



Vaasan yliopisto
UNIVERSITY OF VAASA

OSUVA Open
Science

This is a self-archived – parallel published version of this article in the publication archive of the University of Vaasa. It might differ from the original.

Globalization's Effects on the Value Base of the Finnish Core Curriculum: Perspectives of Cultural Heritage and Cultural Diversity

Author(s): Lehtimäki, Maria; Lehtonen, Tommi

Title: Globalization's Effects on the Value Base of the Finnish Core Curriculum: Perspectives of Cultural Heritage and Cultural Diversity

Year: 2023

Version: Accepted manuscript

Copyright ©2023 Society for Indian Philosophy and Religion.

Please cite the original version:

Lehtimäki, M. & Lehtonen, T. (2023). Globalization's Effects on the Value Base of the Finnish Core Curriculum: Perspectives of Cultural Heritage and Cultural Diversity. *Journal of Indian Philosophy and Religion*, 28, 121-151. <https://doi.org/10.1504/IJIL.2023.133181>

Globalization's effects on the Value Base of the Finnish Core Curriculum – Perspectives of Cultural heritage and Cultural Diversity

Maria Lehtimäki & Tommi Lehtonen

Globalization and its effects on the society was one main motivation behind the reform of education from the Core Curriculum of 2004 to that of 2014. What traits characterize the Core Curriculum's approach to globalization? To answer this question, we examine the Value Base of both the previous and the current document, paying attention to the shift between the Curricula. To map the traits, we adopt a two-fold understanding of globalization as something that both enriches and impoverishes cultures and create two perspectives (framings) that view globalization from these extremes. By equipping the hypothetical perspectives to a framing analysis of the value base, we find out, simply put, that the aim expressed in the value base has shifted from educating the learner on the diversity of the domestic culture to educating them on intercultural communication skills, paving the way to a supranational culture. While specific to the Finnish context, our examination and its results are relevant in the context of any national Core Curriculum. Globalization affects all learning cultures, one way or another, and it is highly important to be conscious of the stance taken to it on the level of education planning.

Keywords: Finnish school system, national curriculum, globalization, multiculturalism, frame-sensitive reasoning, frames, value base

1. Introduction

In this article, we delve into the Finnish Core Curriculum (FCC) to identify the traits that characterize its approach to globalization. We focus on the section of value base in the current document (FCC 2014, 16), the one that preceded it (FCC 2004, 15–16), and the shift that can be detected between the versions. As it is, globalization and multiculturalism, with the “changes in the surrounding world and their effects on children and young people” they introduce (FNBE 2016, see also Halinen et al 2013), were at the heart of the issues that prompted the 2014 education reform. Therefore, the document's approach to globalization, expressed in the value base, can be expected to have undergone a clear shift. The shift, along with the individual accounts of the documents, are a worthwhile object of study due to the impactful role that the document has in guiding the national schooling system.

As normative document, the National Core Curriculum serves multiple purposes, but its primary purpose is to serve the needs of society, particularly economic but also social and ecological requirements, by preparing the nation's youth to respond to them as a skilled workforce, active citizens and enlightened consumers. It was deemed important to “better respond to the requirements

of the dynamic world” (Halinen et al. 2013: 188). As the Core Curriculum document is a central tool of education planning, these changes and their effects were considered by updating the value base, level of general knowledge acquired, and skills taught.

In this study, we acknowledge that due to the complexity of the phenomenon of globalization, these changes brought along by globalization can evoke vastly different calls to action. Through diverse mechanisms, globalization is able to simultaneously enrich and impoverish cultures by increasing cultural contacts but making them more generic (Anderson-Levitt 2003, Creanza et al. 2017, Ritzer 2007; MacIntyre 2003). In effect, it becomes relevant, simultaneously, to strengthen individual domestic cultures and to become more open to the possibility of a supranational, global culture. By using a framing technique (Bermúdez 2021), we equip these approaches to two hypothetical perspectives through which we examine the two versions of the value bases and the shift between them. Such analysis can both reveal fine nuances of the conception of globalization inscribed into the document, locate whether it leans more strongly to one or the other extreme, and identify ways in which the two extremes are merged.

In section 2, we discuss the Core Curriculum document as an administrative object and an object of study. In section 3, we proceed to discussing the phenomenon of globalization and define the paradox that we, in this study, view as a central trait of the phenomenon. In section 4, we proceed to outlining the method of enquiry we employ when targeting the paradox of globalization in the Core Curriculum document. In section 5, we analyze, first, (5.1) the anatomy of the clash of the two frames, and then (5.2) the implications of committing to either. In section 6, we seek to understand why the clash exists, and what that can suggest for education planning and globalization in a broader scope than the domestic curriculum of Finland. Finally, section 7 summarizes the study.

2. The Finnish Core Curriculum as a document and as approach to education

The National Core Curriculum has multiple roles. It is an administrative document that is born as a result of vast societal cooperation and implemented in education planning (Vitikka et al. 2012; Tyler 1949). Its contents represent the nation’s views on education in various steering, developing, and cooperation ventures. In effect, it is a normative document that provides teachers and other educators a comprehensive set of pedagogical reference points for planning their work (Vitikka et al 2012, 87). The Finnish Educational law¹ abides all organizers of education to follow these guidelines.

¹ Basic Education Act (628/1998), Basic Education Decree (852/1998), Government Decree on the National Objectives for Education Referred to in the Basic Education Act and in the Distribution of Lesson Hours (422/2012).

In such deeply steering role, the Finnish Core Curriculum, as any National Core Curriculum, is a collection of pedagogical reference points that have been curated, to the best understanding of contemporary experts and other stakeholders, to prepare the learners for acting in the society. National school curricula have several overlapping goals, from promoting the intellectual, emotional and ethical development of children to preparing a country's citizens to contribute to a sustainable development and the quickly changing global economy. Clearly, the document is written for long-term use. In addition to being written to apply for roughly a decade (like in Finland), its effects carry well beyond that, all the way into the learners' adulthood.

The curriculum-approach to education has multiple levels that are all guided by the curriculum document. It is instructive to differ between at least the levels of the entire nation, the municipalities, and individual schools. The municipal and school-specific levels are tailored to local characteristics, reflecting, for example, the region's or institution's size and way of living. In this study, we focus on the national level, expressed in the Core Curriculum document as guidelines common for all. For this reason, our examination targets the Finnish Core Curriculum as a widely applicable, normative document, whose practical implementation is beyond the scope of this study, but whose guidelines for that implementation we critically assess in the specific scope of the value base section, through the specific lens of globalization. Because the nature of the document defines the form in which these guidelines also in this specific scope apply, it is instructive to briefly explore its history.

The historical roots of the Finnish NSC can be traced back to *Tyler's rational*; the ideas developed by Ralph W. Tyler (1902–1994) in his seminal work *Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction* (1949). Considered to be mother of all texts written on planning, crafting, and executing study curriculum work, Tyler's thoughts carry on to the present day and continue to define the principles from which study curriculum planning today operates (Saari 2021). Tyler's main idea was to standardize and develop the school system through his method, a method that he viewed applicable to any and all school institutions (Tyler 1949, 33, 87). “[A] late arrival in the long drama of education history” (Krug 1950: 310), curriculum-focused study planning² signified a shift from religious and philosophical ideologies to a perspective informed by research and statistics.

Such approach to learning was highly practical. Tyler guided the planners to think the goals that the education should pursue, to consciously select the learning experiences, to effectively transform the learning experiences into effective teaching, and to establishing methods by which the effectiveness

² This practice spread across the world in the 20th century, and got different forms and different names. In the USA, for example, it went by the name *teacher proof curriculum* (Saari 2019, 345).

could be proven. The goals of a planning document, Tyler maintained, should be defined by the needs of the society, and those, again, are to be enquired through empirical surveys. Studied knowledge, especially from the field of psychology, should be used to turn the information provided by the surveys, that is, the societal needs expressed in their results, to learning experiences and variate the learning experiences in all the necessary forms so that they can be taught to learners of all ages and levels. Finally, an objective examination of the effectiveness of the process so far was made by examining the results, exposing a gap between the goals and results. (Tyler 1949, 1–6.) The ongoing, overarching goal, then, was to bridge the gap between goals and realized results closer and closer.

When the practice spread around the world, it got different form that varied, primarily, in the control exercised by the planning authorities. In the USA, for example, this mode of planning wanted to minimize the teachers' ability to modify the carefully selected practices (Eryaman & Riedler 2010; Taubman 2009). In Finland, by comparison, even though the Core Curriculum is crafted in a complex societal network of stakeholders (see Halinen 2013 et al, Vitikka et al 2012), the institution of the teacher is considered an expert position and has remained largely independent.

Therefore, when *Tyler's rational* spread to Finland in 1960–1970 (see Saari 2021, 342–348), its focus was on measurability of the results and their success rather than on controlling the methods by which goals were met. A systematic focus was set on acknowledging what the goals in specific institutions were and securing clear and measurable criteria by which it could be said that they were (or were not) met (Sundman 1975, 2; Komiteamietintö [committee notes] 1970, 22–23). Careful documentation and numerical or binary statistics translate the school phenomenon into the language of the administration and makes it easy to discuss the efficacy of learning across the fields of education and politics (Saari 2019, 342–349). An important part of the revolution of the curriculum-focused method of education planning was to make the school into an institution that would answer to the needs of education and politics alike.

Finland's current study plan, released in 2014 and fourth of its kind³, was crafted following largely the principles of traditional Tylerian curriculum-thinking. Of course, the process has changed and developed over the course of the four cycles, perfecting its role as a method for developing the educational system (Halinen et al 2013). The work for the current Core Curriculum can be seen to have started two years prior to its release, in 2012 (see Karlsson-Pasto 2018). Like any curriculum, it reflects the values, political and social ideologies of its time (Cantell 2013, 195; Vahtivuori-Hänninen

³ After curriculum-thinking landed and got a firm foothold in Finland in 1960's and 1970's, it took until 1985 to get the first NSC. The next followed in 1994 and 2004. (see Halinen, Holappa & Jääskeläinen 2013, 189.)

et al 2014, 21), and the changes made between the previous and the current are representative of the shift in values during the decade.

This shift and its result as expressed, explicitly and implicitly, in the Core Curriculum document, is the focus of this study. The 2014 reform of education was explicitly expressed to be based on views on globalization, the rapidly changing world and living environment, and the diversification of society (FNBE 2016, Halinen 2013, 188). The document's approach to these phenomena is expressed in the value base section.

Thus, it is specifically the section of the value base of the Core Curriculum that express the connection to globalization the most clearly. Indeed, the value base sections preface all the study-subject-specific solutions made in the bulk of the document, and for these reasons, the value base will be our focus. The institution of the core curriculum is based on forming a school institution that supports to the development of the society in the most optimal way by aligning the needs of the society, now and in the foreseeable future, with what it teaches and how it teaches it. As such, the Core Curriculum document is an invaluable tool for understanding how the minds of the young of the nation are guided towards a multicultural, globalized future. In the next section, we discuss these concepts.

3. Paradox of globalization

The paradox of globalization is that it simultaneously enriches and impoverishes cultures as a result of diverse influences on various cultural aspects. To shed light on this paradox that is at the core of our study here, this section explores the relevant definitions of globalization and culture. At large, globalization is a phenomenon that affects multiple areas of life, generally in a unifying manner. The unifying processes are related to goods and services, their consumption, distribution as well as production alike (Anderson-Levitt 2003, Creanza et al. 2017). In addition to concrete products and services, globalization of course also affects intangible products such as knowledge and education and geographically defined traditions and their expressions. Globalization can indeed have a homogenizing effect these culture-bound practices (Ritzer 2007, 95). Such development is often seen as pejorative, while at the same time, the increased cultural contacts are seen as a good thing, often described as enrichment.

It follows that not all cultural contacts are culturally enriching. A more meticulous examination of such borders will not be performed here, but the nature of cultural contact itself is something that must be considered in education planning, as teaching necessarily involves concrete examples, assignments, projects and the like that cannot but take a stance on what is promoted and what

discouraged. Therefore, our focus will be on a selection of aspects that are connected to such activities in the Core Curriculum; on the steering that the document provides for the teachers (and learners) on the practical aspects of globalization. After all, changes introduced by globalization were one of the major reasons behind the current Core Curriculum.

Globalization's inherent ability to connect people and places that in the past would have been separate and far apart can be seen to reach its apex in the idea of a supranational global village – a kind of global culture. The edges of such a culture would be expected to be fuzzy rather than sharp (see O'Neill 2016, 2), and its features (e.g., traditions, habits) general rather than specific. In real life, there is no such unity, at least yet, but rather a collection of ill-compatible perspectives, as famously argued by Alasdair MacIntyre (2003). Nationalities and cultures do not merge but differ, and this, along with the experiences of culture shock and ethical clashes, is a richness (MacIntyre 2003, 349–353, 366–367). Globalization's ability to continue increasing cultural contacts – the unquestioned good aspect of globalization – requires that there are individual cultures to contact. At the same time, for those contacts to be enriching, the nature of the contact must be open-minded. This is the paradox: learning to live in the globalized world in a productive way requires from its agents, simultaneously, the ability to safeguard the existence of one's own culture and the ability to be open to outside influences.

This is an important aspect to be considered in education planning. In the next section, we explain how we construct the hypothetical perspectives through which the two aspects of the paradox are employed in the examination of the Finnish Core Curriculum.

4. Framing as a method of enquiry

As an act of examination, *framing* refers to certain kind of delimitation of scope, a result of which is a *frame*, an entity always tied to the subject of the delimited scope. Framing is thus a wide phenomenon, prominently used in the research fields of psychology (Tversky & Kahneman 1981), politics (Busby et al. 2018), behavioral economics (Kahneman & Tversky 1979), linguistics (Lakoff 2004), and decision-making (Bermúdez 2020). The sociologist Erving Goffman draws all the above uses together, conceptualizing frames as “schemata of interpretation” with the help of which people “locate, perceive, identify, and label” any information (1974, 21, see also Bermúdez 2020, 23). In Goffman's sense, framing is an individual's conscious or less conscious effort to make sense of things.

In the use of an analyst, the practice must be specified from the above. Framing is a consciously used method to contrast different perspectives and draw conclusions on how these perspectives, assumed that their holders are consistent with them, guide behavior, actions, opinion-forming, or decision-making. To employ such tool, we rely on the perspective provided by the decision theorist and philosopher José Luiz Bermúdez's problem-solving technique called *frame-sensitive reasoning* (2020). Based on the conditions of decision theory, the technique places multiple demands on the decision-maker and provides a formal model for reaching the best possible predictable solution to any problem that can be viewed in different ways from different standpoints. We do not go in details into the minutiae of these formal requirements but simply state them in more general manner to the extent they are relevant for the restricted scope of the present study.

The process modeled in the frame-sensitive reasoning strives to make any value-laden point or source of argument abstract, impersonal, and therefore more easily solvable. Through abstraction, the model then helps in identifying the process of one's thoughts behind the reasoning process. The process has four steps (Bermúdez 2021, 248–279), and the solution that emerges from the final juxtaposition:

- (1) **Reflexive decentering**, where the value-laden debate is recognized.
- (2) **Imaginative simulation**, where the reality of supporting either side of the debate are listed as carefully as possible.
- (3) **Perspectival flexibility**, where these effects are hypothetically supported each.
- (4) **Reason construction and juxtaposition**, where the reasons behind the sets of effects are explored.

The four-fold process is the guideline of the analysis. When we take a close look at the value base of the Core Curriculum document, we (1) disseminate the value-laden debate of the paradox of globalization in the text. We proceed to (2) construct both sides of the problem as elaborately as possible, making this the longest step in the process. With the elaborate view in mind, we continue to (3) engage in a kind of role-taking, supporting both of frames at the same time. From this, we (4) compare the reasons for choosing either and juxtapose those reasons against each other. As a result, we arrive at a more thorough understanding of what the stance taken in the Finnish Core Curriculum expresses about its view of globalization.

5. Implications of globalization in the Finnish Core Curriculum

This section reports the frame-sensitive reasoning analysis of the Finnish Core Curriculum's section Value Base (FCC 15–16) exploring the implications of globalization in those parts of the document. In the examination, we employ two hypothetical frames constructed from the basis of views expressed

in the Core Curriculum document. We first construct the frames (5.1) and then apply them in the value base text (5.2) of the document.

5.1 Two perspectives to globalization in the Core Curriculum document

The competing frames through which we review extracts from the curriculum are based on a two-fold criterion. On the one hand, we rely on the juxtapositions we observed in the conception of globalization, those that we grouped together as the paradox of globalization (section 3): as a phenomenon, globalization at the same enriches and impoverishes cultures. On the other hand, we draw from the Core Curriculum document's recurring solution to mention the local and the global teaching points in connection to one another. For example, under the theme of transversal skills related to cultural competence, interaction and expression, the document states:

In basic education, pupils are taught to recognize and appreciate the cultural meanings of the environment and to build their own cultural identity, and a positive relationship with the environment. Pupils learn to know and appreciate their environment and its *cultural heritage, as well as their social, cultural, religious, philosophical, and linguistic roots*. They are encouraged to reflect on the significance of their own background and their place in the intergenerational chain. *Pupils are guided to see cultural diversity as an inherently positive asset.* (FCC 2014, 21)

In the excerpt, the local and the global go hand in hand, as a guideline on the diverse, domestic roots is coupled with a guideline concerning cultural diversity as an asset. This is the gist: the learners will, at the same time, learn to value their own cultural roots and to view cultural diversity as a positive feature of the society. This is a great ideal and aim, and also one that invites the paradox we identified in the previous section. If valuing something means protecting and preserving it, then the practice of viewing cultural diversity as an asset can seem challenging. Drawing from this, we craft the following framings:

Heritage frame: to fulfill its purpose of equipping the learners with the necessary skills to thrive as members of the society, when the society is increasingly influenced by globalization, the school needs to teach the students to develop a strong sense of their own culture in order to make them aware of their own heritage, and through that, facilitate their distinct contribution in the multicultural world.

Diversity frame: to fulfill its purpose of equipping the learners with the necessary skills to thrive as members of the society, when the society is increasingly influenced by globalization, the school needs to teach the students to develop an open-minded and accepting attitude towards cross-cultural influences, and through that, facilitate a prosperous merging of different cultures.

It is important to keep in mind that the frames are consciously constructed as rigid, extreme ends of a cline of attitudes towards globalization and how to react to it. The contradiction between Heritage

and Diversity does not represent our views on what is, according to any ethical criteria, good and bad, recommendable or not recommendable. The frames are constructed as a tool for inspecting and examining the paradox of globalization on the practical level of how it appears in the Core Curriculum document.

Indeed, by taking the Value Base through the frame-sensitive reasoning process, we can observe the detailed composition of the globalization's effects and meaning, the document's natural inclination to represent one or the other extreme more strongly as well as tease out the ways in which different aspects of the extreme perspectives merge in it.

5.2 The value base from two perspectives

The value base informs of all other parts of the document and the changes made in between versions. Thus, perhaps naturally, the value base was one of the initial steps to be considered when the reform work on the Core Curriculum started (Kauppinen 2016, cited in Karlsson-Pasto 2018⁴). Prompted by “reflection on the changes in the surrounding world and their effect on children and young people,” the reform aimed to take these into account “by taking a proactive role in building the future” (FNBE 2016). The Core Curriculum 2014 and the shift between it and the previous version of 2004 is representative of the school's “role in defining what kind of future they should be involved in constructing” (ibid). The values that guide these developments are stated in the value base.

The value bases of the previous (2004) and the current (2014) Core Curricula greatly differ in length. The entirety of the 2004 value base fits into 157 words, whereas the 2014 one takes 686 words, equipped with a subsection devoted to the value base of Cultural diversity as richness, 112 words long. This change alone speaks of the increased diversity of the Finnish society, and the subsequent importance of stating the value base explicitly. On the one hand, it can be that a general consensus and intangible knowledge of the society's values cannot be trusted to exist, or, on the other hand, perhaps the changes bring along new aspects that need to be considered, making the previously existing consensus insufficient. Either way, there is an increased need to express the various aspects of the value base with more care than before.

Bringing along the frame-sensitive reasoning framework now, we start by observing the situation and noticing where the value-laden debate lies. The two frames, Heritage and Diversity, will be treated as hypothetical observers of the value base text, and the value-laden debate will lie where their frames, based on their preferences and priorities, clash. Heritage will hope to see the domestic culture being

⁴ Kauppinen 2016 refers to an interview of Eija Kauppinen, Education Councillor, conducted by Karlsson-Pasto (2018) on 15 September 2016.

represented in the value base, as they believe this will be the action that prepares the pupils for the future best, whereas Diversity will hope to see notions of openness towards a global culture being encouraged, for the same reason. With these expectations in mind, we proceed to comparing the two value base texts. The value base of the previous Core Curriculum (2004, 14, on the left) and the current one (2014, 16⁵, on the right) stand as follows⁶:

The values underpinning basic education are human rights, equality, democracy, the preservation of biodiversity and the viability of the environment, and *acceptance* of multiculturalism. It promotes a sense of community, responsibility, and respect for individual rights and freedoms. It is based on *Finnish culture*, which has developed *in interaction with Indigenous, Nordic, and European culture*. Teaching must consider *national and local characteristics*, national languages, the two national churches, the indigenous Sámi people, and national minorities. The teaching practices also consider *the diversification of Finnish culture, including immigrants from different cultures*. Teaching thus supports the development of the student's own cultural identity and the student's participation in Finnish society and in globalizing world. It also *promotes tolerance* and intercultural *understanding*. Basic education increases equality within regions and between individuals. It considers the diversity of learners and promotes gender equality [...] (FCC 2004, 14)

[...] Basic education is built on the *diverse Finnish cultural heritage*. It has been developed and is continuously shaped by the *interaction of different cultures*. Teaching supports pupils' own cultural identity, their growth as active agents in their own culture and community, and their *interest in other cultures*. At the same time, teaching strengthens creativity and respect for *cultural diversity*, promotes *interaction within and across cultures* and thus lays the foundations for culturally sustainable development. People from different cultural and linguistic backgrounds come together in primary education and are exposed to a wide range of customs, community practices and beliefs. They learn to see things from the perspective of others' life situations and circumstances. Learning together across linguistic, cultural, religious and belief boundaries creates the conditions for genuine interaction and community. Basic education lays the foundations for a *global citizenship* that respects human rights and encourages people to act work for positive change. [...] (FCC 2014, 16)

At first glance, Heritage and Diversity both observe that the cultural reference point presented in the 2004 value base is significantly more local than in the 2014 text. They see that the 2004 text names *Finnish Culture* as a separate entity from the phenomenon of *diversification* it is undergoing, whereas in the 2014 version, Finnish culture is introduced with the prefix *diverse*. Also, the 2004 version paints a greatly more local picture of culture education by stating the importance of the Indigenous Sámi, Nordic countries, and Europe, as opposed to the 2014 version that emphasizes the importance of intercultural exchange through different re-iterations, naming *global citizenship* as the future that the learners are prepared for.

The value-laden debate for Heritage and Diversity lies in the tension between the local and the global culture. Heritage sees that all notions to the traditional Finnish culture have been removed, and finds the development bad. Diversity sees that openness towards global culture is encouraged, and finds the development good. In the frame of Heritage, culture has been impoverished, whereas in the frame

⁵ We specifically focus on the subsection about Cultural diversity as richness (FCC 2014, 16).

⁶ This, and all other excerpts from the Core Curriculum documents 2004 and 2014 are translated by Maria Lehtimäki.

of Diversity, culture has been enriched. Observing the clash of framings here, we have a situation where it seems that the increased cultural contacts and cultural diversity have, at the same time, in this specific context, enriched the culture with more diversity but impoverished its very core.

Such a value-laden debate is a difficult topic to address neutrally. Cultural diversity is a central value of today's world, and voices questioning it are often interpreted as hostile. At the same time, questions on preserving national cultures evoke strong emotions, as the emotional connection to national cultures are formed in and since childhood, making them sacred. When these are, falsely or justly, juxtaposed, discourse easily comes to a deadlock and misunderstandings arise.

The frame-sensitive reasoning technique resigns from these kinds of juxtapositions by basing its principles to formal rationality; a sense of rationality based on consistency, an inherently neutral perspective (Bermúdez 2021, 84 – 89). Therefore, when we proceed to the frame-sensitive reasoning process now, the technique guides us to focus on the seeing how they play out in the context of the value base.

The first step of reflexive decentering requires a distancing act. Reflexive decentering is a “shift from a first-person perspective to a third-person perspective” (Bermúdez 2021, 257), shifting “one’s experiential perspective on the world” in order to “be able to reflect upon the experience itself” (Bermúdez 2021, 255). Prior to the distancing act, Heritage strongly dislikes the development that the Finnish culture is being labeled as diverse, as to her, it should be held as a singular culture that, from this standpoint, interacts with other cultures; Diversity strongly dislikes the notion of insisting on separate national cultures, as to her, this hinders the development of a global culture by insisting on arbitrary boundaries. If these two perspectives were developing the next Core Curriculum document, it is possible that not much work would get done.

To see whether the value base text however facilitates both views, the reasoning must focus on one salient aspect of the debate of how globalization has affected the value base. This we set to be the opening passage according to which the value base, in the 2004 version, a) “is based on Finnish culture, which has developed in interaction with Indigenous, Nordic, and European culture” and in the 2014 version, b) “is built on the diverse Finnish cultural heritage [that] is has been developed and is continuously shaped by the interaction of different cultures.” These sentences connect the value base to, respectively and in the lack of a better word, *traditional* Finnish culture and to a changing Finnish culture. To escape the rigid binary labeling that Heritage and Diversity at present hold on them, they need to be decentered, that is, reiterated further away from the emotion-laden deadlock.

They can be reiterated as follows: Heritage's view emphasizes the historical continuum from our parents and grandparents and the grandparents before them, who have followed and thus created certain traditions that we, in our turn now, must also respect by keeping the traditions alive. This is how we, in the best possible way, equip the learners with the necessary skills to thrive as members of a globalized society. Diversity's view emphasizes the development into the future, a world where we do not restrict ourselves to the blood-heritage of our biological ancestry, but, as individuals, hold ourselves accountable to all other people. This is how we, in the best possible way, equip the learners with the necessary skills to thrive as members of a globalized society. Seen this way, the rigid formulations preventing cooperation are taken to a more descriptive level, making it possible to begin to understand their composition, emphases, and connection points.

The second step, imaginative simulation, guides us to investigate these perspectives with as much detail as possible. The practical purpose of the second step is to "weaken the grip of one's own framing of the situation in order to make room for alternative framings" (Bermúdez 2021, 262). A good way to do this is to consider factual and non-factual propositions. Factual and non-factual propositions denote to statements that are, respectively, such that we can test and prove right or wrong, and such that we deem right or wrong based on our emotions about them only (Bermúdez 2021, 253–255). The latter are unavoidable in value-laden debates, but they obviously should not decision-making and opinion-forming.

In our context, examination of factual and non-factual propositions must mean a careful reading of the value base text. Here, we focus on the current Core Curriculum (2014) and refer to the previous as a point of comparison (2004).

Looking at the value base text, the "diverse Finnish cultural heritage" that "has developed and is continuously shaped by the interaction of different cultures" (FCC 2014) is indeed more inclusive than "Finnish culture, which has developed in interaction with Indigenous, Nordic, and European cultures" (FCC 2004) by implicitly denying the existence of a singular Finnish culture. Instead, they speak of a heritage, understood more as fuzzy-edged category that, first of all, is a result of a group of undefined cultures as opposed to the previous documents itemized list, and *has developed and is continuously shaped* rather than *has developed*. In the view of the current document (2014), cultural shaping is still ongoing rather than, as in the previous version (2004), having been formed already. In this sense, the factual statement made in this passage is that the traditional Finnish culture, understood as historical customs, is transforming. However, this does not mean that it is being abolished or overruled by any other singular culture that it engages in interaction with. Instead, in the value base text of 2014, the Finnish culture on which education planning is based on is not a fixed entity but

fuzzy-edged resource in which the idea of a singular, traditional Finnish culture participates but which does not constitute it.

This kind of Finnish cultural heritage, then, is what “supports pupils’ own cultural identity, their growth as active agents in their own culture and community, and their interest in other cultures.” This sentence navigates reality of the plurality of Finnish culture, leaving room to hyphenate the Finnish identity, for example, with other cultural, religious, or the like categories. The 2004 version maintains that “teaching must consider national and local characteristics, national languages, the two national churches, the Indigenous Sámi people, and national minorities,” formulating a separate guideline for culturally aware teaching as a subtype of an implied default mode of teaching that would not take these into account. The 2014 version, in contrast, incorporates cultural awareness and sensitivity to all teaching as a default.

The pupils of the current version (2014) are allowed and guided to exist as individuals that represent any culture or a combination of cultures, defining the cultures on the individual level. The value base of 2014 promotes neither a monotonic view of Finnish culture nor a supranational, global culture, but instead guides towards constructing an individual identity that can but does not have to be separate from either. When pupils, encouraged to adopt such a cultural identity are guided toward “culturally sustainable development” by promoting respect and interaction between cultures, it has become clear that such objective is not based on either a traditional or monotonic view of Finnish culture or the supranational culture. Thus, the stance of the value base, again, facilitates the development of both but does not actively promote either.

It could even be said that the general attitude of the value base text is rather passive. Stating that “different cultures and linguistic backgrounds come together in primary education and are exposed to a wide range of customs, community practices, and beliefs,” the text acknowledges multiculturalism as the norm of the Finnish schooling system. This interaction that takes place in the school environment, the text suggests, directly leads to the pupils learning “to see the things from the perspective of others’ life situations and circumstances” as “learning together across linguistic, cultural, religious, and belief boundaries creates the conditions for genuine interaction and community.” This sentiment can be blamed for being over-optimistic, as it states the optimal scenario as the most likely one. Obviously (and unfortunately), simply witnessing cultural and other diversity does not automatically make one tolerant, responsive, or proactive about it. As per fact, we can state that the school environment provides the opportunity for this kind of development, and if successful, it promotes general virtues that, in this context, are more inclined towards diversity.

Teaching provided in institutions of basic education, guided by such value base, “lays the foundations for a global citizenship that respects human rights and encourages people to act for positive change” in general, within and outside the school environment. This final sentence of the value base straightforwardly promotes global citizenship, naming it as the culture towards which the children are being guided, but explains it more through the values of respecting equality and being proactive in the face of change. These values, it can be argued, are not exclusive to the global culture, but rather reflect the current cultural climate of change and transition.

Furthermore, naming *global citizenship* at the end of the value base, after having explicated on the role of *diverse Finnish cultural heritage*, the value base text makes it clear that these two cultures are horizontally aligned, but the global citizenship is both larger than the Finnish heritage, thus including it. *Global citizenship* also comes temporally later, as the schools are only able to *lay the foundations* in preparation for the future. The Core Curriculum, then, anticipates that a world requiring a global citizenship will be the cultural environment into which the pupils, perhaps as adults, will belong into. However, based on the precedence given to the diverse Finnish cultural heritage, they will belong to that world as members of the individual culture, hyphenated with the Finnish culture, the model they received in Finnish basic education.

At the end of imaginative simulation, the clash of frames in the value base text seems slightly less strong, and it might be easier for Heritage and Diversity see their concerns in a new light. The third step, perspectival flexibility requires holding both frames in mind simultaneously, trying to understand the perspective of the other party. Perspectival flexibility thus resembles role-taking. The role-taking in frame-sensitive reasoning does not mean swopping one frame with the other and pretending to support it (Bermúdez 2021, 253), but rather considering their own and the other’s frame acceptingly at the same time.

Considering that Heritage deems national culture and traditions as important institutions to be kept alive in the globalizing world, Heritage would probably extend that to also other cultures in the Finnish schooling system. It must be acknowledged that the shift that took place between 2004 and 2014 Core Curricula is connected to the changes in the composition of the cultural backgrounds of the nation’s learners. The number of learners with immigrant background has consistently increased during the last decades, and finding solutions to integrate them into the Finnish society is important for all (NAOF 12/2015, 5). Insisting on making the school monocultural, in this case, only Finnish, is not within the interests of Heritage – quite the opposite. In their view, keeping the traditions and cultures of any local culture alive is the way to react to globalization. They may consider that in the Finnish schooling system, this is the job of basic education. In order for basic education to include

teaching such diverse heritages, the kind of fuzzy-edged view of culture represented in the value base text is required.

Then, considering that Diversity deems openness to diverse cultural influences an important skill in the globalizing world, Diversity can be expected to see the value of Heritage's point of view in the sense of teaching to the pupils what one culture in and of itself is. In Diversity's view, the pupils should be prepared for the globalizing world by teaching them tools to interact across cultures. By participating in keeping the national cultures alive, while also teaching to communicate across them, the schooling system is fulfilling also Diversity's wishes of paving the way towards a global village. After all, a supranational culture must emerge out of the plurality of individual cultures, not to replace them.

It seems that the two might be able to find ways to work together on the next update of the Core Curriculum, if required. Having now identified their value-laden attitudes, dissected them into factual propositions, and finding ways to see the point in each other's rationales, we turn the attention to the reasons for constructing the value base of education planning on either the frame of Heritage or Diversity.

The fourth step of the frame-sensitive reasoning model, reason construction and juxtaposition, is two-fold and aims to find a solution to the clash of frames. Heritage and Diversity are both concerned with the optimal ways to equip the learners of the contemporary, globalized world. Both perspectives, being constructed from the basis of the document, acknowledge the existence of globalization and the need to react to it. As seen when constructing the frames (in 5.1), the cultural roots and cultural diversity are mentioned as separate teaching points (FCC 21), but in the value base, the difference is not made that distinctly.

Constructing the reasons for prioritizing either frame, in the present context of observing the frames in the value base text, means observing the document's inclination to one or the other, ways of combining them, and reasons for doing so. This is to say that we do not attempt to solve the problem of on what to base the perfect Core Curriculum on, but to see which frame, if either, wins out in the Finnish Core Curriculum document, and why that is so.

After the examination, it is evident that while both frames are represented in the text and can be supported through the solutions made in it, it was easier to find support for the Diversity frame than Heritage frame. While it is true that the document grounds education of Finnish Culture (supporting Heritage), the version of Finnish culture is not fixed but changing within the ongoing interaction between cultures (supporting Diversity). Also, while the value base text emphasized the importance

of supporting each student's cultural identity and socialization into their own culture and community (supporting Heritage), it emphasized the importance of respecting all cultures, interacting across cultures, learning to adopt diverse culture-bound perspectives, and global citizenship even more (supporting Diversity).

As a solution to the frame-sensitive reasoning process, it can be concluded that the current Finnish Core Curriculum promotes Diversity and the skills connected to the frame more than the frame and skills of Heritage. Therefore, globalization, per the value base of the Core Curriculum, is a phenomenon in which the pupils are to participate as communicators and negotiators, willing to be molded by cultural interactions, rather than as representatives of a single culture, contributing to the phenomenon by keeping up static parts of it. The institution of culture in a globalized world, based on the value base, is essentially fluid and changing rather than an entity to be kept alive by repetition. The role of the national culture, in this case, the Finnish culture, is to provide a starting point, not a set of boundaries.

A shift in emphases from Heritage to Diversity was clearly noticeable between the previous Core Curriculum (2004) and the current (2014) education planning document. Next, we discuss reasons for that, on the level of establishing a value base for a Core Curriculum document, and consider the results of examining the Finnish Core Curriculum in the more general context of globalization.

6. Discussion of the results of the enquiry

Globalization is no longer a phenomenon that the world is undergoing but an attribute that defines it – *we live in a globalized world*. Globalization has brought along a shift in the point of view that, on the level of education planning, brings along various broadenings to its perspective. The above analysis examined some manifestations of these broadenings in the value base text of the Finnish Core Curriculum of 2014. The shift that took place during the decade between the two latest Core Curricula included rapid changes that arouse when comparing the roles of globalization, multiculturalism, and intercultural exchange between the two versions.

The shift between the documents is revealing in many ways, and the points we raise here focus on explaining some of these aspects. Globalization affects education planning across the world, differing in nuances in the context of specific cultures, but the outlines can be expected to be sufficiently similar for one realization to be valuable to another. Therefore, we maintain that the observations arising from this examination will prove useful in education planning on a more general level.

We paid attention to the difference between the cultural perspective between 2004 and 2014 versions. The previous Core Curriculum (2004) operated from the Finnish culture, providing guidelines on how to *consider* other cultures from this coherent and separate point of view. This point of view is not found in the current one (2014) that states a diverse and still a-changing Finnish heritage as its point of reference. It seems that the time passed between the versions has developed the cultural perspective of the text itself, and it is no longer persuasive to think that the learner would be inspecting other cultures from any singular culture. The previous Core Curriculum (2004) is written from a point of view that is positioned within a culture, promoting “acceptance of multiculturalism”, whereas the current Core Curriculum’s (2014) perspective has developed from accepting multiculturalism to treating it obvious. The current document’s point of view is positioned between cultures that are interactional and changing, inherently difficult if not impossible to be positioned within the traditional Finnish culture.

In the same vein, we also detected a difference between the attitude connected to the cultural perspective. The attitude of the value base had developed from “promot[ing] tolerance” (2004, 14) towards other cultures to being “interest[ed] in other cultures” (2014, 16). The step from acceptance to being interested evidences a stark increase in open-mindedness. Perhaps descriptive of this is also that versions of the word *tolerance* (*suvaitsevaisuus* in Finnish) are prominent across the Core Curriculum of 2004 with altogether 22 instances, whereas in the Core Curriculum of 2014, it is only mentioned in connection to the school subjects of religion and life stance education with altogether four instances. When globalization is no longer about to happen but has become the default, accepting and tolerance can, perhaps, be seen as even outdated and insufficiently passive attitudes to promote.

At the same time, when creative and proactive attitudes towards the effects of globalization become a necessity, a pressure to establish an optimistic attitude towards globalization might develop. Traces of such can be detected in the current Core Curriculum (2014). For example, the document establishes a normative view of cultural diversity through the frequent use of the phrases of *culture* or *multiculturalism as richness*. To compare, the word *richness* (*rikkaus* in Finnish) in its different forms appears only once in the previous Core Curriculum (2004), and exclusively in its concrete sense as an antonym of *poor*, while the current Core Curriculum (2014) defines *multiculturalism as richness* (2014, 16) in the value base, elsewhere in the document (2014, 28; 412), and the phrase can be found in explanations of the curriculum reform (FNBE 2016). While this is, of course, a positive development, it can lead to difficulties in addressing the problems that diversity inevitably also brings along.

In this study, we have identified multiple representations of the challenge, faced by education planners in any part of the world affected by globalization, to preserve a national culture with its habits and traditions while at the same time empowering the nation's young to be open to other cultures. Simply recognizing this paradox and finding ways to solve it in the relevant, restricted contents, can be helpful in the planning efforts of any national curriculum.

7. Summary

In this article, we have explored the Finnish Core Curriculum (2014) through the lens of globalization, asking what kind of beliefs about globalization are connected to the Finnish Core Curriculum of 2014. We constructed two hypothetical perspectives that held different core beliefs about how globalization should be taken into consideration in education planning. The hypothetical perspectives represented the paradox of globalization, one (Heritage) taking the stance that reacting to the effects of globalization on the level of education planning, the local, national culture must be strengthened, and the other (Diversity), in the same context, saw that the skills to be open to cultural influences should be focused on. We employed these hypothetical perspectives in the analysis of the value base of the Finnish Core Curriculum of 2014, inspecting the shift between them. Such analysis could both reveal fine nuances of the conception of globalization inscribed into the document, locate whether it leaned more strongly to one or the other extreme, and identify ways in which the two have merged.

Based on our findings, we suggested that the value base of the current Core Curriculum (2014) in Finland has evolved from the previous (2004) in order to accommodate the increased diversity of Finnish society. The value base of the 2014 document promotes cultural sensitivity, individual cultural identity, and respect for diversity while laying the foundations for global citizenship. It acknowledges a diverse and developing Finnish heritage that cannot be treated as a singular cultural reference point. Similarly, the attitude towards other cultures has evolved from promoting tolerance in the 2004 version to being interested in other cultures in the 2014 version, implying that an increase in familiarity or another such phenomenon has taken place, making it possible to be more actively open-minded in this respect. As globalization necessitates creative and proactive responses, there is a pressure to establish an optimistic attitude towards cultural diversity. The 2014 Core Curriculum frequently describes culture and multiculturalism as richness, highlighting a normative view of cultural diversity. However, this positive development can also present challenges in addressing the problems that diversity introduces.

It must be kept in mind that anything stated in any National Core Curriculum goes through many decision-making bodies before it is offered to a learner in practice. For this reason, our observations here do not necessarily target nor translate into the everyday life of any school institution. Yet, the core curriculum is the basis of all education planning, and the different perspectives to view globalization from are important to consider when updating a curriculum, be that the next update of the Finnish one or any international curriculum.

Today's learners, growing up in a globalized world, hold versatile ideas of culture and often embrace hybrid identities, which may not clash from their perspective, despite traditional expectations. Understanding the paradoxical, enriching and impoverishing, nature of globalization and finding ways to address it within the curriculum is crucial for education planners worldwide. By recognizing this challenge in their own contexts, national curricula can better empower young learners to be open to other cultures, even a global culture, while also taking care of their national heritage.

REFERENCES

- Anderson-Levitt, Kathryn M. (2003). *A World Culture of Schooling? Local Meanings, Global Schooling. Anthropology and World Culture Theory*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Bermúdez, José Luis (2021). *Frame It Again: New Tools for Rational Decision Making*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Busby, E., Flynn, D. J., & Druckman, J. N. (2018). Studying framing effects on political preferences: Existing research and lingering questions. P. D'Angelo (Ed.), *Doing News Framing Analysis II* (pp. 67—90). New York: Routledge.
- Cantell, Hannele (2013). Opetussuunnitelmat ja tuntijakouudistus: arvopohdintaa ja välttämättömiä valintoja [Curricula and curricular reform: reflection on values and necessary choices]. *Kasvatus* [Education], 44: 2, 195–198.
- Creanza N, Kolodny O, Feldman MW. (2017). Cultural evolutionary theory: How culture evolves and why it matters. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*. 25: 114(30), 7782–7789.
- Eryaman, Mustafa Rufus & Martina Riedler (2010). Teacher-proof curriculum. *Encyclopedia of curriculum studies*. Craig Kridel (ed.) Thousand Oaks: Sage, pp. 865–866.
- Finnish National Board of Education (2014). *Finnish Core Curriculum (FCC 2014)*.
- Finnish National Board of Education (2014). *Finnish Core Curriculum (FCC 2004)*.
- Finnish National Board of Education (2016). *New national core curriculum for basic education: focus on school culture and integrative approach*. Available at: <https://www.oph.fi/sites/default/files/documents/new-national-core-curriculum-for-basic-education.pdf>
- Goffman, Erving (1961). *Asylums: essays on the social situation of mental patients and other inmates*. Chicago: Aldine.

- Halinen, Irmeli, Arja-Sisko Holappa & Liisa Jääskeläinen (2013). Opetussuunnitelmatyö ja yleissivistävän koulutuksen uudistaminen [Curriculum work and reform of general education]. *Kasvatus* [Education], 44: 2, 187–194.
- Kahneman, Daniel & Amos Tversky (1979). “Prospect Theory: An Analysis of Decision Under Risk” *Econometrica*. 47:2, 263–292.
- Karlsson-Pasto, Mariann (2018). *Kohti Uutta Opetussuunnitelmaa. Tarkastelussa päätöksenteon osallistaminen* [Towards a New Curriculum. Review of participation in decision-making]. Organizational Communications, Master’s Thesis. University of Vaasa. Available at: https://osuva.uvasi.fi/bitstream/handle/10024/9280/osuva_8364.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y
- Komiteamietintö [committee notes] (1970). *Peruskoulun opetussuunnitelmakomitean mietintö I. Opetussuunnitelman perusteet*. Komiteamietintö A, 1455-0431; 1970, 4. Helsinki: National Council.
- Krug, Edward A. (1950). *Curriculum Planning*. New York: Harper & Brothers.
- Lakoff, G. 2004. *Don’t Think of an Elephant: Know Your Values and Frame the Debate*. White River Junction, VT: Chelsea Green Publishing.
- MacIntyre, Alasdair (2003). *Whose Justice? Which Rationality?* Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press.
- National Audit Office of Finland [NAOF] (2015). *Immigrant pupils and the effectiveness of basic education*. Performance Audit Report 12/2015.
- Parti, Heidi, Heidi Westerlund & Cecilia Björk (2013). Oppimiskäsitykset reflektiivisen musiikkikasvattajan toiminnan ohjaajina [Learning conceptions as guides for the reflective music educator]. *Musiikkikasvattaja. Kohti reflektiivisiä käytäntöjä* [Music educator. Towards reflective practices]. Marja-Leena Juntunen, Hanna M. Nikkanen & Heidi Westerlund (eds.) Jyväskylä: P-S kustannus. pp. 54–70.
- Ritzer, George (2004). *Globalization of Nothing*. Thousand Oaks: Pine Forge Press.
- Saari, Antti (2021). *Kasvatusteoria Antiikista Nykypäivään*. [Educational theory from Antiquity to the Present Day]. e-book. Helsinki: Gaudeamus.
- Sundman, K. (1975). *Evaluaatioprojektista. Tiedonantoja koulututkimuksesta 5/1975* [On the evaluation project. Communications on school research 5/1975.]. Helsinki: Kouluhallitus, Kokeilu- ja tutkimustoimisto [National Board of Education, Office of Experimentation and Research]. pp. 1–5.
- Taubman, Peter M. (2009). *Teaching by numbers: Deconstructing the discourse of standards and accountability in education*. New York: Routledge.
- Tversky, A. and D. Kahneman (1981). The framing of decisions and the psychology of choice. *Science* 211, 453–58.
- Tversky, Amos; Kahneman, Daniel (1981). The Framing of decisions and the psychology of choice. *Science*. 211 (4481): 453–58
- Tyler, Ralph W. (1949). *Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

- Vitikka, Erja, Leena Krokfors & Elisa Hurmerinta (2012). The Finnish National Core Curriculum. Structure and Development. *Miracle of education: The principles and practices of teaching and learning in Finnish schools*. Niemi Hannele, Auli Toom & Arto Kallioniemi (eds.) Rotterdam: Sense Publishers. pp. 83– 96.
- Vahtivuori-Hänninen, S., Halinen, I., Niemi, H., Lavonen, J., & Lipponen, L. (2014). A new Finnish national core curriculum for basic education (2014) and technology as an integrated tool for learning. teoksessa H. Niemi, J. Multisilta, L. Lipponen, & M. Vivitsou (eds). *Finnish Innovations and Technologies in Schools: a Guide towards New Ecosystems of Learning*. pp. 21–32. Sense publishers.