Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

Multicultural Education Review

ISSN: 2005-615X (Print) 2377-0031 (Online) Journal homepage: http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/rmer20

Taking steps towards institutionalising multicultural education – The national curriculum of Finland

Harriet Zilliacus, Gunilla Holm & Fritjof Sahlström

To cite this article: Harriet Zilliacus, Gunilla Holm & Fritjof Sahlström (2017) Taking steps towards institutionalising multicultural education – The national curriculum of Finland, Multicultural Education Review, 9:4, 231-248, DOI: 10.1080/2005615X.2017.1383810

To link to this article: https://doi.org/10.1080/2005615X.2017.1383810

Published online: 23 Oct 2017.

MULTICULTURAL EDUCATION REVIEW, 2017
VOL. 9, NO. 4, 231–248
https://doi.org/10.1080/2005615X.2017.1383810

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

Taking steps towards institutionalising multicultural education – The national curriculum of Finland

Harriet Zilliacus[a], Gunilla Holm[a] and Fritjof Sahlström[b]

[a]Institute of Behavioural Sciences, University of Helsinki, Helsinki, Finland; [b]Faculty of Education and Welfare Studies, Åbo Akademi University, Vaasa, Finland

ABSTRACT

Internationally multicultural education research has pointed to the need to move from superficial to social justice-oriented multicultural education. However, realising this goal in policy and practice is a challenge. This study takes Finland as a case and examines the discursive developments of multicultural education in its national curriculum 1994–2014. Despite being a country which is known for emphasising equity and equality in education, superficial forms of multicultural education have prevailed. However, the results of this study show that the curricular discourse is clearly moving towards social justice education where multicultural perspectives are an integrated part of the curriculum. The 2014 curriculum, which came into effect 2016, emerges as a policy which aims to foster ethical and respectful students with a sense of fairness and an open attitude towards all kinds of diversity. The challenge for Finland is to ensure implementation and advance transformativeness in future curriculum reforms.

ARTICLE HISTORY
Received 7 December 2016
Accepted 27 June 2017

KEYWORDS
Multicultural education; multilingual education; national curriculum; discourse analysis

Superficial understandings of multicultural education that focus narrowly on human relations and celebrating diversity are a wide-spread concern within education in Finland and internationally. Narrow notions of what multicultural education is threaten the politically rooted movement for equity and social justice that underlines multicultural education. As Gorski (2006) and Grant (2016) argue, for multicultural educational to be truly effective, the aims of equity and social justice need to saturate educational policies and practices, and enhance institutional transformation. In Finland, multicultural education has officially been promoted through policy-making during the past decades (Holm & Londen, 2010), and Finnish education has frequently earned international acclaim for supporting equality among students. For instance, the Finnish Basic School Act and the national curriculum of year 2004 were both recently recognised for promoting equality and equal access to education irrespective of ethnic origin, language, age, wealth or location (World Future Council, 2015). Despite the official endorsement of multicultural education, the focus in both policies and teaching practice has, similar to other European countries, commonly been limited to the integration

CONTACT Harriet Zilliacus harriet.zilliacus@helsinki.fi

of immigrant students. Multicultural education has been seen as concerning the ethnically and linguistically Other student rather than having a social justice orientation that includes all students (Dervin, Paatela-Nieminen, Kuoppala, & Riitaoja, 2012; Holm & Londen, 2010). We see multicultural education as an educational approach that aims to support cultural diversity and social justice as well as counter marginalisation and discrimination in education and society. This approach can be seen as critically oriented and including a global perspective in the curriculum and educational practices (Holm & Zilliacus, 2009; Sleeter, 2010).

The persistence of superficial forms of multicultural education as well as recent political changes raise questions about the educational development in Finland. A general problem is that the Finnish comprehensive school has been subject to extensive cuts due to an economic crisis. Also, the 'multicultural backlash' (Lentin & Titley, 2012), and hostility towards multiculturalism are visible in Finnish political discourse. As a response to a rapid increase in asylum seekers in 2015, governmental policies have taken a turn towards a more a nationalist and anti-immigrant development, as also seen in other European countries (Tanner, 2016). A concern is therefore how Finland as a Western nation responds to increasing diversity and globalisation, and how this reflects upon the educational discourse. The national curriculum, the focus of this study, can be seen as a key policy for strengthening and institutionalising multicultural education. Hence, the research question of the present paper is: How have the Finnish national curricular discourses on multicultural education developed over the past two decades from 1994 up until the curriculum of 2014? How can this development in educational discourse be interpreted in the context of increasing globalisation and cultural diversity in education? To answer these questions, a discourse analysis was carried out, which in line with a critical multicultural educational perspective was grounded in the ultimate aim to promote equality in education, and to cultivate practices (Tracy, 2016).

Multicultural Education as a Basis for Curriculum Development

Rizvi (2009) argues that discourses of multiculturalism and cultural diversity have a visible, albeit contested role in policy-making today. Having a curriculum with a multicultural educational perspective represents a normative orientation to curricula, which in its authentic and critical form both includes the support of cultural pluralism and social justice and is rooted in principles such as equality, equity, solidarity, democracy and human rights. Thus, multicultural education is not politically neutral (Grant, 2016; Osler, 2015). This normative orientation, which in the US context has a historical background in a political struggle and the civil rights movement in the 1960s and 1970s, aims at eliminating educational inequalities. However, multicultural education has internationally and within nations taken many forms and is shaped by specific historical, cultural and political situations. A challenge is that terms such as 'multicultural' are floating signifiers in educational discourse (Guilherme & Dietz, 2015). 'Multicultural education', similar to the frequently used term 'intercultural education' in Europe, represents a broad field of different educational solutions and practices internationally. According to Holm and Zilliacus (2009), multicultural and intercultural education cannot be clearly distinguished from one other, but both include superficial and more progressive approaches. In Finland, the most commonly used term is 'multicultural education', which we also use here. In contrast to the US context where minority groups have been in focus, the development of multicultural education in Europe is not as politically rooted, and is to a large extent linked to immigrant integration, which is also the case in Finland where

immigration started to increase in the 1990s. However, the aims of social justice have been present in more critically oriented multicultural education also in Europe (Coulby, 2006; Holm & Zilliacus, 2009).

As Gorski (2006) and Grant (2016) argue, a depoliticisation of multicultural education can generally be seen where its foundational value base has been watered down to 'celebrations of the joys of diversity' (Gorski, 2006, p. 167). Superficial and conservative, rather than critical and transformational, types of multicultural education are undermining the political value base of multicultural education. These forms of education commonly emphasise cultural difference and focus primarily on getting along and learning about different cultures. Emphasis often lies on particular immigrant and ethnic minority groups. Creating cultural understanding, unity, appreciation and competence on a local, national or global level represents central aims. However, by not taking issues of power and justice into consideration, these forms of education tend to emphasise ethnic differences and majority perspectives. Major concerns within educational practice include Othering and essentialising students, as well as the lack of pluralist perspectives. In contrast, critical types of multicultural education focus on social justice issues, discrimination and structural changes, and consequently have a complex view of culture and identity. In this view, multicultural education is aimed at all students, and the focus lies on a multitude of cultural aspects such as ethnicity, language, gender, religion, social class and sexuality as well as their intersections. Transformative goals seeking to change existing power and inequality relations in education are intergal. A key aim is institutional transformation implying that multicultural education is not to only a concern of single teachers and classrooms, but is to be integrated throughout policies and practices (Gorski, 2006; Sleeter, 2010; Sleeter & Grant, 2006).

Multicultural education has received attention in Finland due to migration in combination with the fact that the Finnish school system is built on the pillars of equity and equality. The aims of providing the same education for all and minimising social differences have set clear directions for curriculum reform, starting from the establishment of the comprehensive school in the 1970s. Finland can be seen as part of the Nordic education model, which stems from the notion of seeing education as a common good (Imsen, Blossing, & Moos, 2016; Vitikka, Krokfors, & Hurmerinta, 2012). Accordingly, the Finnish school system is obligated to develop some form of multicultural education addressing social justice issues. Finland has many progressive policies and practices which aim to recognise and support students' linguistic, cultural and religious backgrounds. However, the multicultural education advocated has been fairly superficial. A general shortcoming of multicultural education has been witnessed through the limited focus on immigrant students. The term 'multicultural education' was first used in Finnish policy documents in the 1990s, referring mainly to ethnicity or immigrant status while the existing cultural diversity, such as the country being bilingual, having two state churches, an indigenous population and minority groups and religions, was not seen as part of multicultural education. Part of the difficulty has been that teachers have not received an education in how to teach culturally diverse student populations. Also, visible trends of colonialist perspectives and Othering have been shown, for instance in textbooks (Dervin et al., 2012; Holm & Londen, 2010; Holm & Mansikka, 2013; Mikander, 2015). Key to the multicultural education advocated in Finland is the national curriculum. As a policy document, it represents the main framework to schools and gives considerable guidance for educational practice.

The Finnish National Curriculum in a Globalising Context

The national curriculum has, in line with its name, traditionally been perceived as a 'national' document authorised by the nation state, which defines the aims and goals of education and prepares young people for future citizenship (Isopahkala-Bouret, Lappalainen, & Lahelma, 2014). From an ideological point of view, the national curriculum can be seen as cultural practices demonstrating politically sanctioned ways of thinking and reasoning about community and self and producing sensitivities, dispositions and awareness, which are part of wider societal discourses (Popkewitz, 1997). The curriculum does not only include descriptive or normative statements, but also a performative aspect in that it is linked to doing and action (Marshall, 2001) and it creates 'effects' of policy (Ball, 1990). The curricular discourses importantly construct and affirm notions of differences between groups within education and make distinctions by classifying procedures and practices (Isopahkala-Bouret et al., 2014). Unlike most other countries, Finland has an open and collaborative system for designing the national curricula, which are not purely governed by administrators. The national curriculum is the outcome of a broad national discussion and the teamwork of different stakeholders, such as education providers, academic experts and representatives from industry groups and teacher and student unions. The national curriculum serves as a framework for making local curricula at the municipal and school levels. Teachers generally have an important and quite independent role also in making the local curriculum and creating pedagogical praxis (Vitikka et al., 2012). This dynamic curriculum process creates continuity and consensus and ensures that sudden political changes are not necessarily visible in curricular reforms.

Despite a strong commitment to seeing education as serving the common good and creating solidarity, neoliberal reasoning began to be reflected in educational policy in the 1990s (Isopahkala-Bouret et al., 2014). This shift from social democratic towards neoliberal orientations, which emphasises efficacy and profitableness, represents a general trend within education (Grant, 2016; Imsen et al., 2016). According to Rizvi (2009), this can be understood as an emerging social imaginary that is being created and promoted by the global forces of capital and corporate interests rather than a focus on the common good. Economic functions of education are increasingly emphasised over the social. However, Imsen et al. (2016) as well as Mølstad and Karseth (2016) show that Finland has shown more resistance towards globalisation and neoliberal governing in comparison to other Nordic countries.

Another general development of globalisation can be seen in educational policy-making becoming increasingly influenced by standardised global comparisons, assessment and policy borrowing (Sivesind, Afsar, & Bachmann, 2016). The Programme for International Assessment (PISA) has had an important role for the globalisation of curricula, so also in Finland. Due to PISA, national curricula are now beginning to resemble one another with regard to curricular subjects, content and skills. Another growing and interlinked trend is the focus on specific skills that global citizens require, which have been developed on a European and international arena (Vitikka et al., 2012). In the new curriculum of 2014, signs of a globalising curriculum are clearly visible. The document is intertextually linked to both national and international legislation and educational recommendations. As a 549-page document, it is clearly more extensive than previous curricula, and includes developments, such as the introduction of 'transversal competence'. Competence areas such as 'cultural competence, interaction and self-expression' are largely based on twenty-first-century skills

and are to have a profound influence on learning. These have been forwarded by the recommendations and guidelines formed by the EU and OECD, and were to some extent present in previous curricula through so-called 'cross-curricular themes'. The competence areas are seen as vital, and aim to respond to global changes such as the climate change, the technological change and the growth of cultural and linguistic diversity (Sivesind et al., 2016).

In contrast to the traditional nation-bound view of the national curriculum, Rizvi (2006, 2009) argues that contemporary theories of globalisation challenge the imaginary of the nation state as authority. Central is that nation states increasingly have to deal with not a fixed and clear-cut national population but rather a complex cultural diversity characterised by a fluid and dynamic set of relationships. As we move rapidly from imagining nation states as constituted by unitary cultures to spaces that are characterised by significant levels of cultural diversity and exchange, the role of negotiating transnationalism becomes central in curriculum-making. A major concern for curriculum reform today is how to prepare the individual and the nation state to become part of world society. According to Rizvi (2006), a social imaginary is needed, which represents an alternative policy framework to the growing authority of neoliberal orientations in education. A firmer commitment to social justice and educating for the common good also on a global level is required. Rizvi (2006) suggests, for multiculturalism to survive as a useful policy concept, it cannot remain tied exclusively to the traditional agenda of managing inter-ethnic relations within a nation state. The curriculum needs to have a wider view on diversity and equality, and also include issues of power and privilege. As Osler (2015) argues, multicultural education needs to be revived for a globalised world which does not focus heavily on nation-building. In the case of Finland, the question is whether the educational discourse reflects such a development. In the following, we will investigate the development of Finnish curricular discourses on multicultural education within this context of globalisation and increasing diversity.

Materials and Methods

The research material included the Finnish comprehensive school curricula from 1994–2014 (National Core Curriculum, hereafter NCC, 1994, 2004, 2014), including their amendments. This time span was chosen in order to gain a perspective starting from the time of increased immigration to Finland in the 1990s. Also included were the government's five-year Development Plans for Education and Research from 1991–2012 (Ministry of Education, 1991, 1996, 2000, 2004, 2008; Ministry of Education & Culture, 2012). The three curricula analysed all represent individual reforms with particular terminology and organisation. However, they all consist of a general part including the mission and the underlying values of the education, the conception of learning, the structure of education, the foundations for assessment, as well as a subject-specific part which outlines the objectives and core contents of teaching for each school subject. In the two latest curricula of 2004 and 2014, the goals for developing the learning environment, school culture and working methods are also included.

Discourse analysis (Gee, 2014, 2016) was used for analysing how the discourses on multicultural education are constructed over time. Fundamental for this methodological choice is that language is seen as constitutive rather than transparent, and represents a site where meaning is created and changed. The analysis interpreted and reconstructed existing discourses, that is, language in use, in the texts. The aim was to identify Discourses with a capital

D, that is, discourses composed of distinct ways of language use coupled with distinctive ways of acting, thinking, feeling and believing (Gee, 2014). In line with Gee (2016, 351), discourses involve frameworks (or figured world), that is, 'sets of ideas that guide us in what to expect and how to value, assess, or appreciate things and happenings in specific situations'. Frameworks within the curricula include for instance theories or assumptions about diversity and equality that the text invites or assumes the reader to believe as typical or normal.

In a first read-through of the documents, the analysis focused on tracking concepts (48 concepts in all), such as 'diversity', 'multiculturalism', 'culture' and 'equality' that from a critical multicultural theoretical perspective may be included in discourses on multicultural education. After the frequency of these key concepts had been identified through word-search, we moved to a deeper analysis of the text excerpts where the concepts occurred to create an understanding for their situated meanings and discursive positions. The analysis focused to a lesser extent on the semantic level, and more on situational meanings and frameworks present in the material. This included a broad focus on how discourse was built through aspects such as significance, action, identities, connections, politics and knowledge (Gee, 2014, 2016). Emerging discourses were unearthed within each curricular context, and then refined by comparison with those found in the other curricula, thus identifying similarities and differences between the curricular discourses.

Six partly interlinked Discourses were found on multicultural education (See Table 1). The first two presented under the heading 'Discourses on cultural diversity' include the discursive developments in the data on how cultural plurality is understood and whose perspectives are considered regarding diversity. The four subsequent discourses, presented under the heading 'Discourses on multicultural education', present the discursive developments on the educational aim and scope of multicultural education, the role of language in learning as well as curriculum integration.

Discourses on Cultural Diversity

During the two decades that the curricula encompass, the significance given to cultural diversity in education increases. Also, the meanings attributed to cultural diversity shift as well as its conceptual links to other frameworks such as internationalisation and multiculturalism. Furthermore, political aspects as to whose perspective is dominating in the Discourse change over the course of time.

Table 1. Discursive developments in the Finnish national curriculum 1994–2014.

Discourse	Key development
Discourses on cultural diversity	
1. Meaning of diversity	From seeing diversity as external influences to an intrinsic part of the school
2. Perspective on diversity	From a majority perspective towards pluralistic perspectives on diversity
Discourses on multicultural education	
3. Aim of multicultural education	From internationalisation to educating for an ethical stance
4. Scope of multicultural education	From focusing on the immigrant student to all students
5. The role of language	From seeing language as an enrichment to embracing multilingualism
6.Curriculum integration	From limited towards full curriculum integration

Meaning of Diversity: From Seeing Diversity as External Influences to an Intrinsic Part of the School

In the 1994 curriculum, cultural diversity emerges as linked to outer influences on the education and Finnish society. 'Internationalisation' appears as the key term and is closely associated with international interaction and population mobility. Increasing internationalisation is articulated as one of the main background factors for the need for a new curriculum:

> As our functional environment becomes more and more international, and more and more cultures are introduced in Finland, and as Europe becomes more integrated, our schools must focus on new contents, on increasing interaction between different areas of culture, on creating a more diversified language programme, and on making our internationalism education more effective. (NCC, 1994, p. 16)

In the framework of internationalisation, diversity is articulated as something Finnish students need to be open to, and have tolerance for. The term 'multiculturalism' and references to cultural diversity are introduced in the 1994 curriculum but still have a marginal position. The curriculum does not express cultural diversity in terms of a richness that is to be valued. Cultural diversity is simply expressed in terms of creating 'cultural variation' and a change that the education needs to consider: 'More and more students with different linguistic and cultural backgrounds are flocking into our schools, making our schools more multicultural than before' (NCC, 1994, p. 16). Only in secular ethics education is the student explicitly to learn to value the linguistic and cultural minorities and new Finns. The curriculum generally expresses that students need to develop an understanding for diversity, but they are not seen as being part of diversity. 'Diversity' emerges as something new and foreign generally referring to ethnicity and language. This Discourse is part of a societal discourse on diversity linked to societal change taking place during the 1990s, when many immigrants arrive to Finland. A perception of Finland being homogenous before this time dominated (Saukkonen, 2013). Similar to the curriculum, contemporary policies articulate that multiculturalism is something new that needs to be built up to become a part of the everyday school (Ministry of Education, 1991, 1996).

In contrast to the above, in the curriculum of 2004, the meanings given to diversity have altered. Cultural diversity is stated firmly as a valuable asset that should be recognised in all teaching. Internationalism is still a central theme, and is particularly marked in the cross-curricular theme 'Cultural Identity and Internationalism'. A shift in terminology use is also seen as the term 'multiculturalism' has been given greater emphasis already in the underlying values:

> The underlying values of basic education are human rights, equality, democracy, natural diversity, preservation of environmental viability, and the endorsement of multiculturalism. (NCC, 2004, p. 12)

The terms 'multicultural society', 'multicultural community' and 'cultural diversity' have a significant position in the curriculum. For instance, it is stated that students 'will get an introduction to other cultures and philosophies of life, and acquire capabilities for functioning in a multicultural community, and in international cooperation' (NCC, 2004, p. 37). The move to attach clearly positive and appreciative meanings to diversity is visible in many subjects. In geography, 'The instruction is provided so that the student gets a sense of the richness of natural and cultural environments around the world and learns to appreciate these' (NCC, 2004, p. 176). Also, in educational and vocational guidance, the objective is that the student

will 'come to embrace multiculturalism and internationalism' (NCC, 2004, p. 256). This Discourse is interlinked to other contemporary governmental policies that emphasise that Finnish society and schools are becoming increasingly global. We can see how this Discourse forefronts multiculturalism, but within a framework where multiculturalism is defined through meeting the Other (Ministry of Education, 2000, 2004; Saukkonen, 2013).

In contrast, in the 2014 curriculum, the meaning of cultural diversity is altered. Now diversity is not seen as an outside force, but as an integral part of the school and every student. Compared to the 2004 curriculum, which expresses the wish to embrace multiculturalism, multiculturalism has become part of the community, the school and every student. This can be seen distinctively in that concepts such as 'multicultural', 'multilingual' and 'pluralistic' are used abundantly in the description of the school and the surrounding community. Society is described as changing and global, and the students' identities are seen as multicultural. Within the competence area 'Cultural diversity and language', the pluralistic nature of society is given as a frame:

> The school as a learning community is part of a culturally transforming and pluralist society where the local and the global overlap. Different identities, languages, religions and beliefs coexist and interact. (NCC, 2014, p. 26)

Cultural plurality is explicitly stated as a richness, for example, in describing society in terms of 'a pluralistic society that has understanding for difference and respects equality and human rights' (NCC, 2014, p. 292). Diversity is described as something students should make the most of, and students are 'guided to consider cultural and linguistic diversity and different worldviews as a positive resource' (NCC, 2014, p. 19). More attention is also given to the rights associated with cultural diversity. For example, for Sami language instruction, a starting point is that 'the student knows that the world is linguistically and culturally diverse and that everyone has the right to use and develop his or her own language' (NCC, 2014, p. 420). That no one is to be discriminated against on the basis of 'gender, age, ethnic or national origin, nationality, language, belief, opinion, sexual orientation, health, disability or other personal characteristics' (NCC, 2014, p. 12) is also expressed as fundamental in accordance with the Constitution of Finland (1999) and the Non-Discrimination Act (2004). We can see that the curriculum hereby reinforces other official discourses, which aim to promote multiculturalism in Finnish society (Holm & Londen, 2010; Saukkonen, 2013).

Perspective on Diversity: From a Majority Perspective Towards Pluralistic Perspectives on Diversity

In the 1994 curriculum, cultural diversity emerges through differences to 'the Finnish'. The curriculum articulates that 'to a great majority of comprehensive school students, Finnish culture and contacts with other Nordic countries which are an inherent part of it [Finnish culture] form the basis for their cultural identity' (NCC, 1994, p. 16). There is a visible tendency to see multiculturalism as associated with preserving and strengthening the specifically 'own' cultural identity, which primarily refers to Finnish identity, and to a lesser extent to Nordic and European identity. This view is expressed in the underlying values: 'To foster our national cultural heritage as well as multicultural aspects which have to do with internationalism leads to a new type of clarification of our identity' (NCC, 1994, p. 10). Furthermore, as Räsänen (2007) among others has pointed out, there is an emphasis on the need for students to first understand and evaluate themselves as Finns and only thereafter they are able to

understand and accept others. Consequently, students are encouraged to prioritise Finnish perspectives and identifications. In an analysis of policies and curricula in Norway in the 1990s and 2000s, Karseth and Sivesind (2010) found similar discourses by which cultural diversity implies a renewed focus on national identity in the multicultural society. The Discourse therefore includes power perspectives, which limit whose perspective and knowledge is considered in the education.

When we turn to the 2004 curriculum, we see an emphasis on the student's unique 'cultural identity' and that 'instruction helps to support the formation of the student's own cultural identity, and his or her part in Finnish society and the globalising world' (NCC, 2004, p. 12). Similar to the 1994 curriculum, there is a clear objective to transmit a cultural heritage from one generation to another, which is linked to emphasising Finnish and European culture. The government's educational policy for 1999–2004 also has a clear emphasis on Finnish cultural identity and seeing comprehensive school education as strongly rooted in a unified 'Finnish civilisation', which is tied to humanist and Christian values (Ministry of Education, 2000). The Discourse in the 2004 curriculum appears therefore to be part of contemporary educational discourse, which replicates a unified and fixed view of a national identity and seeing distinct other cultures (cf. Riitaoja, 2013).

As a contrast to the above, the undertaking of the 2014 curriculum is explicitly to encourage students to see cultural diversity in their own environment. The comprehensive school is seen as 'built on a multifaceted Finnish cultural heritage that has taken shape and is being continuously formed in interaction between different cultures' (NCC, 2014, p. 14). Attention to diversity even within the Finnish language and culture is included as the objective for education in Finnish is 'to encourage the student to take note of the Finnish language and its cultural diversity in the surroundings' (NCC, 2014, p. 220). Internationalisation at home is furthermore stressed in language teaching and the goal here is that students become familiar with multilingualism and cultural diversity in the community. There is a visible shift from a local to a global perspective. Global perspectives are commonly highlighted in the text parallel with local perspectives. However, from a critical perspective, what appears to still be lacking is a problematisation of questions of dominance, privilege and power between different cultures and groups within society and the school. This is also lacking from contemporary educational policy documents (cf. Ministry of Education & Culture, 2012). Consequently, even if there is an emphasis on including a multitude of perspectives in Finnish education, there is an absence of critical discourses for instance on the hegemonic position Western cultures hold, which reflects a certain degree of depoliticised multicultural education.

Discourses on Multicultural Education

Four Discourses on multicultural education emerged in the data, which interlink with the Discourses on cultural diversity. The first Discourse focuses on the aim of education and is characterised by a move from the framework of internationalisation to educating for an ethical stance. The second Discourse focuses on the scope of education moving from the immigrant student to all students. The third Discourse concerns the role of language within multicultural education, and finally, the fourth Discourse focuses on curriculum integration. As policy texts, the discourses are strongly oriented towards building action, and focus both on why something is of value and what to teach as well as importantly as goals and expectations of future outcomes of the education (cf. Sivesind et al., 2016).

Aim of Multicultural Education: From Internationalisation to Educating for an Ethical Stance

As we have seen in the curriculum of 1994, internationalisation is a core aim of education. This aim is linked to the frameworks of human rights, national cultural heritage, global citizenship and sustainable living. Fundamental is the respect for the human being and life, and fostering equality in accordance with the UN recommendations and human rights. The key concept 'international education' has been used in curricula since the 1970s, and has been developed on the basis of the UN and UNESCO recommendations (Räsänen, 2007). The goal of international education includes that 'the student accepts the fact that people are different, knows different cultures, understands that the mutual dependence of peoples and nations and equality as well as justice are the basis for human dignity' (NCC, 1994, p. 38). Despite these broad goals, the starting points given for international education are closely linked to reacting to new cultural influences, competiveness and gaining skills to approach changes coming from 'outside'. This Discourse reflects the education policy for 1991–1996, and the objective of providing students with 'basic skills for international interaction' (Ministry of Education, 1991, p. 13).

The framework of internationalism is also visible in the curriculum of 2004, for instance, in the cross-curricular theme 'Cultural Identity and Internationalism'. Gaining multicultural skills is also present through the notion of 'cultural competence'. 'Cultural competence' is a new criterion introduced in the assessment of mother tongue, foreign languages and visual arts. The concept is not defined and its criteria are defined differently in different subjects, but focuses overall on developing knowledge about cultural differences and similarities as well as developing communication skills. As Dervin et al. (2012) argue, the notion of cultural competence in the curriculum includes problematic traits as the starting point lies in a view of 'culture' as fixed and essential. Different cultures are compared to the majority culture, which is not problematised, and the emphasis tends to be on differences rather than similarities.

However, the framework of multicultural education radically shifts in the curriculum of 2014 to include the broad aim of developing an ethical stance. This framework expands the aim of developing ethical reasoning mentioned in the curriculum of 1994. The term 'ethical' is in fact used over 200 times, and key to developing an ethical stance is the relation to oneself, others and to nature. To develop an ethical stance is seen as a fundamental aim in becoming a humane and educated person. As in the 1994 curriculum, this includes striving for the ancient ideals of truth, goodness and beauty as well as aiming for justice and peace. Ideals such as democracy and humanism are also strongly present, which echo the tradition of Bildung and the curriculum of 1970 (Riitaoja, 2013). To be educated means, among other things, having an ethical and respectful attitude:

> Being educated is manifested in our attitudes to ourselves, other people, the environment and knowledge, in the ways we act and in our willingness to take action. Educated persons strive to act righteously and show respect for themselves, other people and the environment. (NCC, 2014, p. 13)

The aim of developing an ethical stance is to be integrated into all subjects. It is for instance reflected in the general assessment criteria in language instruction as 'Growth into cultural diversity and language awareness'. Accordingly, students are to learn to respond to people, other languages, nationalities, gender and cultural practices without prejudice, and to value their own linguistic and cultural background as well as the linguistic and cultural diversity in the world.

Apart from learning to understand, respect and become more aware of cultural diversity, an analytical approach to diversity is also included. For example, the subject Swedish as a second language and literature for immigrants is 'to help the student to expand his or her perceptions of culture, to analyse multilingualism and cultural diversity in the school and the society' (NCC, 2014, p. 361). The curriculum of 2014 also includes a development from focusing on transferring cultural heritage to more strongly focusing on students' abilities to develop a new culture and new ways of thinking. This aligns with a wider educational policy discourse putting emphasis on the students' own participation, creating a learner-centred and collaborative school community, and active citizenship (Ministry of Education and Culture, 2011, 2012).

Scope of Multicultural Education: From Focusing on Immigrant Students to all Students

Up to the curriculum of 2014, the Discourse on cultural diversity is largely confined to immigrant students and to some extent minority students. The right of immigrant students and minorities to grow up to be active members both in their own cultural community and Finnish society is already pronounced in the curriculum of 1994. In the 2004 curriculum, different language and cultural groups are given separate sections in the curriculum, including Sami, Roma, students with sign language and students with an immigrant background. The Sami culture is now also better recognised in that language instruction distinguishes between the three Sami languages as different options. Furthermore, preparatory education and mother tongue instruction for immigrant students are included as optional if the municipality chooses to organise the education. However, similar to the previous curriculum, immigrant and minority students need to learn about Finnish culture and minority perspectives are foremost seen as complementary to majority perspectives and not integrated on their own terms. In contrast, the majority is not required to learn about minority and immigrant students' cultures, and 'integration' therefore does not involve majority students (cf. Holm & Londen, 2010; Räsänen, 2007). Consequently, this Discourse highlights power and politics related to minority and majority positions in the school.

The Discourse in the curriculum of 2014 has changed as all students are seen as multicultural and multilingual, and the significance of diversity is not restricted to highlighting particular students. Notably, instead of 'immigrant integration', in the curriculum of 2014, there is more talk of integrating students with 'other cultural and linguistic backgrounds'. Students are therefore often referred to through their language identities. This change from previous curricula seems to respond to othering being linked to labelling students as immigrants. Through these changes in vocabulary, the experiences of students with immigrant or minority background are also seen as more equal to those of majority students (cf. Zilliacus, Paulsrud, & Holm, 2017).

The discursive developments from focusing on specific student groups to focusing on all students relates to another change in vocabulary. Both in the 1994 and even more strongly in the 2004 curriculum and several contemporary policies (Ministry of Education, 2000, 2004), the normative aim to develop 'tolerance' towards other cultures is significant, for instance in the need to develop tolerance for cultural and religious diversity. However, the conception of 'tolerance' has been criticised on the basis that it expresses an asymmetric position of power between those who have tolerance towards someone or a group and those who are

tolerated (Riitaoja, 2013). The 2014 curriculum uses the term 'tolerance' only once in the entire curriculum, and it is often substituted with 'respect'. Students are encouraged to take other people's perspectives rather than having tolerance for them:

> The student learns to see things from the perspectives of other people's life situations and circumstances. Learning together across the boundaries of languages, cultures, religions and beliefs creates a setting for genuine interaction and communality. (NCC, 2014, p. 14)

In sum, we see a development towards including everyone into the multicultural and supporting equality among all students.

The Role of Language: From Seeing Language as an Enrichment to Embracing Multilingualism

Language learning is closely linked to supporting cultural diversity in all three curricula. In the 1994 curriculum, language skills are articulated as an important element in the internationalisation of education. Mother tongue and language skills are pointed out as important for all students' cultural identities and as valuable cultural capital. Linguistic diversity is supported in that mother tongue is widened beyond the national languages, Finnish and Swedish, to include Sami language, sign language and according to an amendment in 1996 also Romani. In addition, Finnish or Swedish for immigrant pupils can be provided. The curriculum of 2004 strengthened the vast number of mother tongue and language options as it included all in all 11 different forms of mother tongue instruction, instruction in foreign languages as well as language immersion in the national languages. However, the general framework of language learning was focused on fixed languages taught in separate classes and predefined linguistic identities.

In contrast to the above, an expanded multilingual framework arises in the 2014 curriculum. From the multilingual perspective, which by definition uses more than one language in teaching and in its critical forms emphasises social justice (Skutnabb-Kangas, Phillipson, Panda, & Mohanty, 2009), students are encouraged to use all the languages they know in versatile ways during lessons in different subjects and in other school activities. A 'language-aware school' is now set as a goal, and implies that 'each adult is a linguistic models and also a teacher of the language typical to the subject he or she teaches' (NCC, 2014, p. 26). The intrinsic role of language in all learning and subjects, as well as the right to one's own language is stressed. Multilingualism emerges as a central goal of education, and is also linked to the competence area of multiliteracy. Multiliteracy refers in the national curriculum to the ability to produce and work with different kinds of texts in various media and environments, and is connected to the ability to understand and interpret cultural diversity. This multilingual approach emerges as a new discourse, which reflects an overall learning approach committed to cultural diversity. The widened framework of language learning has been forwarded by several policies and language projects, which have promoted the parallel use of different languages as a natural part of school life (cf. Ministry of Education & Culture, 2010).

Curriculum Integration: From Limited Towards Full Curriculum Integration

By giving Finnish perspectives priority, multicultural perspectives have a limited role in the 1994 curriculum. These are given more room in the curriculum of 2004 and are visible in a

number of subjects. However, the curriculum of 2014 brings this development further by integrating multicultural and multilingual perspectives into most subjects of the curriculum as well as into the transversal competencies. This clearly strengthens the power of the multicultural educational framework. For instance, 'Cultural diversity and language awareness' are presented as general principles for the development of the school culture and main objectives of language instruction. Furthermore, different minorities such as the Sami are recognised in various language instructions, and minority and endangered languages are underlined. Only in mathematics, physics and chemistry is this Discourse missing. A number of policies and national projects preceding the new curriculum have underlined the need for multicultural aspects to be integrated in all subjects. This seems to have supported the general development of curriculum integration (cf. Ministry of Education, 2008; Ministry of Education and Culture, 2010; National Board of Education, 2010).

Core values of multicultural education such as human rights, equality and justice are articulated in the value foundation of all three curricula. Notable for the 2014 curriculum is that human rights education is to be integrated throughout all subjects and teaching materials. Intertextually, the curriculum consistently refers to Finnish legislation and international, mainly UN recommendations as providing the basic principles for the education. The aim is to educate students to embrace human rights, including children's rights, global citizenship and to value democracy, equality, equal treatment and cultural diversity. The framework of human rights education was fore fronted in a supplement to the 2004 curriculum on human rights and holocaust education. It has also been promoted through the work of the Finnish Human Rights Center and projects such as 'Democracy and human rights in teacher education' (Ministry of Education & Culture, 2014). Also, goals related to sustainable development are now visible in all subjects. Concepts of 'sustainable lifestyle' as well as 'culturally sustainable development' are commonly used. The concept 'eco-social education' is introduced, which is to include the development of a lifestyle and culture that safeguards the inviolable value of the human being and the diversity of nature.

Even if we can see a clear integration of cultural diversity in the curriculum of 2014, the focus is generally on linguistic and ethnic diversity. Some attention is also paid to religion and gender, which we discuss briefly below.

Religious diversity is recognised already in the curriculum of 1994 as different religious and secular ethics classes were to be organised according to students' religious and non-religious backgrounds. Since 2004, the curriculum includes a total of 12 different religion curricula alongside the majority Lutheran instruction. However, these curricula focus on the students' 'own' religion and include limited perspectives on different religions and worldviews. The new curriculum of 2014 includes notably more pluralistic perspectives, even if the general separation of student groups according to their 'own' religion remains.

Gender equality is also generally supported in previous curricula and through several national projects. However, according to Lappalainen and Lahelma (2015), until 2004 gender issues were treated on quite an abstract level, and concrete guidance about gender equality has been lacking. The curriculum of 2014 takes a leap forward in the discourse on gender and promotes a gender-sensitive approach, which is to be integrated throughout the curriculum. Sexual orientation is also mentioned for the first time. Now the new Swedish gender neutral pronoun 'hen' is introduced in the Swedish language version of the curriculum. Teaching, working methods and study materials are all to support the Act on Equality between Women and Men (1986). Gender equality is stressed, and 'all students should be

supported to discover their potential and create their learning path without gender bound role models' (NCC, 2014, p. 16). We can see transformative elements in this gender-sensitive approach, which have the objective of breaking and reconstructing gender patterns. However, the development of girls outperforming boys in academic achievement is an issue that the curriculum does not address.

Despite this development towards integrating multicultural perspectives throughout curricula, there still remain areas that receive little attention. Social class is one such area. The curriculum of 2014 states that a task of the comprehensive school is to prevent inequality and marginalisation and to promote economic, social and regional equality. This is in line with previous curricula and represents the starting points of the national curriculum when introduced in the 1970s. However, in looking back at the curriculum of 1970, there appeared to be a stronger discourse on combating social class differences than in the curricula of 1994 and 2004 (Lappalainen & Lahelma, 2015). References to social class differences among students are not made explicit in the curriculum of 2014 either. Still, a key goal for the development of the curriculum of 2014 is to combat the trend of increasing inequality (Ministry of Education & Culture, 2010, 2012). In looking at the Discourse on curriculum integration in the curriculum of 2014, there is still a lack of guidelines as to how social equality can be promoted.

Discussion

In a time when the political climate is moving in a direction which narrows down identity politics and re-articulates national values, the Finnish education system is introducing a curriculum with strikingly different discourses on multicultural education. Within these discourses, cultural diversity emerges as an intrinsic part of the school and multicultural perspectives are integrated widely throughout the curriculum. Multicultural education is no longer only for minority students but is closely connected to supporting the development of an ethical stance among all students, which is based on the ideals of humanism, democracy and human rights. In sum, the development of the Finnish national curriculum over the past decades appears explicitly as a movement from a tolerance-oriented and a nation-bound curriculum towards a pluralist- and globally oriented curriculum. Particular developments of interest can be perceived in relation to multilingualism and a transformative approach to gender. However, points of silence with regard to, for example, social class remain. There is still a need for development regarding transformative goals, which would actively deal with structural and personal oppression and inequality, and refrain from depoliticised notions of multicultural education. More explicit aims to eliminate social and educational inequalities and deconstruct whiteness would therefore create an even stronger allegiance to equity and justice.

The collaborative system of curricular reform, which involves many stakeholders, appears to show its strength in promoting new understandings of multicultural education in Finland. Even if globalisation commonly shows a neoliberal orientation, our analysis does not bring neoliberal discourses to the forefront as dominating the discourses on multicultural education. Rather, we see signs of the Finnish national curriculum moving towards a globally oriented curriculum where social justice issues form the core. Internationally, the curriculum of 2014 stands out as an example of a curriculum which strongly supports pluralism and human rights education, and hereby takes steps towards institutionalising multicultural

education. The policy advance strives to foster ethical and respectful students with an open attitude towards all kinds of diversity. This highlights new and other ambitions related to social justice than those restricted to academic achievement and internationally high PISA scores, which Finland has been known for. In the light of the multicultural backlash and neoliberalism, it is, as Grant (2016) maintains, fundamental that our policies and practices do not give critics of multicultural education basis for false critique, for instance through having a narrow focus on immigrant students and not integrating a multicultural framework throughout the curriculum. In line with Osler (2015), this curriculum gives hope for developing national multicultural education policies which support justice by a global ethical framework where the principles of human rights and the perception of interdependence are central.

The pressing issue for Finnish educational practice is how the curriculum of 2014 will be implemented from 2016. What are the capacities of teachers and schools to take on the challenges that the new curriculum raises for the comprehensive school? To ensure the policy effects that are aimed for, it is also crucial that the Finnish Government returns to investing in education. From a policy perspective, we can conclude that significant steps away from superficial forms of multicultural education have been taken, but Finland still needs to push forward institutional transformation. Hence, the discourse on multicultural education has been strengthened, but the question remains whether there will be a commitment to bring this policy into practice and to continue to develop it.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank BethAnne Paulsrud for her valuable comments on the previous drafts of the manuscript.

Disclosure Statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

Funding

This work was supported by University of Helsinki, strategic funding (2015–2017).

Notes on contributors

Harriet Zilliacus is a postdoctoral researcher at the Institute of Educational Sciences, University of Helsinki. Her interests center on issues of cultural diversity in education, teacher education and policy-making. Dr. Zilliacus's doctoral dissertation focused on identity and inclusion in minority religious and secular ethics education in the Finnish comprehensive school. She is currently part of the project *Multilingual and Intercultural Education in Finland and Sweden* at University of Helsinki and Stockholm University (2015–2017).

Gunilla Holm is Professor of Education in the Institute of Behavioural Sciences at the University of Helsinki and director of the Nordic Centre of Excellence in Education 'Justice through Education'. Her research focuses on issues in education related to race, ethnicity, class and gender as well as on photography as a research method. Professor Holm's current projects include *Perceptions and Constructions of Marginalization and Belonging* (2013–2016) and *Multilingual and Intercultural Education in Finland and Sweden* (2015–2017).

Fritjof Sahlström is Professor of Education at Åbo Akademi University, and a member of the executive board of the Nordic Centre of Excellence in Education 'Justice through Education'. Professor Sahlström's research is focused on teaching and learning in multilingual interaction, with an interest in how micro-interactional classroom practices constrain and afford equity. His current projects include the literacy project *Textmöten* (2015–2017) and *Multilingual and Intercultural Education in Finland and Sweden* (2015–2017).

ORCID


Harriet Zilliacus http://orcid.org/0000-0002-5290-9713

References

Act on Equality between Women and Men (609/1986). (1986). [Laki naisten ja miesten välisestä tasa-arvosta (609/1986)]. Finnish Parliament.

Ball, S. J. (1990). *Politics and policy making in education. Explorations in policy sociology*. London: Routledge.

Constitution of Finland (731/1999). (1999). [Suomen persustuslaki (731/1999)]. Finnish Parliament.

Coulby, D. (2006). Intercultural education: Theory and practice. *Intercultural Education, 17*, 245–257. doi:10.1080/14675980600840274

Dervin, F., Paatela-Nieminen, M., Kuoppala, K., & Riitaoja, A.-L. (2012). Multicultural education in Finland: Renewed intercultural competencies to the rescue? *International Journal of Multicultural Education, 14*(3), 1–13.

Gee, J. P. (2014). *How to do discourse analysis: A toolkit*. London: Routledge.

Gee, J. P. (2016). Discourse analysis matters: Bridging frameworks. *Journal of Multicultural Discourses, 11*, 343–359. doi:10.1080/17447143.2016.1226316

Gorski, P. C. (2006). Complicity with conservatism: The de-politicizing of multicultural and intercultural education. *Intercultural Education, 17*, 163–177. doi: 10.1080/14675980600693830

Grant, C. A. (2016). Depoliticization of the language of social justice, multiculturalism, and multicultural education. *Multicultural Education Review, 8*(1), 1–13. doi:10.1080/2005615X.2015.1133175

Guilherme, M., & Dietz, G. (2015). Difference in diversity: Multiple perspectives on multicultural, intercultural, and transcultural conceptual complexities. *Journal of Multicultural Discourses, 10*(1), 1–21. doi:10.1080/17447143.2015.1015539

Holm, G., & Londen, M. (2010). The discourse on multicultural education in Finland: Education for whom? *Intercultural Education, 21*, 107–120. doi:10.1080/14675981003696222

Holm, G., & Mansikka, J.-E. (2013). Multicultural education as policy and praxis in Finland: Heading in a problematic direction? *Recherches en Éducation, 16*, 63–74.

Holm, G., & Zilliacus, H. (2009). Multicultural education and intercultural education: Is there a difference? In M. Talib, J. Loima, H. Paavola, & S. Patrikainen (Eds.), *Dialogs on diversity and global education* (pp. 11–28). New York, NY: Peter Lang.

Imsen, G., Blossing, U., & Moos, L. (2016). Reshaping the Nordic education model in an era of efficiency: Changes in the comprehensive school project in Denmark, Norway, and Sweden since the millennium. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*. Advance Online Publication. doi: 10.1080/00313831.2016.1172502

Isopahkala-Bouret, U., Lappalainen, S., & Lahelma, E. (2014). Educating worker-citizens: Visions and divisions in curriculum texts. *Journal of Education and Work, 27*, 92–109. doi:10.1080/13639080.2012.718745

Karseth, B., & Sivesind, K. (2010). Conceptualising curriculum knowledge within and beyond the national context. *European Journal of Education, 45*, 103–120.

Lappalainen, S., & Lahelma, E. (2015). Subtle discourses on equality in the Finnish curricula of upper secondary education: Reflections of the imagined society. *Journal of Curriculum Studies, 48*, 650–670. doi:10.1080/00220272.2015.1069399

Lentin, A., & Titley, G. (2012). The crisis of 'multiculturalism' in Europe: Mediated minarets, intolerable subjects. *European Journal of Cultural Studies, 15*, 123–138.
Marshall, J. (2001). Varieties of neo-liberalism: A Foucaultian perspective. *Educational Philosophy and Theory, 33*, 293–304. doi:10.1111/j.1469-5812.2001.tb00272.x
Mikander, P. (2015). Colonist 'discoveries' in Finnish school textbooks. *Nordidactica, 4*, 48–65.
Ministry of Education. (1991). *Koulutuksen ja korkeakouluissa harjoitettavan tutkimuksen kehittämissuunitelma vuosille 1991–1996* [Developmental plan for research in education and higher education 1991–1996]. Helsinki: Ministry of Education.
Ministry of Education. (1996). *Koulutuksen ja korkeakouluissa harjoitettavan tutkimuksen kehittämissuunnitelma vuosille 1995–2000* [Developmental plan for research in education and higher education 1995–2000]. Helsinki: Ministry of Education.
Ministry of Education. (2000). *Education and research 1999–2004*. Helsinki: Ministry of Education.
Ministry of Education. (2004). *Education and research 2003–2008*. Helsinki: Ministry of Education.
Ministry of Education. (2008). *Education and research 2007–2012*. Helsinki: Ministry of Education.
Ministry of Education and Culture. (2010). *Perusopetus 2020* [Basic education 2020]. Helsinki: Ministry of Education and Culture.
Ministry of Education and Culture. (2011). *Kansainvälisyyskasvatus 2010 ohjelman arviointi* [Evaluation of the Global Education 2010 programme]. Reports 2011:13. Helsinki: Ministry of Education and Culture.
Ministry of Education and Culture. (2012). *Education and research 2011–2016*. Helsinki: Ministry of Education and Culture.
Ministry of Education and Culture. (2014). *Demokratia ja ihmisoikeudet: Tavoitteet ja sisällöt opettajankoulutuksessa* [Democracy and human rights: objectives and contents in teacher education]. Helsinki: Ministry of Education and Culture.
Mølstad, C., & Karseth, B. (2016). National curricula in Norway and Finland: The role of learning outcomes. *European Educational Research Journal, 15*, 329–344.
National Board of Education. (2010). *Monikulttuurisuustaitojen kehittäminen kouluyhteisössä-ohjelma* [Programme for the development of multicultural skills]. Helsinki: National Board of Education.
National Core Curriculum. (1994). *Grunderna för grundskolans läroplan* [Framework curriculum for the comprehensive school]. Helsinki: National Board of Education.
National Core Curriculum. (2004). *Grunderna för läroplanen för den grundläggande utbildningen* [Core curriculum for basic education]. Helsinki: National Board of Education.
National Core Curriculum. (2014). *Grunderna för läroplanen för den grundläggande utbildningen* [Core curriculum for basic education]. Helsinki: National Board of Education.
Non-Discrimination Act (21/2004). (2004) [Yhdenvertaisuuslaki 21/2004)]. Finnish Parliament.
Osler, A. (2015). The stories we tell: Exploring narrative in education for justice and equality in multicultural contexts. *Multicultural Education Review, 7*(1–2), 12–25. doi:10.1080/2005615X.2015.1048605
Popkewitz, T. (1997). The production of reason and power: Curriculum history and intellectual traditions. *Journal of Curriculum Studies, 29*, 131–164.
Riitaoja, A.-L. (2013). *Toiseuksien rakentuminen koulussa: Tutkimus opetussuunnitelmista ja kahden helsinkiläisen alakoulun arjesta* [Constructing otherness in school: A study of curriculum texts and everyday life in two primary schools in Helsinki] (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Helsinki, Helsinki.
Rizvi, F. (2006). Imagination and the globalisation of educational policy research. *Globalisation, Societies and Education, 4*, 193–205. doi:10.1080/14767720600752551
Rizvi, F. (2009). Global mobility and the challenges of educational research and policy. *Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, 108*, 268–289. doi:10.1111/j.1744-7984.2009.01172.x
Räsänen, R. (2007). Intercultural education as education for global responsibility. In T. Kaivola, & M. Melén-Paaso (Eds.), *Education for global responsibility: Finnish perspectives* (pp. 17–32). Helsinki: Ministry of Education.
Saukkonen, P. (2013). Multiculturalism and nationalism: The politics of diversity in Finland. In P. Kivisto (Ed.), *Debating multiculturalism in the Nordic welfare states* (pp. 270–294). New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
Sivesind, K., Afsar, A., & Bachmann, K. (2016). Transnational policy transfer over three curriculum reforms in Finland: The constructions of conditional and purposive programs (1994–2016). *European Educational Research Journal, 15*, 345–365.

Skutnabb-Kangas, T., Phillipson, R., Panda, M., & Mohanty, A. (2009). Multilingual education concepts, goals, needs and expense: English for all or achieving justice? In T. Skutnabb-Kangas, R. Phillipson, A. Mojanti, & M. Panda (Eds.), *Social justice through multilingual education* (pp. 320–344). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Sleeter, C. E., & Grant, C. A. (2006). *Making choices for multicultural education*. New York, NY: Wiley.

Sleeter, C. E. (2010). Probing Beneath Meanings of Multicultural Education. *Multicultural Education Review, 2*(1), 1–24. doi:10.1080/2005615X.2010.11102867

Tanner, A. (2016). Overwhelmed by refugee flows: Scandinavia tempers its warm welcome. *Migration Policy Institute*, February 10. Retrieved from https://www.migrationpolicy.org/print/15554#.Vtv-Ek1f1WI

Tracy, K. (2016). Discourse analysis: Bridging frameworks or cultivating practices? *Journal of Multicultural Discourses, 11*, 360–366. doi:10.1080/17447143.2016.1226317

Vitikka, E., Krokfors, L., & Hurmerinta, E. (2012). The Finnish national core curriculum: Structure and development. In H. Niemi, A. Toom, & A. Kallioniemi (Eds.), *The miracle of education: The principles and practice of teaching and learning in Finnish schools* (pp. 83–96). Rotterdam: Sense.

World Future Council. (2015). *Realising the rights of children: Nine policies contend for award*. Retrieved from https://www.worldfuturecouncil.org/2015/09/29/realising-the-rights-of-children-nine-policies-contend-for-international-award/

Zilliacus, H., Paulsrud, B., & Holm, G. (2017). Essentializing vs. non-essentializing students' cultural identities: Curricular discourses in Finland and Sweden. *Multicultural Discourses*. Advance Online Publication. doi:10.1080/17447143.2017.1311335