

The Integrated Governance Model for Improving Education Quality (IGMEQ): A Comparative Analysis of Indonesia and Finland Systems

Septien Dwi Savandha^{1*}, Adelia Azzahra², Jonna Kangas³

^{1,2}Swadaya Gunung Jati University, Cirebon, West Java, Indonesia,

³University of Helsinki, Helsinki, Finland

Email: dwisavandha9@gmail.com^{1*}, adeliaazzahra349@gmail.com², jonna.kangas@helsinki.fi³

Abstract: This research aims to compare and evaluate education governance models in Indonesia and Finland, focusing on developing an Integrated Governance Model for Education Quality (IGMEQ) to improve educational outcomes in various national contexts. The study employs a qualitative research method, focusing on stakeholder collaboration, accountability, and continuous improvement. It compares Finland's high-quality education system with Indonesia's decentralized system, strong school autonomy, and focus on student welfare. The research also incorporates policy analysis to assess the impact of existing education policies on educational quality. Qualitative methods like observations and document analysis are used to gain a deeper understanding of public administration practices in education. The proposed IGMEQ-ID aims to address challenges in Indonesia by incorporating elements of decentralization, student welfare, and professional development, fostering trust-based evaluation and professional collaboration. This approach can be applied across various national contexts to enhance education quality.

Keywords: Education Quality, Education System, Finland, Governance Model, IGMEQ.

INTRODUCTION

Education is widely recognized as an important component in national development and a key determinant of a country's socio-economic progress (Azzahra et al., 2024; Berkhout et al., 2024; Heystek & Emekako, 2020). In recent years, the role of public administration in improving the quality of national education has received significant attention (David et al., 2024; Fudiyartanto, 2024; Nasi et al., 2023). Public administration involves implementing government policies and managing public programs, which are important in shaping the education system (Ma & Liu, 2024; Rakhman & Wijayana, 2024). This study explores the impact of public administration on the quality of national education, using the highly valued Finnish education system as a benchmark for comparison (Haataja et al., 2023; Liu et al., 2024; Puustinen et al., 2022). The theoretical foundation of this study is built on the concept of governance in education, which includes the structures, processes, and policies used by public authorities to manage the education system (Astuti et al., 2024; Alila et al., 2020; Kholievich & Abdurashidovna, 2020; Lionardo et al., 2024). This includes resource allocation, policy formulation, implementation, and evaluation (Santos & Pekkola, 2023; Ustun & Eryilmaz, 2018).

A new theory proposed in this study is the "Integrated Governance Model for Education Quality" (IGMEQ), which emphasizes the interconnectedness of different levels of governance—from central government to local schools—and the importance of stakeholder collaboration, accountability, and continuous improvement in educational outcomes (Agung Pambudi et al., 2024; Kholievich & Abdurashidovna, 2020; Li et al., 2024; Sun, 2024; Yang et al., 2023).

Previous studies have extensively documented the success of the Finnish education system, attributing its high performance to several factors, including decentralized administration, teacher autonomy, comprehensive teacher training, and a focus on student well-being and equality (Hotulainen et al., 2020; Moate, 2021; Puustinen et al., 2022; Santos & Pekkola, 2023). For example, Kahila et al. (2024) highlight how the trust-based approach in Finland differs from the accountability-driven model in other

countries, leading to better educational outcomes (Kalalahti & Varjo, 2021). Similarly, research by Pradipta et al. (2021) emphasizes the importance of professional collaboration and continuous investment in teacher development as key elements of Finnish educational success.

The key elements of Finnish educational success, also highlighted by Ukkonen-Mikkola & Varpanen (2022) in their research on "Elements of the pedagogical process in Finnish early childhood education," include an emphasis on play-based learning, multi-voiced development, integrated initial and continuing training, holistic education, and equal educational opportunities, which collectively contribute to the high quality and effectiveness of the Finnish education system.

Although previous research by Rahmi et al. (2023) and Kilag (2023) on the Finnish education system, there is a lack of comparative studies that specifically analyze how different public administration practices affect the quality of education in different national contexts. Most comparative studies tend to focus on educational practices and outcomes without delving into the administrative frameworks and governance models that underpin those practices. In addition, there is still a lack of integrative models that can be applied in various education systems to improve quality through improved governance (De la Calle Cabrera et al., 2024).

This research has a novel approach in combining comparative analysis with the development of a new theoretical model that integrates governance and education quality. By focusing on the administrative aspects of the education system, this study offers a new perspective on how policies and governance can have a direct impact on education outcomes. The proposed IGMEQ framework aims to provide practical tools for education policymakers and administrators to improve the quality of education through better governance practices. This research will contribute to the academic literature on public administration and education policy, as well as provide actionable insights for governments looking to reform their education systems.

The main objective of this study is to examine the role of public administration in improving the quality of the national education system with a comparative analysis of the Finnish education governance model. In particular, the study aims to analyze the key components of the Finnish education governance model that contribute to the high quality of education, identify the strengths and weaknesses of current public administration practices in other countries' education systems, and develop and propose an Integrated Governance Model for Education Quality (IGMEQ) that can be adapted and implemented in various national contexts to improve outcomes education.

METHODS

This study employs a qualitative research method, focusing on a comparative analysis of educational governance models. The research emphasizes stakeholder collaboration, accountability, and continuous improvement—elements typically explored through qualitative approaches. Specifically, the study compares the Finnish education system with those of other countries to identify key components that contribute to Finland's high-quality education. Additionally, the research incorporates policy analysis to identify existing education policies and assess their impact on educational quality. Qualitative methods such as interviews with education stakeholders, direct observations, and document analysis are utilized to gain a deeper understanding of public administration practices in education. Previous research by Pradipta et al. (2021) on the vocational education system in Indonesia, Federick (2020) on the Finnish education system, and Nughroho's (2019) evaluation of student welfare programs provided foundational insights for this study. By integrating these diverse qualitative methods, The analysis was conducted through a survey, where data from interviews, observations, and documents were systematically categorized to identify recurring themes and patterns. These themes were then cross-referenced with existing literature to ensure validity and reliability, enabling a comprehensive comparison of educational governance models. The study aims to develop an Integrated Governance Model for Education Quality

(IGMEQ), adaptable and implementable across various national contexts to enhance educational outcomes.

RESEARCH RESULTS

Evaluation of Public Administration in the Indonesian Education System

In Indonesia, the public administration system in education still faces several challenges. First, strong centralization tends to hinder school autonomy in decision-making, which can affect flexibility in addressing local issues. Second, a lack of focus on student welfare and a lack of health and social service support can hinder students' learning potential. Third, a lack of investment in teacher training and professional development can limit the quality of teaching and learning. Fourth, accountability-driven evaluation models tend to create a competitive rather than collaborative climate between teachers and schools.

The research by Pradipta et al. (2021) evaluates the vocational education system revitalization policy in Indonesia, focusing on the industry's readiness for the teaching factory concept. This aligns with the challenges faced in public administration in education, as described in the statement. Specifically, the research highlights the need for a professional review or accreditation system to develop educational and training programs, indicating a focus on centralization and its impact on local autonomy. Additionally, the study emphasizes the importance of a holistic approach and cooperation across stakeholders to address complex human resource management challenges, including providing relevant training and support for education staff.

The research underscores the need for a strong foundation in human resource management, including strategies for the development, recruitment, and retention of quality teachers and relevant training for education staff. This aligns with the statement's points on a lack of investment in teacher training and professional development, which limits the quality of teaching and learning. Furthermore, the research implies a focus on accountability and its impact on the educational environment, similar to the statement's mention of accountability-driven evaluation models creating a competitive rather than collaborative climate between teachers and schools.

On the other hand, Finland has a different public administration evaluation system. Finland's education system has been successful in implementing strong decentralization in education administration, allowing schools to have significant autonomy in decision-making (Toom & Husu, 2016). The educational process in Finland is built from the societal values of equality and equity through trust in local stakeholders' and teachers' competencies to implement high-quality education (Alila et al., 2022). This decentralization has been accompanied by a focus on student well-being through comprehensive health and social services, which has supported a conducive learning environment. Additionally, continued investment in teacher training has improved the quality of teaching and learning in Finland, and teachers develop professional competencies constantly in order to be able to implement the best pedagogical practices (Ranta et al., 2023; Ukkonen-Mikkola & Varpanen, 2020). These factors collectively contribute to the high performance of Finland's education system, as highlighted in the study by Federick (2020).

Table 1. Comparative aspects of public administration systems in education in Indonesia and Finland

Aspects	Indonesia	Finland
School autonomy	Strong centralization; Many decisions are controlled by the central government	Strong decentralization; Schools have significant autonomy in decision-making
Student Welfare	Lack of focus on comprehensive health and social services	A strong focus on student well-being through comprehensive health and social services

Teacher Training	Lack of investment in teacher training and professional development	Continuous investment in teacher training and professional development
Evaluation Model	Dominated by accountability; creating a competitive climate between teachers and schools	Collaboration-based evaluation; encouraging collaboration between teachers and schools
Teaching Quality	Constrained by lack of investment and teacher training both pre- and in-service teachers	Increased due dedication to their professional growth.

Generally, a comparison of public administration evaluations between Indonesia and Finland shows differences in approaches and implementation. Indonesia still faces challenges in providing autonomy to schools, focusing on student welfare, and investing in teacher training. Finland has successfully implemented decentralization, focusing on student welfare, and investing in teacher training. Therefore, Indonesia can learn from Finland's best practices to improve the quality of public administration in the education system.

Development of an Integrated Governance Model for Indonesian Education (IGMEQ-ID)

Table 2. Development of an Integrated Governance Model for Indonesian Education (IGMEQ-ID)

Element IGMEQ-ID	Indonesia Today	Target IGMEQ-ID
Decentralization	Strong centralization; The school has little autonomy	Strong decentralization; Schools have significant autonomy in decision-making
Student Welfare	Lack of comprehensive health and social services	Focus on comprehensive health and social services for students
Teacher Training	Lack of investment in teacher training and professional development	Continuous investment in teacher training and professional development
Evaluation Approach	Accountability; creating a competitive climate between teachers and schools	Trust-based evaluation; encourage professional collaboration and shared development
Teaching Quality	Constrained by lack of investment and teacher training	Increasing through sustainable investment and teacher training
Professional Collaboration	Competitive climate between teachers and schools	Strong professional collaboration among education stakeholders

Based on this evaluation, the development of the Integrated Governance Model for Indonesian Education (IGMEQ-ID) is highly recommended. IGMEQ-ID should include stronger decentralization elements to give schools greater autonomy in decision-making, as well as emphasizing the importance of student well-being and investment in teacher training. In addition, IGMEQ-ID should incorporate a trust-based evaluation approach to encourage professional collaboration among education stakeholders. By implementing IGMEQ-ID, Indonesia can improve the quality of education through better education governance.

Challenges of Collaboration in Education Administration Indonesia vs Finland

In Indonesia, collaboration between the central and regional governments in education administration is still experiencing obstacles. Strong centralization often hinders effective coordination between the two levels of government, which can reduce flexibility in dealing with specific educational

issues at the local level. Further efforts are needed to strengthen cooperation between the central and regional governments in terms of planning, implementation, and evaluation of education policies.

In Finland, collaboration between the central and local governments is very strong in education administration. This is reflected in an education system that brings together national standards with local flexibility, allowing regions to adapt the curriculum to local needs and contexts. This approach strengthens a sense of belonging at the local level and allows for sustainable educational innovation. At the school level, this increases teachers’ ownership and participation in their pedagogical development and quality development not only personally but also at the school level through cooperation with colleagues.

Key Components in Indonesian vs. Finnish Education Governance

In Indonesia, education governance faces different challenges. Strong centralization in educational decision-making often hampers school autonomy in addressing local problems. A lack of focus on student well-being and a lack of health and social service support can hinder a student's learning potential. Additionally, a lack of investment in teacher training and professional development can limit the quality of teaching and learning.

In the analysis of the Finnish education system, several key components of educational governance that contribute to the high quality of education can be identified. First, strong decentralization allows schools to have significant autonomy in making decisions regarding curriculum, student evaluation, and resource management. Second, focus on student welfare through the provision of comprehensive health and social services to support a conducive learning environment. Third, sustainable investment in teacher training not only improves the quality of teaching but also creates a sense of ownership of educational outcomes. Fourth, a trust-based approach to evaluation and accountability promotes professional cooperation and innovation among teachers and schools (Ustun & Eryilmaz, 2018).

It aligns with a study by Nugroho et al. (2019) on the movement of STEM education in Indonesia highlights several challenges, including the centralized nature of the education system, which hampers local initiatives and autonomy. This is similar to the challenges faced in education governance in Indonesia, where strong centralization often hampers school autonomy in addressing local problems. Additionally, the study emphasizes the need for better teacher training and professional development to improve the quality of STEM education, which is also a challenge in the broader education system, where a lack of investment in teacher training and professional development can limit the quality of teaching and learning.

A comparison of key components in education governance between Finland and Indonesia shows differences in approaches and implementation. Finland has successfully implemented decentralization, a focus on student welfare, and investment in teacher training. Meanwhile, Indonesia still faces challenges in granting autonomy to schools, focusing on student welfare, and investing in teacher training.

Development of Integrated Governance Models for Indonesian and Finnish Education (IGMEQ-ID and IGMEQ-FI)

The development of the Integrated Governance Model for Education in Indonesia (IGMEQ-ID) and Finland (IGMEQ-FI) requires different approaches according to the context and characteristics of each country. IGMEQ-ID must take into account the unique challenges of public administration in Indonesia, while IGMEQ-FI can retain key elements of the Finnish model that has already proven successful.

Table 3. Indicators of education in Indonesia and Finland

Aspects	Indonesia	Finland	Aspects
Literacy Level	95.66% (2018)	100% (2018)	Literacy Level
Education Budget (% GDP)	3.6% (2018)	7.2% (2018)	Education Budget (% GDP)

Student-Teacher Ratio	16:1 (Elementary School), 14:1 (Junior High School) (2018)	12:1 (Elementary School), 11:1 (Junior High School) (2018)	Student-Teacher Ratio
Index PISA (2018)	Reading: 371, Math: 379, Science: 396	Reading: 520, Math: 507, Science: 522	Index PISA (2018)
Decentralization of Education	Tends to be centralized	Highly decentralized	Decentralization of Education
Teacher Training	Growing teacher training programs	High standards, teachers must have a Master's degree	Teacher Training
Key Challenges	Gaps between regions, public administration management, educational infrastructure	Maintaining high quality, the pressure to keep innovating	Key Challenges

Finland and Indonesia show significant differences in their education systems. Finland has a literacy rate of almost 100% and allocates an education budget that is almost double that of Indonesia. Finland's lower student-teacher ratio allows for more individualized attention to students, and the country consistently scores high in the PISA Index. Education in Finland is highly decentralized, giving great autonomy to the regions, while Indonesia is still centralized. The standard of teacher training in Finland is very high, with a minimum requirement for a Master's degree. The main challenge facing Finland is maintaining high quality and innovation, while Indonesia faces gaps between regions and public administration management.

IGMEQ-ID: School Autonomy and Decentralization of Education Administration

IGMEQ-ID should integrate the concept of greater school autonomy in educational decision-making. The decentralization of education administration must also be improved to provide greater flexibility to regions in designing and implementing education policies that are in accordance with local needs.

Table 4. Indicators of decentralized education and school autonomy in Indonesia and Finland

Aspects	Indonesia	Finland	Reference
Decentralization of Education	Growing	Highly decentralized	Data from OECD and UNESCO reports
School Autonomy in Decision	Limited	Tall	Data from OECD and UNESCO reports
Education Budget per Capita	USD 1,128 (2018)	USD 13,865 (2018)	World Bank, 2018
The Role of Local Governments	Limited, more centrally regulated	Very large, local policy dominant	Data from OECD and UNESCO reports
Quality of School Management	Varies, depending on region	Consistently high across the country	PISA and UNESCO Report
School Management Training	Under development	Compulsory, research-based program for directors	Data from OECD and UNESCO reports

The table above shows the importance of decentralization and school autonomy in improving the quality of education in Indonesia. Indonesia is still in the development stage in terms of decentralization of education, with limited school autonomy and the role of local governments that are not yet optimal. In comparison, Finland shows that mature decentralization and high school autonomy contribute significantly to the success of their education system. With a higher per capita education budget and a large role for local governments in designing local policies, Finland is able to maintain a consistent and high quality of school management across the country. Increased administrative decentralization and greater autonomy for schools in Indonesia can provide the flexibility needed to respond to local needs more effectively and encourage innovation and improvement of education quality in various regions.

Comparison of IGMEQ-ID and IGMEQ-FI Implementation

The implementation of IGMEQ-ID may require greater efforts to strengthen administrative capacity at the local level, while the implementation of IGMEQ-FI can focus more on developing existing best practices. Nonetheless, both models should emphasize the importance of inter-stakeholder collaboration, accountability, and continuous improvement in improving the quality of education.

Table 5. Development of Integrated Governance Models for Indonesian Education (IGMEQ-ID) and Finland (IGMEQ-FI)

Element	IGMEQ-ID (Indonesia)	IGMEQ-FI (Finland)
School autonomy	Strong centralization today; Need to increase school autonomy in decision-making	Strong school autonomy; maintain and update according to the evolving demands of education
Decentralization of Administration	Need to increase decentralization to provide greater flexibility to the regions	Strong decentralization already exists; Focus on sustainability and adaptation to contextual changes
Student Welfare	Focus on improving health and social services for students	A strong and sustained focus on student well-being through comprehensive health and social services
Teacher Training	Increased investment in teacher training and professional development is needed	Sustainable investment in teacher training is already in place; constantly updated for quality improvement
Evaluation Approach	High accountability at present; need to transition to a trust-based and collaboration-based evaluation model	Trust-based and collaboration-based evaluations already exist; continue to be adjusted to educational needs
Professional Collaboration	Greater impetus is needed to create a collaborative climate among teachers and education stakeholders	Strong professional collaboration exists; Focus on development and adaptation to educational demands

With the implementation of IGMEQ-ID and IGMEQ-FI, it is hoped that both countries can improve the quality of education through improved governance, emphasis on student welfare, and professional development of teachers.

Discussion

Evaluation of Public Administration in the Indonesian Education System

In Indonesia, the public administration system in education faces a number of significant challenges. Strong centralization tends to hinder school autonomy in decision-making, which can reduce flexibility in addressing local issues. A lack of focus on student welfare and minimal health and social service support can also hinder students' learning potential. Additionally, less investment in teacher training and

professional development can limit the quality of teaching and learning. Accountability-driven evaluation models tend to create a competitive rather than collaborative climate between teachers and schools.

In comparison, Finland has a very different system of public administration evaluation. Strong decentralization allows schools to have significant autonomy in decision-making. A strong focus on student well-being through comprehensive health and social services supports a conducive learning environment. Continued investment in teacher training has also improved the quality of teaching and learning in Finland.

Previous research supports these findings, as revealed by Kahila (2024), who highlights that the trust-based approach in Finland differs from the accountability-driven model in other countries, leading to better educational outcomes. Rahmi et al. (2023) also emphasized the importance of professional collaboration and continuous investment in teacher development as key elements of Finnish educational success.

Development of an Integrated Governance Model for Indonesian Education (IGMEQ-ID)

The development of the Integrated Governance Model for Improving the Quality of Education (IGMEQ-ID) aims to overcome weaknesses in Indonesia's public administration system in education. This model includes elements of stronger decentralization, a focus on student well-being, and sustainable investment in teacher training. A trust-based evaluation approach is proposed to encourage professional collaboration among education stakeholders. IGMEQ-ID is designed to give schools greater autonomy in decision-making, which is expected to improve responsiveness to local needs. In addition, improving student well-being through comprehensive health and social services and investing in ongoing teacher training will contribute to better teaching quality. Collaboration-based evaluation will encourage cooperation between teachers and schools, creating a more positive and productive educational climate.

Challenges of Collaboration in Education Administration Indonesia vs Finland

Collaboration between the central and local governments in Indonesia's education administration is often constrained by strong centralization, which hinders effective coordination. This can reduce flexibility in dealing with specific educational issues at the local level. Therefore, further efforts are needed to strengthen cooperation between the central and regional governments in planning, implementing, and evaluating education policies.

In contrast, Finland shows a very strong collaboration between the central and local governments in the administration of education. The system integrates national standards with local flexibility, allowing regions to tailor the curriculum to local needs and contexts. This approach strengthens a sense of belonging at the local level and allows for sustainable educational innovation.

In the context of research, the importance of collaboration between various stakeholders at the national and local levels has been documented as a key factor in the success of the Finnish education system. This approach creates an environment that supports innovation and adaptation of educational policies according to local specific needs.

CONCLUSION

This study examines the differences in the public administration system of education between Indonesia and Finland and proposes an Integrated Governance Model for Education Quality (IGMEQ). The study found that strong centralization in Indonesia's education system limits school autonomy in decision-making, in contrast to decentralization in Finland, which gives schools significant autonomy. In addition, Indonesia lacks a focus on comprehensive health and social services for students, which is one factor contributing to the success of education in Finland. The lack of investment in teacher training and professional development in Indonesia compared to Finland, which invests sustainably in this regard, is also a major shortcoming. The evaluation model in Indonesia is dominated by accountability, which creates a competitive climate, while Finland uses a collaboration-based evaluation that encourages cooperation. Collaboration between the central and regional governments in Indonesia still faces many

obstacles, in contrast to Finland, which has strong collaboration in education administration. This study emphasizes the importance of adapting elements of the Finnish education system, such as decentralization, focus on student welfare, and investment in teacher training, to be applied in the Indonesian context through the development of the Integrated Governance Model for Education Quality (IGMEQ-ID). Thus, this study provides practical guidance for policymakers to reform the education system to improve the quality of national education.

REFERENCES

- Agung Pambudi, N., Riva Nanda, I., Tahta Alfina, F., & Zulfia Syahrial, A. (2024). Renewable energy education and awareness among Indonesian students: Exploring challenges and opportunities for a sustainable future. *Sustainable Energy Technologies and Assessments*, 63. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.seta.2024.103631>
- Alila, K., Ukkonen-Mikkola, T., & Kangas, J. (2022). Elements of the pedagogical process in Finnish early childhood education. In *Finnish early childhood education and care: A multi-theoretical perspective on research and practice* (pp. 257–274). Springer.
- Astuti, H. M., Wibowo, R. P., & Herdiyanti, A. (2024). Towards the National Higher Education Database in Indonesia: Challenges to Data Governance Implementation from The Perspective of a Public University. *Procedia Computer Science*, 234, 1322–1331. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.procs.2024.03.130>
- Azzahra, A., Rahayu, R., Marlina, N. S., Saebah, N., & Saputro, W. E. (2024). The Role of Education in Economic Growth and Breaking the Chain of Poverty in Indonesia. *Journal of Management, Economic, and Financial*, 2(2), 55–63. <https://doi.org/10.46799/jmef.v2i2.31>
- Berkhout, E., Pradhan, M., Rahmawati, Suryadarma, D., & Swarnata, A. (2024). Using technology to prevent fraud in high stakes national school examinations: Evidence from Indonesia. *Journal of Development Economics*, 170. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdeveco.2024.103307>
- David, S., Zinica, D., Bărbuță-Mișu, N., Savga, L., & Virlanuta, F. O. (2024). Public administration managers' and employees' perceptions of adaptability to change under “the future of work” paradigm. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 199. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2023.123088>
- De la Calle Cabrera, A. M., Leal-Bonmati, M.-R., Guichot-Muñoz, E., & Ortega, M. J. B. (2024). Literacy practices in childhood from a posthumanist perspective: A systematic review. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 127, 102393. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2024.102393>
- Federick, A. (2020). Finland Education System. *International Journal of Science and Society*, 2(2), 21–32. <https://doi.org/10.54783/ijssoc.v2i2.88>
- Fudiyartanto, F. A. (2024). English language teaching in a globalised world: A sociological investigation of Indonesian higher education. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 127. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2024.102395>
- Haataja, E. S. H., Tolvanen, A., Vilppu, H., Kallio, M., Peltonen, J., & Metsäpelto, R. L. (2023). Measuring higher-order cognitive skills with multiple choice questions –potentials and pitfalls of Finnish teacher education entrance. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 122. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2022.103943>
- Heystek, J., & Emekako, R. (2020). Leadership and motivation for improved academic performance in schools in low socio-economic contexts. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 34(9), 1403–1415. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEM-10-2019-0378>
- Hotulainen, R., Vinni-Laakso, J., & Kupiainen, S. (2020). Development of learning to learn competence across secondary education and its association with attainment in Finnish/Swedish high-stake exit exam. *Thinking Skills and Creativity*, 38, 100738. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tsc.2020.100738>

- Kahila, S., Heikka, J., & Sajaniemi, N. (2024). Familiar and comfortable vs. unfamiliar and demanding – Students' discourses on teachers' responsibility and leadership in Finnish early childhood education. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 140. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2024.104495>
- Kalalahti, M., & Varjo, J. (2021). Revisiting universalism in the Finnish education system. *Finnish Journal of Social Research*, 13, 25–40. <https://doi.org/10.51815/fjsr.110792>
- Khollievich, G. Y., & Abdurashidovna, T. S. (2020). Ways to increase the effectiveness of education in an integrated environment. *European Journal of Molecular & Clinical Medicine*, 7(7), 649.
- Kilag, O. K. T., Zarco, J. P., Zamora, M. B., Caballero, J. D., Yntig, C. A. L., Suba-an, J. D., & Sasan, J. M. V. (2023). How Does Philippines's Education System Compared to Finland's? *EUROPEAN JOURNAL OF INNOVATION IN NONFORMAL EDUCATION*, 3(6), 11–20.
- Li, M. R., Zhang, X. M., Wu, M., & Lv, Y. (2024). Collaborative governance in integrated preschool education: A quadrilateral evolutionary game model analysis. *Alexandria Engineering Journal*, 91, 516–534. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aej.2024.02.038>
- Lionardo, A., Nomaini, F., Bafadhal, O. M., Santoso, A. D., & Alfitri. (2024). What makes Indonesian government officials believe in and implement evidence-based policy: The mediating role of religion-science compatibility beliefs. *Heliyon*, 10(3). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2024.e24879>
- Liu, Z., Chen, S., Tang, T., Luo, H., & Guan, Q. (2024). How public education investment and advanced human capital structure affect regional innovation: A spatial econometric analysis from the perspective of innovation value chain. *Socio-Economic Planning Sciences*, 91. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.seps.2023.101800>
- Ma, L., & Liu, Z. (2024). How do local governments respond to central mandate in affordable housing policy? A qualitative comparative analysis of forty-one Chinese cities. *Journal of Urban Management*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jum.2024.05.003>
- Moate, J. (2021). Seeking understanding of the textbook-based character of Finnish education. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 47(3), 353–365. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02607476.2021.1896341>
- Nasi, G., Choi, H., Cucciniello, M., & Christensen, R. K. (2023). A systematic literature review of city competitiveness: A 30-year assessment and future agenda for public administration. *Public Management Review*, 25(8), 1562–1586.
- Pradipta, B. Q., Hirawan, F. B., & Ragamustari, S. K. (2021). Evaluation of policy in the vocational education system revitalization in Indonesia: Examining the teaching factory readiness of the industry. *Jurnal Pendidikan Vokasi*, 11(1). <https://doi.org/10.21831/jpv.v11i1.37693>
- Puustinen, M., Sääntti, J., & Simola, H. (2022). Five decades of persistent decontextualisation of academic teacher education in Finland. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 116. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2022.102053>
- Rahmi, T. S., Mardiyah, A., Yusra, A., Rusdinal, R., Gistituati, N., & Ananda, A. (2023). Learning From the Advanced Education System in Finland. *International Journal of Educational Dynamics*, 6(1), 357–362.
- Rakhman, F., & Wijayana, S. (2024). Human development and the quality of financial reporting among the local governments in Indonesia. *Journal of International Accounting, Auditing and Taxation*, 56, 100634. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.INTACCAUDTAX.2024.100634>
- Ranta, S., Kangas, J., Harju-Luukkainen, H., Ukkonen-Mikkola, T., Neitola, M., Kinon, J., Sajaniemi, N., & Kuusisto, A. (2023). Teachers' Pedagogical Competence in Finnish Early Childhood Education—A Narrative Literature Review. *Education Sciences*, 13(8), 791. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci13080791>
- Santos, Í., & Pekkola, E. (2023). Policy entrepreneurs in the global education complex: The case of Finnish education experts working in international organisations. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 98. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedudev.2023.102749>

- Sun, Y. (2024). The real effect of innovation in environmental, social, and governance (ESG) disclosures on ESG performance: An integrated reporting perspective. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 460. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2024.142592>
- The Movement of STEM Education in Indonesia: Science Teachers' Perspectives. (2019). *Jurnal Pendidikan IPA Indonesia*, 8(3). <https://doi.org/10.15294/jpii.v8i3.19252>
- Toom, A., & Husu, J. (2016). Finnish teachers as 'makers of the many': Balancing between broad pedagogical freedom and responsibility. In *Miracle of education* (pp. 41–55). Brill.
- Ukkonen-Mikkola, T., & Varpanen, J. (2020). Integrated initial and continuing training as a way of developing the professional agency of teachers and student teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 96, 103189. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2020.103189>
- Ustun, U., & Eryilmaz, A. (2018). Analysis of Finnish Education System to Question the Reasons behind Finnish Success in PISA. *Online Submission*, 2(2), 93–114.
- Yang, X., Zhu, X., & Chen, D. (2023). Discourses regarding education governance in the digital age at K-12 level: Possibilities, risks, and strategies. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 132. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2023.104261>



© 2024 by the authors. Submitted for possible open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY SA) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/>).