript{120} In Section 15, the ASchulG stipulates that a DAS may be assigned an additional number of ADLks or BPLKs upon a school’s request, but it has to absorb all the costs entailed by hiring these additional foreign services.\textsuperscript{121} These costs accrue on average €117,398 per year per ADLK, and roughly half that amount per year per BPLK.\textsuperscript{122} Pursuant to Section 13 of the ASchulG, the provision allowing for allocation of additional ADLks or BPLKs will expire on December 31, 2022.\textsuperscript{123}

Based on the above, the following conclusions can be drawn with regard to the DAS:

- Most DAS are conceived as either D-DAS or B-DAS, together accounting for 116 DAS. They receive up to 15 ADLks, provided they award a school-leaving certificate that enables seamless entry to a German university. The aggregate number of teaching hours produced by the 15 ADLks earns the D-DAS and B-DAS far more federal funds than the V-DAS receive.

- Both the D-DAS and B-DAS fully meet AA’s most important mandate relevant to DAS: i.e., focus first on German language and culture. Also, at the D-DAS and B-DAS the language of communication is German.

- The GIB DAS are predominantly set up as V-DAS, and are located in Spanish-speaking Latin America where their language of communication is Spanish. They

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{120} Bundesverwaltungsamt, \textit{Verwaltungsvorschriften des Auswärtigen}, 2014b, 6.
\item \textsuperscript{121} Deutscher Bundestag, \textit{Entwurf eines Gesetzes}, 2013b, 7.
\item \textsuperscript{123} Deutscher Bundestag, \textit{Entwurf eines Gesetzes}, 2013b, 7.
\end{itemize}
receive the lowest number of ADLK/BPLKs, see the highest numbers of students and class groups, and are granted the lowest funding. They have powerful financial incentives to produce at least 25.1 GIB diplomas per year and to obtain at least 20 DSD II certificates per year. If they do, they receive two additional ADLKs but have to pick up 50% of what one ADLK normally costs. If they do not, the only ADLK will be the principal. Given the high number of students, the low number of ADLKs, and their high degree of dependence on the number of GIB diplomas and DSD II certificates they produce, the V-GIB DAS rely heavily on German OLKs and German-speaking OLKs to meet their diploma and certificates quota.

Considering point 3 above, it is valid to assert that the V-GIB DAS are primarily a regional phenomenon of Latin America. All other DAS that offer the GIB DP do not hold the V-DAS status and are treated by the ZfA as B-DAS or D-DAS. The only three exceptions are the V-GIB DAS of Beirut, Ho Chi Minh City, and Brooklyn.124 However, the V-GIB DAS of Brooklyn was under construction and had not yet begun to operate at the time of this writing. The V-GIB DAS in Ho Chi Minh City apparently exits but was awarded its DAS status only recently, and the ZfA has not published any data on this school to date. On the other hand, the V-GIB DAS of Beirut is a special case of geopolitical importance to German authorities, which I will discuss further in Chapter 6. Hence, from this point on the term GIB DAS shall denote the V-GIB DAS located in Latin America only.

124 On June 13, 2018, the WDA published an updated list of the GIB DAS. It features four new GIB DAS: Brooklyn, Ho Chi Minh City, Doha, and Istanbul. As neither the BVA nor the WDA list contains any data on specifics of these four schools, the corresponding fields in Table 3 remain blank. WDA’s updated list also shows that the DAS Hurghada has recently implemented the GIB DP. WDA’s updated GIB DAS list is available from <https://www.auslandsschulnetz.de/wws/bin/5694822-5697638-2-130618_gib-schulen_wda.pdf>. (Accessed July 5, 2018.)
Table 3 provides an overview of all DAS that offer the GIB DP, including the D-DAS and B-DAS. This table features information on each school including school type, school-leaving certificates, the number of overall students, the number of German-speaking students and of students of German origin, the number of ADLKs and BPLKs, the number of German-speaking and non-German-speaking OLKs, and the percentages of German students relative to all students and of German-speaking OLKs relative to non-German speaking OLKs. An exhaustive analysis of each will be conducted in Chapter 5.

Table 3. GIB DAS: School Type, Student Numbers, Certificates, and Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>School type</th>
<th>Certificate</th>
<th>Total of students</th>
<th>German-speaking students</th>
<th>German students</th>
<th>ADLK / BPLK</th>
<th>German-speaking OLK</th>
<th>Non-German OLK</th>
<th>German students relative to all students (%)</th>
<th>German-speaking OLK relative to non-German speaking OLK (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Addis Adeba</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Sek. I, GIB</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>4/1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ankara</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Sek. I, GIB</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>5/0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arequipa</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>GIB</td>
<td>919</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5/2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asunción</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>GIB</td>
<td>1019</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>4/2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barranquilla</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>GIB</td>
<td>925</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5/2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beirut</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>GIB</td>
<td>1068</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballester</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>Fachahi, GIB</td>
<td>1188</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>6/4</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pestalozzi</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>GIB</td>
<td>871</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>5/1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cali</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>GIB</td>
<td>769</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3/1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concepción</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>GIB</td>
<td>923</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4/2</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuenca</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>GIB</td>
<td>619</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3/0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guadalajara</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>GIB</td>
<td>831</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>3/1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guayaquil</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>GIB</td>
<td>1404</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23/3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hurghada</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Sek. I, GIB</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Izmir</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Sek. I, GIB</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>2/0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeddah</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Sek. I, GIB</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>4/0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lima</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>GIB</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2/4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kairo</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Sek. I, 1</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4/0</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>School type</td>
<td>Certificate</td>
<td>Total of students</td>
<td>German-speaking students</td>
<td>German students</td>
<td>ADLK / BPLK</td>
<td>German-speaking OLK</td>
<td>Non-German OLK</td>
<td>German students relative to all students (%)</td>
<td>German-speaking OLK relative to non-German speaking OLK (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managua V</td>
<td>GIB</td>
<td>GIB</td>
<td>691</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>3/0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manila B</td>
<td>Sek. I, GIB</td>
<td>GIB</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>4/0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medellin V</td>
<td>GIB</td>
<td>GIB</td>
<td>941</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4/0</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Salvador V</td>
<td>GIB</td>
<td>GIB</td>
<td>826</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>4/2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz V</td>
<td>GIB</td>
<td>GIB</td>
<td>1277</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>2/0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santiago V</td>
<td>GIB</td>
<td>GIB</td>
<td>681</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2/0</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharjah D</td>
<td>Sek.I, GIB</td>
<td>GIB</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>4/0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney B</td>
<td>Sek. I, GIB</td>
<td>GIB</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>4/0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temperley V</td>
<td>GIB</td>
<td>GIB</td>
<td>519</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3/2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valdivia V</td>
<td>GIB</td>
<td>GIB</td>
<td>677</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4/2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valparaíso V</td>
<td>GIB</td>
<td>GIB</td>
<td>1040</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>4/0</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Germany’s Necessity to Collaborate with the IBO

The history of the current model of the GIB DAS goes back to the year 2000 and is closely linked to two events that shattered the foundation of the German education system. The first event was the redefinition of Germany’s cultural relations and education policy (AKBP) following the fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989. The second event was the publication of OECD’s first PISA results.

The Redefinition of Germany’s Cultural Relations and Education Policy (AKBP)

Developed in the early 1970s, the AKBP was based (until the onset of the new millennium) on the same guiding principles as the ones that had informed AA’s foreign policy at a time when two Germanys existed, and the Cold War almost sparked nuclear Armageddon. Its overall focus was to safeguard peace, prevent conflicts, observe human
rights, and collaborate with partner states. Its goals included propagation of the German language, presentation of Germany as an integral part of European culture, and the promotion of intercultural dialogue and exchange.\textsuperscript{125}

Facing new challenges in the aftermath of Germany’s reunification, the AA revised the AKBP in 2000 and cut its budget.\textsuperscript{126} One of the parties most affected by the new austerity measures were the V-DAS. In an interview I conducted at the KMK, the V-DAS were viewed as costly while producing only a few German-style school certificates. Also, they were reported to attract few students and to “consider themselves national schools that were offering classes in German rather than German schools abroad that were working toward meeting AA’s mandates” (anonymous interviewee).

As a survival option for the V-DAS, the German government approached IBO headquarters in Geneva in 2000 with an offer to provide a German variation of the IB DP to be implemented at the V-DAS.\textsuperscript{127} This move, so it was presented, would make the ailing schools more attractive to local clientele and thus create more sources of revenue. However, the IBO dismissed the offer, arguing that it lacked resources to ensure sustained operation of a purely German IB DP.

Seeking other options to reduce public expenditure, the AA decided that as of 2003 all DAS with low student numbers would have to operate with a reduced number of ADLKs and enter into PPPs to ensure their sustained funding.\textsuperscript{128} If a DAS wanted to


\textsuperscript{126} Auswärtiges Amt, \textit{Auswärtige Politik Konzeption 2000}, 5.


\textsuperscript{128} Auswärtiges Amt, \textit{Auswärtige Politik Konzeption 2000}, 15.
continue to operate under the German banner and award German school certificates, it would have to pay most of its operational costs and recruit qualified, German-speaking OLKs from Germany or the host country. This provision mainly affected the V-DAS in Latin America.

Still recovering from the consequences of the “lost decade” of the 1980s and the financial crisis of the late 1990s, Latin America was the hotspot of political and economic turmoil at the time. For German professionals seeking work experience abroad, Latin America was not the first destination of choice, especially for travelling German OLKs. Instead, the AA, and by extension the ADLKs and BPLKs, pivoted their interests toward the now-booming Russian Commonwealth of Independent States.129 As a consequence, neither ADLKs nor OLKs were looking for work in Latin America. For the V-DAS, this was life-threatening. Then came in the first PISA results.

Publication of OECD PISA Results

On December 4, 2001, OECD published the results of its first PISA study. It revealed to German educators and politicians that the nation’s education system was below the international average.130 German politicians and educators were shocked because these results threatened German foreign interests. Now, it would become even more difficult for the DAS, especially for the V-DAS, to attract foreign clients and convince them of the benefits of studying in Germany.

---


To consider all options, parties interested in the DAS arranged a worldwide conference of the DAS in April 2002 in Mexico City.\textsuperscript{131} The conference was attended by principals and members of the boards of directors from several DAS, the president of the KMK, German education experts, delegates from federal and state educational authorities, and representatives of the German foreign trade. In their concluding statement, the attendees announced the creation of the WDA,\textsuperscript{132} which was tasked with representing the organizational, financial, and conceptual interests of the DAS before the federal government. The attendees recognized that alternatives to the \textit{Abitur} program had to be developed soon to provide an “offensive answer to commercial international offers (IB).”\textsuperscript{133} As German-based international education programs with similar standards to the \textit{Abitur} program were too costly or not available at the time, the conference tasked the KMK to negotiate with the IBO to launch a DP trial phase to be implemented at a number of select V-DAS. The program to be offered was called \textit{Gemischsprachichges International Baccalaureate} (or GIB DP), and it was to be governed by stipulations of the agreement that the KMK had signed with the IBO on March 10, 1986, regarding the recognition of the DP diploma as equivalent to the \textit{Abitur} certificate.\textsuperscript{134} One deviation from the KMK-IBO agreement of 1986 would be made: instruction in history and

\begin{flushright}
\footnotesize

\textsuperscript{132} Kultusministerkonferenz, 2002, \textit{Auslandsbrief} 15, 2.

\textsuperscript{133} Kultusministerkonferenz, 2002, \textit{Auslandsbrief} 15, 3.

\end{flushright}
biology had to be in German.\textsuperscript{135} The IBO agreed, and with that, 14 V-DAS of particular interest to the AA were selected, and the GIB DP scheme was born.\textsuperscript{136} In 2003, nine institutions in Latin America, two in the Middle East, one in Africa, and one in Australia embarked on a three-year trial. Upon its completion, the trial would be evaluated by the BLASchA.\textsuperscript{137}

In 2006 the BLASchA produced its evaluation report, one year after the launch of the long-awaited German International Abitur (DIA). The report was based on surveys conducted with principals, GIB coordinators, and faculty involved in the GIB DP\textsuperscript{138} with both positive and negative aspects. A number of benefits were identified (e.g., more collaborative work between students, higher academic standards, improved work attitude among students, intensive student-teacher relations, participation of students in setting agendas).\textsuperscript{139} Concerns were raised as well. Participating schools were reported to be overburdened with work in biology, mathematics, and chemistry; there were no proper teacher/student materials for the GIB DP in the German language; they had to work with ADLKs who were not proficient in the language of the host country and with students whose German proficiency was not good enough to master courses that had to be taught in German.\textsuperscript{140} The report also said that the GIB DP embraced the GIB DP as it served them as a marketing ploy; GIB coordinators had poor or no command of German;

\textsuperscript{135} Kultusministerkonferenz, \textit{Auslandsbrief} 15, 2002, 11.

\textsuperscript{136} Information as to which V-DAS was part of the trial can be found in Appendix 3, 1.

\textsuperscript{137} Appendix 3, 2.

\textsuperscript{138} Appendix 4: Evaluation of Survey on Pilot Project GIB (1).

\textsuperscript{139} Appendix 5: Evaluation of Survey on Pilot Project GIB (2).

\textsuperscript{140} Appendix 6: Evaluation of Survey on Pilot Project GIB (3).
principals did not speak the language of the host country, and many bemoaned the increased workload that coordinating the GIB DP activities with the traditional school activities entailed.¹⁴¹ Last but not least, the non-German-speaking GIB coordinators reportedly complained about having to deal with two different umbrella organizations (ZfA and IBO) which they claimed were not compatible. All parties involved complained about insufficient offers of IB professional development training in the German language.¹⁴²

Although the report recommended giving preference to the newly created DIA model rather the GIB DP scheme, the German authorities observed the principle of *bona fide* and ended up approving the GIB DP (Appendix 9).¹⁴³ The possibility of adopting the GIB DP also was extended to those V-DAS that did not have the means to implement any German program leading to the award of a type 1 and type 2 school-leaving certificate.¹⁴⁴ However, this offer was not accepted at first. An internal document from the ZfA showing development of the GIB DAS over the years reveals that the V-DAS stayed clear from the GIB DP for another three years. Only in 2010 did the number of participating V-DAS turned GIB DAS rise to 16, then to 23 in 2012, and to 25 in 2016.¹⁴⁵

¹⁴¹ Appendix 7: Evaluation of Survey on Pilot Project GIB (4).

¹⁴² Appendix 8: Evaluation of Survey on Pilot Project GIB (5).

¹⁴³ Appendix 9: BLASchA Resolution Bona Fide.

¹⁴⁴ Appendix 9: BLASchA Resolution Bona Fide.

In the following, I present important insights from this section:

- The GIB DP was adopted under pressure owing to Germany’s poor PISA results and because the German education system did not have a standardized education program for its schools abroad.
- The GIB DP has always been considered “a necessary evil” yet has continued because the AA observed the principle of *bona fide*.
- German authorities have always known that the ADLKs and principals who work at the GIB DAS are not proficient in the host country’s language.
- German authorities have always known that principals were overburdened with work following the introduction of the GIB DP.
- German authorities have always known that teachers and students of the GIB DP lack proper materials for courses that are taught in German, and that students had difficulty coping with the workload in biology, mathematics, and chemistry.
- German authorities have always known that GIB DP coordinators do not speak German well or at all, and they identified early that the ZfA and the IBO are not compatible.

**The International Baccalaureate Diploma Programme**

The International Baccalaureate Diploma Programme (IB DP) curriculum contains the DP core, which includes creativity, action and service (CAS); the extended essay (EE); and theory of knowledge (TOK).\(^{146}\) It also includes six subject groups:

Group 1 subjects are language courses in the form of a literature, language and literature, or literature and performance class. The list of available languages is long and offers anything from Afrikaans and Arabic to Japanese and Urdu. Students are supposed to choose from Group 1 the language they speak best, i.e., their mother language.

Group 2 subjects include language acquisition courses as diverse as Indonesian, Portuguese, or Swahili. German is included, too.

Group 3 subjects include business management, economics, environmental systems and societites, geography, history, information technologies in a globalized society, psychology, and social and cultural anthropology.

Group 4 includes biology, chemistry, computer science, design technology, environmental systems and societies, physics, and sports, exercise and health science.

Group 5 is limited to mathematical studies and mathematics.

Group 6 includes dance, film, literature and performance, music, theatre and visual arts.¹⁴⁷

Students must pick one subject from each subject group. However, the Handbook of Procedures stipulates in point A1.4 that students may choose any one subject from Groups 1 to 4 instead of a Group 6 subject.

All subjects other than language can be taken either in English, French, or Spanish. At least three and no more than four subjects must be offered at the higher level (HL); all others must be offered at the standard level (SL). HL subjects are designed to be

---

taught in 240 clock hours and SL subjects in 150 clock hours\textsuperscript{148} during the two years of DP’s duration\textsuperscript{149}.

The maximum grade a student can obtain in a subject is 7.\textsuperscript{150} Outstanding performance in EE, CAS, and TOK can earn a student a total of three additional points.\textsuperscript{151} Hence, the maximum GPA a student can obtain after the two-year program is 45, while the minimum GPA required for the award of (G)IB diploma is 24, provided a number of additional requirements are met.\textsuperscript{152}

Implementation of the IB DP at the DAS: The GIB DP

Implementing the DP at the DAS implies observance of the \textit{Handbook of Procedures}, the national educational norms and Germany’s stipulations for the DAS. The obligation to adhere to this tripartite constellation has profound consequences for students, teachers, and school management.

Despite the variety of subjects available in the IB DP, students pursuing the GIB diploma face three constraints.

\textsuperscript{148} It is important to clarify that I am talking about clock hours (60 minutes per hour) as opposed to academic hours (45 minutes per class).

\textsuperscript{149} International Baccalaureate Organization (IBO), \textit{Handbook of Procedures}, 2015, A1.2.


\textsuperscript{151} International Baccalaureate Organization (IBO), \textit{Handbook of Procedures}, 2015, A10.5.3.

\textsuperscript{152} International Baccalaureate Organization (IBO), \textit{General Regulations}, 2017a, 9.
1. In line with BLASchA’s provision for the GIB DAS, it is mandatory for all GIB DP students to take history and biology, and to complete these courses in the German language.

2. The prospect of receiving additional funding for producing at least 20 DSD II certificates a year provides an incentive for the GIB DAS to have their students take German as a Group 2 course. The structural-linguistic and pragmatic foci of the Group 2 language courses align with the focus of the preparatory courses offered prior to the DSD II examinations. Therefore, principals and school management discourage students from choosing German in a Group 1 language course. In this way, they economize teaching time, avoid additional expenditure on training for teachers in Group 1 courses, and improve their chances of obtaining 20 DSD II certificates.

3. Increasing globalization virtually requires that today’s citizens of the world speak English well. Therefore, GIB DP students also take English in the form of a Group 2 course.

Considering the established provisions and constraints, the schedule of a GIB DP student normally includes the following subjects from Groups 1 to 5:

- Spanish (HL);
- English (HL or SL), and German (HL or SL);
- History imparted in the German language (SL);
- Biology imparted in the German language (HL);
- Mathematics imparted in the host country’s language (HL or SL).

---

In addition to these five subjects, GIB students must complete at least 100 hours in the Theory of Knowledge course (TOK). Also, students must engage in creativity, action, service (CAS) over the two years of their stay in the GIB DP, and submit an extended essay (EE) of no more than 4,000 words on a topic of their choice presented in one of the subjects available in Groups 1 to 6.

Considering the intensity of six GIB DP subjects, plus the intensity of study required for each subject of the national curriculum (including physics, chemistry, social sciences, informatics, religion, music and sports) to meet the norms of national education authorities in the host country, it is typical for a GIB DP student to have a 42-hour week of school classes. Time spent on homework, CAS, field projects, and the EE is not included in the 42 hours. As a result, GIB DP students at most of the GIB DAS start their classes between 6:50 am and 7:20 am, and they are allowed to leave school between 3:30 pm and 4:20 pm. If heavy daily traffic (which is customary in most cities in Latin America) is factored in, students and teachers normally leave home at 6:00 am and arrive home between 4:00 pm and 5:00 pm.

At the end of the two-year program, GIB DP students sit thirteen written and three oral exams. In-class evaluation of student performance occurs throughout the second year of the GIB DP.\textsuperscript{154} Although all written exams are presented in the language of instruction of the corresponding course, teacher and student materials for the IB DP courses are officially available only in English, French, and Spanish. As a consequence, GIB DP students are often obliged to study history and biology with materials conceived by the IBO in English, French or Spanish, yet they must take the corresponding final

\textsuperscript{154} International Baccalaureate Organization (IBO), \textit{Handbook of Procedures}, 2015, A10.
examinations in German. Although there are private purveyors of student and teacher materials for the GIB history and biology courses, such materials have not been approved by the IBO, and they are not updated or vetted by knowledgeable GIB practitioners on a regular basis. Hence, using them can be risky.

Suboptimal preparation for final examinations, combined with little time for homework, preparation of projects and hobbies, often leads to elevated levels of stress and consequently poor examination results. Item 4 in WDA’s 2017 survey on the GIB DAS shows that the GPA of GIB DP students is 29.9 points—and this is a drop of 3% over the previous three years. When converted to the German grading scale, a GIB GPA of 30 points equals 3.0 in the Abitur.

Besides the fact that the GIB DP curriculum is biased toward humanities, and that it does not adequately prepare GIB DP students for programs the Triple Win Study has identified as most popular among the DAS students (medicine, natural sciences and engineering), a GPA of 3.0 is rarely sufficient to obtain a place at a German university without first completing a one-year pre-university course. The numerus clausus (minimum GPA for certain university programs) required for medicine programs in Germany is 1.0; natural sciences float between 1.5 and 2.3; engineering hovers at 2.0.

Given the unfavorable conversion of GIB DP grades into Abitur grades, it makes more sense for GIB DP students who are willing to pursue their university program in Germany to complete their national program, take the DSD II exam, and then attend a

155 Appendix 11: Mean GPA in GIB DP.
156 Appendix 12: Converting GIB GPA to Abitur.
one-year pre-university course in Germany. BLASchA’s evaluation report of the survey on the pilot project identified this issue, too.\textsuperscript{158} However, schools continue to promote the GIB DP, despite the disadvantages for GIB DP students, because the schools receive more funding and goodwill from local clientele who are looking for an “international program.” The incoherent articulation of student and school interests ultimately leads to collective action problems, which invariably lead to losses for all parties involved because they are not centrally coordinated.

Teachers of a GIB DP class must attend an IB professional development course in their subject every time a new subject guidebook comes out—typically every five years. The same applies to all teachers who are new to a GIB DP class.\textsuperscript{159} Like the problem of non-availability of class materials in the German language for teachers and students for history and biology, professional development courses for languages in Groups 1 and 2, and for history and biology, are rarely available in German in the IB Americas region.\textsuperscript{160} To attend such training, an interested party must travel either to Europe or take the course online in their free time.

GIB DP-related costs are significant for the DAS and its clientele. The institution must shoulder an additional budget of at least half the amount of what an ADLK a year

\textsuperscript{158} Appendix 13: Evaluation of Survey on Pilot Project GIB (6).

\textsuperscript{159} International Baccalaureate Organization (IBO), \textit{Meeting the PD Requirements}, 2018q. <https://www.ibo.org/professional-development/which-type-of-training-is-right-for-meeting/pd-requirements/>. (Accessed July 10, 2018.)

costs for expenses related to IB’s annual fee, teachers’ professional development, tickets, board and lodging, and ancillary expenses. Students, on the other hand, pay around $1,200 for basic services received during the two-year-program. This amount translates into an additional 25% to 50% charge added to what families normally pay in tuition fees for the two years at school in the national program. Understandably, if the results obtained in the GIB DP are not good enough for students to pursue their desired university program in Germany without completing a pre-university course first, the utility of the GIB DP is questioned, and potential candidates for the GIB DP become wary of it. In the end, demand for the program drops and everybody loses.

School Assessments at the GIB DAS

All GIB DAS are subject to two major school assessments: (1) the IB five-year self-evaluation, and (2) the Bund-Länder-Inspektion (BLI). Also, all GIB DAS have an internal quality assessment group, known as the Pedagogical Quality Management (PQM) group, supervising the schools’ adherence to the established standard practices and rules. In the following, I briefly discuss each of them.

---

IB Five-Year Self Evaluation

The IB five-year self evaluation\textsuperscript{162} asks the entire school community to reflect on its school’s strengths and areas that need improvement. It is meant to produce ideas about how to refine the school’s action plan to be able to sustain the IB DP. The assessment process is evidence-based, includes a 12-month self-study phase, and is steered by the IB coordinator. Participation is mandatory for the board of directors, the principal, school management, faculty, students, parents, and support staff.

The assessment finalizes with the submission of a self-study questionnaire, which is available in English, French, or Spanish only. Accordingly, the IBO expects schools under revision to submit it in any one of these three languages. Both the principal and the director of the section the GIB DP is embedded in must sign off on the questionnaire.

The questionnaire is composed of four sections. Section A analyzes the school’s philosophy, and Section B its leadership and structure. Both sections operate with indicators that largely tally with the ones that appear in the BLI evaluation. The Curriculum section, Section C, is reserved for faculty only (which differs from the BLI inspection). The five-year self evaluation asks teachers to state what the strengths and weak points of the curriculum are, what constraints they have with regard to teaching and what they recommend be done to change the current situation. In comparison, the BLI questionnaire bars faculty from participating as its completion is reserved for the principal only. Section D, Assessment, again involves the entire school community.

After submitting the completed questionnaire and the corresponding evidence, the IBO evaluates the school. If it is evaluated negatively, the school is notified that it has six months to address the identified issues. After six months, the IBO may visit the school to check if all issues have been adequately addressed. If a school is to be visited, it is notified of the visit in sufficient time to prepare for it. A school forfeits its membership in the IB world school organization if it consistently fails to comply with IBO’s recommendations. To this day, not a single GIB DAS has been ousted from the IBO.

The major flaw of this evaluation is that inspection visits by IBO representatives are not a rule. This creates incentives for principals to cheat, for they can reap substantial personal benefits with relatively little effort and will not be held accountable for their actions. In line with item 2.1.5 (b) of the administrative agreement signed by the AA and the KMK on the deployment of ADLKs to the DAS, principals may apply for a three-year extension of their initial three-year stay at a DAS. Their request must be endorsed by the board of directors. Boards of directors are affected by market imperfections in the provision of principals and may therefore lack incentives to not comply with the request of the principal, no matter the performance of the principal at the school. In addition to the first extension of three years, principals may also argue that they are involved in activity that is vital to the organizational structure of their host school and request another two-year extension. IB’s five-year self evaluation is one such argument.

The salary (including allowances and premium) of principals who live with their spouse and two children multiplies by a factor of 0.5 relative to their salary in Germany.\textsuperscript{164} Converted to the local currency, this allows an upscale lifestyle and for saving money. Thus principals and ADLKs have an economic incentive to stay at a GIB DAS for as long as possible. Knowing that visits by IBO to their school are more of an exception than a rule, principals do not have to engage in the five-year self evaluation beyond signing the questionnaire or promoting any improvements in the program. If the school’s situation deteriorates notably in the five years between the two five-year evaluations as a consequence of the principal’s slackness, and/or if the school is evaluated negatively in the following evaluation, the principal responsible for this situation has already moved on. As the IBO reserves the right to oversee the quality of the DP, German authorities cannot doublecheck the accuracy of possible negative feedback from the IBO and therefore lack incentives to hold principals accountable retroactively for their activities at a GIB DAS. Further, the successor of a poor principal cannot be held accountable for his/her predecessor’s actions or inactions.

Bund-Länder-Inspektion (BLI)

The \textit{Bund-Länder-Inspektion} (commonly referred to as BLI, and recently as BLI 2.0) is an assessment process handled by the KMK. All 140 DAS must complete this inspection every six years to ensure German quality standards in school processes.

Initiated in 2010, the first BLI cycle focused on development in 6 quality areas, which were measured through 29 indicators: outcomes of learning, learning culture, school culture, board of directors and school management, professional development of staff, and targets and strategies in school development. Once the first cycle was finalized in 2015, it was immediately succeeded by BLI 2.0. Except for a few novelties, the second BLI cycle is largely similar to the first one. The focus is now on skills and student differentiation. Teacher performance is explicitly not an evaluation criterion, and the body responsible for continuous supervision of each school’s compliance with the norms is the school’s own pedagogical quality management group (PQM), which is discussed in the next section.

The BLI 2.0 evaluation is based on surveys and school documentation and is conceived as a four-step cycle: self-evaluation, peer review, assessment report, and balance visit. Once a school successfully completes all four steps of the cycle, it is awarded the “Excellent German School Abroad” certificate, which is a guarantor for the distinguished school’s continuity in the realm of the DAS for at least six more years.

The indicators of the first cycle suggest that the BLI excluded evaluation of the GIB DP and was designed to evaluate only the DAS who award the Abitur, DIA, and/or the Sekundarstufe I and II certificates DSD I and DSD II. For example, BLI’s item 1.3 asked how many learners had achieved the certificate they aspired to obtain. The dividing line was set at 90%. However, according to question 3 of WDA’s tendencies survey of 2017, the success rate of GIB DP students in the period evaluated by the BLI was at 75%.

---

to 76%. As all GIB DAS were awarded their “Excellent German School Abroad” certificates in the first cycle of the BLI, it suggests that the GIB DP was not part of the inspection. Thus, principals had no incentives to channel their resources toward the improvement of the GIB DP as the BLI (and by extension the boards of directors) did not hold them accountable for the results. Appendix 14 shows that in the sample period, the GIB DAS obtained on average more than 12 but far fewer than 25.1 GIB diplomas. Therefore, focusing on the DSD II results to secure the additional funding promised by the AA to DAS who obtain more than 20 DSD II exams seemed much more reasonable than aspiring to obtain additional funding for obtaining at least 25.1 GIB diplomas when no one from the KMK cared about it.

With regard to the DSD II certificates, however, principals did have incentives to go out of their way to secure good results. The DSD II exams yield higher success rates as students with poor performance in German are sifted out of the school in the preceding DSD I exams. Also, principals themselves preside over the DSD II exams, which reduces their accountability to third parties at the school while assuring them positive feedback from the BLI.

The catalogue with the criteria to be evaluated in the second cycle of the BLI (BLI 2.0) was not available to the public at the time of this writing. However, there are signs that the KMK may have realized that the BLI promoted abandonment of the GIB

---
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DP by principals. Page 19 of the official BLI 2.0 presentation brochure suggests that the KMK has realized that the BLI was deeply flawed as it did not promote the accountability of principals to their communities. It explicitly says that as a consequence of the experiences in the first cycle, schools can now request that the revision results be presented simultaneously to management and to the principal. Also, another change, announced on page 19 of the brochure, is that faculty will be presented with the results. However, it remains to be seen if these measures will produce the desired effect.

Principals continue to decide together with the onsite inspectors who of their faculty will be considered to participate in the self-evaluation and peer-review steps. Also, the right to define the indicators that gauge the specific profile of their GIB DAS is reserved to principals and inspectors.\textsuperscript{169} Therefore, it may not make much sense to try to raise the bar of accountability if the possibility of convenience sampling is not eliminated.

Pedagogical Quality Management (PQM) Group

The Pedagogical Quality Management (PQM) group is composed of members of all sub-school levels that operate within the school, and incorporates an envoy from Germany tasked with overseeing the educational quality at the DAS. The mandate of this group is to continuously elaborate on suggestions included in BLI’s final report and to collaborate with the regional process consultant of the ZfA responsible for their particular school. PQM’s constant quality checks are meant to ensure the brand “German School Abroad.” However, as indicated above, PQM’s members (excluding the envoy from

\textsuperscript{169} Bundesverwaltungsamt, } Bund-Länder-Inspektion 2.0, 2014a, 15.
Germany, if the school has one) are all too often selected by principals, a flaw that has
the potential to corrupt the organizational structure at the GIB DAS.
Chapter 5

An Analysis of GIB DAS Members

After analyzing the regimes that govern the organizational structure of GIB DAS, this chapter looks into its members. The analysis progresses downward from members belonging to Cluster 1, to members belonging to Cluster 2, and then to Cluster 3. It spotlights every member from each cluster by looking into their respective interests, responsibilities, constraints, and communication in the context of the GIB DAS. The objective is to identify possible instances of non-correspondence in these four aspects.

Cluster 1

There are seven members of Cluster 1 in GIB DAS’ organizational structure. They are: the AA, the ZfA, the KMK, the BLASchA, principals, ADLKs, and BPLKs.

AA (Auswärtiges Amt/Federal Foreign Office)

The AA has an interest in sustaining the DAS (including the GIB DAS, for now at least) because these schools promote the German language and culture, project a positive image of Germany, generate trust in Germany’s policies, spur an influx of intellectuals into Germany, and contribute to German efforts to comply with the country’s commitment to the UN’s 17 Sustainable Development Goals of the 2030.
AA’s responsibilities relative to the DAS include analyses of performance reports and assessments of appropriate use of granted funds. By extension, AA is responsible for observing all rules that are binding for the DAS.

AA’s constraints relative to the DAS derive from the annual budget that the BT sanctions for the AKBP. Table 4 below provides an overview of tendencies observed in the allocation of AKBP funds to the DAS from 2003 to 2017, specifying political parties that were in office and events that were relevant to the development of the GIB DAS in the sample period.

Between 2003 and 2016, the BT increased the funding for AKBP from €1.106 billion in 2003 to €1.767 billion in 2016, an increase of roughly 63%. However, DAS’ share in the AKBP budget dropped from 31.3% in 2003 to 28.6% in 2016. As AA’s reports do not explicitly refer to the GIB DAS, it can only be assumed that funding for these schools has declined as well.

The downward movement of DAS’ share in the AKBP, as shown in Table 4, can be explained with what the Public Value Study referred to as increased competition between the agents of AKBP. One agent that is in direct competition with the DAS for funds is the Goethe Institut (GI), an agent focused on disseminating the German language and culture exclusively. The GI has received slightly more than one-quarter of AKBP’s budget.\footnote{Auswärtiges Amt, \textit{Bericht der Bundesregierung zur Auswärtigen Kultur-und Bildungspolitik 2016}, 2016, 25. \url{https://www.auswaertiges-amt.de/blob/289396/58d60f4040d34e5a1a0d69fba06de725/170427-akbp16-data.pdf}. (Accessed July 11, 2018.)} Thus, two of AA’s agents are pursuing the same mission, they comprise more than 50% of AKBP’s overall budget, and compete over funds. This competition and AA’s foremost interest in promoting agents that disseminate German culture and
language may eventually lead the AA to reconsider GIB DAS’ utility as disseminator of German culture and language if AKBP’s budget suffers further cuts. An indicator that the AA may have started to do just that is the reduction in the number of ADLks for the GIB DAS since the ASchulG went into effect.

Table 4. DAS’ share in the AKBP: 2003–2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>AKBP in billion €</th>
<th>DAS’ share in AKBP in %</th>
<th>Change in % relative to previous year</th>
<th>Standing government</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>1.106</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>B90/Die Grünen</td>
<td>14 GIB DAS start to operate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>1.135</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>+2.6</td>
<td>B90/Die Grünen</td>
<td>First IB examinations at GIB DAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>1.092</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>-3.9</td>
<td>CDU/CSU/SPD</td>
<td>New government in Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>1.092</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>CDU/CSU/SPD</td>
<td>BLASchA’s evaluation of GIB DAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>1.173</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>+3.9</td>
<td>CDU/CSU/SPD</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>1.304</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>+9.5</td>
<td>CDU/CSU/SPD</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>1.436</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>+9.1</td>
<td>CDU/CSU/SPD</td>
<td>Reelection of CDU/CSU/SPD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>1.513</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>+5.4</td>
<td>CDU/CSU/SPD</td>
<td>First cycle of BLI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>1.478</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>-2.0</td>
<td>CDU/CSU/SPD</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>1.591</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>+7.0</td>
<td>CDU/CSU/SPD</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>1.571</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>CDU/CSU/SPD</td>
<td>Reelection of CDU/CSU/SPD, BLI ends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>1.591</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>+0.1</td>
<td>CDU/CSU/SPD</td>
<td>ASchulG enters into force, BLI 2.0 starts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>1.673</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>+5.0</td>
<td>CDU/CSU/SPD</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>1.767</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>+9.4</td>
<td>CDU/CSU/SPD</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>CDU/CSU/SPD</td>
<td>Protracted coalition negotiations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: compiled by thesis author

Data from:
and
Communication between the AA and its partner members in Cluster 1 is carried out in the German language through official communication channels that include official reports and annual meetings with principals. The incorporation into the “Round Table GIB” of two staff working at a GIB DAS, where the AA is also represented, suggests that the GIB DAS have an additional, indirect communication channel to the AA via the WDA.

ZfA (Zentralstelle für Auslandsschulwesen/Central Agency for Schools Abroad)

To handle the DAS adequately, the AA transferred a substantial part of its DAS-related responsibilities to the ZfA. ZfA’s mission is to supervise all DAS-related activity. Its tasks include, among others:

- advise the DAS in pedagogical and administrative matters and support them in the setup of pedagogical quality management procedures;
- recruit, select, and send faculty to the DAS;
- prepare, train, and provide professional training to faculty selected for the DAS;
- make arrangements for the award of school-leaving certificates;
- design and implement the DSD I and DSD II examinations, and
- establish structures that are conducive to international collaboration.

Communication between the ZfA and the GIB DAS is limited to principals, yet not necessarily to GIB DP-related affairs and GIB DP coordinators. KMK’s report of the

---


Mexico Conference of 2002 states on page 12 that the head of Division 2 at the time was designated to coordinate all activity between the German authorities and the IBO, but failed to extend this duty to the schools.\textsuperscript{173} At some point in the past, GIB coordinators received an e-mail from the head of Division 2 introducing herself (and later on from the male successor) as the person in charge of coordinating GIB DAS’ affairs with the IBO. In this way, GIB coordinators who were in office at that time knew there was someone within the ZfA they could turn to if circumstances called for outside help. However, a communiqué officializing Division 2’s competence with regard to the GIB DP has never been released, and coordinators who joined the GIB DAS at a later time did not know about them having a channel to the ZfA. As a consequence, communication between GIB DP coordinators and the ZfA tends to be ineffective.

One piece of evidence of recent times supporting this thesis is an e-mail sent by the head of Division 2 to the GIB DAS (Appendix 15). It announced a few new developments concerning the GIB DP and stated that its previous notification of new developments “did not reach all principals and IB coordinators” and that “time and again, misunderstandings regarding the funding of professional development training in GIB subjects emerge.”

The previously mentioned points notwithstanding, at least one piece of evidence suggests ZfA’s interest in the GIB DP. The schedule for the annual meetings of GIB coordinators shows that it is possible for GIB DP coordinators to convene once a year to coordinate their activity, increase their knowledge, and implement new policies (“\textit{Koordinierungstreffen – Multiplikation – Implementierung}”). ZfA supports these

\textsuperscript{173} Kulturministerkonferenz, “Auslandsbrief 15,” 2002, 12.
annual conventions financially, although its financial assistance seems to not extend to every GIB DAS; the first item in Appendix 2 suggests that ZfA’s promised financial assistance never arrived at a number of GIB DAS.

Under the German constitution, the German Länder (states) enjoy cultural sovereignty. As a consequence, the ZfA is not authorized to set standards for the award of school-leaving certificates at the DAS. Also, it is not entitled to command teachers who enjoy the civil servant status. Both these prerogatives are reserved to the Länder. The conundrum resulting from the cultural sovereignty of the Länder—the “educational federalism”—is that the ZfA has to coordinate all matters related to educational standards and deployment of teachers with the Länder, which is an extremely resource-consuming task. With enough issues resulting from the educational federalism to be handled with the 109 D and B-DAS, the ZfA and the KMK are wary of taking on additional challenges with the GIB DP. In fact, they consider the GIB diploma, as one interviewee put it, a “common enemy.” Thus, ZfA’s constraint regarding the GIB DAS is lack of competence and consequently lack of incentives to engage.

KMK (Kultusministerkonferenz/Standing Conference of the Ministers of Education and Cultural Affairs of the Länder)

Given Germany’s educational federalism, the award of German school-leaving certificates abroad has to be regulated uniformly, as foreign parents want to send their offspring to a German school, not a Bavarian or Saxon school. The task of regulating

---

educational standards was handed to the KMK. The KMK is composed of the ministers of cultural affairs, education, and research of each of Germany’s 16 Länder, which gives the 16 ministers a forum for discussing education-related topics. KMK’s tasks include, among others:

- reach agreements on the uniformity and comparability of school-leaving certificates to ensure mutual recognition;
- promote quality standards in schools and universities, and
- foster cooperation between educational, scientific, and cultural institutions.\(^\text{175}\)

One the many feats accomplished by the KMK includes the agreement it signed in 1986 with the IBO to recognize the GIB diploma as equivalent to the *Abitur*. Since then, the KMK has renewed this agreement on an annual basis. Another accomplishment is the expansion of eligible subjects to German as a self-taught course, chemistry instead of biology and mathematics: analyses and approaches instead of mathematics. However, considering the shortage of STEM teachers in Germany,\(^\text{176}\) and GIB DAS’ inability to cope with the workload in chemistry and mathematics since the inception of the GIB DP (Appendix 6), the relevance of this move is not entirely clear.

KMK’s responsibilities with regard to the GIB DAS include BLI inspections, negotiation of new GIB DP subjects, and recognition of the GIB diplomas by the German universities. The latter does not seem to be working well, as item 7 of the e-mail in
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Appendix 15 suggests. According to this item, a number of universities continue to disregard the GIB diploma as equivalent to the *Abitur* certificate.

An interviewee in Berlin confirmed that the KMK has not addressed the issue of GIB diploma recognition adequately because of the collective action problem that arises as a consequence of educational federalism, which constitutes KMK’s major constraint with regard to the GIB DAS. GIB graduates wishing to take up university studies in Germany and the AA would be better off if the KMK followed the suggestion of the Public Value Study and the Triple Win Study to ensure that the GIB diploma is recognized at all German universities and that DAS students are relieved of university fees. Resolving these two issues would entice many more GIB DP graduates to take up university studies in Germany. However, each state’s specific interest in its domestic political economy—to attract as many (or as few) GIB DAS graduates as possible—prevents the KMK from making such a consensual decision.

No direct communication channels exist between the KMK and the GIB DAS except through the Round Table GIB. Officially, the information the KMK obtains on the GIB DAS comes from the ZfA and the BLASchA. The GIB DAS, on the other hand, depend on their principals to inform them about new developments concerning the GIB DP. Provided they speak German well enough to read official documents, GIB coordinators can also obtain information on new developments from the corresponding websites.
BLASchA (Bund-Länder-Ausschuss für Schulische Arbeit im Ausland/Committee of Educational Representatives of the Federation and the Länder)

KMK’s cooperation with the AA in all activities related to the DAS is coordinated by BLASchA, a committee composed of one delegate from the ministries of cultural affairs, education, and research of the 16 Länder, as well as the director the School Unit at the AA, and the president of the KMK.\textsuperscript{177} BLASchA’s main task is to provide counselling on general issues concerning the work of the ADLKs and on specific issues related to pedagogical and organizational challenges at the DAS.

As a body that facilitates communication and cooperation between the KMK and the AA, BLASchA’s interest in the GIB DAS and its constraints are presumed to align with those of the two authorities it represents. The GIB DAS have no established direct communication channels to the BLASchA.

ADLKs (Auslandsdienstlehrkraft/Foreign service teacher) and BPLKs (Bundesprogramllehrkraft/Federal program teacher)

ADLKs and BPLKs teach the German-track programs in Germany and have little familiarity with the GIB DP. The ADLKs are generally public servants who perform their duty abroad on behalf of the federal government.\textsuperscript{178} At their host schools, they are supposed to occupy positions of directives, perform counselling activity or direct the

\textsuperscript{177} Kultusministerkonferenz, 2018a.

BPLKs are generally teachers who have completed their university studies but have not yet worked at schools in Germany and are waiting to be confirmed as public servants.

Both ADLKs and BPLKs travel on a German public servant passport, which provides perks abroad. One perk is that this passport shields its holder from scrutiny by local stakeholders. Accordingly, it reduces ADLKs/BPLKs’ accountability to their host schools. Section directors, coordinators, or the head of human resources at their host school have no jurisdiction over ADLKs/BPLKs. The prerogative to evaluate ADLKs and BPLKs at the host school is reserved to principals.

There are two notable differences between ADLKs and BPLKs: (1) ADLKs are automatically eligible to preside over the DSD exams, and (2) receive significantly higher salaries than their BPLK peers. BPLKs must take special training first to preside over the DSD exams (“DSD Gold Certificate”).

ADLKs and BPLKs are expected to give 25.5 academic hours of classes per week (45 minutes per class) and to cover up to three classes per month for absent colleagues. Also, both are expected to be committed to the goals of the AKBP since they are Germany’s official envoys, the country’s visible face at the DAS, and the officially sanctioned link between German culture and the host country in the context of the DAS. As a result, their responsibilities and interests are intimately connected to AA’s interests in the DAS and to Germany’s foreign policy goals: to project a favorable image of
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Germany, procure democratic order at the DAS, ensure high-quality education in line with the German standards, and prevent squandering of federal funds.

Although they are agents of the AA and the ZfA, ADLKs and BPLKs only have an established communication channel to the ZfA. This channel is reserved for communication concerning matters of employment. ADLKs and BPLKs are expected to be bilingual, but in fact they hardly ever are. BLASchA reportedly noticed this in 2006 (Appendix 6) and little has changed since that time.

Principals

Principals hold the ADLK status and are appointed to their position by a committee composed of representatives of the AA, the KMK, the education authority of their state, and the ZfA. There are three preselected applicants, and the committee picks one of them and submits its proposal to the board of directors of the interested DAS, who may or may not accept the proposed applicant.\textsuperscript{181} For an ADLK to qualify for the position of principal, he/she must have previous experience in an executive position in Germany. Principals have the same responsibilities and interests in the GIB DAS as their ADLK peers. They are expected to have good command of the language spoken in the host country. And like the ADLKs, this is mostly not the case.

Differences between principals and ADLKs emerge when it comes to teaching, communication, and accountability. Compared to ADLKs, principals take on more directive tasks, as laid down in BVA’s regulations on the employment of ADLKs and principals, and they coordinate rather than teach. They regularly attend appointments

\textsuperscript{181} Bundesverwaltungsamt, 2016 a, p. 11.
outside the school, which is why it is inconvenient for them and students that they engage in teaching in the intense GIB DP.

In terms of communication, principals are different from ADLKs as only they submit all information on the host school, including numbers of students, teachers’ school leaving-certificates, and graduates who leave for Germany. Also, they sign off on all reports that leave the school and are crucial to their continued operation, such as the five-year self-evaluation questionnaire and the BLI report. Whatever information principals choose to include in these reports or to exclude, the rest of the school community will not know unless principals choose to share it with someone.

The same applies to incoming communication. There is no authority overseeing the principals at a GIB DAS. Therefore, principals may choose at will what incoming information from the German authorities they will or will not share with the board of directors, school management, and faculty. Although they are expected to communicate on a timely basis with stakeholders at their schools and to follow IB’s Programme standards and practices, the *Handbook of Procedures*, and their host school’s rules and regulations, it is their prerogative to judge how they actually interpret these provisions and if they comply or not. If they chose not to comply, little will happen.

Boards of directors have no incentives to file formal complaints about principals or submit negative reports about them, as such complaints and reports defy AA’s judgment and undermine their own credibility. All parties involved in the selection of a principal have conducted a thorough selection process before making a decision, so filing complaints or negative reports is not going to enhance the chances of a GIB DAS to be
assigned another principal, especially at a time when Germany has suffered a shortage of principals for years, and this phenomenon has extended to the DAS as well.

Little or no accountability to the IBO and their host schools, combined with the board of directors’ lack of incentives to hold principals accountable for their actions, promotes a dysfunctional bureaucratic culture that Barnett and Finnemore refer to as “pathologies of international organizations.” If unchecked, these pathologies, which include the power to classify and organize information and knowledge and to fix meanings at one’s own discretion, may ultimately generate a negative working atmosphere, demotivate local staff, and lead to loss of identity with the institution among the local staff.

In the context of the DAS, the power to classify information becomes manifest, among others, when principals decide which sub-groups of the school community may or may not participate in the BLI inspection. Decisions are based on the answers they can expect the selected groups to produce in the presence of external inspectors.

Fixing of meanings is another source of power that principals command. Principals control the narrative about their host schools in their relations with the German authorities. Therefore, they may interpret their schools’ performance in their reports to the German authorities in line with their subjective criteria and own agenda. Reporting high numbers of graduates who leave for German universities when students only expressed their intent to leave is a point in case.
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The loopholes in official documents regulating the responsibilities that limit DAS principals’ accountability suggest that principals are the bottleneck between all clusters composing the GIB DAS’ organizational structure; also that the solidity of GIB DAS’ organizational structure may largely depend on the professional ethics of principals.

Cluster 2

Cluster 2 is composed of members of the board of directors. It also includes school management and faculty.

Boards of Directors

The WifOR study states on page 6 that boards of directors at the DAS include nine members on average. These nine members perform their service on a voluntary basis, accumulating an average of 1,200 hours of work per year. Their activity is estimated to be worth €96,000 per year, meaning that each member of the board of directors performs voluntary work worth roughly €900 per month. Assuming that a school year has 40 weeks, board members are reported to dedicate 3.3 hours per week of their free time to their respective DAS each. This altruistic dedication poses the question of motivation.

As depicted earlier in Table 3, the number of German and German-speaking students at the V-DAS in Latin America is extremely low relative to the overall student numbers. Assuming there is some degree of proportionality between the number of German and German-speaking students and the number of German or German-speaking members of the boards of directors, the low numbers of German and German-speaking
students suggest that boards of the GIB DAS do not have many Germans. The most plausible explanation for the motivation of host-country nationals to sit on the board of a GIB DAS is that they have German roots and derive pleasure from this work, identify themselves with the German culture, and possibly enjoy a distinct social status within their local communities on account of their board activity. Accounts of GIB coordinators and my observations confirm this inference.

Having entered into a PPP with the German federal authorities boards’ most important task is to safeguard the DAS status of their school in order to qualify for AA’s financial and resource assistance. To receive financial and resource assistance from Germany, the DAS must meet the following six criteria:\textsuperscript{185}

\begin{enumerate}
\item The school must offer instruction in the German language and the possibility of obtaining the \textit{Abitur}, the DIA, the GIB DP, or the DSD I and DSD II certificates.
\item The school must demonstrate that it continuously generates \textit{Abitur}, DIA, or GIB DP diplomas.
\item The school must demonstrate that it has incorporated democratic values into the organizational structure of the school.
\item The sponsor of the school must be able to finance the school’s operation in a sustainable manner and without reliance on AA’s financial assistance.
\item The school must guarantee appropriate use of federal funds and undisturbed conduct of business.
\item The school must prove that the gains derived from its operation are used exclusively to improve the school’s organization.
\end{enumerate}

\textsuperscript{185} Deutscher Bundestag, 2013, 6.
Fulfillment of criteria 2, 3, and 5 is left in the hands of principals. Fulfillment of criteria 1, 4, and 6 is strictly an obligation of the boards of directors who are also supposed to work together with principals to ensure fulfillment of criteria 2, 3 and 5. This duty is fulfilled by the administrator who is an extension of the board at the operational level of the GIB DAS.

To meet criterion (1), boards must ensure they have sufficient financial capabilities to hire additional ADLKs to cope with the workload of programs leading to the award of DSD II certificates. To meet criterion (4), boards must ensure that the school establishes a viable long-term business plan and sticks to it. To do this, the GIB DAS charge steep tuition fees. The WifOR study highlights on page 22 that the DAS in Latin America register the highest income from tuition fees worldwide, although students pay the lowest fees worldwide. Contrasting the relatively low numbers of ADLKs and BPLKs the GIB DAS employ with the high numbers of local students they cater to, as well as the steep tuition fees combined with the prohibition against the GIB DAS to generate profits, suggest that the GIB DAS in Latin America either face high operational costs or that they reinvest their surplus funds in their organizational structure. To fulfill criterion (6), Section 13 of the ASchulG\textsuperscript{186} stipulates that a certified public accountant of the host country may attest the school’s non-profit-making character.

The constraints that members of the boards of directors have with regard to the GIB DP derive from market failure in the provision of principals. If principals do not care about supporting the GIB DP at their host school, boards cannot do much about it other than talk to the principal. To report him/her to the ZfA is not a sound tactical option.

\textsuperscript{186} Deutscher Bundestag, 2013, 11.
Usually, boards of directors communicate directly with principals and administrators only within the schools. On rare occasions, they may summon school management to their sessions. However, faculty hardly ever have an opportunity to inform the board of their interests, concerns, and suggestions. Boards do communicate directly with the WDA. Consequently, it is fair to assume that at least some members of the boards of directors are proficient in German.

WDA (Weltverband Deutscher Auslandsschulen/World Federation of German Schools Abroad)

WDA has 148 members, and 122 of them hold the DAS status. The federation was created in the aftermath of the first world congress of 2002 with the goal of representing the interests of the DAS before the federal authorities. It defines itself as a pressure group that represents the interests of the DAS before the official authorities and associated agencies. Specifically, it organizes annual meetings for members of the boards of directors of the DAS and the world congresses every four years. Also, it sponsors studies on the DAS, supports the boards of directors in the realization of their tasks, and promotes their projects through the provision of services that the DAS require.\footnote{187 Weltverband Deutscher Auslandsschulen, 2018c.}

WDA’s interest in the GIB DP became evident to the public only recently with the announcement of the Task Force GIB.\footnote{188 Weltverband Deutscher Auslandsschulen, 2018b.} The task force was established to offer associated schools the possibility to exchange information on the particularities of their
GIB DP. Then it staged a Round Table GIB in its Berlin headquarters in January 2018 with the goal of discussing the issue of recognition of the GIB diploma by the German universities. The Round Table GIB was attended by a representative of the BLASchA, one representative of the IBO, ZfA’s liaison with the IBO, the head of the department responsible for the DAS within the AA (Unit 605), the president of WDA’s board of directors, one person associated with one of the 33 GIB DAS representing the interests of the boards of the GIB DAS, one member of WDA’s board of directors who is domiciled at one of the GIB DAS specified in Table 3 and WDA’s chairperson. The fact that the WDA has not published any clues on the outcomes of the Task Force and the Round Table GIB mars WDA’s interest in the GIB DP while suggesting that it is not interested in promoting downward communication with Cluster 2 and Cluster 3 members.

WDA’s constraint with regard to the GIB DP is their allegiance to the D and B-DAS. Even if the 18 DAS who are not members of the WDA were D and B-DAS, these schools’ weight within the association by far exceeds the weight of the GIB DAS. Since the interests of the D and B-DAS clash by design with the interests of the GIB DAS over the allocation of federal funds, the WDA cannot effectively represent the interests of the GIB DP and the D and B-DAS at the same time.

School Management

School management at the GIB DAS is usually comprised of the deputy principal and section directors. Principals are part of the management, too, yet due to the particularities of their responsibilities and attachments they have been considered in this
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study as members of Cluster 1. Deputy principals most certainly used to be section directors before being promoted. Therefore, I am conflating section directors and the deputy principal and referring to them as school management or simply management. As there are usually four sections (kindergarten, primary, middle school, and secondary level), management is made of five members.

Virtually all GIB coordinators have reported that school management at their schools come from the host country and are senior non-German-speaking OLKs. Mostly, they had been at the school when the school was a national school that was offering classes of German instead of pursuing German foreign interests (see Chapter 4). Therefore, management’s interest in the GIB DP is situational and motivated by convenience and personal economic incentives: They work at a school that has decided to implement the GIB DP and because they hold a senior position that pays above the average and because they want to keep their jobs, they must bear with the GIB DP. However, as the program generates more work which is not compensated, they see no reason to support it.

Seniority is management’s major constraint when it comes to the GIB DP. Acemoglu and Robinson\textsuperscript{190} show in different historical and national contexts how seniority breeds fears of creative destruction and fear of loss of power when novel developments start to unfold in conservative settings, which ultimately translate into obstruction of progress. In the case of GIB DAS’ management, fears of creative destruction and loss of power have all too often prevented management from supporting the GIB DP at their schools.

The GIB DP is only a program within a DAS that caters to a small fraction of all school students but impacts the entire school community. The number of GIB diplomas the school produces determines the scope of funding and allocation of human resources by the ZfA. For students of the GIB DP to obtain their diploma, curricula in the sections preceding the upper secondary level had to be adjusted accordingly. This created additional work for school management who are responsible for (among other things) curriculum design. Adjustment of curricula to the GIB DP has invariably promoted discussions of quality in education prior to implementation of the GIB DP, which has defied the expertise of school management.

Last but not least, management are mostly not directly involved in GIB DP academic activity, yet they have to be knowledgeable about the program. This means additional reading, training, quality controls by the GIB coordinator, and attendance at extracurricular meetings. The prospect of additional work becomes an issue, especially when the board of directors decides that the GIB DP should be inclusive and admit as many students into the program as apply for admission.

Following the logic of the law of large numbers, boards have an incentive to promote inclusiveness in the GIB DP. Large numbers of students in the GIB DP are likely to produce large numbers of GIB diplomas. And large numbers of GIB diplomas translate into larger financial assistance from the German authorities. However, as student and teacher numbers in the GIB DP rise, management, and especially the director of the section the GIB DP is embedded in, see their influence over faculty, students and
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parents dwindle. Fearing loss of power, section directors have incentives to forge alliances with like-minded faculty and to disregard the GIB DP.

Facing more work and lacking incentives to promote the GIB DP management prefer to free ride and do little to promote the GIB DP. Several interviewees and my field observation support this argument. Also, senior GIB coordinators and senior faculty from various DAS have confirmed that the slow development of the GIB DP at the DAS in the first years following BLASchA’s approval recommendation (Appendix 10) was owing to management’s resistance to embrace this novel program.

As ADLKs and principals have their own reasons to stay clear of the GIB DP (lack of adequate materials for teachers, poor foreign language skills hindering understanding of IB documents published in Spanish and English, BLI loophole regarding the oversight of quality in education in the GIB DP, ZfA’s failure to commit ADLKs to teaching in the GIB DP by providing professional development training) and because boards are constrained by time (3.3 hours of work per week for all school matters) and their non-involvement with the community beyond principals and administrators, management are rarely checked on their commitment to the GIB DP.

Management usually practices sideward, downward and upward communication. However, owing to their inability to speak German, school management have no direct access to information on the GIB DP that comes from Germany or appears on German websites. Consequently, they lack the ability to understand the legal provisions regulating the GIB DP at the DAS and therefore depend on their principals’ explaining these provisions to them. Principals, however, may have no incentives to empower management on this matter as such empowerment could raise the bar of accountability
for them. In the end, management lose interest in comprehending the specificities of the GIB DP and follow the example of principals.

GIB DP Coordinators

By design, coordinators are the most interested parties in consolidating the GIB DP, as their stay at a GIB DAS depends on GIB DP’s output. If the program produces many GIB diplomas, they enjoy recognition. If it does not, criticism of their professional performance abounds.

The list of coordinators’ responsibilities is long and includes anything from ideological alignment of the entire school community, to IB’s mission statement, to oversight of exams.\textsuperscript{193} Coordinators cherish sideward, upward, and downward communication, yet their insufficient language skills in German (see Appendix 7) put them in the same position as management when it comes to gathering information from German authorities. Although they could in theory reach out to the ZfA, the informal character of the communication channel to the ZfA and their inability to communicate in German prevents them from doing so.

The constraints limiting GIB DP coordinators’ scope of action in the GIB DP are largely determined by the decisions that management and principals make with regard to the program. If they support the program and boards free up funds for the consolidation of the GIB DP, then coordinators do well and gain influence over students, faculty, and parents. However, if management and principals decide to free ride and let the program

\textsuperscript{193} International Baccalaureate Organization (IBO) 2015, A3.1
stagnate instead of engaging in it, there is not much coordinators can do to improve GIB DP’s quality.

Faculty (OLKs)

Faculty at the GIB DAS are made of varying proportions of German teachers, German-speaking teachers, and non-German-speaking teachers. The German OLKs are German teachers who stopped working in Germany, relocated to another region of the world, and found employment at a GIB DAS. The German-speaking OLKs are nationals of some other German-speaking country or different walks of life who ended up living abroad and working at a GIB DAS. Also, this group includes foreign nationals whose mother language is not German but they have attained a level of German fluency that the principal in charge considers good enough for teaching. The non-German-speaking OLKs are generally trained teachers from the host country who were lucky enough to be hired by the GIB DAS. All German, German-speaking, and non-German-speaking OLKs are subject to the local laws and norms. Their salaries are lower than those of ADLKs and BPLKs but are considerably higher than salaries they would receive from another local employer. ADLKs receive salaries that are three to six times higher than those of OLKs.

To keep German OLKs motivated, the school often grants them special allowances, such as free travel tickets to Germany every second year. The German-speaking OLKs are kept motivated through measures like travel to Germany as chaperons of school outings, whereas the non-German-speaking OLKs are offered German language
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courses at no expense. All OLKs enjoy the right to send their offspring to the GIB DAS without payment of tuition fees or at discount fares. Hence, OLKs’ interest in the GIB DAS is motivated by economic considerations but not pegged specifically to the GIB DP.

All OLKs usually have a workload of at least 27 hours a week, and they also have to cover for absent colleagues. There are no restrictions on maximum number of hours per month as is the case with the ADLKs.

**German-speaking** OLKs tend to speak the language of the host country and have some emotional attachment to their new environment. Therefore, they tend to stay in their new homeland longer than the ADLKs and BPLKs. The GIB DAS take advantage of this by assigning them groups that need continuity to perform well and whose performance is crucial to ensure sustainable funding of the school. Most **German-speaking** OLKs work in classes that prepare students for the DSD I and DSD II exams. Some also work in the GIB DP, and a small minority does both. The German-speaking OLKs tend to be in charge of classes of German in the primary years section and the middle school and to engage in their school’s marketing activity. The non-German-speaking OLKs are mostly in charge of classes where the language of instruction is not German, including the GIB DP subjects taught in the language of the host country.

In addition to their regular workload, OLKs involved in the GIB DP are expected to direct students in their research projects for the EEs and to accompany them in their CAS activities. These additional responsibilities are not paid for by the schools, as indicated in sections 3e and 3f in Appendix 1.

The constraints of OLKs involved in the GIB DP are determined by management’s lack of empathy for their work. Although many OLKs would like to excel
in the GIB DP and thus improve their standing in the GIB DAS to make themselves less dispensable, they often lack incentives to do so. Management and principals at the GIB DAS hardly ever recognize their extra efforts but may be the first ones to bash them when the results are not as good as they would like. Consequently, a “free-rider” problem emerges. The entire school community draws benefits from the GIB DAS status, but no one has an incentive to engage in it.

OLKs engage with school management and the principal in two-way communication in general meetings and face-to-face situations. OLKs involved in the GIB DP also practice open two-way communication with GIB DP coordinators as both parts have the same motives with regard to the GIB DP: They want their students to perform well in the GIB DP, also because they want to improve their leverage on management in future negotiations. Although OLKs have access to IB’s virtual platform where they can engage in chatrooms with peers from other parts of the world, exchange ideas, and up- and download useful teaching materials, they have to go through the GIB coordinator when they want to communicate directly with the IBO both ways. Only the GIB coordinator has a direct communication channel to IB Answers, which is IBO’s customer service.

Communication between faculty and the ZfA or other members of Cluster 1 other than the principal does not occur. Naturally, OLKs communicate most with the students and parents. Therefore, they have a magnifying effect in the dissemination of GIB DP-related information.
Students and Parents

All GIB DAS are private schools that play by the rules of the market. Competition in the international school market is fierce,¹⁹⁵ and the GIB DAS are not exempt from this competition. As a consequence, private schools are keen on committing their clientele as early as possible. To tap into new resources, all GIB DAS have incorporated a kindergarten section in their schools.¹⁹⁶ Once a child is admitted to kindergarten, he/she is likely to stay at the GIB DAS for the ensuing 14 years until he/she graduates from the upper secondary level.

As children almost never have a say in the decision regarding their schooling, it is important to first consider parents’ interest in the GIB DAS. Considerations related to social status surely play a role. Germany promotes itself as “inventive, innovative, cosmopolitan, creative and visionary,”¹⁹⁷ and these attributes elicit positive connotations when parents think about their children’s future.

Germany’s successful use of soft power is compelling. AA’s campaigns such as “Invest in Germany” (launched in 2003),¹⁹⁸ “Germany – Land of Ideas” (launched in 2006),¹⁹⁹ and the “Year of Germany” realized on all continents since 2008 and soon to


¹⁹⁶ Bundesverwaltungsamt, 2014a.


reach the US, have created stereotypical images of Germany that are enticing to many people. Thus, the decision of parents to send their offspring to a GIB DAS is presumably motivated by ideological considerations. They deliberately choose a German school instead of a French or British school.

As children grow older, their responsibilities get bigger, too. Whether or not they live up to their responsibilities is measured through exams. In the GIB DAS, students are expected to pass standardized German language exams from the sixth grade on, and every two years thereafter. The most decisive exam is the DSD I, which students sit in the ninth or tenth grade. They may fail once, but a second failure is penalized by forfeiture of their right to a place at the school. The constant pressure of the German proficiency exams upon students often sparks a negative attitude toward the school. If the exam results are poor and German staff at the school projects a negative image, students easily confuse their negative attitude toward the school with a negative attitude toward Germany. The experiences they have when they go on school exchanges to Germany (sometimes once, sometimes twice during their stay at their GIB DAS) is decisive. If it is positive, their extrinsic motivation—originally fueled by their parents’ interest in the German culture—turns into an intrinsic one that translates into the development of a genuine interest in Germany. Students return to their home country motivated to enter the GIB DP and then study in Germany. If not, students want their stay at the GIB DAS to end soon and be allowed to study elsewhere. Thus, their restraints with regard to the GIB DP are largely informed by their personal experience with the German culture, both inside and outside the school. With low numbers of ADLKs at the GIB DAS, changing principals, relatively
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short stays in Germany and relatively high numbers of German-speaking OLKs at their schools their interest in Germany is largely informed by their personal experience with German-speaking OLKs. Parents, on the other hand, face an economic constraint, for the GIB DP implies additional costs.

Communication of students and parents with members of Cluster 2 unfolds in both ways and in the language of their home country. Neither students nor their parents are allowed to communicate with members of Cluster 1 other than the principal.
Chapter 6

Assessing GIB DAS Susceptibility to Negative Evaluations

This chapter is dedicated to the assessment of GIB DAS’ susceptibility to a negative evaluation of their role as AA’s foreign policy tool. Every indicator specified in Chapter 3 is dealt with in a separate section. Most data sources considered in this chapter were mentioned in Chapter 4. Wherever this is not the case, the corresponding piece of evidence will be specified here.

Situational Specificity

Depending on the time and place of occurrence, a hazard may affect all GIB DAS in the same manner or have greater or lesser consequences for individual GIB DAS. The GIB DAS are exposed to AA’s conducting a utility study as no such study has been realized to this day. However, they may not all be equally exposed. AA’s geopolitical interest in particular parts of the world may lessen the impact on schools located in the most-favored regions. Conversely, schools located in parts of the world where the AA pursues fewer interests may suffer greater losses. Also, interest of the German public in the utility of the GIB DAS raises the bar for AA’s accountability to the taxpayer. If the public acknowledges the utility of the GIB DAS, the AA may have fewer incentives to question these schools’ contribution to the goals of AKBP.
Proxy 1: AA’s Interest in World Regions

**Proxy question:** Are all regions of the world equally important to the AA?

**Definition:** The AA does not pivot toward any particular regions of the world. Therefore, it directs federal resources to all parts of the world equally.

**Purpose:** To identify possible pivots of Germany’s foreign interests.

**Calculation method:** Establish the ordinal order in which the AA specifies its foreign policy goals and foci. Use the number of children of German expatriates at the GIB DAS of all regions. Calculate the ratio of ADLKs to the overall number of students at GIB DAS. Assign values: 2 if all evidence points to Yes, 1 if evidence is inconclusive, 0 if all evidence points to No.

**Data required:** AA’s foreign policy goals statement, AA’s list of regional foci, population of German offspring at the GIB DAS, population of ADLKs at the GIB DAS.

**Data sources:** AA’s website, BVA’s data records, data of federal authorities, data of associated agencies.

**Interpretation:** Explicit references to certain regions as priority regions are indicative of Germany’s regional pivot. A high number of German students at a GIB DAS is indicative of Germany’s obligation to strong commitment to that school. A high number of GIB DAS with high numbers of German students in a particular region is indicative of Germany’s strong commitment to that regions. The number of ADLKs at a school underscores the importance of that school to Germany: The higher the ratio of ADLKs to German students, the more important the school. Accordingly, the higher the number of schools with a high ratio of ADLKs to German students in a particular region, the more important is the region to the AA.
Findings:

- German foreign policy is guided by five fundamental principles which determine AA’s activity: 1) European integration and the European Union; 2) the transatlantic partnership; 3) fostering peace and security around the world; 4) promotion of Democracy and human rights; and 5) commitment to fair and sustainable globalization and rules-based international order.\(^\text{201}\) These principles clearly establish a hierarchy of AA’s priorities in world regions. (value = 0)

- AA lists its regional foci in an ordinal manner: Transatlantic relations, the Middle East and Maghreb, Reconstruction of Afghanistan, Asia, Africa and Latin America.\(^\text{202}\) That Transatlantic relations and the Middle East and Maghreb come before Asia, Africa and Latin America rules out the possibility of an alphabetical order. (value = 0)

- The PASCH initiative, a project initiated by the AA and supported by the ZfA, the GI and the DAAD with the aim of creating and strengthening a network of some 1,500 partner schools with special links to Germany, refers explicitly to Asia, the Middle East and Central and Eastern Europe as these agents’ priority regions.\(^\text{203}\) (value = 0)

- Table 3 shows that ratios of German offspring relative to numbers of non-German offspring are consistently lower at GIB DAS located in regions that rank highest


\(^{203}\) PASCH Initiative, *What is PASCH?*, 2018b.
on AA’s list of regional foci: Turkey, Saudi Arabia, the UAE, Egypt, Taiwan, the Philippines and Ethiopia cater to a considerably higher number of German offspring than the GIB DAS in Latin America, the region that appears in the last position of AA’s list of regional foci. The only exception to this pattern is Australia, which also sees a high number of German children. Australia is not mentioned in AA’s list of regional foci at all. However, large numbers of German citizens in a region are indicative of AA’s high degree of commitment to regions. Likewise, low numbers of German citizens in a region reflect AA’s reduced interest in a region. (value = 0)

- BVA’s regulations of the selection process of ADLKs (p. 9) indicates that the ZfA gives preference to ensure quality in education at the DAS located in Europe, Turkey and Asia. It explicitly states that the ZfA reserves the right to select ADLKs for the DAS in these regions, whereas the selection of ADLKs to be employed in other regions of the world may be defined by principals based on the CVs principals find in ZfA’s virtual databases.\(^{204}\) (value = 0)

- Table 3 shows that the numbers of ADLKs/BPLKs tend to be higher at GIB DAS located in regions that rank highest on AA’s list of regional foci than the numbers of ADLKs at GIB DAS located in Latin America. Still, some GIB DAS in Latin America feature as many ADLKs/BPLKs as the GIB DAS in other regions of the world. However, the GIB DAS in Latin America cater to considerably more host-country students than their counterparts in other regions of the world. When considering the numbers of ADLKs/BPLKs relative to all students, the ratios at

\(^{204}\) Bundesverwalungsamt, 2016a, 9.
the GIB DAS in Latin America are significantly lower than those of the GIB DAS in other regions of the world. All factors considered, the absolute high numbers of ADLKs/BPLKs at the GIB DAS in Latin America become meaningless.

(value = 0)

Conclusion: Germany’s pivot toward the Middle East and Asia, and to a lesser degree to Africa, is evident. As a consequence, Germany is more committed to the GIB DAS that are located in the Middle East, Asia and Africa than to those in Latin America. Schools in the first three regions cater to more German and German-speaking students than those in Latin America, both in absolute and relative numbers. As a consequence, Germany deploys many more resources to Middle East, Asia and Africa than to Latin America. Evidence suggests unmistakably that Germany has not an equally strong interest in all GIB DAS. Those located outside of Latin America seem to matter, whereas those that are located in Latin America seem to be tolerated.

Rating: 0

Proxy 2: German Public’s Interest in the GIB DAS

Proxy question: Is German public interested in consolidating the GIB DAS?

Definition: The Parliament, researchers, and civil society are interested in consolidating the GIB DP at the DAS. Therefore, they engage in debates on the GIB DAS and the purpose they serve. They conduct research on these schools, discuss them in different settings, and desire to learn more about them. Politicians inquire about the GIB DAS in the Parliament, researchers conduct studies on the GIB DAS, pressure groups
organize public events to promote the GIB DAS, civil society releases articles that deal with the GIB DAS and universities accept the GIB diploma.

**Purpose:** To identify German public’s interest in consolidating the GIB DAS.

**Calculation method:** Establish the number of minor and major inquiries on the GIB DAS in the Parliament and the years of their occurrence. Establish the number of publicly available research projects conducted on the GIB DAS. Establish the number of official events organized by pressure groups in Germany to promote the GIB DAS. Establish the number of publications on the GIB DAS. Relate the previously established numbers to the pre or post-approval phase of the GIB DAS. Establish the number of German universities that accept the GIB diploma without any delay and relate this number to the overall number of institutions of higher education in Germany. Establish share and compare with the past. Recognize tendencies. Assign the value 2 if the tendency is positive, 1 if it stagnates, and 0 if it is negative or no relevant evidence is found.

**Data required:** Surveys, research projects, civil society publications, minor and major inquiries of the BT on the GIB DAS and the number of institutions of higher education in Germany that recognize the GIB diploma relative to the overall number of institutions of higher education in Germany.

**Data sources:** AA, ZfA, WDA, and the PASCH initiative’s surveys and research projects on the GIB DAS; BT’s list of recommended works on GIB DAS; BT’s catalogue of minor and major inquiries on the GIB DAS; IBO’s list of institutions of higher education in Germany which recognize the GIB diploma; IBO research department’s list of research projects on the GIB DAS.
**Interpretation:** Surveys, research projects, publications and BT’s minor and major inquiries on the GIB DAS are indicative of the general public’s interest in these schools if they are accessible to the public in general. If they are not, public is presumed to be oblivious of the GIB DAS. Multiple publications within a short period of time are indicative of sustained interest following an event that spotlighted the GIB DAS in that specific period of time. The more events there are, the more interested the public is in the GIB DAS. Instances of interest of the recent past have more value than those of the distant past and are indicative of unfolding public interest in increasing the value of the GIB DAS. Research conducted on the GIB DAS is indicative of scholars’ interest in consolidating the GIB DP at the DAS. The number of institutions of higher education in Germany that accept the GIB DP is indicative of civil society’s acceptance of the educational quality of the GIB DP, which is presumed to consolidate the program. The higher the number, the more accepted the education offered in the GIB DP and the higher the degree of public’s appreciation of GIB DAS’ value to Germany’s foreign policy.

**Findings:**

- The WDA and the ZfA have internally conducted a small number of surveys on the GIB DAS, but the results have never been published to the public. (value = 0)
- WDA’s position paper of 2016 regarding the GIB DAS\(^\text{205}\) advocates GIB DAS’ cause. It argues that the GIB DAS should be entitled to more federal funding to be more effective. This document as well as information on the constitution of the Round Table GIB and the Working Group GIB appear on WDA’s website,

although the latter two do not provide any insights rather than describe situations. (value = 1)

- The two scientifically conducted research projects on the DAS that I discussed earlier contain rather scanty or misrepresented information on the GIB DAS. (value = 0)

- The list of recommended readings that I received from the German parliament following my inquiry about GIB DAS-related internal documents and publicly available body of literature does not contain any references to the GIB DAS. This list is marked as Appendix 17. (value = 0)

- IBO’s research department contains a large body of scientific studies on the IB DP that go back to 2003, yet not one of them deals with the GIB DP. (value = 0)

- It is good news that 106 institutions of higher education in Germany\(^{206}\) out of a total of approximately 700 institutions of higher education in the country\(^{207}\) accept the GIB diploma, according to IBO. Based on my observations over the years, I can confirm that the tendency is positive. (value = 2).

- The German federal parliament (BT) has dealt three times with the GIB DAS. The minor inquiry of 2006\(^{208}\) had the objective of establishing the German federal government’s stance on the recognition of the GIB diploma as equivalent to the

---


Abitur certificate, if interested DAS wished to implement the GIB DP to ensure their survival in the market. The reply to that inquiry provides clues to a positive take of the federal government on the GIB DAS.\textsuperscript{209} Also, it implies that it would consider negotiating again with the IBO the introduction of a purely German version of the GIB DP at some point in time. However, I could not find any evidence suggesting that this has happened indeed. BT’s major inquiry on the GIB DAS of 2012 features questions on GIB DAS’ sustained funding.\textsuperscript{210} These questions were asked in the context of the drafting of the bill on the ASchulG. Unfortunately, I have not been able to find an official reply of the parliament to these questions. (value = 1)

\textbf{Conclusion}: Bureaucracies have done little to promote the GIB DAS in the German society. The WDA and the ZfA keep the results of their surveys on the GIB DAS in their drawers. The fact that the Task Force and the Round Table GIB have been created that these groups’ achievements have not been published is not conducive to awareness-raising in the German public. The BT has taken an interest in the GIB DAS only at specific points in time. First, at the time when the trial phase of 2003-2006 was under evaluation. Then, when the ASchulG was under discussion. These two instances of BT’s interest in the GIB DAS are indicative of BT’s taking seriously its role of supervisory body of German taxes. However, they are not indicative of BT's interest in consolidating the GIB DAS scheme. IBO’s statement on the number of institutions of higher education that accept a GIB DP has been published only recently. IBO’s recent

\textsuperscript{209} Deutscher Bundestag, Drucksache 16/1624, 2006a.

interest in the value of the GIB diploma to German universities partly offsets the failures from the past and provides momentum to the cause of the GIB DAS. (value = 1)

Rating: 1

Social Organization

Social organization is a function of organizational culture. If all parties involved in the GIB DP at the DAS pull in the same direction, these schools’ susceptibility decreases. AA’s evaluation is likely to arrive at the conclusion that the GIB DAS are easy to handle. However, if key stakeholders do not align their interests on the strategic and operational levels, GIB DAS’ susceptibility increases. Too much noise elicits rather negative connotations.

To align the GIB DAS strategically is a duty of the KMK, the ZfA and the boards of directors. To align the GIB DAS operationally lies in the hands of principals, school management and faculty. For strategic and operational stakeholders to align their interests in the GIB DP at the GIB DAS strategically and operationally, all stakeholders must stand behind the GIB DP. If they don’t, failures in governance occur, which increases the noise. If they do, strategic and operational stakeholders work tightly together and form a stable structure. As a consequence, AA’s evaluation is likely to not produce negative results. It will consider the GIB DAS a tool that is easy to handle.

Proxy 1: Promotion of the GIB DP by Strategic Stakeholders

Proxy question: Do the KMK, the ZfA and boards of directors have incentives to promote the GIB DP?
**Definition:** The KMK, the ZfA and boards of directors are strategic stakeholders in GIB DAS’s operation who recognize the perks of the GIB DP, are interested in consolidating the GIB DP, and are not constrained in their actions. Their strong interest in the GIB DP at the DAS and non-existing constraints provide incentives to work in favor of the GIB DP and support its continued operation.

**Purpose:** To identify if strategic stakeholders have incentives to promote the GIB DP.

**Calculation method:** Identify each strategic stakeholder’s interests and constraints with regard to the GIB DP at the DAS, rate and count ratings. Assign 2 if all evidence points to Yes without constraints, 1 if Yes but constrained and 0 if No without any doubt. Calculate the aggregate result and rate. Consider the proportion of marks assigned.

**Data required:** Description of each stakeholder’s tasks with regard to the GIB DP at the DAS, statements indicating their interests and constraints of strategic stakeholders in the GIB DP (or their lack thereof), official documents defining/constraining their actions with regard to the GIB DP at the DAS, insights from field study and interviews, numbers on education outcomes.

**Data sources:** Websites, e-mails, internal documents, public statements, interviews.

**Interpretation:** Strategic stakeholders have different incentives to support or to not support the GIB DP. If their interests outweigh their constraints, strategic stakeholders have incentives to support the GIB DP at the DAS. Likewise, if their constraints outweigh their interests, they lack incentives to support the GIB DP.
Findings:

- The KMK is interested in the utility of the GIB diploma. It has signed an agreement with the IBO on the recognition of the GIB diploma as equivalent to the *Abitur*-certificate in 1986 and has renewed it since then on an annual basis. However, it has raised the bar for students by restricting the availability of GIB DP subjects considerably: Students must complete history and biology in German. Students at the GIB DAS are often not interested in seeing German history and prefer the complete an economy or politics course in their national program instead. (value = 1)

- The KMK is interested in responding to the market demand. Therefore, it has negotiated incorporation of two new GIB DP subjects into the pool of available subjects: chemistry and mathematics: analyses and approaches. However, these are subjects that are either affected by teacher shortages, have registered poor results at the GIB DAS, or did not manage to cope with the corresponding workload in the past. (value = 1)

- The KMK is interested in that GIB DP graduates experience no setbacks when applying to a German university. Therefore, it has endorsed the GIB diploma in German universities. The endorsement process has not quite finished yet, but it is going in the right direction. (value = 2)

- As much as the KMK may be interested in engaging more in the development of the GIB DP, it is constrained in its doings by the educational federalism in Germany and the resulting collective action problem regarding the allocation of resources. (value = 0)
• The KMK has taken an interest in the supervision of GIB DP-related academic matters. Therefore, it has included in its rebooted BLI 2.0 version provisions that specifically allow for the definition of indicators that capture the profile of the GIB DAS. (value = 2)

• ZfA’s description of its duties does not contain any specific reference to the GIB DP. This is indicative of ZfA’s lack of will to commit itself too much to the GIB DP at the DAS. (value = 0)

• The ZfA supports GIB coordinator meetings. It has established a three-year schedule for these meetings.\textsuperscript{211} (value = 2)

• The ZfA provides financial resources to the GIB DAS for them to send their GIB coordinators to annual GIB coordinator meetings. However, money seems not to reach the benefitted GIB DAS always. Also, the ZfA does not provide professional development training to ADLKs who are deployed to a GIB DAS. (value = 1)

• The ZfA is interested in taking the GIB DP to the next level. Therefore, it has participated in the Round Table GIB. However, their intentions are not clear as the general public has not been informed about the outcomes. (value = 1)

• The ZfA shows its interest in the GIB DAS by financially supporting participation of GIB DAS’ staff in IBO’s professional development training. However, the workshops of relevance to the GIB DAS are mostly held in Europe and ZfA’s funding covers only a part of the overall expenditure. (value = 1)

\textsuperscript{211} See Appendix 16: Three-Year-Schedule for GIB coordinator meetings
• The ZfA is limited in its actions with regard to the GIB DAS on account of Germany’s educational federalism. The domestic political power games provide incentives to not engage in the GIB DP-related matters more than necessary. (value = 0)

• Boards of directors are interested in the GIB DP on account of economic considerations. Being able to award an internationally recognized school-leaving certificate helps boards to make their schools more attractive to students and to prevail in the local competition for new clients. (value = 2)

• Boards of directors have powerful political incentives to support the GIB DP. Their schools have entered into a PPP with the German authorities. Such a proximity to the German authorities translates into a distinguished societal standing. Members of the boards are always present when dignitaries from Germany pay the GIB DAS an official visit and they are invited to participate in WDA’s conventions where they can forge alliances with stakeholders of the German politics. (value = 2)

• Ideologically, boards of directors identify themselves more with the “encapsulated mission” mandate of the DAS than with the ideology-driven rationale behind the GIB DP. After all, they preside over German schools abroad who have incorporated an international program in their academic proposal. Their school community and the human resources that the GIB DAS command outside the GIB DP are by far larger than those that are engrained in the GIB DP. If an affordable alternative “German-style” option emerges, they are likely to embrace it and let
the GIB DP go. For the time being, however, they have incentives to support the GIB DP at their schools. (value = 1)

**Conclusion:** All parties considered, the aggregate ratings for each member are represented in the following Table 5:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>KMK</th>
<th>ZfA</th>
<th>Boards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unrestricted interest</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest offset by constraint</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constraint</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: thesis author

All parties together seem to have slightly more unrestricted interests in the GIB DP than they have reasons that justify their staying clear of the GIB DP (5:4). Their aggregate interests as offset by their aggregate constraints are also as strong as their unrestricted interests. Therefore, it is fair to assume that stakeholders who are responsible for the strategic planning of the GIB DP acknowledge GIB DAS’ interests, concerns and desires. They may have a strong interest in improving GIB DAS’ situation. For now, however, they do not go out of their way to promote the GIB DP at the DAS because they are constrained in their actions. The logic behind it is comprehensible: institutions are composed of people, and people consider costs and benefits before they become active. If costs outweigh the benefits, they have little incentives to become active. Likewise, if benefits outweigh costs, they have incentives to become active. The ZfA and KMK have little incentives to work any harder in favor of the GIB DP than they already do because
circumstances seem not to favor deployment of major resources for now. The GIB DAS are operating just fine with the resources that have been released to them so far. As improvement of the GIB DP would require use of a disproportionately large amount of resources, they have no incentives to change the current situation. For the boards of directors the GIB DP is a means to and end that promises them positive economic and political outcomes, both professionally and personally. Therefore, they have incentives to promote the GIB DP, at least until an affordable “German-style” alternative emerges.

Rating: 1

Proxy 2: Promotion of the GIB DP by Operational Stakeholders

Proxy question: Do principals, school management and faculty have incentives to promote the GIB DP?

Definition: Principals, school management and faculty are operational stakeholders in GIB DAS’ operation who recognize the perks of the GIB DP, are interested in consolidating the GIB DP, and are not constrained in their actions. Their strong interest in the GIB DP at the DAS and non-existing constraints provide incentives to work in favor of the GIB DP and support its continued operation.

Purpose: To identify if operational stakeholders have incentives to promote the GIB DP.

Calculation method: Identify each operational stakeholder’s interests and constraints with regard to the GIB DP at the DAS and weigh them against each other. Estimate the weight of each argument, assign values 2 – 1 – 0 and add up these values
Data required: Statements indicating the interests and constraints of operational stakeholders in the GIB DP (or their lack thereof), numbers on education outcomes, insights from field study and interviews.

Data sources: Websites, internal documents, interviews.

Interpretation: Operational stakeholders have different motives to promote or to not promote the GIB DP. If their interests outweigh their constraints, operational stakeholders have incentives to work in favor of the GIB DP at the DAS. Likewise, if their constraints outweigh their interests, they lack incentives to promote the GIB DP.

Findings:

- When serving abroad, principals act on behalf of the AA in the context of the DAS. Hence, they have been found to be proven teachers who are suitable to represent Germany’s interests abroad. Accordingly, they are expected to rank their interests in the GIB DAS in the same manner the AA does: “Creation of stable foundations for international relations with the synergy of knowledge and culture and the dialogue between people” comes before “promotion of the German language in Europe and around the world”. Principals lack knowledge of the GIB DP in operational matters, yet they desire to produce positive, measurable results. This constellation provides them incentives to invert the order of interests, stick to the program they are familiar with from Germany, prioritize DSD II certificates, and then focus on the GIB DP. The inversion does not imply that principals do not promote the GIB DP. Rather, it suggests that principals have incentives to let the GIB DP operate the same way it did when they joined their host school and to focus on the DSD II exams. (value = 1)
• Their initial lack of knowledge of the GIB DP and no accountability to the BLI or IBO for matters related to the GIB DP provide principals incentives to not push the GIB DP agenda. Producing the minimum number of 12 GIB diplomas seems to be a given and whether their host schools will receive an additional funding or not for producing at least 25.1 GIB diplomas will not affect principals personally or professionally. If they succeed, they will reap no personal or professional benefits from their feat. If they don’t, no one will hold principals accountable with retrospective effect. As promoting the GIB DP requires additional effort, implies empowerment of potential checkers, and does not entail any personal or professional rewards rather than promise more accountability to the school community, principals have no incentives to promote the GIB DP. (value = 0)

• When considering principals’ incentives in economic terms, the panorama changes. They have powerful economic incentives to stay at a GIB DAS for as long as possible. Upscale lifestyle and the ability to save money are powerful motivators. Therefore, they have incentives to make the GIB DP work well and earn their boards’ endorsement for a second term. (value = 2)

• From the practical perspective, principals have incentives to not work against the GIB DP. If the quality of the program deteriorates, they may bring parents on to the scene. However, their lack of accountability to the local communities also provides incentives to not work too much in favor of the GIB DP. The best play involving the least effort is to let the GIB DP as it had been when they took office. (value = 1)
• Seniority of members of the school management spurs their fear of creative destruction and provides an incentive to not promote the GIB DP. To work in favor of the GIB DP implies redesigning curricula, which generates comparisons between the traditional curricula and the new ones. Ultimately, this may lead faculty to question management’s expertise. (value = 0)

• Promoting the GIB DP means additional work for the management. Additional meetings, readings, quality controls and trainings are time-consuming and mostly not remunerated by schools. Such prospects are not encouraging. (value = 0)

• The implementation of the GIB DP entails giving up established patterns of governance. Faculty and the GIB coordinators tend to be more knowledgeable in GIB DP related matters than senior school management, which increases their possibility of being defied in their decisions if these decisions are not aligned with the provisions included in the IB Programme standards and practices and the Handbook of Procedures. Hence, promoting the GIB DP may come at the cost of loss of power (value = 0).

• Unless they are ideologically deeply committed to the promotion of interculturality, the German faculty at the GIB DAS have no special interest in promoting the GIB DP. They are generally knowledgeable in topics related to the German education, which already creates a huge workload and stress. The GIB DAS require of their students to constantly sit exams, which must be designed, discussed, corrected and returned in a timely manner. Also, teacher and student materials for GIB DP courses in German are not available, which is not conducive to presentable student results. This may provide outsiders with arguments to
critique the German faculty’s professional skills. Hence, taking on additional responsibilities in a program they are not familiar with, not receiving a salary increase for it, and exposing themselves to thoughtless critiques provides the German faculty incentives to not promote in the GIB DP. (value = 0)

- German-speaking and non-German-speaking faculty have incentives to promote the GIB DP, but tactical considerations prevent them from doing so. If they promote it and work in it, they can improve their standing in the GIB DAS and make themselves less dispensable. However, in the event of poor results they will become an easy target of critiques, and dispensable. As neither principals nor school management or the German-speaking fraction of the OLKs get involved in the GIB DP or embark on creating the macro-conditions necessary for students and faculty to thrive, those who work in it cannot expect empathy and understanding in the event of poor results. This raises the stakes for faculty and the resulting dilemma eventually creates free-rider problems that adversely impact education outcomes. (value = 0)

**Conclusion:** Apart from the economic incentives that principals have to promote the GIB DP, all other parties considered here reap no benefits from working in favor of the GIB DP at their schools. Instead, they associate the GIB DP with personal and professional disadvantages. The following Table 6 shows the aggregate ratings on the operational level.
Table 6: Aggregate Ratings of Incentives to Support the GIB DP on the Operational Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th>School management</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unrestricted interest</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest offset by constraint</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constraint</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

KMK  ZfA  Boards

Source: thesis author

The only motives compelling principals to engage are economic reasons and school management’s behavior. If principals engage in the GIB DP and align their management, the kickback will significantly improve working conditions. For now, increased accountability to the school community, loss of power over a substantial part of students and faculty, and free-rider problems prevent academic stakeholders at the operational level from promoting the GIB DP and are the root causes of their tendency to defect. However, principals have a magnifying effect and can greatly influence the overall outcome. (value = 1)

Rating: 1

Access to Resources

Richness in resources makes exposed groups less susceptible to hazards. The greatest assets a school can have are committed teachers and recognition of the market. If the GIB DAS have enough properly trained teachers at their disposal to cover all subjects taught in German, if demand for the GIB DP is on the rise, and if the program produces
positive education outcomes, AA’s cost-benefit analysis of the GIB DAS is likely to arrive at the conclusion that administering these schools pays off as they are in demand and serve the purpose they were created for.

Proxy 1: Provision of Human Capital

Proxy question: Is GIB DAS’ pool of properly trained teachers large enough to cover all classes in the GIB DP and produce positive academic results?

Definition: The GIB DAS have enough properly trained teachers to cover their GIB DP classes with properly trained staff. Properly trained staff are ADLKs and BPLKs, they have passed the state exams to become teachers and were hired to ensure the award of the GIB diplomas. These teachers teach classes of biology, history and German in the GIB DP. Principals do not count as they do not engage in the GIB DP. All classes in biology, history and German in the GIB DP can be covered with the ADLKs/BPLKs. Also, these teachers must ensure good results in the GIB DP. Good results are those where the mean GPA equals or tops IB’s worldwide mean, and where the pass rate meets or lies above BLI’s dividing line of 90%.

Purpose: To identify possible market failures in the provision of human capital needed to meet the requirements of positive education outcomes in the GIB DP.

Calculation method: Identify number of GIB DP subjects to be taught in the German language. Identify number of teaching hours prescribed for each ADLK/BPLK. Identify number of weeks per school year and consider the reduced number in grade 12 (prior to GIB DP exams). Establish the number of academic hours that the Handbook of Procedures prescribes for biology, German, and history and consider the corresponding
stipulations in the KMK Agreement. Consider established practices at the GIB DAS. Consider number of student groups per cohort per GIB DAS. Relate all numbers to one another and calculate final result. Relate the final result to average GPA achieved by IB DP students worldwide. Also, relate the final result to WDA’s survey on GIB DP outcomes.

**Data required:** Mean GPA for IB DP students worldwide; pass rate of GIB DP students; number of minimum teaching hours required for GIB DP subjects at higher level (HL) and standard level (SL) that must be taught in German; number of teaching hours needed at the GIB DAS to teach biology, German, and history; number of ADLKs/BPLKs at the GIB DAS; number of students at each GIB DAS; maximum number of students allowed per group in the GIB DP; average number of students per group in the GIB DAS.

**Data sources:** Table 3, Handbook of Procedures; BVA’s administrative agreement; WDA’s survey on education outcomes; IBO’s statistical bulletin; field observations.

**Interpretation:** GIB DAS are interested in producing as many GIB diplomas as possible. An increase in the numbers of GIB diplomas awarded is indicative of their success. Also, DSD certificates matter to the GIB DAS. Therefore, they employ teachers in both programs who can ensure the required results. These teachers reportedly include ADLKs/BPLKs only. If the number of hours that need to be taught in the GIB DP in the German language exceeds the number that ADLKs/BPLKs combined are obliged to teach at a DAS, there is a market failure and the likelihood of obtaining positive outcomes in
the GIB DP decreases. If the hours that ADLKs/BPLKs are supposed to invest in the DSD exams are counted in, the situation of the affected GIB DAS worsens.

Findings:

- In line with the stipulations of the KMK Agreement, either biology or mathematics (also chemistry, as of 2019) must be taught at HL. All GIB DP subjects must be taught without any interruption over two years. German and history can be taught at SL.

- According to the stipulations of IB’s Handbook of Procedures, each HL subject must be taught over at least 240 clock hours during the two years of DP’s length. SL subjects must be taught over 150 clock hours.

- A school year lasts at least 40 weeks and each academic hour lasts 45 minutes. Hence, the number of academic hours for HL subjects is 300 (240 x 1.25) and for SL subjects 187.5 (150 x 1.25). However, in the second year of the GIB DP, students finalize their school year five weeks earlier because of the GIB exams. Thus, students spend 75 weeks in the GIB DP. In these 75 weeks they must cover the biology curriculum in 300 academic hours and history and German in 187.5 academic hours. Thus, each group is supposed to see 4 (150 hours / 37.5 weeks per year) academic hours of biology per week per cohort and 2.5 (93.75 hours / 37.5) academic hours of German and history per week per cohort.

- As the GIB DP lasts two years, the previously specified academic hours for students multiply by the factor two for teachers. Thus, each biology teacher must employ 8 academic hours per week per group, and each German and history teacher must employ 5 academic hours per week per group.
• Each ADLK/BPLK teaches a maximum of 25.5 hours per week.

• Experience at the GIB DAS has shown that all GIB DAS employ 6 academic hours per week for biology, 5 for German, and 4 for history in the GIB DP. Otherwise, they will not cover the GIB DP curricula. The German authorities have known about it since the inception of the GIB DP.

• In line with item three of BVA’s administrative regulations for the funding of the DAS, a financially supported group may not have more than 25 students.

• Item 1 in WDA’s survey of 2017 says that on average 24 students per cohort in grade 12 were reportedly enrolled in the GIB DP in 2017. The WifOR study says on page 15 that the V-GIB DAS see on average 22.7 students per group. Consequently, there are on average two groups of students enrolled in the GIB DP in grade 12, the second year of the GIB DP. An equal number of groups can be expected in grade 11, the first year of the GIB DP.

• Based on the above point, each biology teacher should teach 16 academic hours per week (4 hours per group per cohort x 2 groups x 2 cohorts) in the GIB DP. Accordingly, German and history teacher should teach taught 10 (2.5 hours per group per cohort x 2 groups x 2 cohorts) academic hours per week in the GIB DP.

• Biology teachers effectively teach 450 academic hours per group over two years (6 academic hours x 75 weeks). German teachers teach 375 academic hours per group over two years, and history teachers teach 300 academic hours per group over two years. If the two parallel groups per cohort are considered, these
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numbers rise to 900 hours (biology), 750 (German), and 600 (history), respectively.

- Considering the 25.5 academic hours/week (1,020 academic hours per school year) limit for ADLKS/BPLKS, and that every German course that prepares students for the DSD exams has at least 4 academic hours per week (or 160 hours per school year), it becomes evident that the ADLKS/BPLKS employed in the GIB DP biology course cannot engage in regular German classes at the same time. Consequently, more than one ADLK/BPLK is needed to cover the workload in the GIB DP for biology. In German and history, teachers can teach in the GIB DP and in DSD programs at the same time. Based on the above, at least four ADLKS/BPLKS, excluding the principal, are required for each V-GIB DAS to cover all classes, if the goal is to sustain the current average results in the GIB DP at the DAS.

- According to Table 3, the V-GIB DAS of Cali, Cuenca, Guadalajara, Managua, Medellín, Santa Cruz, Santiago de Chile and Valparaíso have no more than four ADLKS/BPLKS combined (excluding the principal).

- The mean GPA for GIB DP students in 2016 was 29.6 points.\(^{214}\)

- IB’s worldwide mean GPA in 2016 was 30.0 points.\(^{215}\)

**Conclusion:** Evidence suggests that there are at least eight GIB DAS in Latin America (Cali, Cuenca, Guadalajara, Managua, Medellín, Santa Cruz, Santiago de Chile

\(^{214}\) Appendix 19: Mean GPA in GIB DP.

and Valparaíso) who may be suffering from market failure in the provision of ADLKs/BPLKs. These schools employ a number of ADLKs/BPLKs that is too low to adequately cover classes in biology but large enough to cover German and history. If the ADLKs at these schools also get involved in the DSD exams, they are being exploited.

An alternative plausible explanation to the exploitation thesis is that some GIB DAS may be employing German-speaking OLKs in the GIB DP to reduce the workload of the ADLKs/BPLKs in biology and allow for their employment in the DSD programs. Appendix 14 supports this thesis: The GIB DAS Cali does not have enough teachers to cover all GIB DP classes, yet she still ranks among the best GIB DAS in terms of number of GIB diplomas obtained. However, that she does not rank among the GIB DAS with the highest scores may also suggest a negative correlation between the employment of OLKs in the GIB DP and GIB DP results. Only four GIB DAS have met the criterion for a pass rate of at least 90%: Cali, Asunción, Addis Abeba and Sydney. However, only Cali and Asunción are V-GIB DAS which operate on a reduced number of ADLKs. The GIB DAS Asunción has also reached a mean GPA that lies above the worldwide mean for GIB DP students. Therefore, the conclusion is that no V-GIB DAS is able to meet both criteria (90% pass rate and GPA ≥ IB world mean), and that only the GIB DAS Cali is able to meet BLI’s requirement of 90% pass rate while operating on a number of ADLKs that is too low to cover the GIB DP course with ADLKs. (value = 0)

Rating: 0
Proxy 2: Local Demand

**Proxy question:** Is the GIB DP in demand in the local markets?

**Definition:** The GIB DAS generate growing demand for the GIB DP in the local markets and are therefore able to sustainably finance their operation.

**Purpose:** To establish the tendency of demand of the GIB DP in the local markets.

**Calculation method:** Relate reported numbers of all students admitted to grade 12 with the number of students admitted to GIB DP.

**Data required:** Numbers on GIB diplomas produced.

**Data sources:** WDA’s survey of 2017 on outcomes in the GIB DP.

**Interpretation:** If the number of students who seek admission to the GIB DP at the DAS is on the rise, the GIB DP enjoys recognition among the local students. However, an upward tendency suggests increase in demand and recognition of the GIB DP only if the growth rates exceed the growth rates of all students being admitted to grades 11 and 12. Otherwise, the growth rate observed in the numbers of students who were admitted to the GIB DP unfolds normally, reflects only an increase in student numbers at the school, and is a function of the law of large numbers. If both growth rates behave similarly, the value 1 will be assigned.

**Findings:**

- WDA’s survey on GIB DP outcomes of 2017\(^{216}\) shows an increase in the numbers of students enrolled in grade 12 at 25 GIB DAS. Between 2013 and 2017, the GIB DAS registered a growth rate of 86\% (from 943 in 2013, to 1,102 in 2017).

\(^{216}\) Appendix 20: Number of Students in Grade 12.
WDA’s survey on GIB DP outcomes of 2017 (Appendix 18) shows an increase in the numbers of students enrolled in the GIB DP in grade 12 at the same 25 GIB DAS and in the same sample period as previously mentioned. The overall number rose from 397 in 2013 to 594 in 2017, which represents an increase of 69%.

**Conclusion:** Evidence suggests that demand for the GIB DP may have declined between 2013 and 2017. The increase in the absolute numbers of students who had been admitted to the GIB DP (+69%) is not indicative of growing demand for this program. It could just as well be the result of youth bulge in the previous years. In the same sample period 2013-2017, the number of all students who had been admitted to grade 12 (national upper secondary program and GIB DP) registered a significantly larger growth rate (+86%). Comparing both growth rates, the idea suggests itself that demand for the GIB DP may have suffered a significant drop. However, a plausible alternative explanation for the drop in demand is that schools could have restricted their admission policy to the GIB DP. Although GIB DP coordinators reported that their schools tend to loosen their admission policies, at least one coordinator reported that her school had chosen to make admission to the GIB DP more restrictive. Still, hard data are more convincing that the account of one coordinator.

**Rating: 0**

**Access to Political Power**

Political representatives reduce the susceptibility of the group they represent by lobbying decision makers to adopt courses of action that benefit their group. They are close to the group they represent, know its interests and weaknesses, are committed to its
well-being, and therefore qualify as its representatives. They have been legitimized by the group, for the group’s individual members have given their express or tacit consent to a social contract that bounds the political representatives to obey the rules of the group. Also, they are close to the decision makers they lobby and familiar with their respective beliefs and customs. Their political legitimacy and closeness to decision makers gives them credibility. Both the group and decision makers benefit from interacting with each other through political representatives as such interaction reduces transaction costs. Associating the administration of the GIB DAS with reduced costs of transaction, the AA is likely to assess the utility of these schools positively, at least in terms of cost-effectiveness and these schools’ impact on the federal budget.

Proxy 1: Political Representation Before German Authorities

**Proxy question:** Are GIB DAS legitimately and effectively represented before the German politics?

**Definition:** To lobby political decision makers to adopt courses of action that will consolidate the GIB DP and to avoid the collective action problem, the GIB DAS have collectively appointed a representative. Their appointee is familiar with their interests, pursues these interests, operates on good data, and is held accountable for his/her actions.

**Purpose:** To establish the effectiveness of GIB DAS’ lobbying decision makers in Germany.

**Calculation method:** Establish the process of appointment of the representative and its quality, establish the process of data collection in the GIB DP for the use in the political arena, establish the responsibilities of the appointee and compare them with
achievements attributable to him/her and these achievements’ reach. Estimate the effectiveness of political representation.

**Data required:** Accounts of stakeholders, public announcements, e-mails, meeting records.

**Data sources:** GIB DP coordinators, WDA website, president of the WDA, lobbypedia.de website.

**Interpretation:** Legitimacy and effectiveness of political representatives are established on the basis of documented evidence and statements of stakeholders. If documented evidence and statements of stakeholders suggest that the appointment resulted from a transparent democratic procedure and involved all or a majority of the GIB DAS, the representative has been legitimized and enjoys authority. Otherwise, he/she cannot be said to be acting on behalf of the GIB DAS. To establish the effectiveness of political representation, data collection and accountability of the representative to the group he/she represents are analyzed. If evidence suggests that the process of data collection may be flawed, makes no reference to the appointee’s responsibilities and achievements, does not indicate that the achievements are shared with the represented parties, and fails to show that the represented parties are prompted to comment on the achievements and to propose further courses of action, representation is ineffective. If evidence suggests compliance with all of these criteria to some degree, political representation is effective.

**Findings:**

- The WDA represents the interests of the DAS before the politics. The GIB DAS are a sub-group of the DAS. The DAS and the GIB DAS compete over the
allocation of scarce resources. Hence, the WDA has a conflict of interests when vying for the interests of the DAS and the GIB DAS at the same time. This problem has been solved by incorporating into the WDA a representative of the GIB DAS and by entrusting him/her with the task of working in favor of the GIB DP. On WDA’s website, Mr. R. of the GIB DAS of Valdivia is reported to be the contact for the GIB DAS before WDA’s board of directors. He has held this position since 2015.217

- The process of Mr. R.’s appointment to his position could not be established. My e-mail to WDA’s president requesting information on this topic remains unanswered. While working at the GSDS, the board of directors never informed me about any political representation of the GIB DP before the WDA.

- None of the coordinators present in the 2015 and 2016 coordinator meetings were aware of Mr. R.’s role as political representative of the GIB DP before the WDA.

- None of the coordinators who were present in the 2015 and 2016 coordinator meetings reported to submit data on the performance of their GIB DP to their boards of directors. All of them reported to send them always to principals. Also, all of them reported that the accuracy of the data is never checked or cross-checked.

- The previously mentioned website of the WDA includes conflicting information regarding the allegiance of Mr. R. The announcement of a meeting held in January 2018 begins by stating that the WDA had initiated Round Table GIB. However, the first phrase of the article points to Mr. R. as being the initiator of
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the Round Table. Whether Mr. R. is a liaison or a representative and on behalf of whom he actually acts cannot be clearly established. A liaison usually has the responsibility to facilitate communication between two parties. A representative, on the other hand, has allegiance to one party and is expected to advocate that party’s interests before other parties.

- The previously mentioned website of the WDA also mentions that the Task Force GIB has been operating since 2015. It is reported to provide a forum for the GIB DAS for the exchange of information and experiences within the WDA. Not one of the consulted GIB coordinators can confirm to have ever been notified of that task force or requested by anyone sitting on that task force to submit data on the performance of the GIB DP at their schools.

- The previously mentioned website of the WDA refers to the presentation of WDA’s survey on the GIB of 2017 and the Triple Win Study in the context of the Round Table GIB. The announcement also reads that the convention discussed the current challenges related to the recognition of the GIB diploma by the German universities and possible approaches to a solution. However, it does not specify any resolutions and coordinators have not been notified of any resolutions either.

- Another topic that was discussed in the context of the Round Table GIB was the impact of the conversion of GIB’s GPA on the recognition of GIB diplomas. Moreover, the convened parties deliberated on the sense and possibilities of introducing alternative GIB subjects that must be instructed in the German language. No results of these deliberations have been published.
• The last two topics that were discussed in the context of the Round Table GIB focussed on class material for teachers and students and professional development trainings. The consulted GIB coordinadors could not confirm that the resolutions the convened parties may have made with regard to any of the discussed topics have not been communicated to them.

• The meeting of GIB DP coordinators described in Appendix 1 was an attempt to set up the coordinators of the GIB DP as a political institution in its own right. The invitation to participate was sent to all coordinators from the IB Americas region, included suggested topics, and prompted the invited parties to propose other topics. The resolutions of that convention were agreed on in consensus decisionmaking and forwarded to ZfA’ consultant in that region with the request to reply. A reply never came back. The convention did not appoint any person in particular to represent their collective interests before the German authorities.

• The same process described in the previous point was followed one year later when GIB DP coordinators convened again. In their minutes, the attending GIB DP coordinators specified that they requested of the ZfA to closely collaborate with them (Appendix 2). Again, a reply from the German authorities never came back.

• WDA’s presidency did not comment to my request to specify the topics the two forums discussed.
Lobbypedia, a company specialized in reporting pressure groups working at different ministries in Germany, has no record of the DAS or GIB DAS being represented before the AA.\textsuperscript{218}

**Conclusion:** There is not enough evidence to suggest that the GIB DAS are not legitimately and effectively represented before the German authorities in matters related to the GIB DP. The boards of directors of each GIB DAS may be communicating with the WDA through a liaison who sits on the board of a GIB DAS. However, there is not enough evidence to suggest that the GIB DAS are represented legitimately and effectively before the German authorities. The fact that the WDA hosted a meeting to discuss topics of relevance to the GIB DP does not mean that the purpose of the discussion was to consolidate this program. After all, the attending parties (KMK, ZfA, WDA, IBO) have conflicting interests with regard to the GIB DP and no resolutions or proposed courses of action have been published. Also, Mr. R.’s role is unclear. He is associated with a GIB DAS but seems to work also for the WDA. The fact that coordinators do not forward their information to boards and boards may not obtain all GIB DP related information from principals does not rule out the possibility that the WDA may operate on bad data. The exclusion of GIB DP coordinators from agenda-setting and information-sharing is not conducive to effective political representation. Also, there is evidence suggesting that neither the DAS nor the GIB DAS are officially represented before the AA. As the only conclusive piece of evidence points to No, the value assigned is (value = 0).

**Rating:** 0

Proxy 2: Political Representation Before the IBO

**Proxy question:** Are the GIB DAS legitimately and effectively represented before the IBO?

**Definition:** To lobby the IBO to adopt courses of action that will consolidate the GIB DP and to avoid the collective action problem, the KMK has appointed a representative. The appointee is familiar with KMK’s interests, pursues its interests, operates on good data, and is held accountable for his/her actions.

**Purpose:** To establish the effectiveness of KMK’s lobbying the IBO.

**Calculation method:** Establish the number of instances that suggest political representation of the GIB DAS before the IBO, establish the process of appointment the representative and its quality, establish the responsibilities of the appointee and compare them with achievements attributable to him/her and these achievements’ reach. Estimate the effectiveness of political representation.

**Data required:** Public announcements, e-mails, articles, accounts of stakeholders, internal documents.

**Data sources:** Websites of the KMK, IBO, and WDA; interviews at the KMK, and the headquarters of IB Americas region in Bethesda, Maryland.

**Interpretation:** Legitimacy and effectiveness of political representatives are established on the basis of documented evidence and accounts of stakeholders. If documented evidence and accounts suggest that the appointment involved a democratic procedure and included stakeholders, the representative enjoys authority. Documented evidence must describe the appointee’s responsibilities and achievements. Also, it must indicate that the achievements are shared with the represented parties, who are prompted
to comment on them and to propose further courses of action. If evidence suggests compliance with all of these criteria to some degree, the political representation is regarded legitimate and effective. Likewise, if evidence suggests noncompliance with any of these criteria, the political representation is considered illegitimate and ineffective.

Findings:

- Appendix 19 reflects a part of the minutes of a deliberative session of the School Committee of the KMK dated October 2 and 3, 1986. In this document, item 5 on page 12, paragraph 2, reads that the KMK abstains from appointing a permanent representative to IBO’s governing body for the time being. However, it says that the KMK reserves the right to appoint one such representative if circumstances call for it. Paragraphs 3 and 4 of that same item219 clearly indicate that the KMK has awarded the School Committee a mandate to act on its behalf before the IBO and leave no doubt that the Committee’s actions will be checked.

- IBO’s websites do not contain any indications of a representative within the IBO that would be in charge of representing the interests of the GIB DAS.220

- IBO’s website indicates that the KMK had negotiated with it a recognition agreement and recently the inclusion of new options into the pool of available GIB DP subjects.221
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• All coordinators have confirmed to have received an e-mail from the IBO that indicated the person in charge of attending to their matters. The designated person speaks English and Spanish and is part of IBO’s staff. The designated person does not propose any courses of action aimed at consolidating the structure of the GIB DP at the DAS but accepts proposals.

• During my visit to the headquarters of IB Americas region in Bethesda, Maryland, in February 2016, I inquired about possible representatives of the GIB DAS before the IBO. The response was that there is one such representative, she is domiciled in Netherlands, and speaks directly with the KMK.

• My interviewees at the KMK confirmed that the KMK has designated a person to represent its interests before the IBO and referred me to the stipulations contained in Appendix 19.

• The presentation of the Round Table GIB on WDA’s website GIB specifies that a directive of the IBO took part in the Round Table GIB. That directive is a liaison between the BLASchA and IBO’s presidency.

**Conclusion:** There is enough evidence to suggest that the GIB DP at the DAS is legitimately and effectively represented before the IBO. The appointment process was transparent and followed democratic principles of decision making, the appointee knows exactly what her responsibilities are and she is held accountable for her actions. The representative may have been involved in the negotiation of the new GIB DP subjects for GIB DAS students.

**Rating: 2**
Technical Knowledge of the GIB DP

Technical knowledge includes in-depth understanding of all regimes that govern the functioning of a system. Provisions, benefits resulting from adherence to these provisions and consequences of noncompliance, and expiring provisions are key aspects of technical knowledge. Technical knowledge determines the scope of vulnerability inasmuch as lack thereof leads to skewed perceptions of risk and may induce decision makers to not act when they should or to take inappropriate preventive measures.

Exposed groups who do not have technical knowledge are unable to take appropriate preventive measures directed at enhancing their coping capacity and ability to respond. In the context of the GIB DAS, it is crucial that principals and boards of directors be knowledgeable about the ASchulG and the associated administrative regulations. As of January 1, 2023, the GIB DAS will forfeit their right to request additional ADLKs/BPLKs. Prior to that date, it cannot be ruled out that the AA evaluate these schools’ contribution to the attainment of the AKBP goals. Both these events have the potential to cause great loss at the GIB DAS, unless principals, boards and coordinators are aware of the hazards and take appropriate preventive measures. GIB DP coordinators, on the other hand, must be knowledgeable about all new developments that may affect the program they lead on the operational level. This allows them to keep the principal (and the board of directors, if it were to request any information) informed about new regulations passed by the IBO that, if not observed, could adversely affect their students’ performance. Also, their technical knowledge allows GIB DP coordinators to devise tactics that improve their students’ results without increasing faculty’s workload. Moreover, they have a basic understanding of the scope of the ASchulG and the associated administrative regulations
to explore viable options prior to the impact of a hazard. Thanks to their technical knowledge, principals, members of the boards of directors and GIB DP coordinators are well prepared for AA’s evaluation.

Proxy 1: Principals’ and Boards’ Technical Knowledge of the GIB DP

Proxy question: Do principals and members of the boards of directors receive technical instruction in the field of the GIB DP at the DAS?

Definition: To acquire technical knowledge, principals and members of the boards attend meetings where they receive technical instruction on matters related to the GIB DP at the DAS. There, they engage in discussions on the GIB DP with peers and authorities. As a consequence, principals and members of the boards of directors have updated information on the program and know what steps they must take to ensure their GIB DP’s sustained operation. Therefore, they are prepared to face AA’s evaluation of their schools’ utility.

Purpose: To establish the capacity of principals and members of the boards to anticipate the impact of federal policies affecting the GIB DP.

Calculation method: Estimate principals and boards’ familiarity with GIB DP related affairs on the basis of documented evidence and information obtained from principals and the WDA.

Data required: Accounts, articles.

Data sources: Principals, WDA websites.

Interpretation: Principals and members of the boards are expected to be savvy in GIB DP related affairs and to have the capacity to anticipate the impact of federal
policies if they engage in forums that offer the opportunity to expand on technical knowledge about the GIB DP. As a consequence, they comprehend the reach of the stipulations of the ASchulG and associated administrative regulations and their impact on their schools. If evidence suggests that principals and members of the boards do not get the input necessary to comprehend the GIB DP, they are considered not knowledgeable about the GIB DP.

Findings:

- The WDA organizes American meetings for the DAS on an annual basis. These meetings are restricted to principals and members of the boards of the DAS who are located in North and Latin America. The meetings were initiated in 2010 and offer the attendees a forum to discuss school-related affairs. In these meetings, the WDA stages informative sessions on the latest developments in politics that may affect the DAS in the Americas. The selected venues have included the B-DAS Bogotá (2010), GIB DAS San Salvador (2011), GIB DAS Guadalajara (2012), B-DAS Rio de Janeiro (2013), GIB DAS Cuenca (2014), B-DAS Puebla (2015), GIB DAS Buenos Aires (2016) and B-DAS Lima (2017).  

- At the meetings in 2011, 2012, 2014, 2016, and 2017, GIB DP-related topics were a subject of discussion. These discussions mostly revolved around the implications of the strict regulations that the ASchulG have for budgetary and human capital planning at the GIB DAS. The 2018 meeting occurred in October and was held at the GIB DAS Valdivia. On average, some 35 schools out of the
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44 DAS that exist in the Americas send representatives to these annual meetings. However, the available documents do not reveal how many of the attendees were principals and how many were members of boards.

- Principals I have interviewed confirmed that in the preparation courses they receive prior to their foreign service, GIB DP related topics are presented to them. These sessions revolve around operational topics such as subject selection and use of the GIB diploma, but do not treat topics related to legal provisions that may adversely affect the GIB DAS.

**Conclusion:** Evidence suggests that principals and the boards of directors are very likely to have technical knowledge of the GIB DP and the capacity to anticipate the impact of hazards in their schools. The WDA organizes America Meetings for the DAS and thus provides a forum for principals and members of the boards of directors to discuss GIB DP related topics. Four of the eight meetings that have been realized so far were held at a GIB DAS and on five occasions the GIB DP appeared on the agenda, including the last two years. The meeting of 2017 was held at a B-DAS and GIB DP related topics were still discussed. This suggests that the GIB DP has become an important subject of debate. This year’s meeting will be hosted by the GIB DAS Valdivia. Given that an employee of that school, who is reported to act as a representative of the GIB DP, has been incorporated into the WDA, it is fair to assume that the GIB DP will appear on this year’s agenda again. There is an upward tendency in the discussions of GIB DP related topics, which allows for concluding that principals and members of the boards are well aware of the hazards their schools are exposed to.

*Rating: 2*
Proxy 2: Unintentional Communication with OLKs in Germany

**Proxy question:** Are GIB DP coordinators knowledgeable about all matters relevant to ensure sustained continuation of the GIB DP?

**Definition:** GIB DP coordinators know that all provision of the Handbook of Procedures, IB Programme standards and practices, the ASchulG and the associated administrative regulations are equally important to the survival of the GIB DP at their school. To be up to date, they attend relevant meetings and professional development sessions where they expand on their knowledge of the GIB DP and engage in discussions with their peers. As a consequence, GIB DP coordinators have updated information on the regulations governing the GIB DP and know what steps they must take to make the GIB DP work and produce positive results.

**Purpose:** To establish the capacity of GIB DP coordinators to ensure positive education outcomes and anticipate hazards to their GIB DP.

**Calculation method:** Estimate GIB DP coordinators’ familiarity with GIB DP related affairs on the basis of information obtained from them directly.

**Data required:** Accounts, five-year self-evaluation questionnaire.

**Data sources:** GIB DP coordinators, IBO website, minutes of coordinator meetings.

**Interpretation:** GIB DP coordinators are knowledgeable about all the provisions included in the Handbook of Procedures and IB Programme standards and practices. Therefore, they know which subject combinations are possible, what measures they can take to reduce the workload for students and faculty, and what tactics they can pursue to boost the results of their GIB DP students. Also, they are familiar with the incentives
their school has to produce as many GIB diplomas and DSD II certificates as possible. Therefore, they understand the reason why ADLKs/BPLKs are assigned fewer classes and receive a lighter workload than their OLK peers. Last but not least, they know that funding of their school largely depends on their hard and soft skills. If any of these criteria is not fulfilled, they are considered to be familiar with the inner workings of the program, but not conscious of the hazards they are exposed to. Therefore, they are not considered knowledgeable of the GIB DP.

Findings:

- All coordinators must attend a professional development training for coordinators organized by the IBO. However, if they do it or not will not be controlled by anyone until the next five-year self-evaluation.

- My experience with the GIB DP coordinators has shown that all but one had taken such training. The only coordinator who had not taken the training was new to his position and was scheduled to attend the training within months.

- Item 1 on page 4 in Appendix 1 reflects coordinators’ awareness of the need to have their staff adequately trained at a reasonable cost (organization of on-site training sessions instead of sending their staff abroad). Also, it shows the tactics they devise to reduce the workload of the ADLKs in Biology and OLKs in Mathematics and to improve the results of students without impacting the workload of the faculty of other subjects (to not assign teachers groups from different programs and grades and concentrate workload in clusters instead). To eliminate free riding of the faculty that is not involved in the GIB DP, they recommend forming groups of teachers who will be collectively responsible for a
subject and to pay all teachers equally. Also, they recommend a few other measures that aim at eliminating the collective action problem with regard to the recruitment of properly trained teachers.

- In the minutes in Appendix 2, the GIB DP coordinators recommend expanding the number of GIB DP subjects available to make the GIB DP more attractive to the students.

- My observations and own experience have shown that GIB DP coordinators are unaware of the stipulations of the ASchulG and the associated administrative regulations. As a matter of fact, I was unaware of them, too, before I started to write this thesis. Principals’ unequal assigning of workload to ADLKs and OLKs was one of the most discussed topics in the meetings and none of us had a plausible and well-founded argument for it.

- My observations and experience found that coordinators are not always familiar with the DSD exams and their importance to the schools. As a matter of fact, some coordinators displayed an attitude toward the DSD programs that was not much different from the one that their German OLK peers and school management display toward the GIB DP, i.e., some degree of disregard and detachment.

- My observations and experience found that coordinators are well aware of the impact of their hard and soft skills on education outcomes. Still, some coordinators are professionally better prepared to do their job well than others. For example, coordinators who do not speak German (in 2017, only 5 of the reported 22 V-GIB coordinators in Latin America had good command of German)
lack the capacity to assess the quality of teacher and student materials that are not available in Spanish. Also, they cannot help their students to decide which university in Germany is the appropriate one for them, what use their GIB diploma at determined universities in Germany has and how to interpret the conversion of GIB GPA into Abitur-GPA. Other coordinators did not have a good command of Spanish, which did not make them credible to the parents of students. Also, some German coordinators have displayed deficiencies in the interpretation of non-, para- and extra-verbally conveyed units of communication and got stuck at the minimization stage of intercultural communication, which invariably led to miscommunication.

**Conclusion:** In general, GIB DP coordinators are familiar with the inner workings of the program, but they are not conscious of the hazards they are exposed to. They know very well how to optimize teaching hours, motivate faculty and students, and work toward the attainment of their GIB diploma quotas. However, some of them do not establish the interdependent relation between the DSD certificates and GIB diplomas and the importance the DSD and GIB programs have for the GIB DAS. In most cases, local coordinators tend to be better skilled in the use of soft power, whereas coordinators with a German background display more practical skills. Likewise, there are also local coordinators who speak some German and perform well and those who do not speak any German and perform even better. This is mostly thanks to their long experience as coordinators at a GIB DAS, which is especially the case at some of the GIB DAS who

---

participated in the trial phase. In any case, most GIB DP coordinators if not all lack the
capacity to anticipate the hazards that flow from the stipulations of the ASchulG.

Rating: 1

Communication

Communication is the core of every organization as it determines its effectiveness
and strength. Whether it flows upward, downward, or sideways, whether it is realized
either orally or in written form, or takes place in formal or informal settings, that defines
the speed with which sender and receiver can exchange information, react, and achieve
the intended purpose.224 If all parties to a communicative act pursue the same goal and
want to avoid miscommunication, they share information with each other. Free
information sharing avoids cheating and enhances accountability.

In the context of the GIB DAS, in order for communication to reduce the
susceptibility of GIB DAS’ organizational structure to hazards, it must progress in both
ways between key stakeholders. Also, the administration of each GIB DAS must be
aware that the school communicates with the outside world even though it may not intend
to do so. The way the school presents itself to the outside world is how its quality in
education and commitment to the GIB DP and German teachers will be perceived. As the
founder of pragmatics in human communication Paul Watzlawick emphasized: one
cannot not communicate.225


Proxy 1: Information Sharing

   Proxy question: Do communication flows in organizational structure of the GIB DAS promote this structure’s stability?

   Definition: Information-sharing and accountability of stakeholders are key to the stability of a social structure. Therefore, each member who is crucial to the stability of the structure shares information with other crucial members without any constraint. The information-sharing process flows both ways. Therefore, members can check the information they receive from other parties and can hold them accountable for their actions.

   Purpose: To identify weak points in the communication process between crucial members in GIB DAS’ organizational structure as these weak points reduce this structure’s stability.

   Calculation method: Identify crucial members in the communication process. Establish communication flows between all members of the school community as well as between crucial members inside and outside the school community. Identify if communication between crucial members flows both ways and promotes accountability. Assign the value 2 if Yes, 1 if it is one-way and accountability is limited, and 0 if No. Count and rate 2 if Yes for all, 1 if Yes and No, and 0 if No for all.

   Data required: Data from the analysis part.

   Data sources: E-mails, articles, websites, minutes.

   Interpretation: Communication between crucial stakeholders flows freely if the final rating is 2; communication is satisfactory if the rating is 1; communication is ineffective if the rating is 0. If the value is 2, all stakeholders share their information with
other crucial members freely and are held accountable for the data they forward to other members. The value 1 is assigned to stakeholders who do not practice two-way communication and are not fully held accountable for their actions. Value 0 means that there is no two-way communication between crucial stakeholders. As a consequence, there is no accountability and the organizational structure of the affected GIB DAS is susceptible to hazards.

Findings:

- Crucial members in communication on matters related to the GIB DP are GIB DP coordinators, principals, boards of directors, the WDA, the ZfA, and the AA.

  GIB DP coordinators are key because they collect raw data in the field, administer them, and submit them to the principal without processing. Principals are decisive as they process the data they receive from coordinators and send them in their reports to the ZfA.

  The ZfA is essential because it interprets the information included in the reports from principals, produces its own reports for the AA based on the data they have received from principals, and disseminates statistics on the performance of the GIB DAS. The AA is vital because its makes final decisions regarding the GIB DAS based on the information it receives from the ZfA. The WDA is important too because it is a pressure group with direct access to political decision makers who has the power to influence outcomes. The WDA gets its data on the GIB DP from principals and boards. Boards are central because on the household
level they are the only strategic stakeholders. As such, they depend on good data to be able to devise viable long-term prevention plans for their schools.

To illustrate how communication flows between all members of GIB DAS’ organizational structure, Figure 4 below reflects communication flows as discussed in Chapter 5. The arrows indicate communication flows on matters related to the GIB DP. The dotted arrows indicate that communication on GIB DP related matters could be possible but is not practiced, either because resorting to this practice implies forgoing the regular conduct with all the consequences that skipping a nexus in a hierarchically operating organizational structure entails or because the corresponding parties choose to not embrace it. In any case, the dotted lines represent failures in accountability in GIB DP related matters. The grey lines connect the members of the Round Table GIB.
Figure 4. Communication Flows in GIB DAS’ Organizational Structure

Source: Thesis author
- Students and parents feed the coordinator with data and the coordinator provides feedback. Students and parents also inform faculty and management, but communication of faculty and management with the students and parents in GIB DP related matters is limited to information-sharing concerning curricular affairs (faculty) or affairs that intersect with affairs from the national programs (management).

Faculty and the coordinator exchange their information freely. Faculty and management (excluding coordinators) communicate freely, yet only on affairs that intersect with affairs from the national programs.

The coordinator and management communicate freely in the best-case scenario. In real life, the coordinator informs management but hardly ever gets any feedback from them. The same panorama applies to the communication between the coordinator and the principal. The principal requests of the coordinator to submit all data on the GIB DP he/she has but abstains from doing the same the other way. Management and the principal communicate on the GIB DP with the purpose of checking coordinators. Faculty inform the principal whenever they are required to do so, also with the purpose of checking coordinators.

The center piece in the information-sharing process is the principal. The principal requests information from all stakeholders yet shares his/her information freely with the ZfA and the WDA only. If he/she chooses to, he/she also includes the board in this process. The school community (excluding the board) has no authority to check the principal on the accuracy of the information he/she commands and forwards to the other members of the structure. The board has that authority but may lack incentives to
exercise it too thoroughly. The board also has the authority to request information from the management and the coordinator, but skipping the principal means openly undermining his/her authority. Therefore, the board prefers not to do it. Management has no authority and no incentives to skip the principal and communicate with the board freely.

Communication between the board and the ZfA is limited to notifications of principal candidates and delivery of reports. Both these instances may or may not be related to the GIB DP. In any case, the board lacks incentives to communicate with the ZfA with the purpose of checking the principal on the accuracy of his/her reports. The board and the WDA communicate freely, while between the WDA and the coordinator there is no communication at all.

The ZfA and the coordinator could communicate freely but the ZfA prefers to not keep this communication channel open. The ZfA communicates freely with the AA but does not communicate directly with the KMK. The KMK obtains its information on the GIB DP at the DAS from the BLAschA, who is the nexus between the AA and the KMK. Communication between the IBO and the German authorities lies in the hands of the KMK, whose educational federalism constraint provides no incentives to promote the GIB DP at the DAS.

Free communication between the AA, the ZfA, the BLAschA, the WDA and the IBO on GIB DP related affairs is only a recent phenomenon that takes the form of the Round Table GIB.

**Conclusion:** Communication flows between members of the organizational structure of the GIB DAS may be a serious weak point in this structure as two-way
sideward and downward communication stops at the level of principals. Coordinators collect all information there is on the GIB DP and forward it to principals. There are multiple bodies checking the accuracy of the information collected by coordinators. If they were to detect any anomalies, these bodies will inform principals about what they found out and coordinators will be held accountable for their actions. Therefore, coordinators are assigned the value (2): They communicate freely, and their information is checked.

Principals receive their information mainly from coordinators and may check the accuracy of that information with multiple bodies. However, they are not obliged to inviting anyone from the school to crosscheck the information they include in their reports to the ZfA. Therefore, they may go unchecked and may not be held accountable for their actions. If boards exercise their authority to check, principals are held accountable for the accuracy of their information. However, boards lack incentives to exercise that power. Thus, principals are assigned the value (1): They are the neuralgic point in the whole organizational structure of the GIB DAS and their information is not necessarily checked.

Boards receive their information from principals. That information may or may not be accurate. As they do not crosscheck it with coordinators, they may be operating on skewed data. As a consequence, they may be forwarding skewed data to the ZfA and the WDA. This practice is not conducive to anyone’s accountability, therefore the value assigned is (0).

The ZfA and the WDA both receive their information from principals and boards. They may be operating on skewed data and forward it to the AA without crosschecking.
them. As the AA (and by extension the KMK) makes decisions that impact the whole structure, ZfA, WDA and the boards’ failure to crosscheck the information they receive from principals enhances the susceptibility of GIB DAS’ organizational structure. Therefore, the value assigned is (0).

The disconnect between coordinators and boards on the one hand, and coordinators and the ZfA and the WDA on other hand as well as the unchecked authority of principals to interpret raw data promote decision-making based on bad data and reduce the involved members’ accountability to the other members of the organizational structure of the GIB DAS. The findings produced in the analysis of the indicator under study suggest that the accuracy of all information regarding the performance of the GIB DP at a DAS is a function of the professional skills of coordinators and professional ethics of principals. If either one of these two is not given, the structure of a GIB DAS may be brought down by the dynamic factor “human behavior.” However, as human behavior is not generalizable and because everybody deserves the benefit of the doubt, this indicator is rated (1).

Rating: 1

Proxy 2: Unintentional Communication with OLKs in Germany

Proxy question: Do administrators have a long-term plan to consolidate the GIB DP at their DAS?

Definition: Administrators of the GIB DAS are aware of the importance of the GIB DP to their school’s continued operation as a DAS and of their constraints in hiring ADLKs/BPLKs. To ensure stable federal funding in the long run and conservation of
their DAS status, they are interested in attracting OLKs from Germany for them to teach classes in the GIB DP and work toward the award of at least twelve GIB diplomas per year. To this end, they have released funds to set up and maintain their school’s website in the German language. They care about presenting information in the German language on the help relocating German-speaking OLKs will receive from their employer.

**Purpose:** To identify administrators’ farsightedness with regard to the conservation of their DAS status.

**Calculation method:** Visit the websites of all GIB DAS. Find the links to pages specifying perks for travelling German-speaking OLKs. Identify if the information these schools provide on the help relocating German-speaking OLKs will receive from them. Assign the value 2 if Yes and extensive, 1 if Yes but inconclusive, and 0 if None. Count the values (19 schools x 2 = 38) and rate 2 if Yes for more than 75% (≥28.5), 1 if Yes and No between 74% and 25% (28 – 9.5), and 0 if No 24% or less (≤9).

**Data required:** Website presentations.

**Data sources:** Websites of all GIB DAS in Latin America.

**Interpretation:** Knowing that as of 2023 the V-GIB DAS will not be able to hire more than one ADLK and aware of their dependence on the DAS status to be eligible for federal funds, administrators take preventive measures and try to attract as many OLKs from Germany as possible. OLKs domiciled in Germany will seek employment at a DAS abroad, if they find one that offers attractive work conditions and helps them to relocate. To present their school as an attractive place of work, administrators see to it that their school presents itself to the general public as an employer who cares about new staff. Therefore, the school describes in the German language the help that travelling German-
speaking OLKs will receive when they relocate. They have already started to compete with other GIB DAS over German-speaking OLKs because they know that it takes a German OLK some time to familiarize himself/herself with the GIB DP curriculum and to ensure positive results. If the information provided on the help for travelling OLKs is extensive, the corresponding administrator’s support of the GIB DP will be rated 2. If the information provided is specified in German but rather scanty, the rating is 1. 0 will be assigned to administrators who fail to make sure that information on their help for travelling German-speaking OLKs appears on their school’s website.

Findings: Table 7 presents the findings relevant to the analyzed criterion.

Table 7. Links to Websites of 20 V-GIB DAS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Website</th>
<th>Help in GER (2 – 1- 0)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arequipa</td>
<td><a href="http://www.cmu.edu.pe/de/trabajaenelcmu/">http://www.cmu.edu.pe/de/trabajaenelcmu/</a></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asunción</td>
<td><a href="https://www.goethe.edu.py/home.html">https://www.goethe.edu.py/home.html</a></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barranquilla</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ds-barranquilla.org/de/unsere-schule/die-schule/">http://www.ds-barranquilla.org/de/unsere-schule/die-schule/</a></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bs As (Ballester)</td>
<td><a href="https://iballester.edu.ar">https://iballester.edu.ar</a></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bs As (Pestalozzi)</td>
<td><a href="http://www.pestalozzi.edu.ar">http://www.pestalozzi.edu.ar</a></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cali</td>
<td><a href="http://www.dscal.edu.co/2_5/de/internationale-kontakte/information-fuer-neuankoemmlinge">http://www.dscal.edu.co/2_5/de/internationale-kontakte/information-fuer-neuankoemmlinge</a></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concepción</td>
<td><a href="http://dschile.cl/de/#">http://dschile.cl/de/#</a></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuenca</td>
<td><a href="http://www.cues.edu.ec">http://www.cues.edu.ec</a></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guadalajara</td>
<td><a href="http://www.colegioalemangualajara.edu.mx/nuestro_colegio.php?=informacion">http://www.colegioalemangualajara.edu.mx/nuestro_colegio.php?=informacion</a></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guayaquil</td>
<td><a href="http://www.cahgye.edu.ec/ceibos/espanol/index.php">http://www.cahgye.edu.ec/ceibos/espanol/index.php</a></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lima</td>
<td><a href="http://www.cbi.edu.pe">http://www.cbi.edu.pe</a></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managua</td>
<td><a href="https://www.coalnic.edu.ni">https://www.coalnic.edu.ni</a></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medellín</td>
<td><a href="http://www.colegioalemanmedellin.edu.co">http://www.colegioalemanmedellin.edu.co</a></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Salvador</td>
<td><a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Q6UOE1Pvc70">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Q6UOE1Pvc70</a></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td><a href="http://ds-santacruz.bo/de/">http://ds-santacruz.bo/de/</a></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>Website</td>
<td>Help in GER (2 – 1 - 0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temperley</td>
<td><a href="http://temperleyschule.edu.ar/aleman/unsere-schule/unserschulprofil/88">http://temperleyschule.edu.ar/aleman/unsere-schule/unserschulprofil/88</a></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valdivia</td>
<td><a href="https://www.dsvolivia.cl/olk/">https://www.dsvolivia.cl/olk/</a></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valparaiso</td>
<td><a href="http://www.dsvolpo.cl/de/gib/">http://www.dsvolpo.cl/de/gib/</a></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.dsvolpo.cl/de/">http://www.dsvolpo.cl/de/</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: thesis author

**Conclusion:** A vast majority of GIB DAS administrators seem to lack a long-term plan geared toward consolidating the GIB DP at their schools. Only 3 out of 19 administrators of the GIB DAS have made sure that their school’s website offers conclusive information presented in the German language on the help German teachers will receive from their new employer upon relocation when scouring the websites of the GIB DAS for job opportunities. These schools include the GIB DAS Arequipa, Cali and San Salvador. According to the data presented in Table 3, the GIB DAS Arequipa and Cali display relatively lower percentages of German-speaking OLKs relative to their non-German speaking peers than those observed at the other GIB DAS. Therefore, it makes sense for them to constantly look for new German staff. However, apart from the GIB DAS Concepción, Guadalajara, Managua, San Salvador, Santiago and Valdivia all other schools also display ratios lower than one German-speaking OLK to two non-German-speaking OLKs. For them, it would also make sense to look for new German OLKs. Still, they remain quiet.
Relating the data from Table 3 to the finding of this section suggests that administrators of the DAS Arequipa, Cali and San Salvador are aware of the shortage of German-speaking OLKs, consider the GIB DP important to the survival of their school as a DAS, have anticipated the race for German-speaking OLKs that is sure to begin in the next few years, and actually care about being awarded as many GIB diplomas as possible. Therefore, they have either followed their far-sighted principal’s suggestion to free up resources for the setup and maintenance of enticing websites presented in the German language or have come up themselves with a tactic to attract new qualified staff as of now. In any case, they seem to support the idea of sustaining the GIB DP at their school in the long run. The GIB DAS San Salvador, on the other hand, features a relatively high ratio of German-speaking OLKs relative to non-German speaking OLKs and should not be expected to vie with competing schools for more OLKs. Still, the administrator at this school has decided to not rest on his/her laurels and to spur competition among the OLKs by attracting new ones. The twenty-nine-minute video this school offers to interested parties shows the school from its best side and is certainly enticing.

No other administrator seems to recognize the importance of long-term positive results in the GIB DP to the survival of their school as a DAS. A plausible alternative explanation is that some locations may see large sizes of population of German origin or are attractive enough to German-speaking OLKs for schools in these places to not be concerned about them being able to hire German-speaking OLKs on short notice. These schools include especially the ones that feature ratios of German-speaking OLKs relative to non-German speaking OLKs of at least 1:2 as presented in Table 3. In total, six out of the nineteen GIB DAS in Latin America display this ratio or a higher one. However,
hoping that the current workforce will stay at these schools beyond the year 2023 isn’t much of a long-term plan. Therefore, this proxy is rated (value = 0).

Rating: 0
Chapter 7

Findings and Conclusion

This chapter provides the answers to my research question and the three related sub-questions specified in Chapter 1. First, I highlight the findings from this investigation and make three policy recommendations whose implementation will reduce the susceptibility of the GIB DAS. Then, I make a recommendation for future research on the GIB DAS. Next, I describe how the assessment tool employed in this study can be expanded to capture all aspects of relevance to the assessment of GIB DAS’ vulnerability. Finally, I present my conclusions.

Answer to the Research Question

The central research question was how susceptible the structural organization of the GIB DAS is to an evaluation of these schools as a useful foreign policy tool. Considering the ratings of each proxy assessed, the answer to this question is “considerably susceptible.” Five proxies were rated (0), two were rated (2), and the remaining five proxies each earned the value of (1). The overall value produced for the vulnerability component “susceptibility” is (9). In line with the assessment tool and the grading and calculation procedures specified in Chapter 3, GIB DAS’ overall organizational structure is currently “unstable.”
Answers to the Related Sub-Questions

Sub-question #1: Are all GIB DAS equally susceptible? The answer to this question is No. The ones that are particularly susceptible are the V-GIB DAS located in Latin America and more specifically those in the Andean region.

The V-DAS are entitled to considerably fewer federal means and resources than the D and B-DAS. Accordingly, it is the V-GIB DAS and not the D or B-GIB DAS who have to be concerned about their future as a DAS. There are 22 V-GIB DAS, and 19 are located in the Latin American region. The remaining ones are in Asia (Beirut and Ho Chi Minh City) and New York City. The two V-GIB DAS in Asia may not have to be as concerned about their future funding, as the AA is clearly pivoting toward Asia and not considering the Latin American region as part of its main focus. Given that the AA may sustain a school even if the school does not produce the expected results, as long as it serves AA’ geopolitical interests it is unlikely that the V-GIB DAS of Asia will receive the same treatment by the AA as the V-GIB DAS in the Latin American region.

Another distinction of the V-GIB DAS has to be made on the regional level. Some GIB DAS in Latin America provide education services to a considerably larger number of students of German origin than others. In absolute and relative terms, the V-GIB DAS Pestalozzi, Ballester and Temperley in Argentina, Valparaíso in Chile, Santa Cruz in Bolivia, San Salvador in El Salvador and Managua in Nicaragua feature considerably higher numbers and ratios of students of German origin and German-speaking students relative to the overall number of students observed in schools located in Colombia, Ecuador and Peru. The GIB DAS with high numbers of students of German origin and German-speaking students provide the AA political incentives to sustain these
schools as the AA can expect more of their students to study in Germany than students who have no historical tie to Germany. Also, the AA is obliged to cater to the education needs of German expatriates.

When percentages of German-speaking OLKs relative to non-German-speaking OLKs are considered, schools that have low ratios are expected to be more susceptible than otherwise. Schools that feature relatively low ratios of German-speaking OLKs relative to non-German-speaking OLKs include, in the Andean region, the GIB DAS Arequipa, Barranquilla, Cali, Cuenca, Guayaquil, Lima, Medellín and Santa Cruz. However, the GIB DAS Cali and Arequipa seem to be countering their susceptibility by pursuing a long-term plan that attracts new German OLKs through online presentations.

Relating all these findings to each other, the answer to the first sub-question is that the GIB DAS Barranquilla, Cuenca, Guayaquil, Lima and Medellín are the most susceptible to AA’s evaluation of their utility to the German foreign interests.

Sub-question #2: What are the structural root causes of GIB DAS’ susceptibility? The structural root causes I have identified include (1) Germany’s pivot toward specific world regions; (2) educational federalism; (3) incoherent responses to market needs and incoherent curriculum adjustments; (4) market imperfections in the provision of teachers and principals; (5) lack of accountability of principals to their school community, (6) principals’ unfamiliarity with the GIB DP and lack of incentives to engage in it, and (7) management’s fear of creative destruction.

The Latin American region does not play a major role in AA’s strategic plans (1), which provides no incentives for the AA to sponsor the V-GIB DAS any more than they do now. Educational federalism creates collective action problems which prevent the
KMK and the ZfA from engaging in activity conducive to strengthening the organizational structure of the GIB DAS through central coordination of GIB DAS’ common interests (2). DAS students prefer to study natural sciences and engineering in Germany but see a curriculum at their GIB DAS that is biased toward humanities (3). Their subject election options are expanded to subjects which suffer from teacher shortages or in which GIB DAS students have traditionally performed poorly (4). The shortage of principals creates incentives for boards to not hold principals accountable for their actions or inactions (5). In principals, in turn, unfamiliarity with the GIB DP leads to a low degree of identification with the program, while lack of accountability to their school communities creates them incentives to stay clear of the considerable additional workload that the GIB DP implies (6). Following the example of the leader, inward-oriented management do not have to fear major consequences if they freeride on the GIB DP (7). This attitude is then adopted by inward-oriented staff, who are the vast majority at the GIB DAS. Outward-oriented staff could be motivated enough to engage, but do not have incentives to do so. Principals, management and administrators often lack empathy for the GIB DP and therefore fail to duly compensate additional work in the GIB DP. Moreover, there are no adequate teacher and student materials available in German for two key subjects of the GIB DP. Therefore, teachers of the GIB DP subjects to be taught in German cannot prepare their students adequately for the final exams and expose themselves to critique if the GIB DP results are not as good as anticipated. The result is low motivation in teachers, which eventually leads them to freeride, too. Freeriding does not promote professional competition among peers and low competition lowers the standards. In the end, students earn relatively poor results in the GIB DP. These are often
not good enough for students to seamlessly take up their desired university program in Germany. The ensuing backlash at the schools may spark a drop of demand for the GIB DP and consequently generate lower numbers of GIB diplomas. Ultimately, this chain of events may lead the AA to conclude that the GIB DAS are not performing the task they were created for. As there is no pressure group advocating exclusively their interests before the AA and because two-way sideward and downward communication in the GIB DAS terminates at the level of principals, critics can freely slander the GIB DAS as complicated and the GIB DAS may not even know it. The result is a skewed risk perception and no preparedness for hazards at the GIB DAS.

Sub-question #3: What can the GIB DAS do to minimize their susceptibility? To minimize GIB DAS’ susceptibility, I have three tactical recommendations which I am confident will break down the previously described vicious circle and eliminate a number or ailments from which the GIB DAS currently suffer:

1. To increase their leverage over principals and ensure principals’ accountability to their host schools, my first recommendation is that boards present the proposed principal candidates with their individual school’s action plan. The proposed candidate has to commit himself/herself to the goals and the deadlines therein specified. One of the provisions of the GIB DP should request principals’ involvement in academic activity in the GIB DP, for example through the supervision of EEs. If he/she defects from his/her commitments, boards will have a tangible argument to approach the ZfA with a request to replace the principal without anyone losing their face.
Once principals start engaging in the GIB DP, they are sure to develop some degree of empathy for students and faculty engrained in the GIB DP and support consolidation of the GIB DP. More importantly, engaging principals in the GIB DP will spotlight them as leaders worth following. The ensuing trickle-down effect will initiate a virtuous circle. Seeing that they are held accountable for their actions or inactions, principals will have incentives to motivate their management to commit themselves to the GIB DP, too. If they don’t, they can be replaced by professionals who do on just grounds without the school association having to incur in compensatory payments. Accordingly, the inward-oriented faculty will be prompted to reevaluate their attitude and their affiliation with an international school. Last but not least, students and parents will appreciate the changing conditions as the entire school community will be geared toward finding solutions to reduce the stress levels of students and to improve their results.

2. My second recommendation is meant for administrators: Start planning for a future with no more than one ADLK, start recruiting German OLKs in Germany, and start creating incentives for German-speaking and non-German-speaking OLKs to commit themselves to the GIB DAS in the long term. To recruit German OLKs, administrators had better see to it that their schools present themselves attractively on school websites and offer economic and non-economic incentives. To design online school presentations in German is not costly and considerably increases the chances of producing the desired effect. To create incentives for faculty is pricier than picking up half the costs of one ADLK or operating the school without any funding from Germany. Once all OLKs realize that GIB DP’s
major workload is duly recognized by the school, a sound competition among
them will emerge. OLKs will be motivated to excel to reap the promised
economic and non-economic benefits. They will complete additional professional
training and thus spark sound competition between colleagues. Competition will
increase the academic standards, produce better education outcomes, and spur
demand for the GIB DP in the local markets. An increase in demand will benefit
the entire school community as the AA will find little reason to question the
utility of the GIB DAS.

3. My third recommendation is that the ZfA free up additional resources for the
establishment of central coordination of the GIB DAS. Constant communication
with coordinators, organization of professional development training sessions in
the regions, search for properly trained teachers willing to engage in the GIB DP,
design of teacher and student materials for GIB DP courses, design and
maintenance of a virtual platform for GIB DP teachers to exchange their
experiences and materials are all measures that require a relatively small amount
of investment yet are sure to boost the education outcomes in the GIB DP in the
long run. More importantly, central coordination of GIB DP activity at the DAS
will provide a checking instance for principals and eliminate their lack of
incentives to promote consolidation of the program.

Proposal for Future Research on the GIB DAS

In the event that AA invokes Section 3, clause 2 of the ASchulG against all V-
GIB DAS or any one V-GIB DAS in particular, the affected schools have one option that
could turn out to be viable: they can stick with the DP (that is, not the GIB DP) and
continue to offer the DSD I and DSD II language certificates. This move means that
affected schools will not be able to award school-leaving certificates that entitle their
holders to enter a German university directly, which will certainly not appeal to some
local clients. However, it will make the schools attractive to other shares of the local
population. The affected schools will forfeit their official DAS status, yet gain the status
of a DPS school (*Deutsche Profilschule*, German Profile School). DPS also enjoy ZfA’s
support and AA’s funding, although in minor proportions (see Chapter 4). Most
importantly, DSD graduates will meet the requirements for the application to pre-
university programs in Germany: To hold a school-leaving certificate from the host
country that qualifies its holder for admission to a university in the host country and
proficiency in German at the B2/C1 level. Once they successfully complete a pre-
university program, students will be authorized to take up university studies in Germany
in programs their *numerus clausus* is good enough for. Also, DPS offering the IB DP will
no longer be constrained by provisions of the KMK Resolution. Therefore, students will
be able to choose any one subject from the groups 3 and 4 and have the liberty to select
any one subject from group 6, too. These possibilities will surely attract new clients in
numbers that will offset the numbers of families turning their back on the schools that
they no longer consider to be “genuinely German”. In sum, the tradeoff of abandoning
the GIB DP and the constraints of the KMK Agreement in favor of the IB DP and the
relative liberties that come along with the DPS status could pay off for the affected
schools. To find out how large the potential benefits from adopting the IB DP at the
expense of losing the DAS status would be, could be the central question of future
research on the GIB DAS. The V-GIB DAS will be surely interested in knowing the answer to this puzzle.

**Proposal for Continuation of the Vulnerability Assessment**

For parties interested in expanding the assessment tool presented in this study by including the two factors that are missing (“capacity to respond” and “ability to adapt”) and applying it to their school to determine its particular degree of vulnerability, I propose to proceed as follows.

“Capacity to respond” can be operationalized through the indicators “alternative emergency plan” and “speed of implementation of alternative emergency plan.” The corresponding proxies could be, for example, (1) “length of employment of teachers in the GIB DP” and (2) “academic background of teachers employed in the GIB DP. The logic behind these three proxies is the following:

- The more experienced and knowledgeable the teachers currently employed in the GIB DP are, the easier it will be for the affected school to replace the GIB DP with the IB DP. Teachers who teach Spanish, mathematics, English, and German will not have to complete any additional professional training as they are already trained in DP subjects. Teachers for the subjects of groups 3, 4, and 6 that will be taught in Spanish must be trained. But the pool of available human capital for these subjects is much larger in the local markets than is the case with the German OLKs. Having the option to choose from among various candidates will spur competition in the faculty and eventually raise academic standards. Students and families can be expected to embrace this development and the possibility of
choosing from a larger pool of subjects than the GIB DP allows. Consequently, schools offering the IB DP and the DSD options will become more attractive to a broader public than is the case today. All these factors could offset the affected school’s loss of funding from Germany and therefore not endanger their continued operation as a DSD school under the German banner.

- If the affected schools employ faculty with an academic background that makes them eligible for teaching IB DP subjects of the groups 3, 4, and 6, they will be able to change from GIB DP to IB DP instantly. Professional development training for these subjects is offered in Spanish in the IB Americas region throughout the year and teachers can be expected to adapt their specialized knowledge to novel teaching techniques within short periods of time.

The indicator “ability to adapt” could be operationalized through the proxies “alternative sources of finance” and “strategic alliances with local educational institutions.” The logic behind both these proxies is straightforward:

- Schools establish their financial dependence on the federal funds under the ASchulG. Then they eliminate all ADLK-related costs from the equation. Also, they eliminate the increased cost of employment of German OLKs working in the Kindergarten section and of those who teach subjects in German that will no longer be offered in German (biology, mathematics). The next step is to establish the amount of freed-up funds and the final amount of all funds they have at their disposal. This information will tell them if, and in what proportions, they have to tap into additional funding sources.
• If schools lose their DAS status, they will not have to focus primarily on sending their graduates to universities in Germany. Consequently, they can establish agreements with local and regional universities to facilitate their graduates’ admission. This move will make the affected schools attractive to a broader public.

Rating and scaling could follow the same logic as applied in this study to the calculation of susceptibility. Then, the overall vulnerability score will be calculated in line with the logic underlying the PAR model, namely:

\[
\text{Vulnerability} = \text{Susceptibility} - (\text{Capacity to respond} + \text{Ability to adapt})
\]

If the equation produces a result indicating substantial losses for the GIB DAS, they may want to consider the alternative option: To create incentives for their current faculty to commit themselves to the GIB DP.

Conclusion

This study has shown that the GIB DAS are currently considerably susceptible to an evaluation of their utility as a tool of Germany’s foreign policy and that their organizational structure is unstable. The scope of potential losses the GIB DAS will suffer if the evaluation produces adverse results, and they do not take appropriate preventive measures, is likely to exceed the scope of efforts they could make in the short term for the AA to evaluate them as a tool that is serving the purpose it was designed for and for which demand is high and handling easy.
Their cost of operation is by far lower than that of the competing D and B-DAS, and this circumstance gives them an edge over their competitors. To convince the AA that they also rate well in the other three categories—purpose, demand, and handling—the GIB DAS should take their fate into their own hands. There is not much the GIB DAS can do to change AA’s pivot toward other parts of the world or to induce German politicians to advocate a change in the constitution to overcome the problems that flow from educational federalism.

Relying solely on WDA’s commitment to lobby for their cause may turn out to be insufficient, as WDA’s pool of competing clients is far larger than that of the GIB DAS. If the interests of the D and B-DAS cannot be reconciled with those of the GIB-DAS, it is not difficult to see which side the WDA will pick.

What the GIB DAS can do now to minimize their vulnerability is to control the variable “principal’s behavior” and build up their capacity to respond and ability to adapt. Management of these three aspects lies in the hands of boards of directors. Once the variable “principal’s behavior” is controlled, a positive trickle-down effect initiating a virtuous cycle can be expected. Were this variable under control, the present study would have produced a rather different result. School management, faculty, and demand for the program would have surely fared far better.

To build up their capacity to respond, it is pivotal that the GIB DAS start attracting qualified OLKs and retaining them over long periods of time. To achieve that, they must create attractive work conditions and incentives for OLKs to commit to the GIB DAS and evaluate every school member’s affiliation with their cause. In the event that unforeseeable circumstances create political conditions that will make it impossible
for the GIB DAS to retain their DAS status, these schools are advised to have an alternative action plan ready to go. Implementation of the DPS model could be one such alternative plan.
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