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Epilogue: Changing times, changing paradigms
In the 1980s, the global geography of education was very different than it is today. Although international tests to compare what students knew existed then, there was not a commonly accepted index to compare the educational performance of nations and jurisdictions. In practically every country there were world-class schools that educated champions in international academic Olympics and other competitions. Often because of that success of individual students in international competitions, some policy-makers thought their education systems were among the best in world (typically, the former socialist systems of Eastern Europe). At that time, the performance of educational systems was also determined by student enrolment and graduation statistics, educational attainment levels, or simply by the reputation that country had in other fields, such as university education, innovation and technology, or prosperity. On the same basis, there were people, like the Finns for example, who believed their schools were mediocre, at best, when compared to other nations. In the 1990s, the international education superpowers included the UK, the United States, France, Germany, The Netherlands, and Sweden. East Asian education systems, many parts of Canada, and Finland, which now dominate international benchmarking, didn’t receive much global attention at that time.

The origin of the current global educational reform thinking dates back to the 1980s when many developed nations realized that their education systems would not able to lead the way in economic, technological, and social transformations that were emerging globally. Since it was difficult to compare the quality of education systems due to the absence of reliable global data, the motivation to reform education systems primarily came from national studies and research projects. One significant and frequently cited report was *A Nation at Risk* (1983) in the USA during the Ronald Reagan administration. The other one that received much more global attention was the *Education Reform Act* (ERA) of 1988 in England. This large-scale reform legislation became so important – not only for that country but also for much of the rest of the world – that it – in more ways than one – became a watershed event in international educational reform movement. The public sector policies of Margaret Thatcher constituted a particular approach to educational change that built on free-market inspired competition and parental choice as the key principles of raising the quality of schools. There had been earlier attempts to transform education systems through free market principles elsewhere (e.g. Chile), but ERA became the most well-known and globally researched act of its kind (Carnoy 1998; Levin and Fullan 2008). Several other large-scale school system reforms in North America, Europe, and Asia-Pacific were inspired by it, both ideologically and educationally.

The reason for the issuance of ERA and its unexpected survival under Tony Blair’s Labour government in the 1990s and flourish during the tory rule after that in England was the common-sense logic of its initial architecture. Levin and Fullan (2008, 289) describe it through the following four operational principles:

- **Competition among schools would lead to better outcomes for students.**
- **Autonomy for schools is necessary in order for schools to properly compete.**
- **Freedom for parents to choose schools for their children.**
- **Information for the public based on comparable measures of student achievement and on a single national curriculum.**

These assumptions of whole-system educational reform soon became the driving ideas of education policies in other countries as well. International development organizations, consultants,
philanthropies, media outlets, and especially private corporations engaged in education policy change adopted the reform thinking that has its origins in ERA. Education reforms in many parts of the USA, Canada, and Australia adopted variations of this reform logic. School competition and choice, standardization of teaching and learning in schools, systematic management of data through standardized testing, and privatization of public education soon spread to other countries, as well, including countries in developing parts of the world.

When the emergence of market-based education reforms became evident worldwide at the dawn of the third millennium, Boston College professors Andy Hargreaves and Dennis Shirley (2009) developed a framework to analyze the evolution of the global education reform agenda in more systematic ways. They use the metaphor of Change Ways (or reform paradigms) in describing different phases in the history of educational change. The ethos of educational reform thinking arising in the wake of ERA evolves into the Third Way of educational change in the Hargreaves and Shirley model of Four Ways of Change. The Third Way is a way of market competition and standardization of schooling in which professional autonomy is gradually replaced by the ideals of efficiency, productivity, and rapid service delivery. New terms such as “standards,” “accountability” and “effectiveness” appeared as commonplace in education policy discourse replacing “autonomy”, “trust” and “pedagogy” and thereby occupied much of the technical attention of education consultancy and policy advocacy communities. This emerging marketplace education ideology promised to governments efficiency and transparency, and to consumers diversity and quality. They were soon trumped by uniformity and standardization instead. Hargreaves and Shirley (2009, 9) write:

In the United States, statewide high-stakes tests were increasingly administered to all students – even those who were newly arrived from abroad without the barest rudiments of English. Standards were easy to write, inexpensive to fund and they spread like wildfire. They were revered in administrative and policy circles but by-passed or resisted in classrooms. However, as scripted and paced literacy programs were then imposed in many districts and on their schools, the bureaucratic screw tightened with increased ferocity.

Early lessons from the large-scale education reforms in England, the United States, New Zealand, Australia, and Sweden – among other countries – became widely available to all through new communication technologies and the Internet in the 1990s. These reform lessons were particularly influential in the transition and developing countries – Central and Eastern Europe, the former Soviet Union, and Latin America – where the externally determined educational standards and national testing were adopted as the key drivers of educational change in circumstances that often lacked capacity and resources to steer foreign-designed reforms. The success or failure of these change efforts was not adequately judged and many reform efforts created more debates on their actual impacts than evidence-supported lessons for further improvement. In the 1990s, whole-system school reform introduced mechanisms to increase parental choice regarding their children’s education that, in turn, placed schools in a new situation where they were competing against other schools for student enrolment.

But there were some who were not convinced that this reform movement was the best way to enhance teaching and learning in schools. Many European countries, including France, Germany, Norway, Belgium, and Japan and Singapore in East Asia were among those countries where school policies remained distant to the idea that market-based reform ideology suited reforming education systems. Finland, which Cable News Network (CNN) humorously called the education world’s
ultimate slacker because of its relaxed and unorthodox approach to schooling, outperformed the other countries in the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) in the first three PISA surveys with policies diametrically opposed to those embraced in the United States, the UK, and other countries that followed the path of marketization and privatization. Finland was for a long time seen as a stranger and educational lone wolf. The international consulting firm McKinsey, which analyzed the success factors in the best performing education systems after the third PISA survey didn’t even include Finland as a high-achieving system due to its non-conservative policies and reforms (Mourshed et al. 2010). This being the case, it is especially surprising that Finland’s system is now regarded as the educational Holy Grail, particularly due to its ability to elevate teaching profession to be among the most wanted career options for young Finns.

**The Global Educational Reform Movement**

We know much more about how different countries score in international league tables than we know about how education reforms in these countries have been designed and implemented. The literature indicates that the focus of education policies in many parts of the world has shifted from structural reforms – e.g. changes in length of schooling, governance structures, or institutional arrangements – to improving the quality and equity of education (Darling-Hammond 2009; Hargreaves et al. 2010; Sahlberg 2016). As a result, global reform efforts focus increasingly on developing new standards for schools, introducing more frequent assessments and examinations to test students and teachers, allocating resources to teacher professional development, investing in technology-assisted teaching and learning, and finding more efficient ways to provide high quality teaching and learning for all students. Sometimes these reforms are designed by applying solutions designed in other countries (e.g. curriculum reforms in some parts of the Middle East) and occasionally by imitating foreign education policy principles found in books and journals (e.g. system-wide reforms in South-Eastern Europe). The transfer of education policies across country borders has become so common that it can be called a Global Movement. Some of the consequences of this movement have benefited schools, such as more systematic focus on student learning instead of just instruction, high expectations for all students rather than just some, and integration of technology as part of teaching and learning in schools. Other consequences of this global movement have not always been beneficial for teachers’ work and students’ learning in schools; for example, narrowed focus on curriculum, less professional autonomy, and over-reliance on test scores as the only criteria for good education.

The original idea for the Global Educational Reform Movement, or GERM, is from Andy Hargreaves and his research on how standardization affected teachers’ work in schools in the late 1990s. In *Learning to Change: Teaching Beyond Subjects and Standards* (Hargreaves et al. 2001), he presented a critique of the standards-based reform movement that became prevalent from the 1990s. Emotional and intellectual aspects of educational change have been commonly known characteristics of successful education reforms. GERM, however, brought new change forces to national policymaking. Hargreaves and colleagues claimed:

> A new, official orthodoxy of educational reform is rapidly being established in many parts of the world. This is occurring primarily in predominantly Anglo-Saxon countries but through international funding organizations such as the World Bank and the global distribution of policy strategies, elements of this orthodoxy are increasingly being exported in many parts of the less-developed world as well. (Hargreaves et al. 2001, 1)
The inspiration for GERM comes from three sources in the 1980s and the 1990s. The first was the then new paradigm of learning that challenged existing behaviorist conceptions of how people learn. The breakthrough of constructivistic approaches to learning gradually shifted the focus of education reforms from the teacher to the student and learning. According to this paradigm, intended outcomes of schooling emphasize deeper conceptual understanding, problem-solving, recognition of multiple intelligences, and advancement of social skills.

The second inspiration was the public demand for guaranteed, effective learning for all pupils. The worldwide campaign of Education for All insisted not only that every child must have access to school, but also that common learning standards for all must be offered as means to promote the ideal of universal education. Centrally mandated learning standards in tandem with aligned national standardized student assessments became the main means proposed to improve the quality of educational performance in many parts of the world during the 1990s. Learning standards and aligned testing of student achievement were often limited to the core subjects in national curricula, i.e. reading literacy, mathematics, and, more recently, science.

The third source feeding the expansion of GERM was the demand to move decision-making authority from central offices to local governments. Decentralization of governance enhanced school autonomy and thereby also brought with it stronger accountability for schools and teachers. A common means to hold schools and teachers accountable for learning in school was to link that accountability to externally employed standardized test results. This, in turn, shifted the focus from school-based assessments to external standardized tests that radically changed the nature of teaching and learning in schools. Various forms of test-based accountability have emerged where school performance and raising the quality of education are closely tied to processes of accreditation, promotion, sanctions, and financing. Strengthening the role of test-based accountability in national education policies has remained a controversial area subject to continual debates in education systems affected by GERM.

**Five features of global educational reforms**

Since the 1980s, at least five globally common features of education policies and reform principles have been employed in attempts to improve the quality of education, especially in terms of raising student achievement. The first is increasing *competition* between schools. Almost all education systems have introduced alternative forms of schooling to offer parents with more *choice* regarding their children’s schooling (OECD 2013). The voucher system in Chile in the 1980s, free schools in Sweden in the 1990s, charter schools in the United States in the 2000s, and secondary academies in England in the 2010s are examples of faith in competition as an engine of betterment of education. At the same time, the proportion of more advantaged students studying in private schools or independent schools has grown (OECD 2013). In Australia, for example, nearly every third primary and secondary school student studies in non-governmental schools (Jensen et al. 2013). School league tables that rank schools based on their performance in national standardized assessments have further increased competition between schools. OECD data show that according to school principals across OECD countries more than three-quarters of the students assessed by PISA attend schools that compete with at least one other school for enrolment (OECD 2013). Finally, students especially in many Asian countries experience stronger pressure to perform better against their peers due to tough race to best high schools and universities (Zhao 2012).

The second is *standardization* in education. Outcomes-based education reform became popular in the 1980s, followed by standards-based education policies in the 1990s, initially within Anglo-Saxon
countries. These reforms, quite correctly, shifted the focus of attention to educational outcomes, i.e., student learning and school performance. Consequently, a widely accepted—and generally unquestioned—belief among policy makers and education reformers is that setting clear and sufficiently high performance standards for schools, teachers, and students will necessarily improve the quality of desired outcomes. Enforcement of external standardized testing and school evaluation systems to judge how these standards have been attained emerged originally from these standards-driven education policies. Standardization draws from an assumption that all students should be educated to the same, ambitious learning targets which, in turn, has led to prevalence of prescribed curricula and homogenization of curriculum policies worldwide. National Curriculum in England, in the 1990s New National Education Standards in Germany in 2010s and Common Core State Standards in the United States at the moment of writing are examples of attempts to bring coherence and quality to teaching and learning in all school.

The third common feature of the global education reform movement is focus on core subjects in curriculum, such as literacy and numeracy. Basic student knowledge and skills in reading, writing, mathematics, and natural sciences are elevated as prime targets and indices of education reforms. Due to the acceptance of international student assessments such as OECD’s PISA, and IEA’s TIMSS and PIRLS as metrics of educational performance, these core subjects have now become to dominate what pupils study, teachers teach, schools emphasize, and national education policies prioritize in most parts of the world. According to the OECD and research on national education policies in a number of countries, national education policies are increasingly influenced by the international student assessments, especially PISA. Breakspear (2012) summarizes PISA’s policy influence:

The results make clear that PISA is becoming an influential element of education policymaking processes at the national level. Furthermore, the findings provide preliminary evidence that PISA is being used and integrated within national/federal policies and practices of assessment and evaluation, curriculum standards and performance targets.

Literacy and numeracy strategies that increased instruction time for so called core subjects in England and Ontario are concrete programmatic examples of the global educational reform movement. In the United States, the No Child Left Behind legislation led most school districts to steal teaching time from other subjects, especially from social studies, arts, and music, to be better prepared for state tests that measured student performance in literacy and mathematics (Jennings and Stark Rentner, 2006). At the same time, however, successful life and employment require that young people are curious, know how to work with other people, can solve wicked problems, and master leadership.

The fourth characteristic is test-based accountability that is to hold teachers and schools to account for students’ achievement through external standardized tests in schools. School performance – especially raising students’ measured achievement – is intimately tied to the processes of evaluating, inspecting, and rewarding or punishing schools and teachers. Performance-based pay, data walls in teachers’ lounges, and school league tables in newspapers are examples of new accountability mechanisms that often draw their data primarily from external standardized student tests and teacher evaluations. The problem with test-based accountability is not holding students, teachers and schools accountable per se, but rather how accountability is arranged and how the related mechanisms affect teachers’ work and students’ studying in school. Whenever school accountability
relies on poor-quality and low-cost standardized tests, as is the case in many places, accountability becomes what is left when responsibility is subtracted.

The fifth globally observable trend in educational reform is **school autonomy** that is required for greater parental choice. Parental choice is an idea that became commonly known as a consequence of Milton Friedman’s economic theories. Friedman and many of his disciples state that parents must be given the freedom to choose their children’s education and thereby encourage healthy competition among schools to better serve families’ diverse needs. Typically school choice manifests itself through emergence of private schools that are autonomous in terms of management and instruction and where parents use vouchers or pay tuition for their children’s education. Today there are scores of various types of autonomous schools other than fee-based private schools to expand choice in education markets. Charter schools in the United States, Free Schools in Sweden, Academies in England, and religious schools in the Netherlands are examples of mechanisms to advance parental choice. School autonomy ideology maintains that schools should be free to decide who are the teachers, how teaching and learning are arranged, and also measure their own performance.

Table 1. Global Educational Reform Movement and its impact on educators’ work
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competition between schools</th>
<th>Collaboration suffers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The basic assumption is that competition works as a market mechanism that will eventually enhance quality, productivity and efficiency of service. When public schools compete over enrolment with charter schools, free schools, independent schools and private schools they will eventually improve teaching and learning.</td>
<td>Increasing emphasis on competition between schools and among teacher in the same school narrows real reasons and opportunities to collaborate and help one another. Teachers are not willing to share their ideas and experiences with other teachers because of the fear of losing their competitive edge. Teaching becomes individual race for better results and bonuses.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standardized learning</th>
<th>Creativity suffers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Setting clear, high, and centrally prescribed performance targets for all schools, teachers, and students to improve the quality and equity of outcomes. This leads to standardized teaching through externally designed curriculum to ensure coherence and common criteria for measurement and data.</td>
<td>Teachers are not encouraged to search for school-based and personalised solutions in order to create optimal learning opportunities for all. Creativity is limited to teachers who teach “creative subjects” and often seen as an opposite to standardization.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus on literacy and numeracy</th>
<th>Whole-child development suffers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basic knowledge and skills in reading, writing, mathematics, and the natural sciences serve as prime targets of education reform. Normally instruction time of these subjects is increased on the expense of other subjects (like arts and music).</td>
<td>When teaching and learning focus too much an the basics it often reduce time and other resources available for arts, music, social studies, physical activity and other parts of child development. This also makes it more difficult to help all students to find their true talent.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test-based accountability</th>
<th>Trust-based responsibility suffers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School performance and raising student achievement are closely tied to processes of promotion, inspection, and ultimately rewarding schools and teachers. Teacher pay and school budget are determined by their students’ test scores. Sanctions often include terminating employment or closing down the school. Census-based student assessment and data to inform policymaking</td>
<td>Stronger accountability through standardized testing jeopardises building a culture of responsibility and trust within the education system. Reliance on externally collected data and decisions regarding learning and performance also diminished trust is schools’ ability to informed professional judgement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School autonomy</th>
<th>Teacher autonomy suffers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basic premise is that schools need increased autonomy in order to provide parents with more freedom to choose their children’s education. Schools are free to choose their teachers, manage their budgets, and set their modus operandi. Ideally parents should be able to use the public funds set aside for their children’s education to choose the schools — public or private – that work best for them.</td>
<td>School autonomy has often led to lessening teacher professionalism and autonomy for the benefit of greater profits for school owners. Many schools with more autonomy insist its teachers to follow common sets of behavior and teach according to predetermined ‘scripts’. School autonomy should not be mixed with the professional autonomy of teachers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GERM has had significant consequences particularly for teachers’ work in schools wherever it has been a dominant driver of change as Table 1 illustrates. The most significant consequences are shrinking professional autonomy, eroding trust in teachers as professionals, and narrowing space for collaboration between teachers and among schools. Performance standards set by the educational authorities and external consultants have been brought into the lives of teachers and students without full understanding that most of what pupils need to learn in school cannot be formulated as a clear standard. New forms of student assessments and testing that have been aligned to these standards are often disappointments and bring new problems to schools. However, because the standardization agenda promises significant gains in efficiency and quality of education, it has been widely accepted as a basic ideology of change, both politically and professionally.

Disturbing evidence
The OECD’s PISA is, in many ways, both a product of GERM as described in this chapter and, at the same time, it has been used as the primary driver of it. International standardized student assessments, especially PISA, are becoming global curriculum standards for many education reforms (Breakspear 2012; Heyneman and Lee 2014), and prevalence of PISA (now controlled also by global education firm Pearson) has spawned the move toward standardized testing in many nations (Ravitch 2013), and envy of education systems with superior scores regardless of the inhumane means used to achieve them (Zhao 2014). Introduction of the PISA Test for Schools by the OECD (and administrated by McGraw-Hill educational firm) is another push toward testing-driven school policies. Those who see international student assessments as global competitions on standardized achievements make sure that schools, teachers, and students are well prepared to teach these standards and take those tests. Learning materials are adjusted to fit to the style of these assessments and teaching is geared more to success in these tests. As a consequence, lives in many schools around the world are unevenly split between the important academic study that these tests measure and other “not-so-important” study, which these academic measurements don’t cover.

At the same time, however, it is due to a more mindful use of the PISA data that we now have more aspects to look at when we analyze cross-country education policies worldwide. There are two questions that are much better answered through PISA data than without them. The first one is: What are the performance trends in reading, mathematics, and science in countries that have built their school policies on the five features of GERM described above? In other words, is there evidence that competition, choice, standardization, testing, and accountability in education policies have improved student learning in international comparisons since the 1990s? The second question is: What are the lessons from the OECD PISA study for countries that hope to enhance their school systems? In other words, does the evidence that the PISA database provides enforce the features of GERM or not?

The first part of the evidence of the impact of GERM-related education policies comes from the first four cycles of the PISA study since its launch in 2000. OECD member countries that have notable elements of GERM in their education policies in the 1990s and the 2000s include the United States, England, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, The Netherlands, and Sweden. Figure 1 shows the national average scores of 15-year-old students in the mathematics test in PISA since its inauguration in 2000. None of these countries was able to consistently improve mathematics performance despite the promises made when competition, choice, and more frequent testing of students were introduced in these countries or jurisdictions. Indeed, quite the opposite. Declining performance has
been the destiny of each of them. It seems obvious, at least in the light of the PISA data, that GERM has failed to fulfill the expectation that policy-makers had when they assumed that education reforms will succeed with these change logics.

The second source of evidence is the latest PISA study, released in late 2013. In 2012 when the OECD collected the data for that study from 65 education systems, GERM had spread globally. School competition and choice (Heyneman 2009), increasing governance of education systems by data collected through standardized student assessments and examinations (OECD 2013), common use of accountability systems that require schools’ test results to be made public (Meyer and Benavot 2013), and the growing role of the private sector in funding education reforms and providing education (Ravitch 2013) have been evident trends throughout the world. In its recent reports of the 2012 PISA findings, which include all of the most developed nations and much of the rest of the world, the OECD made this determination (OECD 2013):

Since the early 1980s, reforms in many countries have granted parents and students greater choice in the school the students will attend (p. 54).

Between 2003 and 2012 there was a clear trend towards schools using student assessments to compare the school’s performance with district or national performance and with that of other schools (p. 159).

On average across OECD countries with comparable data from 2003 to 2012, students in 2012 were 20 percentage points more likely than their counterparts in 2003 to attend schools where the use of tests or assessments of student achievement are used to monitor teacher practice (p. 160).

Figure 1. National averages of 15-year-old students’ mathematics achievement measured by PISA between 2000 and 2012.
Many countries have carried out their own studies to understand how market mechanisms affect their education systems. Wiborg (2010) studied the impact of 20 years of the free school system (government-funded private schools) in Sweden and drew the following conclusion:

The Swedish experiment (using for-profit private providers) has proved expensive and has not led to significant learning gains overall. At the same time the Swedish reforms, albeit on a small scale, appear to have increased inequality, even in the context of this very egalitarian system. (Wiborg 2010, 19)

The Australian Grattan Institute examined how market mechanisms, especially school competition, choice, and autonomy, impact schools’ performance. The conclusion was that relying on markets is not the best way to improve student learning. The report stated that by increasing competition, government policies have increased the effectiveness of many sectors of the economy. But school education is not one of them. (Jensen 2013, 35)

An inevitable question emerges: Do PISA findings reinforce the premises of GERM being right? Let’s take a look at three key findings of PISA 2012 to see how the elements of GERM believed to be the drivers of successful reforms resonate with that global evidence.

The first finding is that education systems that give schools autonomy over curricula and student assessments often perform better. This contradicts the basic premise of GERM, which assumes that externally set teaching standards and aligned standardized testing are preconditions for success. PISA shows how success is often associated with professional autonomy balanced with a collaborative culture in schools. Evidence also shows how high performing education systems engage teachers to set their own teaching and learning targets, to craft productive learning environments, and to design multiple forms of student assessments to best support student learning and school improvement.
The second finding is that high average learning outcomes and system-wide equity are often interrelated. Equity in education means that students’ socioeconomic status has little impact on how well they learn in school. Equity is high on the agenda in all successful school systems. Focus on equity means to give high priority to universal early childhood programs, comprehensive health, and special education services in schools, and a balanced curriculum that has equal weight in arts, music, and sports, and academic studies. Fairness in resource allocation is important for equity, too. PISA 2012 shows that fair resourcing is related to the success of the entire school system: high student performance tends to be linked to more equitably resource allocation between advantaged and disadvantaged schools.

The third finding is that school choice and competition do not improve the performance of education systems. In the OECD countries, school choice and competition between schools are related to greater levels of segregation in the education system. That, in turn, may have adverse consequences for equity in learning opportunities and outcomes. Indeed, successful education systems do better than those that have expanded school choice. All successful school systems have a strong commitment to maintain their public schools and local school control. PISA 2012 data show that the prevalence of charter and free schools with related competition for students has no discernible relationship with student learning.

Post-script
I have argued elsewhere that teachers in the United States or England, typically, are no worse or better than teachers in higher performing countries like Finland or Canada. In most countries around the world teachers decided to become teachers for the same reason: they want to make difference in children’s lives. This said, I don’t think that the primary problem in lower-than-expected performing education systems is the lack of teacher quality, and that the solution would be to find the best and the brightest to become teachers. But I do believe – against some commonly expressed views – that the quality of an education system can exceed the quality of its teachers. Teaching is team sport, not an individual race. This is perhaps the most powerful lesson from better performing education systems: What teachers need is greater collective professional autonomy, in other words, more freedom from bureaucracy. At the same time, more collaboration between teachers means that they are more dependent on one another.

The overall picture of the consequences of GERM becomes clearer when we look at lessons from some of the most successful education systems: Finland, Singapore, and Canada. Finland has been a consistent high performer of PISA through to the latest PISA study in 2012 (Sahlberg 2015). Significantly, none of the elements of GERM mentioned in Table 1 has been adopted in these countries as they have been where GERM has been the driver of change. This, of course, does not imply that competition, school autonomy, or accountability per se would be harmful and therefore should be avoided in education policies and reforms. But the evidence is very clear that market-based education policies that rely on these elements of GERM are the wrong way as has also been endorsed by the OECD (OECD 2013). Finland, Singapore and Canada all have some of these elements in their current school policies, but none of these education systems treats them as primary drivers of change. The conclusion is that a good educational system can be built using policies of professional autonomy, trust and collaboration instead of the market principles promoted by GERM.
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