Conditions for Mutuality and Reciprocity in Development Education Policy and Pedagogy

Hanna Alasuutari University of Oulu (Finland)

Abstract

This paper analyses policies that seem to promote mutuality and reciprocity in develop-ment education partnerships and pedagogy. It explores challenges to mutuality and reciprocity in global and development education pedagogy in countries in the Global North and proposes that critical literacy and ethical intercultural learning can be a way forward to a renegotiation of ideas of self and other and of power relations between the North and South.

Keywords: development education, global education, North-South relations, critical literacy, intercultural learning

Introduction

In recent years, educators around the world have been encouraged to 'bring the world into their classrooms' by addressing global issues in their teaching (Andreotti and Souza, 2008:23). However, while policies, strategies and guidelines for global and development education have been formulated in different countries (see for example: Council of Europe, 2002; Ministry of Education, 2007a; 2007b; 2009b), the responsibility over the interpretation of these documents and the decisions of what global issues to address and how to address them remains with the teacher.

Recent educational research indicates that global and development education tends to approach global issues in ethnocentric and uncritical ways that ignore how global processes and agendas are constructed and reinterpreted in different con-texts (see Bourn, 2008; Virgilio, 2007; Andreotti, 2006; Andreotti and Souza, 2008). Dasen and Akkari (2008) define ethnocentrism as a psychological process that leads people to believe that 'there is only one best way to do things or to view the world – his or her own' (p.7). In this paper, I define an 'uncritical approach' to global and development education as an approach that does not engage with historical analyses of power relations for example between the North and the South or the

politics of knowledge production and representation that have worked to sustain unequal relations of power and distribution of wealth and labour in the world.

Uncritical and ethnocentric educational approaches to global education, if left unexamined, may reinforce ideas of cultural superiority and reproduce the mechanisms that actively produce inequalities in education and in society. While underscoring the enormous potential for education to provide valuable opportunities for learning related to global citizenship, this paper engages with some of the obstacles for the realisation of this full potential in terms of equipping learners for ethical intercultural relations based on mutuality and reciprocity (Alasuutari, 2010; Alasuutari and Räsänen, 2007). I place particular emphasis on intercultural relations that are established between the Global North and South as that is the interest of my on-going doctoral studies[1].

I begin this paper with discussing the conceptual framework of a critical approach to global and development education through the process of conditions of mutality and reciprocity in policy and pedagogy. Next I move on to a critical analysis of global and development education policies in Finland focusing on the language of reciprocity and mutuality. In the second part of the paper I discuss challenges to mutuality and reciprocity in global and development education pedagogy in Finland and propose that critical literacy and ethical intercultural learning can support the renegotiation of ideas of self and other and of power relations between the North and South.

Critical Approach of Global Education

Teachers could 'bring the world into her/his classroom' and discuss global issues and development with her/his students for example within the rhetoric of development aid without challenging the asymmetry, superiority or ethnocentrism that are part of the development aid discourse. This kind of uncritical approach could end up in outcomes that are contradictory to those of development and global education policies. Schools and teachers are often considered independent actors that transmit 'neutral' knowledge and values to the students (May, 1999:30; Räsänen, 2009:6; Tomperi, Vuorikoski and Kiilakoski, 2005:16: Alasuutari and Jokikokko, 2010:31). However, as Räsänen (2009) outlines, schools have created and strengthened prejudices, stereotypes and one-sided ideas both consciously and unconsciously. Feelings of superiority, for example, towards developing countries could be maintained and supported by teachers implementing global and development education within the rhetoric of development aid in their classrooms, if the teachers do not question the one-sided and superior perspectives of such uncritical approaches.

That is why I propose the incorporation of critical literacy and ethical intercultural learning as a way to address the still dominant ethnocentrism and the lack of engagement with issues of power and representation in development and global

education in Finland and elsewhere. Such steps are necessary to create the conditions for reciprocity and mutuality in North-South encounters and partnerships.

Critical literacy applied in development education can be understood as a need for an educator to recognise the connections between language, power and knowledge (Andreotti, 2007). This could mean the ability to analyse both development theories and the development industry critically by acknowledging the connections between language, power and knowledge, together with the practical experience of encountering issues related to development. Some of the key questions to pose when analysing development theories and the development industry through critical literacy could be what are the assumptions informing different perspectives related to development and who decides what is real and in whose name? (Andreotti, 2007; Bourn, 2008:17). This may lead to a more thorough understanding of contemporary global issues and contemporary power relations. *An ethical relationship towards the other* (Andreotti, 2007) and *ethical intercultural learning* (Alasuutari, 2010; Alasuutari and Jokikokko, 2010) support the idea of reflexive ethics that invites continuous and critical negotiation and dialogue on ethical issues. This requires a stance that recognises the right of 'the other' to create different narratives about what is real and ideal, which in turn calls for a responsibility to understand that our own narratives come from our contexts and are shaped by our histories and cultures. In this way, if we engage in dialogue about development, we will not be trying to 'win' the debate, but to listen to ourselves and others, to understand where we are coming from, to learn to collaboratively define common goals in our contexts and to work together – in solidarity.

Ethical intercultural learning in this paper is understood as a lifelong learning process based on ethics that includes various experiences, phases and processes. Ethics and ethical relationship towards the other, encountering otherness and reflection are crucial in this process and that is why these different dimensions are discussed below.

Intercultural learning processes invites learners to an ethical discussion that allows them to meditate on relativism and ethnocentrism (Bredella, 2003:47; Alasuutari and Jokikokko, 2010:28). According to this view, ethics could be considered and negotiated in the process of intercultural learning as life situations are different and unique avoiding cultural supremacy[2] and aiming to encounter one's own and the other's knowledge system/s[3] (Alasuutari and Jokikokko, 2010:29). As Andreotti points out (2010:11), this kind of reflexive ethics would not seek to 'suggest what people ought to be, what they ought to do or what they ought to think'. Instead we should keep all possibilities open and engage critically with each possibility to listen and to negotiate ethically with others, and to analyse and take responsibility for the implications of our ethical choices in order to avoid relativism or ethnocentrism (see also Alasuutari and Jokikokko, 2010:28).

It has been argued whether encountering or understanding the other is possible in the first place. As Bredella (2003) claims, there are philosophers who claim that we are always 'prisoners' of our own culture and unable to achieve a critical distance from it, and that is why understanding the otherness is impossible. However, as Kristeva (1992) claims, we should aim at understanding otherness as part of one's own identity (see also Rastas, 2007) and acknowledge identity negotiation as a continuous and dynamic process rather than static situation. Intercultural learning aims at encountering and analysing one's own values, beliefs and assumptions as well as those of others. This process of learning also conducts towards awareness of the power structures and other issues related to power in different levels. As outlined, 'the learning process should not occur merely at the level of thought, but should also be translated into action' (Alasuutari and Jokikokko, 2010:28-29). Many scholars claim that one can encounter the other if one has first understood otherness in oneself (Alasuutari, 2005; Eriksson Baaz 2002; Kristeva 1992; Lamminmäki-Kärkkäinen 2002; Rastas 2007; Alasuutari and Jokikokko, 2010). However, sometimes meeting the other might be the starting point for encountering plurality and otherness in oneself (Alasuutari, 2005; Alasuutari, 2010). Moreover, questioning one's identity in relation to others (Abdallah-Pretceille, 2006:476-477) and oneself is integral to the process of intercultural learning (Alasuutari, 2010).

It has been argued that intercultural learning could be analysed as experiential (Kolb, 1984; Jarvis, 1987), sociocultural (Lave and Wenger 1991, Säljö 2001) and transformative (Mezirow 1991, Mezirow and Taylor 2009) learning process (Jokikokko, 2009; Alasuutari and Jokikokko, 2010:28). However, transformative learning theory (Mezirow 1991, Mezirow and Taylor 2009) provides useful tools for supporting intercultural learning that might require transformation of meaning schemes[4] and meaning perspectives, especially when dealing with global and development education in teacher education in Western societies (Alasuutari and Jokikokko, 2010:28). As meaning perspectives[5] are created during primary socialisation in childhood, it is difficult to influence or change them. To support more profound changes, it is important to acknowledge that the reformed system of meanings might create an emotional conflict and may also lead to a re-orientation on emotional levels, which are often the last ones to change in more profound perspective transformations (Jokikokko, Lamminmäki-Kärkkäinen and Räsänen 2004:335, Alasuutari and Jokikokko, 2010:30). As it has been suggested, reflection on a cognitive level is not enough, the emotional level, too, should be considered in the process of perspective transformation (Jokikokko, Lamminmäki-Kärkkäinen and Räsänen 2004; Alasuutari and Jokikokko, *ibid*.). In intercultural encounters and ethical relationships towards other people often need to question the values, beliefs and assumptions that they have considered 'right' and 'normal'. Perspective transformation involves understanding that there are issues and concepts that might be understood in a variety of ways, as well as making visible what affects and has affected one's own construction

of meaning perspectives (Alasuutari and Jokikokko, 2010:30). When discussing intercultural learning and ways of supporting it, it is important to analyse the learning process with more lenses including issues of power and social justice, and utilise theories of post-colonial approach (for example Spivak 1999; Andreotti, 2010).

These abilities and the approaches that critical literacy and process of ethical intercultural learning support could be considered as conditions for mutuality and reciprocity and as guidelines for development and global education policy and pedagogy.

Terminology of global education in Finland

The variety and dynamic construction of the terminology around global and development education reflects the complexities of these fields, the construction of meaning in context (according to different ideological and political agendas) and also the rapid changes societies have been going through, that affects which/whose agendas are prioritised.

In its current policy documents, Finland follows the approach to global education promoted and supported by the Council of Europe: the Maastricht Declaration (Council of Europe, 2002) that is the key result of the Global Education Congress held in November 2002 in the Netherlands and aims to shape the vision of global and development education in Europe to 2015. Due to the Council of Europe's North-South Centre and Global Education Network Europe (GENE), the principals and terminology of the Maastricht Declaration have had a degree of influence in shaping policies in Europe (Bourn, 2008:9). The Maastricht Declaration views global education as an umbrella term covering human rights, peace, development, environment, and intercultural education, with an emphasis on 'opening people's minds to the realities of the world' and encouraging social and global change (see also Bourn, 2008).

In March 2007, the Ministry of Education in Finland published a programme called Global Education 2010 as a result of recognising the role of education sector in managing globalisation (Ministry of Education 2007b:124). In May 2007, the Ministry of Education in Finland launched a project entitled 'Education for Global Responsibility' (see Ministry of Education, 2007b:5). The sub-themes of global education according to these policy and project documents are: intercultural education, education for human rights, peace education, development education, intercultural communication, education for sustainable development, and citizenship education (Council of Europe, 2002; Ministry of Education 2007a; 2007b). All these sub-themes are integral to the definition of global education in Finland.

In this view of global education, development education can be considered as just one theme amongst many and therefore its specific priorities of engagement with

North-South relations and with the development of partnerships based on mutuality and reciprocity may be overshadowed by an array of competing themes, each with its competing priorities. Although some of these themes/priorities might overlap (depending on how a theme is interpreted in an educational context), they can also put forward contradictory demands.

My argument is that mutuality and reciprocity should not be only priorities of development education, but of global education itself. If ethnocentrism is a psychological tendency in national education systems, having mutuality and reciprocity as stated goals of any theme related to global education would at least make the problem of cultural supremacy and ideological reproduction more visible by emphasising the importance of ethical intercultural relations. If this were the case, analyses and renegotiations of power relations and of ideas of self and other would become central to global education policy and pedagogy.

However, just changing the language, although important in itself, may not lead to changes in practice. This is illustrated within the theme of development education itself: although language use has shifted over the years towards an emphasis on mutuality and reciprocity and debates have steered towards those concepts, policies and guidelines are still contradictory and practices are lagging behind. In the next section I engage with global education policies in Finland to explore some of these contradictions.

Global Education Policy Documents in Finland

The three most important global education policies and projects and guidelines that have influenced the global and development education practices in the Finnish context are: the Maastricht Declaration (Council of Europe, 2002) and Global Education 2010 programme (Ministry of Education, 2007a) and the Education for Global Responsibility project by the Ministry of Education (2007b; 2009).

The Maastricht Global Education Declaration (Council of Europe, 2002) is the basis for the Council of Europe's North-South Centre's current definition of global education. This declaration also provides the framework for the Finnish Global Education strategy, Global Education 2010 (Ministry of Education, 2007a). The Maastricht Global Education Declaration (Council of Europe, 2002) selects five areas as the components of global education:

> Global Education is education that opens people's eyes and minds to the realities of the world, and awakens them to bring about a world of greater justice, equity and human rights for all. Global Education is understood to encompass Development Education, Human Rights Education, Education for Sustainability, Education for Peace and Conflict Prevention and Intercultural Education, being the global dimensions of Education for Citizenship. (Council of Europe, 2002).

As Ryden (2009:157) points out, the declaration does not state why those five areas were selected; it simply assumes that 'a world that is just, peaceful, and sustainable is in the interest of all' would involve these components.

The Global Education 2010 (Ministry of Education, 2007) policy programme is based on the Maastricht Global Education Declaration (Council of Europe, 2002) and was written in order to re-consider the direction of global education in Finland. This policy document (Ministry of Education, 2007:9) recognises the roots of global education (see Bourn, 2008; Andreotti, 2007) and considers through the following statement that global education should be planned as a life-long learning process (Ministry of Education, 2007a:9,14):

> The citizenship skills needed in today's world transcend national borders. The capacity for cultural sensitiveness and empathy is born early. There is a justification for starting the learning of multiculturalism in early childhood education and carrying in on as an integral part of not only general education but also vocational and adult education. (Ministry of Education, 2007:9).

While extensive work has been carried out in Finland on global education policy and strategy, the practical applications of critical and holistic global education are not yet clearly visible in mainstream, formal Finnish education (see Ministry of Education, 2011). Some experiences of 'good practices' exist (see Anttalainen and Lampinen, 2009:139-149), but such examples reside in the margins of educational practice and are not an integral part of, for example, early childhood education or vocational or adult education.

Reviews of the policy documents do open possibilities for mutuality and reciprocity in development education and current policies have started to use a kind of language that seems to be sensitive to cultural difference. For example the Global Education 2010 policy document aims at defining global education as a concept that:

> Promotes national and international interaction, inter-cultural dialogue and learning from one another; global education is a process helping us understand and appreciate difference and different cultures and make choices that promote development. (Ministry of Education, 2007a:11)

However, the same policy document also restricts participation of other perspectives by placing certain topics beyond critique or debate, such as ideas of the universality of human rights or Western concepts of democracy.

> Together with other nations, Finland is committed to adhering to the guiding Millennium principles such as… human rights, democracy and good administration. (Ministry of Education, 2007a:10).

The Global Education 2010 program was evaluated three years after its launch (Ministry of Education, 2011). The evaluation report outlines that the Global Education 2010 program has been considered to be the first of its kind, to be needed and important. However, people interviewed for the evaluation consisting of representatives of different ministries, higher education institutions and non-governmental organisations stated that the policy document was not well-known (Ministry of Education, 2011:17). The Global Education 2010 policy document (Ministry of Education, 2007a:19) emphasises the need for continuous evaluation and monitoring activities:

> The results obtained in global education will be systematically monitored and analytically evaluated in Finland through the creation of procedures for assessing quality and impact (Ministry of Education, 2007a:19).

Yet the evaluation report of the Global Education 2010 program points out that co-ordination, assessment and evaluation were not well handled neither given enough resources in the process. (Ministry of Education, 2011:22).

In 2007 after the Ministry of Education published the Global Education 2010 program (Ministry of Education, 2007a), experienced researchers representing different Finnish universities and scientific fields were invited to write an article by probing the central themes of global education from the perspectives of their expertise such as human rights education, intercultural education, peace education, cultural literacy, development studies and global education and citizenship. This was the beginning of the Education for Global Responsibility Project (Ministry of Education, 2007b) that brought different actors of global education: researchers and activists together through various seminars and publications (Ministry of Education, 2011:30). The thorough analysis of different sub-themes of global education in the Finnish context during the Education for Global Responsibility project led to the suggestion of another term, Education for Global Responsibility. This term has been used since in various strategies and frameworks in Finland (see Ministry of Education, 2009a; Center for International Mobility Organisation, 2010). Ryden (2009:157) claims that one central intention of the Finnish 'Education for Global Responsibility' project led by the Finnish Ministry of Education was to integrate the components of education for global responsibility, rather than referring to them as five discrete specialisations as mentioned in the Maastricht declaration (Council of Europe, 2002).

The Ministry of Education's document (2007b) about Education for Global Responsibility project discusses development education in detail. Laakso (2007:60-70), for example, outlines possibilities for an alternative development education. Yet, the more recent document (Ministry of Education, 2009b) related to the same project does not discuss development education in particular. It reflects rather on global education in general in which a role for development education exists. Ryden (2009) states, for example, that 'development, referred to in development education, is about caring for people lacking proper living conditions due to poverty, insufficient health care and other shortcomings' (p:157). It is undoubtedly important to care; however, concentrating foremost on ideas for development aid in development education without utilising approach of critical literacy and process of ethical inter-cultural learning may leave possibilities for development education aiming at mutual and reciprocal encounters and learning unexamined.

Potential of Development Education in Supporting Mutuality and Reciprocity in Global Education Pedagogy

Academic scholars in the area of development education emphasise that development education practices have historically been influenced by the challenging perceptions of colonial North-South relations (Bourn, 2008; Andreotti, 2007). Visions of reality that are imposed as universal and the impact of colonialism and neo-colonialism on development education have also been questioned (Andreotti, 2007). However, eurocentric notions of charity and benevolence are still present in development education policies (Ryden, 2009,157).

Ideas about development, developing countries, and developed countries are based on individual narratives framed by collective narratives constructed through socialisation processes from the early years through to adulthood. Narratives about the 'other' being poor and helpless are not a matter of individual ignorance, but rooted in collective narratives that are socially, culturally and historically situated. The construction of the 'other' as inferior (and in need of help) sustains the construction of the 'self' as superior and the narrative that links superiority with deserved privilege (to decide, control, save, help, educate, etc.). These narratives may be reinforced at school with the support of development education pedagogy that focuses on 'support for international aid' without considering the ways development education links with more complex processes shaped by historical encounters (Bourn, 2008).

Understanding the complexity of development, including its background and effects on the contemporary world order, is essential to approaches to development education committed to mutuality and reciprocity. According to Andreotti and Souza (2008), without such understanding, development education may result in surface-level encounters with the 'other' and 'in the uncritical reinforcement of notions of supremacy and of the universality of 'our' (Western) ways of seeing and knowing'(p.23). The uncritical reinforcement of ideas of self and other have several implications, including: the devaluation of other knowledge systems and reinforcement of unequal dialogue and power relations (Andreotti and Souza, 2008), the reproduction of a paternalistic desire to help the weaker (Heron, 2007) and the maintenance of the mutuality gap (Johnson and Wilson, 2006).

Taylor (Andreotti, Jefferess, Pashby, Rowe, Tarc and Taylor, 2010) points out, that 'difference continues to structure hierarchical relations of feeling, knowing and being' (p.12). Furthermore, as approaches of global education often inherit pedagogies of nations, particularly liberal multiculturalism, openness to other ways of knowing, feeling or being is difficult. However, development education provides possibilities for critical literacy and may support the processes of ethical intercultural learning if discourses of charity or benevolence would not be the only imperatives in the pedagogical approaches of development education.

It is important to note as mentioned earlier in this paper that schools have been utilised in building and maintaining stereotypes either consciously or unconsciously (Räsänen, 2009). On the other hand, schools and teachers can also be active in deconstructing stereotypes and supporting transformation and reconstruction, though this may prove difficult for teachers, who are often surrounded by mainstream perspectives from staff, school leadership, and parents (*ibid*). To support teachers to encounter the challenges of mutuality, the pedagogical implications of critical development education in teacher education should be made explicit. Critical literacy with a continuous, life-long process of ethical intercultural learning may function as tools to support development education practices that uphold the principles of mutuality and reciprocity.

Discussion

As critical development education challenges uncritical and ethnocentric educational approaches of global education it is important to acknowledge that the kind of changes that might be required for example in teacher's overall worldview for understanding and implementing critical global and development education do not happen overnight but perhaps in small steps.

As discussed in this article, understanding the complexity of development, including its background and effects on the contemporary world order, is essential to approaches of development education aiming at mutuality and reciprocity. If closing the mutuality gap (Johnson and Wilson, 2006) and aiming towards reciprocity in global education would be accepted as one of the aims of global education; development education, critical literacy and ethical intercultural learning should be part of pre- and in-service teacher education.

In addition, one of the next steps that could be addressed in Finland would be to discuss the implementation of the statement of Global Education 2010 program (Ministry of Education, 2007:13) emphasising that global education should be part of the school's every day and operational culture. This could suggest mainstreaming global education policy and pedagogy. Critical global and development education pedagogy utilising the approaches of critical literacy and ethical intercultural learning could become part of the whole curriculum from early childhood education to higher education, especially teacher education, and vocational and adult education.

As the evaluation of the Global Education 2010 (Ministry of Education, 2011) mentioned, there is room for improvement for example in coordination of implementing global and development education in practice in Finland. European non-governmental organisations (NGOs) in the Global North seem to be very active in the area of development education (DEEEP and Concord, 2009:83). Many Finnish NGOs for example cooperate extensively at different levels with Ministry of Education and Ministry for Foreign Affairs, schools and teacher training institutions in

providing learning materials and methods for schools and teachers and there have been attempts to co-ordinate the work of NGOs in order to avoid overlaps and cover the whole geographical area of Finland and not just the bigger cities.

Many scholars analysing practices and approaches of global education in Finland (Piattoeva, 2010; Rajander and Lappalainen, 2010; Alasuutari and Jokikokko, 2010; Kuukka, 2010; Riitaoja, Poulter and Kuusisto, 2010) claim that present measures of global education are still insufficient and even counterproductive. The current national core curriculum is still based on nationalistic and ethnocentric approach, as its original task was to forge national unity at the expense of diversity (Piattoeva, 2010:7). 'Multicultural events' and 'theme days' that are organised on an extra-curricular basis and with uncritical approach describe the current practices of global and development education in Finnish schools (see Räsänen, 2005; Lappalainen 2003; Piattoeva, 2010).

As Anttalainen and Lampinen (2009:139-149) state, some experiences of 'good practices' in the area of teacher training and in-service training activities are there, but such examples exist only in the margins of educational practice. These 'good practices' also do not target the big number of teacher students or practicing teachers in different parts of Finland who would need support in their own learning about global education and implementing critical global education.

Specific and comprehensive policies and guidelines such as the Maastrich Declaration (Council of Europe, 2002), Global Education 2010 programme (Ministry of Education, 2007a) and Education for Global Responsibility project (Ministry of Education, 2007b) and their continuous critical analysis and development are very much needed even if mainstreaming global education would require the theme to be mentioned or referred to also in general education policy documents. However, the documents alone cannot change the practices. In addition, there should be committed human resource and systematic and continuous coordination, evaluation and assessment of the implementation global education pedagogy as the Evaluation report of the Global Education 2010 points out (Ministry of Education, 2011).

In Finland there are human resources and knowledge how to mainstream critical global and development education pedagogy (see for example Piattoeva, 2010) even if there is still lack of coordination and collaboration between different actors for example in higher education institutions and non-governmental organisations. The parliamentary elections held in April 2011 highlighted ethnocentric and xeno-phobic expressions and ideas for public discussions. This might encourage different actors of critical global and development education pedagogy to consider better collaboration. It would also demand that Ministry of Education would not forget its central co-ordinating role. It is important that global education is considered as part

of the programme of the new government, part of the new core curriculum and not only as a short term project.

I propose the incorporation of critical literacy and ethical intercultural learning as part of the process of mainstreaming global and development education pedagogy as a way to address ethnocentrism. It will make sure that issues of power and representation in development and global education and pedagogy are addressed in Finland and elsewhere. This is necessary to create the conditions for reciprocity and mutuality in North-South encounters and partnerships.

I also propose that development education is part of a broader agenda of global education and the principles of mutuality and reciprocity of critical development education be adopted as key principles for global education itself. I recognise that more discussion and research are necessary in relation to both critical literacy and ethical interculturalism so that we can understand the implications (both positive and negative) of these strategies in practice.

Hanna Alasuutari (hanna.k.alasuutari@oulu.fi) is a researcher and doctoral student in the Faculty of Education in the University of Oulu in Finland, where she has also been teaching in the fields of development and education, education in transition and qualitative methodology. She has also worked as development worker involved with governments and NGOs in formal education in North and South. Hanna is a mother of mixed heritage children (Finnish-Somali) who inhabit the ambivalent space between the cultures from the North and South.

Notes

1 My doctoral thesis discusses challenges and possibilities of intercultural co-operation in the education sector development aid programme in the Global South.

2 Cultural supremacy in this paper is understood as the projection of one's own values as superior to those of others. It refers to the projection one's own values as superior to those of others. It refers to the projection of European epistemology as universal (Mignolo, 2000).

3 From the perspective of epistemological pluralism there are multiple ways of knowing that can be equally valuable, and integrating this plurality results in a more thorough understanding of complex systems. For example the Western knowledge systems represent only one way of knowing amongst many (Andreotti, 2010)

4 Meaning schemes refer to those beliefs, attitudes and emotional reactions that are transformed during a lifetime (Mezirow and Taylor, 2009; Taylor, 1998:13). Meaning schemes are considered to work together to construct one's meaning perspective.

5 Meaning perspectives refer to 'one's overall world view' and changes in them occur less frequently (Alasuutari and Jokikokko, 2010:29).

References

Abdallah-Pretceille, M. (2006) 'Interculturalism as a Paradigm for Thinking about Diversity', *Intercultural Education*, 17 (5):475-483.

Alasuutari, H. (2005) 'Experiences of Development Cooperation from the Perspectives of Partnership', In R. Räsänen and J. San (eds.) *Conditions for Intercultural Learning and Co-operation,* Turku: Finnish Educational Research Association.

Alasuutari, H. (2010) Conditions for Mutual Learning in Education Sector Development Co-operation. In: M. Järvelä, L. Ritola and J. Sitomaniemi-San (eds). *Education, ethics and diversity. A Publication in Honour of Professor Rauni Räsänen*: Oulu: Faculty of Education.

Alasuutari, H. and Jokikokko, K. (2010) Intercultural Learning as a Precondition for more Inclusive Society and Schools. *Finnish Journal of Ethnicity and Migration* 5(3):27-37.

Alasuutari, H. and Räsänen R. (2007) Partnership and ownership in the context of education sector programs in Zambia. In Takala, T. (Ed.). *Education sector programs in developing countries – socio-political and cultural perspectives*: Tampere:Tampere University Press.

Andreotti, V. (2006) Soft versus critical global citizenship education. *Development Education: Policy and Practice*, 3:83-98.

Andreotti, V. (2007) An ethical engagement with the Other: Gayatri Spivak on education. *Critical Literacy: Theories and Practices*, 1(1):69-79.

Andreotti, V. and Souza, T. M. (2008) Translating Theory into Practice and Walking Minefields: Lessons from the project 'Through Other Eyes'. *International Journal of Development Education and Global Learning*. 1 (1):23-26.

Andreotti,V. (2010) 'Global Education in the '21st Century': Two Perspectives on the 'Post-' of Modernism', *International Journal of Development Education and Global Learning* 2 (2):5-22.

Andreotti, V., Jefferess, D., Pashby, K., Rowe, C., Tarc, P. and Taylor, L. (2010) Difference and Conflict in Global Citizenship in Higher Education in Canada. *International Journal of Development and Global Education* 2 (3):5-24.

Anttalainen, K. and Lampinen, J. (2009) Tietoa, taitoa ja asenteita – esimerkkejä hyvistä käytänteistä. In J. Lampinen and M.Melen-Paaso (Eds.) *Tulevaisuus meissä. Kasvaminen maailmanlaajuiseen vastuuseen.* Opetusministeriön julkaisuja 2009:40. 139-150.

Bourn, D. (2008) Development Education: Towards a re-conceptualisation. *International Journal of Development Education and Global Learning*. 1(1):5-22

Bredella, L. (2003) 'For a Flexible Model of Intercultural Understanding', in Alred, G., Mike Byram, M. and Fleming,M. (eds.), *Intercultural Experience and Education*, Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Limited.

CIMO [Organisation for international mobility and cooperation](2010) *Strategia*. [Strategy]. *2020. Suuntana aidosti avarakatseinen Suomi*. [Genuinly open-minded Finland as a goal] http://www.e-julkaisu.fi/cimo/strategia-2020/

Council of Europe (2002) Maastricht Global Education Declaration. European Strategy Framework For Improving and Increasing Global Education In Europe to the Year 2015 http://www.deeep.org/fileadmin/user_upload/downloads/Consensus_on_DE/Maastricht_Declaration.pdf

Dasen, P. and Akkari, A. (2008) Ethnocentrism in education and how to overcome it. In Dasen, P. and A. Akkari,A. (eds.), *Educational theories and practices from the majority world*:7-22). New Delhi: Sage Publications.

DEEEP and Concord (2009) Development Education and the School Curriculum in the European Union. A report on the status and impact of development education in the formal education sector and school curriculum in member states of the European Union. 17.11.2010 http://www.kehys.fi/julkaisut/concordin-julkaisut/development-education-and-the-school-curriculum-in-the-european-union-concord-deeep-2009

Eriksson Baaz, M. (2002) *The White Wo/Man's Burden in the Age of Partnership. A Postcolonial Reading of Identity in Development Aid,* Department of Peace and Development Research, Göteborg University, Göteborg: Vasastaden Bokbinderi.

Heron, B. (2007) *Desire for Development. Whiteness, gender and the helping imperative.* Wilfrid Laurier University Press. Waterloo: Canada.

Jarvis, P. (1987) *The sociology of adult and continuing education*. London: Croom Helm.

Johnson, H. and Wilson, G. (2006) North-South/South-North Partnerships: Closing the Mutuality Gap. *Public Administration and Development,* 26 (1), pp.71–80.

Jokikokko, K., Lamminmäki-Kärkkäinen, T., and Räsänen, R. (2004) Education for Intercultural competence. In V. Puuronen,V., Häkkinen, A., Pylkkänen, A., Sandlud,T. and Toivanen, R. (eds.), *New challenges for the welfare society* (pp.329–345). Joensuu: University of Joensuu.

Jokikokko, K. (2009) The role of significant others in the intercultural learning of teachers. *Journal of Research in International Education*, 8(2), 142–163.

Kolb, D. A. (1984) *Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Kuukka, K. (2010) Rehtorin eettinen johtaminen monikulttuurisessa koulussa. *Finnish Journal of Ethnicity and Migration* 5(3):38-48.

Kristeva, J. (1992) *Muukalaisia itsellemme*, Helsinki:Gaudeamus.

Laakso, L. (2007) Making Sense of Development in a Divided World In: T. Kaivola T. and Melen-Paaso, M. (eds.) *Education for Global Responsibility – Finnish Reflections.Publications of the Ministry of Education 2007*:31. Helsinki University Press. 59-70.

Lamminmäki-Kärkkäinen, T. (2002) Identiteetin kulttuuriprofi ili ja toiseuden purkaminen. In R. Räsänen, K. Jokikokko, M. Järvelä and T. Lamminmäki-Kärkkäinen (eds.), *Interkulttuurinen Opettajankoulutus: Utopiasta todellisuudeksi toimintatutkimuksen Avulla*: Oulu: Acta E55: 71–84

Lave, J., and Wenger, E. (1991) *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

May, S. (1999) Critical multiculturalism and cultural difference. In S. May (ed.) *Critical multiculturalism: Rethinking multicultural and antiracist education*. London: Farmer Press.: 11–41

Mezirow, J. (1991) *Transformative dimensions of adult learning*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Mezirow, J., and Taylor, E. (eds.), (2009) *Transformative learning in practice. Insights from community, work-place and higher education*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

Mignolo, W. (2000) *Local Histories/Global Designs*, Princetown: Princetown University Press.

Ministry of Education (2007a) Global Education 2010.Helsinki: Helsinki University Press. Publications of the Ministry of Education, Finland 2007:12 http://www.minedu.fi/export/sites/default/OPM/Julkaisut/2007/liitteet/opm12.pdf?lang=en

Ministry of Education (2007b) *Education for Global Responsibility – Finnish Perspectives*. (eds.) Kaivola, T. and Melén-Paaso, M. Helsinki: Helsinki University Press. Publications of the Ministry of Education 2007:31 http://www.minedu.fi/export/sites/default/OPM/Julkaisut/2007/liitteet/opm31.pdf?lang=eng

Ministry of Education (2009a) Korkeakoulujen kansainvälistymisstrategia 2009–2015. [Internationalisation strategy of higher education 2009-2015). Publications of the Ministry of Education. 2009:21. http://www.minedu.fi/export/sites/default/OPM/Julkaisut/2009/liitteet/opm21.pdf?lang=fi

Ministry of Education (2009b)*Tulevaisuus meissä. Kasvaminen maailmanlaajuiseen vastuuseen. [Future in us. Growing up for the global responsibility]*. (Eds.) Lampinen, J. andMelen-Paaso, M.Publication of the Ministry of Education 2009:40. 156-163.

Ministry of Education (2011) *Kansainvälisyyskasvatuksen 2010-ohjelman arviointi (Evaluation of Global Education 2010 programme.*) Räsänen, R. Publication of the Ministry of Education 2011:13.

Piattoeva, N. (2010) Schooling for Multiculturalism? The Case of Finland. *Finnish Journal of Ethnicity and Migration* 5(3):4-8.

Rajander, S. and Lappalainen, S. (2010) Expectations and Future Prospects: The Language of the Cosmopolitan Child. *Finnish Journal of Ethnicity and Migration* 5(3):9-16.

Rastas, A. (2007) Rasismi lasten ja nuorten arjessa. Doctoral Thesis. Acta Universtatis Tamperensis/ Nuorisotutki-musseuran julkaisuja 78. Tampere: Tampere University Press Juvenes Print.

Riitaoja, A-L., Poulter, S. and Kuusisto, A. (2010) Worldviews and Multicultural Education in the Finnish Context – A Critical Philosophical Approach to Theory and Practices. *Finnish Journal of Ethnicity and Migration* 5(3):87-95.

Räsänen, R. (2005) Etninen moninaisuus koulujen haasteena. In T. Kiilakoski, T. Tomperi and M. Vuorikoski (eds.) *Kenen Kasvatus? Kriittinen Pedagogiikka ja Toisinkasvatuksen Mahdollisuus*, Tampere: Vastapaino.

Räsänen, R. (2009) Monikulttuurisuus ja kansainvälistyminen koulun ja opettajan haasteena. In J. Jokisalo and R. Simola (eds.) (2009) *Monikulttuurisuus luokanopettajankoulutuksessa: monialaisten opintojen läpäisevä juonne*. Joensuu: Joensuun yliopisto. 1-20.

Rydén, L. (2009) Epilogue – some insights from the project Education for Global responsibility. In. J. Lampinen and M. Melen-Paaso (eds.) *Tulevaisuus meissä. Kasvaminen maailmanlaajuiseen vastuuseen*. Opetusministeriön julkaisuja 2009:40. 156-163.

Spivak, G. C. (1999) *A Critique of Postcolonial Reason: Toward a History of the Vanishing Present,* Cambridge (Mass): Harvard University Press.

Säljö, R. (2001) *Oppimiskäytännöt. Sosiokulttuurinen näkökulma*, Juva: WS Bookwell Oy.

Tomperi, T., Vuorikoski, M. and Kiilakoski,T. (2005) 'Kenen kasvatus?', in T. Kiilakoski, T. Tomperi and M. Vuorikoski (eds.) *Kenen kasvatus. Kriittinen pedagogiikka ja toisinkasvatuksen mahdollisuus*, Tampere: Vastapaino.

Virgilio, F. (2007) Development education: The European Perspective on Global Active Citizenship Through De-centralised Cooperation. In H-G. Kotthoff and S. Moutsios (2007) *Education Policies in Europe: Economy, Citizen-ship, Diversity*. Munster, Germany: Waxmann.