

<https://helda.helsinki.fi>

Comparing multicultural education in China and Finland : From policy to practice

Liu, Xiaoxu

2020-05-02

Liu , X 2020 , ' Comparing multicultural education in China and Finland : From policy to practice ' , Asian Ethnicity , vol. 23 , no. 1 , pp. 165-185 . <https://doi.org/10.1080/14631369.2020.1760078>

<http://hdl.handle.net/10138/343199>

<https://doi.org/10.1080/14631369.2020.1760078>

cc_by_nc_nd

acceptedVersion

Downloaded from Helda, University of Helsinki institutional repository.

This is an electronic reprint of the original article.

This reprint may differ from the original in pagination and typographic detail.

Please cite the original version.

Comparing multicultural education in China and Finland:

From policy to practice

Abstract:

Over the last several decades multicultural education has played a key role in many educational policies and practices internationally. In this article, the author examines multicultural education in the Chinese and Finnish contexts through a comparative study. The comparison includes the scope of diversity, the policy and practice of multicultural education, and what two distinct educational systems can learn from each other. A critical multicultural education framework and pluralistic unity nationality theory have been employed to discuss the policy and practice of multicultural education in both countries. The analysis clarifies commonalities and context-bound differences. Implications and suggestions for further development of multicultural education in both countries are also explored.

Keywords: multicultural education, critical multiculturalism, pluralistic unity nationality theory , China, Finland

Introduction

The process of globalization inevitably brings together representatives of different groups, and scholars worldwide are increasingly interested in multicultural education. Multicultural education problematizes the interaction between different ethnic groups, genders and social classes, as well as aims to promote diversity, quality for all, equity and equality in education. Multicultural education is a timely issue both in China and Finland, only under different guises. The term ‘multicultural education’ and the set of values associated with it emerged alongside the Civil Rights Movement in North America during the 1960s and 1970s and its focus was diversity for several minority groups. In Europe, multicultural education is often considered to be a phenomenon related to the massive arrival of migrants in the 1970s which accelerated the process of decolonization and globalization¹. Meanwhile, although Finland has always been a multicultural country with Sámi people, Swedish-speaking people and Romani people, multicultural education in Finland was often symbolized and known in the context of education for migrant students since the 1990s.

Multicultural education is considered to be synonymous with intercultural education as these labels are also unstable and can be used interchangeably.² Often, the difference in use seems mostly geographical. Hence, in Europe, the preferred term is ‘intercultural education’, while especially in the United States but also Australia and Asia the term ‘multicultural education’ is preferred.³ However, multicultural education is also commonly used term in Finland. Thus, in this article, the term ‘multicultural education’ is used to convey both labels, as it is the commonly used term both in China and in Finland, and is more suitable when discussing these two contexts. To understand research on multicultural education in Chinese and Finnish contexts, a literature review is carried out to describe the current status of multicultural education in both countries.

In China, since the 1980 s, Chinese scholars have been trying to adopt the theory of multicultural education in order to develop Chinese ethnic minority education.⁴ Nowadays, multicultural education is an important theory (or approach) in discussing ethnic minority education in China.⁵ To be specific, research concerning multicultural education in China has been categorized into six themes: Marxism and ethnic minority education, patriotism and national unity in education for ethnic minority students, theory of multicultural education, determinants of ethnic differences in education, school facilities and teacher quality, and preferential policies. Studies concerning multicultural education in China focus on the guiding ideology of ethnic minority education and its emphasis on national unity, ethnic differences in educational experiences and outcomes, and ways in which policies should address these educational differences.⁶ Multicultural education in China emphasizes the importance of respecting the traditional cultures of ethnic minority groups. Moreover, it is considered to be a method for teaching ethnic minority students about both mainstream and minority cultures while emphasizing the value of national unity.⁷ However, research about multicultural education in China is vague and limited. Most articles and books relating to multicultural education rely more on theoretical arguments rather than empirical study.⁸

In the Finnish context, research on multicultural education has had a short history within the field of Finnish educational sciences and teacher education. The term ‘multicultural education’ was first used in Finnish policy documents in the 1990 s and was used to refer mainly to a person’s ethnicity or migrant status. Recently, multicultural education in Finland has come to refer to a more critical practice within multicultural education with a focus on social justice, discrimination and structural changes as well as the infusion of cultural diversity issues in education.⁹ The concept of multicultural

education and its focus on ‘culture’ has been criticized internationally for the pitfalls of essentialism and relativism.¹⁰ Culture should be seen as being essential for making up one’s identity, including not only ethnic origin, but also gender, social class, and religion. Alertness, caution and a critical attitude are continuously required in the use of the term ‘culture’ in education and in how difference is to be taken into consideration.¹¹ Moreover, the criticism of multicultural education is focused on the lack of attention on power issues in education which is also the most important concept within critical multicultural education. According to research by Hummelstedt-Djedou, Zilliacus and Holm in 2018, the Nordic research context shows signs of re-conceptualization, which includes a widening of the field and the emergence of new and more critically oriented approaches. Specifically, researchers prefer to use concepts other than multicultural education to approach questions of social justice, diversity and equality in education. In addition, linguistic rather than multicultural categorizations are stressed as a marker of students’ identities. Other alternative concepts such as ‘intersectionality’, ‘anti-racism’, ‘norm-critical education’ and postcolonial analysis also emerge.¹²

A lot of research on multicultural education has been conducted to discuss aims and implementations of multicultural education in different countries. However, there is a lack of agreement on perspectives, dimensions and theoretical concepts of multicultural education between countries.¹³ Comparative study is conducted in this research as it offers the possibility to analyze and critique education from a considerable distance.¹⁴ Meanwhile, it also creates the space for dialogue among the various definitions, discourses, and practices of multiculturalism in two unique countries. This article compares China and Finland, countries, whose histories differ greatly. China can be considered to represent a typical ‘eastern country’ with a population that displays substantial diversity, whereas Finland can be regarded as a Nordic country, where migration is a relatively new phenomenon that dates back to the 1990 s.

This comparative study of multicultural education in China and Finland explores how multicultural education is guaranteed and implemented through policy making and practice in China and Finland. Further, this paper also examines whether there is gap between policy and practice in these two countries and suggests ways in which these two countries could potentially learn from each other. This comparative study aims to gain an understanding of a scholarly insight into multicultural education in these two countries. For the purpose of this study, three research questions were identified: 1) How is multi- cultural education identified in Chinese and Finnish policies, 2) How is multicultural education implemented in China and Finland and does there exist a gap between policy and practice, and 3) What can China and Finland learn

from each other.

Theoretical framework

Global educational research has often relied on constructions of the notion of education from a 'western' perspective and leaves very little space to peripheries. This problematic and somewhat biased approach often leads to research that ignores local contexts and local ways of discoursing. Thus, in my research, I pay attention to bridging the gap between 'the East' and 'the West', and seek ways in which I can combine the theoretical approaches used in both educational systems.

Many researchers have asserted that there are three main theoretical propositions to be used for the study and practices of multicultural education. These include conservative, liberal and critical multiculturalism.¹⁵ In particular, conservative multiculturalism recognizes both cultural and ethnic differences, while categorizing and ascribing certain attributes to minority groups. Thereby, the focus of conservative multicultural education lies in educating the culturally different 'Other' and assimilating them into mainstream society.¹⁶ In contrast to conservative multiculturalism, liberal multiculturalism firmly opposes assimilation as a response to cultural diversity and views diversity in society as something that ought to be accepted and celebrated. However, liberal multiculturalism can easily contribute to culturalism, a phenomenon that entails that those particular ethnic groups are identified as the same and assigned characteristics that are considered by the namers as innate. Culturalism is therefore problematic because there are differences between group and individual identities.¹⁷

Critical multiculturalism not only emphasizes recognizing and celebrating difference and reducing prejudice, but also structurally analyses unequal power relations and challenges unjust institutional practices.¹⁸ Critical multicultural education adheres to challenging the cultural hegemony of dominant cultural groups, social classes and genders. As opposed to the previously mentioned multiculturalism, critical multiculturalism is concerned with social changes as well as social justice, and their relevance to education. The aim of this critical type of multicultural education is to expose a range of social inequalities caused by hidden education curricula. It also focuses on power relationships in the historical and social context within which inequalities take place.¹⁹ Similarly, multicultural education also needs to consistently reformulate itself so that it can play a part in the formulation of a more just world. Critical multicultural education should respond in transformative ways to the hegemonic normalizations that continue to marginalize some groups as 'the Other', while considering already-privileged groups as 'normal'.²⁰ Education can play an important role in supporting local and global forms

of justice when they are implemented in ways that respond directly to the newest forms of exclusion, disenfranchisement, and marginalization.

A theory of multicultural education that takes into consideration Chinese characteristics has also been developed. China has always been a highly pluralistic country and guided by a culturalist tradition that assimilated many groups into its cultural centre.²¹ Therefore, pluralism is as important as unity in conceptualizing ethnic intergroup processes in China.²² Already in the end of the 80 s, Fei suggested a pluralistic unity nationality theory (zhonghua minzu duoyuan yiti 中华民族多元一体) to describe the basic pattern of ethnic relations in Chinese history in his ‘Turner Lecture’.²³ The pluralistic unity nationality theory makes up the base for research on Chinese multicultural education. Moreover, it is the most important theory concerning ethnic studies in the Chinese academic circle, which provides guidance for China’s ethnic policies. According to Fei, three terms ‘Zhonghua Minzu’ (the Chinese people as a whole), ‘Hanzu’ (the Han) and ‘Shaoshu Minzu’ (ethnic minority groups) have been connected to each other throughout China’s long history. It is to be noted that within the Han and other ethnic groups, there exists a multistrata pluralistic configuration. Moreover, such a configuration is often volatile rather than static, meaning that groups of any stratum can be divided, reunited and re-divided. Some can actually be disintegrated yet remain unified outwardly, while others may insist on certain ethnic peculiarities after having mixed with another group for centuries. Thus, according to the pluralistic unity nationality theory, the Han and other ethnic groups are both ‘the self’ and ‘the other’ to each other, which influences the discourse of research on multicultural education and policy making.²⁴ Fei’s formulation was applied to the field of education in the People’s Republic of China (PRC), with a number of Chinese scholars and officials debating its relationship to minority education and the Western discourse of multicultural education.²⁵

Research method

This paper is based on sampled articles and documents in Chinese and English. It concerns traditions on ‘multiculturalism and multicultural education’ in Chinese and Finnish academia between 1990 and 2018. The articles were selected according to a three- step process. Firstly, four search phrases ‘multiculturalism/diversity in Finland’, ‘multi- culturalism/diversity in China’, ‘multi/intercultural education in China’ and ‘multi/ intercultural education in Finland’ were used to find journal articles in the largest Chinese journal database, namely the Chinese National Knowledge Infrastructure (CNKI), as well as the Education Resources Information Center (ERIC)

and Social Science Citation Index (SSCI) databases. Primary articles published between 1990 and 2018 were selected. Furthermore, decrees and documents issued by the Chinese and the Finnish government concerning multicultural education were also collected. After the initial selection of literature, snowball and backtracking references were also searched.

Secondly, abstracts were read and articles that were not relevant to the research questions were excluded, which lead to 270 journal articles including 200 Chinese articles and 70 English articles for final review. Lastly, critical discourse analysis was used to analyze the data. As described by Blommaert and Verschuren, language is the central medium of discourse, as a way into ideology. A discourse-analytical approach will encourage a focus on how meaning is produced through discourse.²⁶ Critical discourse analysis attempts to analyze both opaque and transparent structural relationships of dominance, discrimination, power and control when these are manifested in language.²⁷ Another aim of critical discourse analysis is to investigate critically social inequality as it is expressed, constituted and legitimized by language use.²⁸ However, it needs to be noted that for the purpose of this article restricted amounts of literature regarding Finnish multicultural education were consulted due to the author's limited Finnish language abilities. Therefore, all the articles and documents concerning multicultural education in Finland referred to in this paper are in English instead of Finnish.

Chinese and Finnish contexts

In contemporary China, education for diversity mainly refers to 56 ethnic groups and migration between rural and urban areas. After the recognition campaign of the 'minzu' (ethnic group, 民族) in the 1950s and early 1960s, ethnic identity in China is still an official category defined by the government and placed on all identity cards.²⁹ According to the newest Sixth National Population Census of the PRC published in 2011, Han people account for 92 percent of the total population speaking nearly 2000 distinct dialects or sub-dialects and 55 ethnic minority groups comprise 8 percent of the population.³⁰ There are about 120 mother tongues in minority regions, among which 30 minority languages have written scripts.³¹ Although 55 ethnic minority groups are often generalized as minorities, there is a huge diversity between ethnic groups. For instance, the biggest ethnic minority group is Zhuang (壮族) which has the population of around 17 million but the least populous ethnic group Tartar (塔塔尔族) only has 3556 people.³² The geographic distribution patterns of ethnic groups are also quite diversified. Tibetans, Uyghurs and Mongolians live more concentrated in their

traditional residential areas, while Han, Manchu, and Hui are spread throughout the country.

In comparison, multiculturalism in Finland is often symbolized by the increasing number of migrants since the 1990 s, and multiculturalism and migration are closely tied together in research.³³ According to Statistics Finland, there were over 400 thousand persons with a foreign background living in Finland at the end of 2018, which constitutes some 7.3 percent of the entire population. In addition, the number of people recognized as Sámi and having Sámi as their mother tongue was around 1900 in 2018, and 5 percent of the population were Swedish-speaking Finns.³⁴ Moreover, even before the migration to Finland, there was already a tradition of guaranteeing minority rights. For example, Finland is a bilingual country with two parallel school systems in Finnish and Swedish. Finland also has two national churches Lutheran and Russian Orthodox as well as rights for the Sámi indigenous people and Romani people.³⁵

Regarding political system design, the PRC designates a system of regional autonomous areas in locations where large numbers of ethnic minority groups reside. Regional ethnic autonomy is the basic policy adopted for resolving the ethnic issue in China and also an important political system of the state. The National People's Congress (quanguo renmin daibiao dahui 全国人民代表大会) adopted the Regional Ethnic Autonomy Law of the People's Republic of China (zhonghua renmin gongheguo minzu quyue zizhi fa 中华人民共和国民族区域自治法)³⁶ in 1984. According to the law, the people's congresses of ethnically autonomous areas have the power to enact self-governing regulations in the light of the political, economic and cultural characteristics of the ethnic groups in the areas concerned (article 19). In particular, the freedom to use and develop ethnic languages and characters, and customs is guaranteed (article 10). The freedom of religious belief should be respected and guaranteed by the state, social groups and individuals. Discrimination and oppression against any ethnic group is prohibited, and acts that undermine national unity and create ethnic divisions are prohibited.

Meanwhile, in terms of education, there is a gap between ethnic minorities and Han concerning the development of science and technology, economy, education and other fields. The Han have more resources and most of the regions with large ethnic minority populations are relatively underdeveloped, socially and economically.³⁷ The Regional Ethnic Autonomy Law also emphasizes the support from the government to develop both basic and higher education for ethnic minority groups. According to article 71, the state should set up colleges and universities, regular classes and preparatory classes that enroll only or mostly students from ethnic minority groups in higher education. Ethnic minority students can be recruited from specific areas and assigned jobs in specific areas after graduation. Colleges and universities and vocational schools have

appropriately set lower enrollment requirements for students from ethnic minority groups, especially for ethnic groups with small populations. Local government and schools use multiple methods to assist students from economically disadvantaged families to complete their education. In basic education, ethnic middle schools should be established in economically advanced areas, and classes in regular middle schools which specifically recruit ethnic minority students should also be set up. Preferential policies have also been adopted to attract teachers and graduates with teaching qualifications to teach in ethnically autonomous areas.³⁸ Five province-level autonomous regions, 30 autonomous prefectures, 120 autonomous counties and 1256 ethnic townships have been established across the country. These autonomous areas comprise 64 percent of the territory of mainland China.³⁹

Similarly, in Finland, self-government and autonomy is also given to the Sámi people to protect and develop their own language and culture. The Sámi have had Constitutional self-government in the Sámi Homeland in the spheres of language and culture since 1996. This self-government is guaranteed by the Act on the Sámi Parliament and managed by the Sámi Parliament, which is elected by the Sámi. The Skolt Sámi also maintain their tradition of village administration, under the Skolt Act, within the area reserved for the Skolt Sámi in the Sámi Homeland. The Sámi Homeland is legally defined and covers the municipalities of Enontekiö, Inari and Utsjoki as well as the Lappi reindeer-herding district in the municipality of Sodankylä.⁴⁰ Moreover, Swedish is one of the two national languages in Finland and the Swedish speakers are well integrated to Finnish society.

There are also some bilingual or Swedish municipalities which guarantee residents' right to speak Swedish with authorities. For instance, Åland is an archipelago with Swedish as the only official language. Åland has been granted significant legislative power vis-à-vis the Autonomy Act and thereby constitutes a federalized arrangement. It possesses its own regional assembly and regional executive with exclusive powers in the fields of education, health, culture, industry and policing and elects a single representative to the Finnish Parliament. Finnish state law applies in the areas in which the Åland Parliament does not have legislative powers including foreign affairs, most areas of civil and criminal law, the court system, customs and state taxation.⁴¹

In conclusion, each country's population has a different composition. China has a longer history as a multiethnic country and consequently more experience with attempting to manage cultural difference. This experience is guided by a culturalist tradition that has assimilated many ethnic and other groups into its cultural centre.⁴² Moreover, Finland is often regarded as being culturally and ethnically homogeneous despite its long history with Swedish speakers, Sámi people and Romani people. Discussions and research regarding Finnish multicultural education have been going

on since the second half of the twentieth century, and now increasingly strive to involve migrant and indigenous communities in these discussions.⁴³ But political system in China and Finland are similar in terms of guaranteeing the rights of language and culture of minority groups, although their histories differ.

Policy and practice of Chinese multicultural education

In China, the descriptive term ‘multiethnic country/society’ is generally accepted, while the term ‘multicultural education’ is not deliberately promoted. Policy documents issued by the Ministry of Education (MOE) and the State Ethnic Affairs Commission (SEAC) make frequent reference to the importance of ‘cultural pluralism’.⁴⁴ China’s concept of cultural diversity might be traced as far back as the Confucian notion of ‘harmonious yet different’ (he’er butong 和而不同).⁴⁵ Furthermore, ‘unity and diversity (duoyuan yiti 多元一体)’ is the aim and goal of ethnic policies in modern China, education is an important field to promote multiculturalism in China.⁴⁶

In the field of education, multiculturalism is realized through the bilingual education policy and preferential policies for ethnic minority groups. In many ways, language policy is the central characteristic of China’s education policy. As mentioned before, the Regional Ethnic Autonomy Law guaranteed ethnic minorities’ rights to use and develop ethnic languages and characters, customs and religious belief. Meanwhile, both basic education and higher education are stipulated to meet the requirement of students from ethnic minority groups. Moreover, preferential policies for minority students and teachers, such as lowering the cutoff level or providing bonus points for ethnic minority students at all school levels, were adopted in line with the law to boost minority students’ educational outcomes.⁴⁷

After 26 years of development, the Outline of the National Medium and Long Term Educational Reform and Development Plan (guojia zhongchangqi jiaoyu gaige he fazhan guihua gangyao 国家中长期教育改革发展规划纲要)⁴⁸ was published in 2010 to further promote the development of multicultural education in China at the national level. Firstly, the government is further developing preparatory classes for ethnic minority students at universities and colleges, and increase efforts to support the education of ethnic groups with a small population. Secondly, the plan advocates bilingual teaching in ethnically autonomous areas and protects the rights of ethnic minority groups to use their native language. The pre-school bilingual education is strengthened and ethnic minority teachers and textbooks are supported by the government. Further, it also aims to offer Mandarin language courses to promote the national

language. Thirdly, the government provides preferential policies to attract ethnic minority elites to work in minority areas and attract ethnic minority students to study in inland China.⁴⁹

In particular, language, religion and customs are often taken to describe objective 'cultural markers' in ethnic identification and language is the dominant cultural symbol of a particular group identity.⁵⁰ Thus, bilingual education remains a strongly visible indicator of a state's position on multicultural education. In the ethnic minority autonomous areas (minority areas) of China, bilingual and multilingual education has been adopted in basic education since the 1950s, and the approaches to the practices differ widely for geographic, economic, political and linguistic factors. Four distinct practice models have been recognized based on research by Adamson and Feng: the accretive, balanced, transitional and depreciative model.⁵¹ The accretive model strongly emphasizes that the minority language is the medium of instruction in schools. Moreover, minority language is stressed in the school environment as the official language for notices and school documents. Mandarin and English are taught as school subjects. This model is mainly found in the areas in which the ethnic group comprises the majority of the population and their ethnic language is well established, such as the Yanbian Korean autonomous prefecture. Secondly, the balanced model pays almost equal attention to the ethnic minority language and Mandarin. The minority language and Mandarin are both used as a medium of instruction and the bilingual environment is supported by manifesting both Mandarin and minority language notices on the walls and encouraging teachers and students to interact in both languages. English is taught as a subject from the third grade onwards with Mandarin and the minority language as medium. This model is often found in the mixed ethnic communities like Inner Mongolia where the demographics indicate a relatively even mix of the ethnic minority people and the majority Han group.

Thirdly, the transitional model prioritizes Mandarin ahead of the minority language with two variations. The first variation is identified in areas with a significant Han presence where one or more minority languages are spoken. However, the ethnolinguistic vitality of the minority languages tends to be moderate because of the interaction with the Han majority in Mandarin. The medium of instruction in school is predominantly Mandarin and the dominant minority language in the area is taught as a subject at the primary school level. Ultimately, Mandarin becomes the dominant language in school and the minority language eventually disappears, prior to secondary school. The other variant is found in schools in remote, rural settings where one minority group dominates. These languages may or may not have their own written scripts, although the communities generally maintain a strong oral tradition. In this case, the minority language is used as the medium of instruction from grade 1 to 3 with

Mandarin taught as a subject. In many cases, the textbooks of school subjects are also in Mandarin. After two or three years, Mandarin replaces the minority language as the medium of instruction and English is taught as a school subject.

The fourth depreciative model is a weak form of trilingual education characterized as depreciative on the basis that the potential for developing trilingualism is denied to the students in favour of bilingualism in Mandarin and English. This linguistic depreciation occurs in schools at which students and staff have the capacity to be trilingual, but do not have tangible provisions to use the minority language as the medium of instruction, much less offer it as a subject or encourage its use as the language of daily discourse in school. These schools are usually found in the language communities in which the ethnolinguistic vitality of the minority language is weak or the minority language lacks a written form.⁵²

Regarding the curriculum, the Outline of Basic Education Curriculum Reform (jichu jiaoyu kecheng gaige gangyao 基础教育课程改革纲要) which was also called New Curriculum Reform was implemented by the MOE in 2001. The aim was to implement three-level curriculum management and to enhance the adaptability of the curriculum to local schools and students. As one of the major facets of curriculum modernization, the previous emphasis on a unified national curriculum has been relaxed and decentralized into a three-layer system: national curriculum, local curriculum, and school-based curriculum.⁵³ The MOE plans the basic education curriculum and management policies and also determines the national curriculum categories and hours. In addition, the national curriculum standards and evaluation system has been developed by the MOE. At the provincial level, provincial education administrative departments can individually develop curriculum standards and textbooks to be used within their province. Local schools can also develop textbooks emphasizing the specific circumstances of local social and economic development. It is at the local (provincial) and school levels that the values of cultural diversity can be most effectively implemented.⁵⁴ Thus, a variety of local textbooks are developed in ethnic minority areas.⁵⁵ These textbooks include local ecological environment, local life, folk customs, social history, language, arts and ethnic literature. Their aim is to increase understanding among ethnic groups nationwide, as well as to make state schools much more attractive to ethnic minority communities, thereby promoting a harmonious multiculturalism for a more unified nation.⁵⁶

Except for language policy for ethnic minority groups, preferential policies also play an important role in Chinese multicultural education in terms of promoting the quality of minority education and narrowing the gap between the Han and ethnic minorities. In particular, preparatory classes in higher education and lowering the cutoff level or providing bonus points for minority students at all school levels are the more important

measures.⁵⁷ One-year and two-year preparatory classes have been set up at some colleges and universities for ethnic minority students to prepare for undergraduate and master's education. In most cases, the duration of the preparatory class is one year, and two-year preparatory classes are targeted at ethnic groups with relatively small populations and students with poor Mandarin. Ethnic minority students who finish high school education or undergraduate education can be enrolled in preparatory classes with lower admission requirements or bonus points. After one or two years of study and passing the exam, they will receive the regular undergraduate and master's education. The main subjects of preparatory classes for high school graduates are Mandarin, mathematics, English, computer science, ethnic theory and fundamentals of law. For undergraduate students, there are modern and contemporary literature, classical literature, English and other elective subjects. Those responsible for preparatory classes have the autonomy to design their own curriculum, but the curriculum in the preparatory class is difficult to design because students will be distributed across more than 100 majors after finishing the preparatory class. Moreover, the preparatory class for undergraduate students is also part of the program 'the plan of high-level elites of ethnic minorities' (shaoshuminzu gao-cengci gupan rencai jihua 少数民族高层次骨干人才计划)⁵⁸ which is especially designed for master's and doctoral students. The plan of the program in 2020 is to recruit 1000 minority doctoral students and 4000 master's students from ethnic minority origins.⁵⁹ Until now, more than 100 universities have been offering preparatory classes for ethnic minority students.⁶⁰

Furthermore, the most significant preferential policy for ethnic minority students has been setting lower cutoff points for admission to all school levels, especially colleges and universities. As early as 1950, the government stipulated for the first time that 'though their examination scores are a little lower, ethnic minority students can be shown leniency in school admissions'.⁶¹ Nowadays, this practice varies according to different regions (compact ethnic minority community/non-compact ethnic minority community; urban area/rural area), different teaching languages and special admission scores. For instance, in Hebei province, the minimum admission score to college and university is reduced by 10 points for students from its ethnically autonomous counties and by 5 points for minority students from a non-compact ethnic community. Moreover, ethnic students from remote areas are treated differently from those from big cities. For example, in Yunnan Province, minority students from border areas, mountainous high-lands, nomadic pastoral areas and other compact ethnic minority communities can have 10 points added onto their College Entrance Exam scores, while minority students from elsewhere enjoy only priority in university

admission over Han Chinese students under identical terms and conditions.

Different policies are also employed according to different teaching languages. For example, in Qinghai province, minority students from six ethnically autonomous prefectures who take part in the National College Entrance Examination (NCEE) in Mandarin can be granted 30 points. In addition, special admission scores are set for ethnic minority students in some provinces. In the Inner Mongolia Autonomous Region, special university and college admission scores are lower for Mongolian students who have received their basic education in ethnic minority languages. For instance, in 2019, Inner Mongolia set up admission scores for first enrollment into Humanities and Science majors at 522 points and 477 points for Han students, whereas the scores for students educated in the Mongolian language were 398 points and 348 points respectively.⁶²

However, there are significant discrepancies between policy and practice, as well as between promoting pluralism and unity.⁶³ In terms of bilingual and trilingual education, differentiated practice is implemented because of the complex ecology shaped by geo- graphic, demographic, linguistic, pedagogical, historical, economic and political factors. Bilingual and trilingual education practice can vary from the predominance of an ethnic minority language at one extreme to the predominance of Mandarin at the other. Thus, the quality of bilingual and trilingual education varies in different regions and not all languages can be equally promoted.⁶⁴ Furthermore, Ma conducted research in Xinjiang Uyghur autonomous area and found increasing support for Mandarin as the medium of instruction among ethnic minority parents.⁶⁵ Zhang and Liu also argued that bilingual/ trilingual education may hinder the integration and upward mobility of ethnic minority people.⁶⁶ There are also various difficulties associated with implementing bilingual/ trilingual education. Firstly, because of poverty, there exists a lack of qualified bilingual/trilingual teachers who can appropriately implement bilingual/trilingual education to minority classroom instruction.⁶⁷ Secondly, although curriculum reform gives more space to local schools to develop local textbooks, these textbooks vary in quality and some ethnic language textbooks are translated directly from materials originally written in Mandarin, but not adapted to the minority students' learning needs. Meanwhile, researchers have found that speaking Mandarin guarantees not only better employment opportunities but also 'the option of entry into the identity of being Chinese.' Discriminatory views toward minority languages and cultures from local government officials still exist.⁶⁸

Preferential policies have considerably increased ethnic minority students' access to higher education and further facilitated educational equity and equality. However, there has been considerable debate in China and also worldwide concerning preferential policies for specific groups in education. Reverse discrimination is the

most significant argument which claims that the favoring of some specific groups may disadvantage the majority group.⁶⁹ At the same time, preferential policies also paste the tag of ‘insufficient ability’ on minority students and influence both how they view their own position in society and how others perceive them.⁷⁰ Teng and Ma also argued that ‘current policies are no longer effective in promoting social equality and multicultural education. Because the current implementation no longer accords with the original intent of the policy, and the use of ethnic identity as the sole criteria for educational preferences creates a blunt and ineffective tool for increasing educational equality. The system should be reformed in order to take into account obvious differences in geography, class and income levels.’⁷¹

Policy and practice of Finnish multicultural education

In Finland, the values of Finnish education are based on quality and equality regardless of differences in racial, ethnic, cultural, or socio-economic backgrounds. Finland has laws and a national curriculum which can be interpreted as being supportive of multicultural education.⁷² Specifically, the Constitution of Finland guarantees the rights of every society member to their own language and culture. It declares: ‘The national languages of Finland are Finnish and Swedish. The right of everyone to use his or her own language, either Finnish or Swedish, before courts of law and other authorities, and to receive official documents in that language, shall be guaranteed. The public authorities shall provide for the cultural and societal needs of the Finnish-speaking and Swedish-speaking populations of the country on an equal basis. The Sámi, as an indigenous people, as well as the Romani and other groups, have the right to maintain and develop their own language and culture.’ Especially in the case of the Romani group, regardless of policy and educational reform, the children of Romani remain largely on the outskirts of the educational system due to prejudice and pressure from within the ethnic group.⁷³

Meanwhile, the value of educational quality and equality is also reflected in the fact that Finland guarantees migrants the same educational opportunities as the majority.⁷⁴ It needs to be noted that migrant students/students from migrant background are defined as newly arrived/first generation, second generation or returning migrant children and young people.⁷⁵ However, the definition of who can be labeled a migrant child is unclear in Finland. Therefore, the status of students from migrant background in Finland can only be done on the basis of nationality or mother tongue. According to the Population Research Institute, children who have moved to Finland with their parents are considered migrants.⁷⁶ Sometimes children of one or two migrant parents also are considered migrants even if they were born in Finland. The estimation of children with a migrant background is usually calculated on the basis of a child’s

reported mother tongue.⁷⁷

The Act on the Promotion of Migrant Integration⁷⁸ came into force in 2011, and aimed to promote integration, equality and making migrants play an active role in Finnish society. Different measures and services which help migrant students to acquire the essential knowledge and skills they need to function in society are prescribed to promote integration, including a personalized integration plans for individuals and families, as well as integration financial assistance to aid integration.⁷⁹ In particular, the integration plan involves not only Finnish or Swedish language training, but also provides teaching of the migrant's mother tongue, and the teaching of reading and writingskills in his or her language, studies that complement basic education. Moreover, financial support is also provided to migrants so that they have secure for the duration of the participation in the measures carried out as part of the integration plan. In addition to the integration plan and assistance, measures promoting the integration of migrant children and young migrants like child welfare aftercare, special measures for children in special need are also stipulated.

In regard with education, the National Core Curriculum is an important policy to guarantee the development of multicultural education in Finland. Prior to the publication of the 2014 core curriculum, the discourse on cultural diversity was largely confined to migrant students/students from migrant background and only to some extent to ethnic minority students. Holm and Londen conducted a research in 2010 to examine the multicultural education discourse in Finland by analyzing the national and municipal curricula for comprehensive schools, educational policy documents and teacher education curricula. The analysis showed that cultural diversity was regarded as ethnicity, languages and religions regarding to migrants. And the existing diversity including bilingual students, two national churches and an indigenous population was excluded from multicultural education.⁸⁰

However, the 2014 curriculum reveals a change in discourse, as all students are seen as multicultural and multilingual, and the significance of diversity is not restricted to highlighting particular students. Notably, instead of 'migrant integration' in the curriculum of 2014, there is more talk of integrating students with 'other cultural and linguistic backgrounds'.⁸¹ Society is described as changing and global, and the school as a learning community, is seen as a part of a culturally transforming and pluralist society in which different identities, languages, religions and beliefs coexist and interact.⁸² The meaning of diversity in the Core Curriculum has changed from being an external influence, to becoming an intrinsic part of the school. Furthermore, the perspective on diversity has also developed to a pluralistic perspective rather than a majority perspective. Attention to diversity even within the Finnish language and culture is included as the objective for education in Finland is 'to encourage the student

to take note of the Finnish language and its cultural diversity in the surroundings'.⁸³ Therefore, multicultural education at curriculum level 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. The curriculum of 2014 also significantly promotes the institutionalization of multicultural education as it supports human rights, democracy and pluralism education.⁸⁴

Schools play an important role in integrating students with migrant background and realize multicultural policies.⁸⁵ Policies related to the linguistic and cultural rights of migrant and minority students have been developed and implemented in educational field. Some forms of action, such as native-language instruction and subsidies for migrant associations, have already become institutionalized. Migrant students have had the right to education in their mother tongue since 1998. Native language instruction for students with migrant background contributes to the pupil's growth into a multicultural person and his/her integration in Finnish society. Furthermore, Finnish schools also organize teaching and learning according to migrant students' capacities and backgrounds, as schools and municipalities have enough autonomy to plan their own curriculums to reflect the local context. Hereby the student's individual background and his/her progress in Finnish/Swedish are considered in the assessment of other subjects. Moreover, the religious diversity among pupils is also taken into account in school practices.⁸⁶

Similar to China, preparatory education has also been implemented since 2014 to improve opportunities for general upper secondary education for students from migrant backgrounds. The preparatory education supports migrants and foreign-language speakers to improve their native-language and Finnish, and other learning skills needed in upper secondary education, and also lifelong learning and self-development. Promoting knowledge about Finnish society and culture is also one of the significant objectives of the preparatory education.⁸⁷ Thus, Finnish schools place significant responsibility on well-trained teachers to support the child in both the mother tongue and Finnish or Swedish. Since 2010, focus has been increasingly oriented towards multicultural and multi-language teacher competencies to ensure the availability of high quality education for all students regardless of their racial, economic, ethnic or linguistic background. The Ministry of Education has set up teacher networks to help in matters related to migrant education.⁸⁸

However, gaps between policies and practices still exist. For instance, Mira, Varjo and Jahnukainens' research showed that youths of migrant origin in general, and boys in particular, share a contradiction which refers to the combination of a positivity toward education and difficulties in learning and studying. Their research also indicates

that the migrant-origin youth confront the upper secondary choices in a much more complex and multidimensional situation than their native-Finnish counterparts.⁸⁹ In addition, Ismail's research and the report of Migrant Pupils and the Effectiveness of Basic Education (Maahanmuuttajaoppilaat ja perusopetuksen tuloksellisuus) published in 2015 also confirm the gap between migrant students and native-Finnish students. Ismail's research shows that Finland has the widest performance gap between its migrant and native students. Finnish basic education does not provide all migrant students with equal opportunities and it highlighted that in some groups, the second-generation students at the Finnish schools are doing worse than the first-generation migrants.⁹⁰

Moreover, the report of Migrant Pupils and the Effectiveness of Basic Education (Maahanmuuttajaoppilaat ja perusopetuksen tuloksellisuus) published in 2015 tried to compare the effectiveness of basic education between migrant students and the majority. It also looks at how pupils with a migrant background had been supported in learning Finnish and their mother tongue by the age of 15. According to the report, when compared to pupils belonging to the native population, basic education does not provide equal opportunities for pupils with a migrant background. In addition, 15-year-old pupils with a migrant background are clearly inferior to the native population in mathematics, literacy and science. This gap still exists after considering gender, grade level, socioeconomic background, native language and entry age.⁹¹ Moreover, migrant students' background influence the schools' efforts in supporting students' native language and Finnish learning. The socio-economic position of pupils with a migrant background is on average weaker than that of the native pupils. The language spoken at home also has a particular influence on literacy that students who speak Finnish and Swedish perform better in literacy. In addition, about half of first-generation migrants had attended Finnish language support education during primary school.⁹² However, the percentage of second-generation migrants was slightly lower due to the decentralized distribution of migrants. Thus, the equality of guaranteeing migrant students' native language learning is challenged because students from Russia, Estonia and Iraq are more likely to be supported than those from Somalia, the former Yugoslavia and Turkey. Therefore, second-generation migrants need more support to achieve the goal of educational equality. Moreover, the reasons why migrant students' academic performance is not as good as native students should also be further researched.

Conclusion and discussion

To explore the possibilities of learning from each other, comparison of multicultural education in China and Finland is made. This article has shown opportunities to examine examples of contextualized dilemmas and see different contexts between countries and within countries.⁹³ What stand out most clearly from this discussion are the ways in which China and Finland not only providing ideological space for each other to define multicultural education within the context of its own policy and practice. These two countries but also looking outward to establish its own unique position and relevance within the global community.

Multicultural education in China especially concerning ethnic minority education is highly politicized and Chinese multicultural education has a two-fold objective: national unity and cultural diversity to respond to change as a result of its economic development and globalization.⁹⁴ It does so mainly through language policy the aim of which is to protect minority language, and preferential policies for ethnic minorities in order to promote education quality and equality. Furthermore, the curriculum reform focuses on decentralized curriculum which can reflect local concerns. However, research has confirmed that a gap exists between China's minority policy and its practice.⁹⁵ Minority groups' languages and cultures are facing challenges from poverty in minority regions, the lack of qualified bilingual teachers, and the powerful influence of official Mandarin and Han culture.⁹⁶

In Finland, the Constitution and the National Core Curriculum guarantee the rights of every society member to one's own language and culture both in and out of schools. In particular, native-language instruction and subsidies for migrant associations have already been taken on a relatively institutionalized status. Moreover, preparatory education for students whose mother tongue is something else than Finnish, has been adopted and multi-cultural teacher training programs have also been established. Still, practice in multicultural education varies depending on the diversity of the school context and the interest of the teachers.⁹⁷ Thus, in the context of policies on multiculturalism in both countries, it is possible to see a number of similarities in terms of multicultural education. Both Chinese and Finnish multicultural education aim to support cultural diversity and social justice, as well as countering marginalization and discrimination in education and society.⁹⁸

Secondly, both the Chinese and Finnish research shows signs of re-conceptualizations of multicultural education, which include a widening of the field and the emergence of new and more critically-orientated approaches. In particular, cultural diversity in both countries is no longer narrowly seen as ethnic, language and

religious diversity. Teng has already stressed the importance of broadening the focus on multicultural education to include not only the minorities but also the mainstream Han community in 1998.⁹⁹ Meanwhile, the discourse of diversity in the Finnish core curriculum has also changed from ‘migrant languages and religions’ to ‘other cultural and linguistic backgrounds’ to ‘diversity within Finnish language and culture’. The meaning of diversity in the Finnish context has changed from external influence to become an intrinsic part of the school. The perspective of multicultural education has been broadened from one-way thinking about multicultural education to two-way integration that forms shared concepts and social institutions together.¹⁰⁰ ‘The other’ or ‘the minority’ in both China and Finland should be taken better into account in an ethical way. More research is needed to explore the practice of two-way integration in both China and Finland. Lastly, although laws and core curricula in both countries guarantee and promote the development of multicultural education, there are still discrepancies between policies and practices.

The differences between multicultural education in China and Finland are thus different responses to the unique geopolitical and demographic circumstances of the nation. And different frameworks of multicultural education within China and Finland are defined and practiced. Although local schools are taking more responsibility, policy tilt from the government is still the primary means to promote multicultural education in China. In contrast, the implementation of Finnish multicultural education emphasizes institutional practices to a greater degree as teachers have a high degree of autonomy to select textbooks, instructional methods and create assessment.¹⁰¹ In both China and Finland, more teachers with different ethnic, language and religion backgrounds are employed. Some teacher training programs are adopted to promote multicultural education. However, multicultural education has not been the obligatory in all systematic teacher training programs. Multicultural education should be further systematically promoted and implemented from national policy to everyday class, especially in teacher training programs.

Additionally, Chinese multicultural education is based on pluralistic unity nationality theory and critical multiculturalism is widely explored and promoted in Finnish multi-cultural education. However, two theories can enlighten each other and provide refer- ence. For Chinese multicultural education, based on the current focus of not only pursuing educational equality and quality for all, but also celebrating diversity, it is also important that all students should possess the tools necessary for navigating the current social order. There is a call within critical multicultural education for the selective discourse from dominant discourses which cover language, interaction styles and knowl- edge. So that people of all backgrounds in China are not only able to survive within the mainstream, but more importantly they are armed to

transform it.¹⁰² Meanwhile, the pluralistic unity theory is also applicable in the Finnish context that people with different ethnic, migrant and language backgrounds coexisted in Finnish history and also in modern Finland. The relationship between groups is volatile and people's identity is changing all the time as groups of any stratum can be divided, reunited and re-divided. Thus, both pluralism and unity should be promoted simultaneously to decrease the current socio-economic and ethnic segregation of Finnish schools.

Notes

1. Dervin, "Towards Post-intercultural Education in Finland?" 19–29.
2. Hummelstedt-Djedou et al., "Diverging Discourses on Multicultural Education in Finnish," 184–202.
3. Holm and Zilliacus, "Multicultural Education and Intercultural Education: Is there a Difference," 11–28.
4. Wan and Bai, "Comparison between Western Multicultural Education and Minority Education in China," 32–41.
5. Jin, Pei and Xiao, "The Chinese Nation: "National Complex" or "National Entity"?" 1–13.
6. Cherng et al., "China: Sociological Perspectives on Ethnicity and Education," 301–344.
7. Ma, 2007, "Comparative Research on Affirmative Action in China and America," 117.
8. See note 4 above.
9. See Finnish National Board of Education (FNBE). "National Core Curriculum for Basic Education 2014."
10. Mikander, Zilliacus and Holm, "Intercultural Education in Transition: Nordic Perspectives," 40–56.
11. Holm and Mansikka, "Multicultural Education as Policy and Praxis in Finland," 63–74.
12. See note 10 above.
13. Leeman and Reid, "Multi/intercultural Education in Australia and the Netherlands," 57–72. 14. Ibid.
15. Gorski, "What we're Teaching Teachers," 309–318.
16. See note 2 above.
17. Palaiologou and Gorski, "The Evolution of Intercultural and Multicultural Education," 353–355.
18. May and Sleeter, "Introduction: Critical multiculturalism," 7–22.

19. Wang, *Between Modern Schooling and Cultural Heritage*, 71–72.
20. See note 17 above.
21. Postiglione, *Education and Social Change in China*.
22. Postiglione, *Education, Ethnicity, Society and Global Change in Asia*.
23. Fei, “Pluralist-Unity of Chinese Nation,” 1–19.
24. *Ibid.*
25. See note 19 above.
26. Blommaert and Verschuren, *Debating diversity*, 1–9.
27. Fairclough, “Critical Discourse Analysis as a Method,” 121–38.
28. Wodak, “Critical Linguistics and Critical Discourse Analysis,” 50–69.
29. Postiglione, “Making Tibetans in China,” 1–20.
30. Li, “Chinese as a Lingua Franca in Greater China,” 149–76.
31. Zuo, “China’s Policy towards Minority Languages,” 80–91.
32. See Sixth National Population Census of the People’s Republic of China.
33. Holm and Londen, “The Discourse on Multicultural Education in Finland,” 107–20.
34. See the website of Statistics Finland https://www.stat.fi/index_en.html.
35. See note 11 above.
36. See Regional Ethnic Autonomy Law of the PRC: [provisions/regional-ethnic-autonomy-law-of-the-peoples-republic-of-china-amended](http://www.cecc.gov/resources/legal-provisions/regional-ethnic-autonomy-law-of-the-peoples-republic-of-china-amended).
37. See Multicultural Research Center of Beijing Normal University, “National Report of Multicultural Education of China,” 28.
38. See <https://www.cecc.gov/resources/legal-provisions/regional-ethnic-autonomy-law-of-the-peoples-republic-of-china-amended#body-chinese>.
39. Wu, *Introduction to Ethnic Issues*, 1–10.
40. Kent, *The Sami Peoples of the North*.
41. Hepburn, “Forging Autonomy in a Unitary State,” 468–87.
42. See note 21 above.
43. See note 41 above.
44. Leibold and Chen, *Minority education in China*.
45. Postiglione, “Education and Cultural Diversity in Multiethnic China,” 27–43.
46. *Ibid.*
47. *Ibid.*
48. See http://old.moe.gov.cn/publicfiles/business/htmlfiles/moe/moe_177/201407/17904.html.
49. See the document

http://www.gov.cn/jrzg/201007/29/content_1667143.htm.

50. Smith, National Identity.
51. Adamson and Feng, "Trilingualism in Education," 243–58.
52. Ibid.
53. See note 44 above.
54. Ibid.
55. See
http://old.moe.gov.cn/publicfiles/business/htmlfiles/moe/moe_309/200412/4672.html.
56. See note 29 above.
57. Lu, "Research on the Reform of Preparatory Class Teaching," Tao and Wang, "Exploring the Development of Teaching Reform," 53–54.
58. This project began in 2005 with the aim of training a group of high-level elites from ethnic minorities. This project helped ethnic minority students to take master's and doctoral degrees in Chinese top 100 universities and most students were from the western province of China.
59. The enrolment plan of "the plan of high-level elites of ethnic minorities" for 2020 issued by ministry of education in can be found at
http://www.moe.gov.cn/srcsite/A09/moe_763/201909/t20190930_401889.html.
60. Yuan, "A Review of the Studies on Chinese Ethnic Education Policy"; Xie, "Research on the Preferential Policies"; Ma, "Comparative Research on Affirmative Action"; Teng and Ma, "Preferential Policies for Ethnic Minority Groups"; and Hui and Jiang, "Research on the Ethnic Preparatory Education," 103–5.
61. Teng and Ma, Affirmative action in China and the US.
62. Wang, "Preferential policies for Ethnic Minority Students," 149–63.
63. Zhou, "Language Policy and Illiteracy," 129–48.
64. Zhang, Evaluating Trilingual Language Teacher Training Programmes, 6–20.
65. See note 7 above.
66. Zhang and Liu, "Analysis on the Equity of Minority Education," 9–13.
67. Teng, "The Idea of Plurality and Unity," 75–90.
68. See note 45 above.
69. Cherng et, al., "China: Sociological Perspectives on Ethnicity and Education," 203–344; and Teng and Ma, "Preferential Policies for Ethnic Minority Groups," 10–18.
70. Leibold, Ethnic Policy in China.
71. Teng and Ma, "Preferential Policies for Ethnic Minority Groups," 10–18.

72. See note 33 above.
73. Lähteenmäki-Smith and Salminen, Promoting Social Inclusion of Roma.
74. Saukkonen, "Multiculturalism and Nationalism," 270–294.
75. European Commission, "Integrating Students from Migrant Backgrounds."
76. Population Research Institute, "Migration in Finland."
http://www.vaestoliitto.fi/in_english/population_research_institute/facts-and-figures/migrationin-finland/.
77. Harju-Luukkainen and McElvany, "Immigrant Student Achievement and Education Policy in Finland," 87–102.
78. See the document at
<https://www.finlex.fi/en/laki/kaannokset/2010/en20101386.pdf>.
79. Tørslev et al., "Refugee and Immigrant Children's Right to Education," 30–35.
80. See note 33 above.
81. See note 9 above.
82. Zilliacus, Holm and Sahlström, "Taking Steps towards Institutionalising Multicultural Education," 231–48.
83. Ibid.
84. Ibid.
85. See note 74 above.
86. Ibid.
87. See note 79 above.
88. Ibid.
89. Kalalahti et al., "Immigrant-Origin Youth and the Indecisiveness," 1242–62.
90. Ismail, "Immigrant Children," 717–34.
91. Various and Pulkkinen, "Migrant Pupils and the Effectiveness of Primary Education," 35–51.
92. Ibid.
93. See note 13 above.
94. See note 7 above.
95. See note 19 above.
96. Wang and Phillion, "Minority Language Policy and Practice in China," 1–14.
97. See note 74 and 79 above.
98. See note 13 and 82 above, Ma, "Education of Ethnic Minorities in

Contemporary China.” 99. See note 21 above.

100. See note 11 above.

101. See note 79 above.

102. See note 17 and 18 above.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author.

Notes on contributor

Xiaoxu Liu is a PhD candidate at the Faculty of Educational Sciences at the University of Helsinki. Her research interests include multicultural education, education for diversity and Chinese minority education.

Bibliography

Adamson, B., and A. Feng. “Trilingualism in Education: Models and Challenges.” In *Trilingualism in Education in China: Models and Challenges*, edited by A. Feng and B. Adamson, 243–258. Dordrecht: Springer, 2015.

Banks, J. A., P. Cookson, G. Gay, W. D. Hawley, J. J. Irvine, S. Nieto, J. W. Schofield, et al. “«diversity within Unity: Essential Principles for Teaching and Learning in a Multicultural Society.»” *Phi Delta Kappan* 83, no.3(2001): 196–203. doi:10.1177/003172170108300309.

Blommaert, J., and J. Verschueren. *Debating Diversity: Analysing the Discourse of Tolerance*. London: Routledge, 2002.

Cherng, H. Y. S., Hannum, E., Lu, C., Kong, P. A., & Yu, X. “China: Sociological Perspectives on Ethnicity and Education: Views from Chinese and English Literatures.” *The Palgrave Handbook of Race and Ethnic Inequalities in Education*, 301–344. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan, Cham, 2019.

Dervin, F. “Towards Post-intercultural Education in Finland?” In *Oppiminen Ja Pedagogiset Käytännöt Varhaiskasvatuksesta Perusopetukseen*, edited by Pyhältö, K. M. and Vitikka, 19–29. Opetushallitus, 2013.

European Commission. “Integrating Students from Migrant Backgrounds into Schools in Europe: National Policies and Measures.” *Eurydice Report*. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union, 2019.

Fairclough, N. “Critical Discourse Analysis as a Method in Social Scientific Research.” *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis* 5, no. 11 (2001): 121–138.

Fei, X. T. “Pluralist-Unity of Chinese Nation.” *Journal of Peking University* 4 (1989): 1–

Finnish National Board of Education. *National Core Curriculum for Basic Education 2014*. Helsinki: National Board of Education, 2016.

Gorski, P. C. “What We’re Teaching Teachers: An Analysis of Multicultural Teacher Education Coursework Syllabi.” *Teaching and Teacher Education* 25, no. 2 (2009): 309–318. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2008.07.008.

Harju-Luukkainen, H., and N. McElvany. “Immigrant Student Achievement and Education Policy in Finland.” In *Immigrant Student Achievement and Education Policy*, edited by L. Volante, D. Klinger, and O. Bilgili, 87–102. Cham: Springer, 2018.

Hepburn, E. “Forging Autonomy in a Unitary State: The Åland Islands in Finland.” *Comparative European Politics* 12, no. 4–5 (2014): 468–487. doi:10.1057/cep.2014.10.

Holm, G., and M. Londen. “The Discourse on Multicultural Education in Finland: Education for Whom?” *Intercultural Education* 21, no. 2 (2010): 107–120. doi:10.1080/14675981003696222.

Holm, G., and J. E. Mansikka. “Multicultural Education as Policy and Praxis in Finland: Heading in a Problematic Direction?” *Recherches en éducation* 16 (2013): 63–74.

Holm, G., and H. Zilliacus. “Multicultural Education and Intercultural Education: Is There a Difference.” In *Dialogs on Diversity and Global Education*, edited by M. Talib, J. Loima, H. Paavola and S. Patrikainen, 11–28. Berlin: Peter Lang, 2009.

Hui, J. D., and J. Yu. “Research on the development of Ethnic Preparatory Education in Colleges and Universities [论高校民族预科教育的发展思路].” *Journal of Ningxia University: Humanities and Social Sciences Edition* 26, no. 5 (2004): 103–105.

Hummelstedt-Djedou, I., H. Zilliacus, and G. Holm. “Diverging Discourses on Multicultural Education in Finnish Teacher Education Program Policies: Implications for Teaching.” *Multicultural Education Review* 10, no. 3 (2018): 184–202. doi:10.1080/2005615X.2018.1511341.

Ismail, A. A. “Immigrant Children, Educational Performance and Public Policy: A Capability Approach.” *Journal of International Migration and Integration* 20, no. 3 (2019): 717–734. doi:10.1007/s12134-018-0630-9.

Jin, B. H., S. Y. Pei, and R. Xiao. “The Chinese nation: ‘national complex’ or ‘national entity’? [中华民族: “民族复合体” 还是 “民族实体”?].” *Heilongjiang Ethnic Series* 9, no. 1 (2012): 1–13.

Kalalahti, M., J. Varjo, and M. Jahnukainen. “Immigrant-origin Youth and the Indecisiveness of Choice for Upper Secondary Education in Finland.” *Journal of Youth Studies* 20, no. 9 (2017): 1242–1262. doi:10.1080/13676261.2017.1321108.

- Kent, N. *The Sami Peoples of the North: A Social and Cultural History*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019.
- Kilpi-Jakonen, E. "Continuation to Upper Secondary Education in Finland: Children of Immigrants and the Majority Compared." *Acta sociologica* 54, no. 1(2011):77–106. doi:10.1177/0001699310392604.
- Lähteenmäki-Smith, K., and V. Salminen. *Promoting Social Inclusion of Roma: A Study of National Policies*. Finland: European Commission, 2011.
- Leeman, Y., and C. Reid. "Multi/intercultural Education in Australia and the Netherlands." *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education* 36, no. 1 (2006): 57–72. doi:10.1080/03057920500382325.
- Leibold, J. *Ethnic Policy in China: Is Reform Inevitable?* Honolulu, HI: East-West Center, 2013.
- Leibold, J., and Y. B. Chen. *Minority Education in China: Balancing Unity and Diversity in an Era of Critical Pluralism*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press, 2014.
- Li, D. C. "Chinese as a Lingua Franca in Greater China." *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 26 (2006): 149–176. doi:10.1017/S0267190506000080.
- Lu, G. Z. "Research on the Reform of Preparatory Class Teaching [大学民族预科教学改革探讨]." *Journal of Harbin Vocational and Technical College* 1 (2012): 53–54.
- Ma, R. "Education of Ethnic Minorities in Contemporary China." Paper presented at the International Symposium on China's Positive Policies in Minority Education: Plural Perspectives. USA: Dickinson College, April 14-15, 2006.
- Ma, X. Y. "Comparative research on affirmative action in China and America [中美少数民族教育优惠政策的差异]." *Research on Ethnic Education* 18, no. 1 (2007): 117.
- May, S., and C. E. Sleeter. "Introduction: Critical Multiculturalism: Theory and Praxis." In *Critical Multiculturalism*, edited by S. May and C. E. Sleeter, 7–22. London: Routledge, 2010.
- Mikander, P., H. Zilliacus, and G. Holm. "Intercultural Education in Transition: Nordic Perspectives." *Education Inquiry* 9, no. 1 (2018): 40–56. doi:10.1080/20004508.2018.1433432.
- Multicultural Research Center of Beijing Normal University. *National Report of Multicultural Education of China*. Beijing: Beijing Normal University, 2010.
- Palaiologou, N., and P. C. Gorski. "The Evolution of Intercultural and Multicultural Education: Scholarship and Practice for New Sociopolitical and Economic Realities." *Intercultural Education* 28, no. 4 (2017): 353–355. doi:10.1080/14675986.2017.1334367.
- Population Research Institute. "Migration in Finland." http://www.vaestoliitto.fi/in_english/population_research_institute/facts-and-figures/migrationin-finland/

- Postiglione, G. A. "Making Tibetans in China: The Educational Challenges of Harmonious Multiculturalism." *Educational Review* 60, no. 1 (2008): 1–20.
doi:10.1080/00131910701794481.
- Postiglione, G. A. "Education and Cultural Diversity in Multiethnic China." In *Minority Education in China: Balancing Unity and Diversity in an Era of Critical Pluralism*, edited by J. Leibold and Y. Chen, 27–43. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press, 2014.
- Postiglione, G. A. *Education and Social Change in China: Inequality in a Market Economy*. New York: Routledge, 2015.
- Postiglione, G. A. *Education, Ethnicity, Society and Global Change in Asia: The Selected Works of Gerard A. Postiglione*. London: Routledge, 2017.
- Saukkonen, P. "Multiculturalism and Nationalism: The Politics of Diversity in Finland." In *Debating Multiculturalism in the Nordic Welfare States*, edited by P. Kivisto and O. Wahlbeck, 270–294. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013.
- Smith, A. D. *National Identity*. London: Penguin, 1991.
- Tao, Y. F., and J. Wang. "Exploring the Development of Teaching Reform of Ethnic Preparatory Education in the New Situation—Taking Ningxia University as an Example [试探新形势下民族预科教育教学改革的发展—以宁夏大学为例]." *Journal of Inner Mongolia Normal University (Philosophy and Social Sciences Edition)* 41, no. 6 (2012): 69–71.
- Teng, X. "The Idea of Plurality and Unity in Configuration of Chinese Nationality and China's Bilingual Education for Its Ethnic Minorities." *Chinese Education & Society* 34, no. 2 (2001): 75–90. doi:10.2753/CED1061-1932340275.
- Teng, X., and X. Y. Ma. "Preferential policies for ethnic minority groups and education equality in Chinese higher education [中国高等教育的少数民族优惠政策与教育平等]." *Research on Ethnicity* 5, no. 10 (2005): 10–18.
- Teng, X., and X. Y. Ma. "Preferential Policies for Ethnic Minorities and Educational Equality in Higher Education in China." In *Affirmative Action in China and the US*, edited by M. Zhou and A. M. Hill, 83–98. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009.
- Tørslev, M. K., and A. S. Børsh. "Refugee and Immigrant Children's Right to Education: A Comparative Analysis of Education Policies Targeting Immigrant Children in the Nordic Countries." *CAGE Policy Report* 2, 2017.
- Various, T., and J. Pulkkinen. "Migrant Pupils and the Effectiveness of Primary Education." *Performance Review Report* 12, 2015.

- Wan, M. G., and L. Bai. "Comparison between western multicultural education and minority education in China [西方多元文化教育与我国少数民族教育之比较]." *Research on Ethnicity* 6 (2008): 32–41.
- Wang, T. Z. "Preferential Policies for Ethnic Minority Students in China's College/university Admission." *Asian Ethnicity* 8, no. 2 (2007): 149–163. doi:10.1080/14631360701406288.
- Wang, W. *Between Modern Schooling and Cultural Heritage: Education and Ethnicity in Southwest China*. Lund: Lund University, 2019.
- Wang, Y. X., and J. Phillion. "Minority Language Policy and Practice in China: The Need for Multicultural Education." *International Journal of Multicultural Education* 11, no. 1 (2009): 1–14. doi:10.18251/ijme.v11i1.138.
- Wodak, R. "Critical Linguistics and Critical Discourse Analysis." In *Discursive Pragmatics*, edited by J. Zienkowski, J. Östman, and J. Verschueren, 50–69. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2011.
- Wu, S. M. *Introduction to Ethnic Issues* [民族问题概论]. Chengdu: Sichuan People's Press, 1999. Xie, F. "Research on the preferential policies for ethnic minority enrollment at higher education in China [论我国高等教育中的少数民族入学优惠政策]." *Journal of Management* 11 (2010): 266–267.
- Yuan, D. S. "A review of the studies on Chinese ethnic education policy in the past three decades [近三十年来中国民族教育政策研究述评]." *Journal of Guiyang University (Social Science Edition)* 7, no. 5 (2012): 33–36.
- Zhang, P. "Evaluating Trilingual Language Teacher Training Programmes for Minority Dominated Regions in Xinjiang: Current Practice and Challenges." Diss. Prifysgol Bangor University, 2016.
- Zhang, S. X., and X. D. Liu. "Analysis on the Equity of Minority Education: Oral Study of Educational Anthropology of a Principal [少数民族教育公平问题探析——一位校长的教育人类学口述研究]." *Contemporary Education and Culture* 2, no. 1 (2010): 9–13.
- Zhou, M. L. "Language Policy and Illiteracy in Ethnic Minority Communities in China." *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 21, no. 2 (2000): 129–148. doi:10.1080/01434630008666398.
- Zilliacus, H., G. Holm, and F. Sahlström. "Taking Steps Towards Institutionalising Multicultural education—The National Curriculum of Finland." *Multicultural Education Review* 9, no. 4 (2017): 231–248. doi:10.1080/2005615X.2017.1383810.
- Zuo, X. L. "China's Policy Towards Minority Languages in a Globalising Age." *Transnational Curriculum Inquiry* 4, no. 1 (2007): 80–91

