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**Abstract**

This comparative study examines the views of Finnish and Japanese student teachers on global perspectives (GP) in relation to their future profession. As global citizens, teachers should know, one, the cultural and historical backgrounds of pupils and their families, and two, how to teach interrelated themes and global issues. The research questions of this study are, “How do student teachers conceptualise global perspectives in relation to their future teaching, in Oulu and Hiroshima?”; “How do those students view the role and significance of GP in their future teaching?”; and, “How does teacher education support the development of GP?” My theoretical framework rests on Gaudelli’s heuristic model of global citizenship education (2009) and on Hanvey’s five aims of GP (1982), enriched by principles of critical pedagogy (Giroux 2004, Freire 1985). The main body of empirical data was acquired through interviews with and questionnaires completed by students in the two contexts.

This study found differences and similarities in the Finnish and Japanese student teachers’ views of global perspectives. Those views, in many respects, reflect Hanvey’s model of five aims, “perspective consciousness” and “cross-cultural awareness” in particular. Views derived from critical pedagogy were less visible. Remarkable differences were evident in terms of Gaudelli’s “four orientations” model. The Japanese student teachers expressed nationalistic tendencies more often than their Finnish counterparts, who stressed humanistic principles. Neo-liberalist and transformational orientations were more difficult to detect in the Japanese data.

In both cases, the student teachers saw GP as valuable for their future profession, referring to “cross-cultural awareness” within a humanistic orientation. However, the Japanese student teachers stressed “perspective consciousness” as part of a nationalistic orientation, while the Finns justified the teaching of GP in terms of “global dynamics” in a transformational orientation. Both groups saw teacher education programmes as significant to the development of GP, expressing similar views on the importance of curricula and of professors’ knowledge. Yet, while the Finnish student teachers saw peer support and varied assignments as helpful in developing GP, the Japanese considered those factors to be less relevant.
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Tämä vertaileva tutkimus tarkastelee suomalaisten ja japanilaisten opettajaksi opiskelevien näkemyksiä globaaleista näkökulmista (global perspectives) suhteessa heidän tulevaan ammatiin. Maailmankansalaisina opettajien tulisi tuntea oppilaidensa ja heidän perheidensä kulttuurihistorialliset taustat sekä kuinka heidän tulisi huomioida globaalit kysymykset opetuksessa.


Tulokset osoittavat, että suomalaisten ja japanilaisten opettajaksi opiskelevien näkemyksiä globaaleista näkökulmasta on sekä yhtäläisyyksiä että eroavuuksia. Heidän käsityksensä heijastavat suurelta osin Hanveyn mallin viitta koskien eri tavoitteista. Japanilaisten opiskelijat ehtivät kuitenkin painottaa kulttuurien välistä ymmärrystä osana globaalien näkökulmien kehitystä ja opettajankoulutuksen rooliquin, toisaalta suomalaiset opiskelijat pitivät vertaistukea ja erilaisia tehtäviä oppimisprosessia edistävänä, mikä toisaalta ei korostunut japanilaisten aineistossa.
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## Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CME</td>
<td>Critical Multicultural Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP</td>
<td>Critical pedagogy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FNBE</td>
<td>Finnish National Board of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCE</td>
<td>Global citizenship education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE</td>
<td>Global education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP</td>
<td>Global perspectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HE</td>
<td>Higher education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IC</td>
<td>Intercultural Competence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME</td>
<td>Multicultural Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEXT</td>
<td>Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science, and Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoEC</td>
<td>Ministry of Education and Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PISA</td>
<td>Program for International Student Assessment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1 Introduction

This study focuses on teacher education and on how student teachers view global challenges in a rapidly changing, international world. Inter-cultural and international encounters are no longer a privilege for some: advancements in technology and digitalisation mean that such encounters have become a phenomenon concerning everyone in one way or another. Education can play an important role in preparing pupils to live in diverse societies, offering competences to future citizens in a globalised world.

Teachers, in particular, are responsible for preparing future world citizens, asked to accommodate diverse, growing needs and to prepare pupils for uncertainty in an unprecedented future (Niemi, 2000; Niemi & Jakku-Sihvonen, 2006). To understand the changing needs for future teachers, discourses surrounding teacher training must be examined generally and in a specific cultural and national context. Gaining insight into the views of student teachers is necessary, as agents for bringing change to future classrooms and—potentially—to future society. To design topical, innovative teacher training programmes, student voices must be heard and observed when building those programmes (see Blum & Bourn, 2013; Sjölie, 2014).

This comparative study focuses on two contexts in teacher training programmes, the first in Finland, the second in Japan. Those two contexts offered a natural environment for this research: the author has studied personally in both countries. Those experiences sparked my interest in the differences and similarities of educational policies and practices, from global perspectives. Acknowledging the unique features of Finland and Japan, education experts have suggested that the nations share characteristics, particularly when analysing the student achievements of the world’s “best performing” countries—see, for example, Sahlgren, 2015. These comments made me reflect more closely on educational issues, such as global perspectives, from a wider, historical, socio-cultural viewpoint.

In the planning stages of this study, I noted that plentiful research had already been conducted on terms and concepts regarding multiculturalism and global education—see, for example, James Banks, Sonia Nieto, Audrey Osler, Rauni Räsänen. I marked, nonetheless, that insufficient attention had been given to exploring differences and similarities in the interpretations of those ideas, in various contexts (see Harriet Marshall’s The Global Education Terminology Debate, 2016). This study aims, consequently, to respond to that concern, through the eventual building of a comprehensive model combining the theoretical perspectives
that I consider crucial to higher education—to teacher training in particular. After carefully considering the multiple, often unclear, ambiguous terms and concepts available, I decided to use “global perspectives” (GP) as an umbrella term in this study. I will introduce, therefore, a comprehensive theoretical framework combining the ideas of two prominent social studies researchers, Robert G. Hanvey (1982) and William Gaudelli (2009).

Empirically, I was keen to discover how interpretations of GP differ or coincide in educational contexts. I pursued testing of my comprehensive model as designed, to discover to what extent interpretations differ in different contexts; in this case, in teacher training in Oulu, Finland and in Hiroshima, Japan.

1.1 Aims and research questions

This research aims, principally, to understand the views of student teachers on global perspectives and to comprehend how those student teachers experience teacher education when preparing for teaching. I will discuss my findings in relation to higher education policies, to the curricula of teacher training, and to other socio-cultural aspects of the differences in the educational institutions of the two countries.

My principal research question is, “How do student teachers view the concept of “global perspectives” in relation to their future teaching and their experiences during teacher training?” My secondary questions are as follows.

1. How do the student teachers, in Oulu and Hiroshima, conceptualise global perspectives in relation to their future teaching?
2. How do the student teachers in Oulu and Hiroshima see the role and significance of global perspectives in relation to their profession as teachers?
3. How does teacher education support the development of global perspectives, according to the student teachers in Oulu and Hiroshima?

My first secondary question focuses on how student teachers see global perspectives, exploring how student teachers understood the concept in both contexts. The second aims to establish the significance of global education in student considerations of their future as teachers. The third question examines the role of teacher education in developing the global awareness of student teachers in these two socio-cultural contexts.

My data was collected using interviews and questionnaires, including quantitative and qualitative data. Relevant policy papers and curricula were studied
so as to increase a contextual understanding of the two cases and strengthen interpretation of the gathered data.

1.2 Positioning the researcher

My interest in pursuing this comparative study derived from life experience. After a period of compulsory education in Japan, I attended high school in Australia and New Zealand. My world view began to change significantly. I realised—for the first time—that, in certain contexts, I belonged to a minority group with different physical characteristics, possessing certain cultural values that labelled me “Asian.” This realisation shocked me. I had spent most of my life in a small town in Japan, living with people whose thinking might be described as somewhat “normative.” Around the same time, I became acquainted with friends who were migrants, of “mixed race,” scholarship holders, and local citizens by naturalisation. I learned profoundly about historically rooted cultural tensions and religious conflicts from international friends later, when I was actively involved in international student organisations at a university in North America. Beginning my career, I could not resist wondering what “success” and “international” really meant when acting for a global company—not quite realising the privileges that offered me the chance to formulate such questions.

In 2010, I began studying at the master’s programme entitled “Education and Globalisation” (EdGlo, 2010–2012) at the University of Oulu, Finland. The two-year programme was research-oriented, focusing on ethics, policy, planning, comparative research, and many other aspects of educational science. Learning with classmates from diverse professional and cultural backgrounds was a critical turning point. Having to engage in theories about cultural cooperation and globalisation, I realised that I had been blind during my volunteer work, had thought naively and applied “helping” imperatives without understanding an underlying socio-cultural complexity. I began—only then—to see the consequences of my post-compulsory education in western nations and its profound impact on me. It led me to reflect, first emotionally, later critically, on my national, cultural, and original identity. Soon, a perpetuated interest in the Finnish education system emerged in my mind, with a continued reflection on the Japanese educational climate.

To some extent, I carry a multicultural or perhaps even “hybrid” identity. Had all my educational experiences taken place in a mono-culture, I might not have been inspired to pursue this kind of comparative research. The immersion led me
to strive to discover how I might contribute as an intercultural educator and researcher aware of the privilege of seeing other perspectives, able to value dialogical relationships and viewing continuous reflection as important.

In approaching the two contexts, Finnish and Japanese, from a comparative perspective, certain aspects encouraged the author to pursue this study. The ability to speak “the native language,” to communicate in Japanese, was helpful in establishing academic networks with researchers and collaborators at Japanese universities, including Hiroshima University. Various opportunities allowed me to engage with Japanese student teachers and teacher educators face-to-face. Language proficiency is essential, I contend, in conducting research outside one’s native country. Wills and Rappleye (2011) exemplify such thinking, arguing that “neither Japan nor Japanese education has been easy for outside observers to understand, given both the mixed messages from Japan itself and the high walls of geographic location, sophisticated cultural codes, and an imposing language” (p. 37). My background offered me knowledge when choosing appropriate literature to deepen my research discussion. I am not affiliated with Hiroshima University—a lack of affiliation that offered space for the participants, the interviewees, to speak comfortably and confidentially about their perceptions and experiences.

Although I conducted interviews with Finnish student teachers in English—as discussed in Sub-chapter 4.4—my experiences of studying in Oulu and knowledge of Finnish society were useful in creating common ground with the informants. The Finnish students were open and freely shared their thoughts on their teacher training. Moreover, my experiences of graduate and post-graduate studies at the University of Oulu have helped me to connect with experienced teacher educators and to locate relevant literature on Finnish education. I was given occasional teaching opportunities at the international master's programme (EdGlo) and at the “Intercultural Teacher Education” (ITE) programme at the Faculty of Education. This led me to engage critically with the Finnish education system, which receives current favourable attention globally. In summary, varied experiences and academic research networks have added to and guided this study over the last four years.

As a doctoral candidate, I attended the “Norwegian University of Science and Technology” (NTNU) in Norway for two semesters as an Erasmus Exchange researcher. I joined a doctoral student course at the NTNU and conversed with researchers, teacher trainers, and doctoral candidates, who shared their insights into their educational systems. This offered me further opportunities to reflect on the Nordic context in general and on Finnish education from the viewpoint of another Nordic country.
2 The research contexts

This chapter will present background information about Finland and Japan. The following discussion explores the historical development of the respective education systems, of primary school teacher education in the two countries, and, more specifically, of teacher training at the University of Oulu and Hiroshima University. Throughout the presentation of information and discussion in this chapter, I present factors that contribute to making this comparison between Finland—the University of Oulu—and Japan—Hiroshima University—a rigorous, comparative study.

Both Finland and Japan have committed strongly to developing national education over the years and have outperformed other nations persistently in many international student assessments, such as PISA and TIMMS (see, for example, OECD, 2010, 2013).

Very different mechanisms manage the development processes in the two countries. In Finland, the “Ministry of Education,” abbreviated to “MoEC,” develops educational and related policies on publicly funded education in Finland1. The “Finnish National Board of Education” (FNBE) 2, under the MoEC, implements the strategies outlined by the MoEC. Currently—however—educational decision-making in Finland is very decentralised: its municipalities and local authorities are the main arbitrators of quality in education and curricula. The state offers national core curriculum guidelines and educational laws, providing a ground and framework for educational activities. However, in recent educational reforms, curricula development processes have stood on common collaborative efforts performed by trade unions, administrators, and other educational stakeholders (Vitikka et al., 2012). Universities are fairly autonomous in making decisions about teaching content, but are controlled through financial laws, regulations, and mutual agreements. The same legislation governs teacher training in Finland’s higher education.

Japan’s education administration system is much more centralised. In Japan, the government holds decision-making power and designs and distributes a national curriculum every ten years. The Japanese “Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology,” abbreviated to “MEXT,” with the “Central Council of

---

1 The Finnish Ministry of Education has changed its name to the “Ministry of Education and Culture,” which is why, in the strategy for 2009 to 2015, the name is shorter.

2 The National Board of Education has changed its English name to “The National Agency for Education.”
Education,” develops that national curricula, which education providers and schools follow strictly. Teacher education in universities must follow government requirements.

Socio-culturally, both nations have acquired the myth that they are “homogenous” societies (see Jokikokko, 2009; Tsuneyoshi, 2011). Meanwhile, their two very different educational systems face a similar challenge, to accommodate growing diversity, with implications for teacher training in preparing future teachers for a globalised era.

I chose Finland and Japan as points of comparison in elements of GP for several reasons. Both are relatively small countries and have been viewed as monocultural, with a relatively small number of migrants—and both have stressed the homogeneity of their cultures and educational systems. However, in recent years, both have outlined commitments to internationalisation. As such, these contexts-in-transition were chosen for comparative study, to better understand the views and realities of student teachers belonging to societies with, one, mythical images as homogenous nations; two, strong performances in international educational tests; and three, growing needs and interests in preparing teachers for diversity.

2.1 Finland

The following will discuss the development of Finland’s education systems and the development of global education in Finland. It will introduce Finnish primary school teacher education and—more specifically—teacher training at the University of Oulu.

Background statistics of Finland

Finland, officially the Republic of Finland, is a Nordic country that shares a border with Sweden, Russia, and Estonia via the Baltic Sea. It has a population of around 5.5 million (Statistics Finland, 2017) and a surface area of approximately 338,000 km² (Geological Survey of Finland, 2015). The Finnish government functions as a parliamentary democracy lead by a Prime Minister; the Finnish President is the head of state, responsible for foreign policy.

In 2017, Statistics Finland reported that roughly 4.5% or 249,452 of the Finnish population were foreigners, the largest migrant groups from Estonia at 20.7%, Russia at 11.7%, Iraq at 4.7%, China at 3.5%, and Sweden at 3.2%. I will note at this point that, since a European “migrant crisis” in 2015, the number of asylum
seekers in Finland has increased dramatically. The above statistics do not reflect the current number of asylum seekers.

**Historical overview of Finnish education**

Finland experienced a number of transformative changes in its educational history before acquiring fame in international assessments such as “The Program for International Student Assessment” or “PISA.” In his article on the paradoxes of Finnish educational development, Sahlberg (2011a, p. 3) writes the following:

> The story of Finland is a story of survival. Being a relatively small nation situated between much larger powers of the East and the West has taught the Finns to accept existing realities and take a chance with available opportunities. Diplomacy, cooperation and seeking consensus have thus become hallmarks of contemporary Finnish culture. These traits all play an important part also in building an educational system that has enjoyed global attention due to equitable distribution of good teaching and learning throughout the Finland (Sahlberg (2011a, p. 3).

Similarly, Castells and Himanen (2002) describe Finnish history in terms of a “biological-economic” and “political-cultural” struggle. The severe winters in Northern Europe curbed crop growth, causing enormous causalities in Finland, which had relied mainly on agriculture and had a subsistence economy until the 1950s (Castells & Himanen, 2002). One may explain the political-cultural effort in terms of Finnish history and geography. Finland warred from 1939 to 1945 with the Soviet Union, the large power in the East—war that meant the loss of twelve percent of its former territory, the relocation of eleven percent of the population, and other social, cultural, political, and economic changes (Sahlberg, 2011a). Education became an important means of raising Finland from poverty after conflict.

Three aspects of Finland’s changing education after WWII prepared the nation’s transformation—through economic improvement—into a Nordic welfare state (Sahlberg, 2011a); namely, one, the provision of equal opportunities for education (1945–); two, the establishing of a public comprehensive school system (1965–); and three, the improvement of educational quality and expansion of higher educational institutions (1985–) (Sahlberg, 2011a).

After the war, education was seen as the main vehicle for transforming Finland’s society and economy, by achieving democracy and social equality (see
Aho et al., 2006; Sahlberg, 2011a). To provide equal educational opportunities for all, reforms of basic comprehensive schooling began in the 1960s and were realised in the early 1970s (Aho et al., 2006; Sahlberg, 2011a). Reform was driven by the idea that, to become a member of the western democratic nations in Europe, education for everyone in Finland was vital (Niemi, 2009).

Glancing to the west of Finland, Sweden had, arguably, the most effective educational and democratic model in the 1960s. Like administrators in other Nordic nations, Finnish policy-makers in the 1970s borrowed the comprehensive school paradigm from Sweden, a model that “trailblazed” the building of educational systems in Scandinavian countries (Antikainen, 2006, p. 230). Subsequently, the nine-year Finnish comprehensive school reform drove—successfully—a guarantee of education for every Finn, even those in rural areas; this was accompanied by a unified national curriculum (Sahlberg, 2011a). Later, Finnish education experienced shifts in educational priority—for example, from rethinking the theoretical and methodological foundation of schooling in the 1980s to valuing efficiency in the structures and administration of the 2000s (Salhberg, 2011a, p. 9).

One example of the vital importance to Finland of education is the country’s decision to join the OECD’s comparative education assessment, PISA. Following the Finnish PISA “miracle” in 2001, many international scholars have aimed to discover how “Finland has travelled a long way from a poor agrarian state in the early twentieth century to a modern welfare democracy at the start of the millennium” (Darling-Hammond, 2009, p. 148). Multiple educators around the world have expressed interest in how Finland managed to become an internationally competitive, knowledge-based society with a “successful” educational performance, as evidenced by international assessments (Sahlberg, 2011b; Simola, 2005). Many reasons have been offered for Finland’s success and for its high PISA achievements, from the effects of small differences between geographical areas and student backgrounds to its teacher training, which happens at universities and includes a master’s degree.

One recent challenge for Finnish education has been to prepare future citizens with the skills and competences to compete with other players in a global, market-oriented economy. An internationalisation of higher education has become arguably essential, given expanding international activities in university education; for example, acknowledging an increasing mobility of staff, students, and researchers—and collaborating in international research across the world. Internationalisation of higher education in Finland is also supported by European integration (Dobson & Hölttä, 2001), through which an accelerated
internationalisation of societies in the region calls Finnish universities to assure students of an adequate provision of chances to study in other European countries. One may view these attempts through the lens of a handful of strategies already in place; for example, through the “Strategy for the Internationalisation of Higher Education Institutions in Finland 2009–2015” (Ministry of Education and Culture, 2009), the “Development Plan for Education and Research 2011–2016” (Ministry of Education and Culture, 2011), and the “Research and Innovation Policy Guidelines for 2011–2015” (see “The Research and Innovation Council of Finland, 2010”). The implementation of those strategies has been evaluated on the basis of the numbers of incoming and outgoing students; the internationalised curricula uses English as its language of instruction.

**Global education developments in Finland**

Finnish educational policy has a relatively lengthy history of teaching global perspectives, particularly since Finland joined the United Nations in 1955 and the European Union in 1995. The national curriculum for comprehensive schools mentioned international co-operation as early as in the 1970s, using the term “international education,” whose aims were linked, tightly, to Article 26 of the Universal Declaration of Human rights, 1948. Article 26 stated,

> “Education shall be directed to the full development of the human personality and to the strengthening of respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms. It shall promote understanding, tolerance and friendship among all nations, racial or religious groups, and shall further the activities of the United Nations for the maintenance of peace.”

In the 1970s, the United Nations league in Finland developed international education, published a guidebook about international education, and translated UNESCO recommendations for international education into Finnish. These were, one, in 1974, recommendations for education for international peace, understanding, and cooperation, including education relating to human rights and fundamental freedoms; and two, in 1995, a declaration and integrated framework of action in education for peace, human rights, and democracy. As is visible in the UN and UNESCO definitions, the scope of “international education” is wide, covering equity, peace education, human rights education, intercultural education, and, in later documents, education for sustainable development (see Pudas, 2015, p. 48; Räsänen, 2007, pp. 18–30).
During the 1980s and 1990s, international education occurred in some form in Finland’s national curriculum frameworks, although emphases varied. For example, the 1990s curriculum stressed knowledge of cultures, growth towards multiculturalism, and valuing discussion when building local curricula. The 2004 national guidelines recognised even more clearly the multicultural nature of the Finnish population. The core curriculum discussed how Finnish culture has developed through interaction between Nordic, European, and indigenous cultures, addressing how Finnish culture has been diversified by arrivals from abroad. Its guidelines mentioned areas of international education, such as human rights, as a value basis for education—and as cross-curricular themes to be observed. However, how various school contexts and cultures realised international education depended very much on each school and staff (see Pudas, 2015, pp. 59–62; Räsänen, 2009, pp. 25–40).

International education was evaluated for the first time in Finland in 2004, in a process by a peer review team from the “North-South Centre” of the Council of Europe. The Finnish term “kansainvälisyyskasvatus” or “international education” was changed to “global education,” so as to better address the challenges of globalisation and to remind people of joint responsibilities as citizens living on the same planet. The peer review grounded its findings in the Council of Europe’s definition of global education (2002), a definition that also influenced the development of Finland’s global education policy.

“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 dimension of Education for Citizenship.”

(Definition by the Council of Europe in 2002 and 2012)

One recommendation of the evaluation in question was that Finland should devise a national plan or programme for global education. Consequently, the Ministry of Education and Ministry of Foreign Affairs established a committee to draft such a programme, published in 2006 as the “Global Education 2010 Programme.” The committee pursued the creation of a holistic framework involving all sectors of society in realising global education goals. Their comprehensive agenda includes—for example—one, life-long education, from early childhood to adult education; two, life-wide education involving formal, non-formal, and informal education;
three, inter-sectoral and interdisciplinary approaches, involving co-operation between professionals and workplaces; four, comprehensive transformations in school curricula and school ethos; five, action in local and global arenas; and six, a holistic view of a human being and learning as including cognitive and affective elements and active participation (Ministry of Education, 2007b; Räsänen, 2009, pp. 28–29).

To continue their strategy-making, the Ministry of Education and the Finnish National Agency for Education launched several projects involving various sectors in development, aiming to clarify a conceptual framework for implementing global education. The most significant of those projects have been “Education for global responsibility,” beginning in 2007, and “As a global citizen in Finland,” beginning in 2010. “Education for global responsibility” released several publications of researchers’ articles on aspects of global education. Perhaps the best-known of those publications was “Education for global responsibility—Finnish perspectives” (2007), which stressed the urgency of sustainable development in global training, introducing the term “global responsibility” to describe the goal of global education (Kaivola & Melen-Paaso, 2007). “As a global citizen in Finland” continued to pursue clarification and—besides its engagement with researchers—involved teachers and schools in its endeavours. Its final publication, “Schools reaching out to a global world” (2011), combines reports of school experiments with input from experts, who have striven to define the competences required by global citizens (Jääskeläinen & Repo, 2011). In her input to “Schools reaching out to a global world,” Liisa Jääskeläinen contends that global citizenship is a relatively widely explored, but complex idea whose meaning varies somewhat, according to context. Jääskeläinen illustrates the competences required by global citizens using the image of a flower. In the flower’s centre is a global citizen’s identity and ethics, directing that citizen’s actions. The surrounding competences—or petals of the flower—consist of a sustainable lifestyle, of intercultural competence, and of a global citizen’s civic competence, global responsibility, development partnership, and economic competence. Jääskeläinen reminds the reader, however, that such a “competence flower” may gain new petals, meaning that in a changing world, one should leave space for new questions and emerging themes (Jääskeläinen, 2011, pp. 74–75).

In 2010, GENE, the “Global Education Network in Europe”—and a Finnish national team—evaluated the implementation of Finland’s “Global Education 2010 Programme.” One finding was that, as a concept, “global education” remains unclear to many actors in Finnish education—and that the relationships between
global education and *many* other related concepts are unclear. The evaluation also found that, as a whole, practitioners consider global education important, but that levels of implementation varied from one institution to another. Realising global education, in other words, depends very much on whether or not knowledgeable staff members commit to the task. When participants in the evaluation were asked, “What are the most important conditions for developing global awareness in education?” they suggested two areas rather unanimously; namely, one, to include global awareness *explicitly* in national core curricula; and two, to include thorough, compulsory education on global awareness in teacher training (see “Kansainväisyyyskasvatus 2010 -ohjelman arviointi 2011”—in English, “2011 evaluation of the Global Education 2010 Programme”).

While the above evaluations found deficiencies in the implementation of the Global Education Programme, the process, including successive projects, has—for example—clearly influenced the Finnish national core curriculum, as many of those coordinating global education development work in Finland were involved in drafting the 2014 *national curriculum guidelines* for comprehensive schools. Values such as equity, dialogue, participation, democracy, responsibility for the environment, and celebrating cultural diversity are clearly visible in the 2014 curriculum definitions of “broad-based” or *transversal* competences and of a school ethos. Moreover, “sustainable development education” has brought increased attention to policy documents and appears to constitute an umbrella term for many sub-areas of global education. The most recent Finnish school curriculum has specified a mandatory implementation of at least one integrated theme per school year, raising opportunities for teachers to acknowledge global perspectives in their daily work (National Agency for Education, 2014).

Teacher education in Finland is university education; higher education strategies are particularly relevant to this thesis, therefore. When I gathered the data for this study, Finland’s national strategy for higher education was entitled the “Strategy for the Internationalisation of Higher Education Institutions in Finland 2009–2015.” That many-sided plan specifies opportunities for student teachers to expand their world views while studying. It discusses contents, methods, exchanges, other mobility programmes, and learning from diverse study groups at Finland’s home universities, setting the following five aims for internationalisation in higher education.

1. Creating a genuinely international higher education community—for example—through staff and student projects, exchanges, and mobility
2. Increasing the quality and attractiveness of higher education for international students
3. Exporting expertise through international partnerships and collaboration
4. Supporting a multicultural society
5. Promoting global responsibility.

Goal four stresses that “people with immigrant backgrounds and foreign exchange and degree students, teachers, researchers and other personnel are a resource that promotes internationalisation at home.” Goal five states that Finnish higher-education institutions must “utilise their expertise to solve global problems and to consolidate competence in developing countries.” The strategy declares that the activities of higher education institutions must be ethically sustainable and must support student requirements for acting in a global environment, incorporating an understanding of the global effects of those activities.

These goals are diverse, some might say contradictory—or, at least, tension may occur between certain of them. The nature of that tension depends considerably on the orientations of the approach to internationalisation in question; on whether, for instance, the export of expertise is driven by a neoliberal agenda—or if international development projects stand on mutual learning and on equal partnerships. In any case, an initial ethical basis for global education, originating in human rights documents, is apparent in aspects of the higher education strategy of 2009 to 2015. In 2018, the newest plan for internationalising higher education in Finland was launched, entitled, “Better together for a better world—Policies to promote internationalisation in Finnish higher education and research 2017–2025.” The overarching goal of that new plan, as in previous strategies, is to make genuinely international higher-education communities. The document states that, by 2025, Finland will be open, international, and linguistically and culturally rich, somewhere people will display positive attitudes towards others and the surrounding world. The plan stresses quality, attractiveness, and a welcoming environment for international students and experts. Alumni receive a special mention in the plan, whether having lived abroad or in Finland. However, approaching the document as a whole reveals a focus on exporting Finnish competence, on research visibility, and on business co-operation in international forums and networks. A move to neoliberal ideas is visible, therefore, in the higher-education policy documents of Finland. This move to the neoliberal does not appear in comprehensive school documents such as the core curricula, whose wide idea of
global education expresses human rights, equity, democracy, and sustainable development as key values.

2.1.1 Becoming a primary school teacher in Finland

Aho, Pitkänen, and Sahlberg (2006) argue that reforms in teacher training in Finland were essential to ensuring the implementation of the above comprehensive schooling. After 1971, all Finnish teacher training, including primary school teacher training, was moved gradually to universities (Kansanen, 2003). Since 1979, teachers at primary schools, recognised as class teachers, are required to complete a master’s degree majoring in educational science, submitting a master’s thesis (see Aho et al., 2006; Niemi & Jakku-Sihvonen, 2006; Sahlberg, 2007). Eight universities in Finland currently offer teacher training for primary school teachers. Finnish teacher education is a two-tier programme, including a three-year bachelor’s degree and two-year master’s degree. Following the Bologna Process (European Commission, 2016), Finnish universities apply the European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System (ECTS), which aims to help secure transparent frameworks for learning achievements and course “workload.” Each ECTS credit means twenty-seven working hours. The credits required to complete primary-school teacher training is 300 ECTS to 180 ECTS for a “Bachelor of Arts” in education and 120 ECTS for a “Master of Arts” in education (see, for example, Sahlberg, 2010; the University of Helsinki, 2016).

A unique characteristic of Finnish teacher training is its focus on a research-based curriculum (Hökkä & Eteläpelto, 2014; Tryggvason, 2009). Finnish teacher training offers a strong foundation in research and theoretical engagement, so that student teachers can cope with everyday teaching and classroom situations (Kansanen, 2007). Teacher training in Finland stresses academically-oriented preparation, in which student teachers are given chances to develop analytical skills, systematic approaches, and reflective practices (Niemi & Jakku-Sihvonen, 2006; Sahlberg, 2007). The teacher training expects student teachers to engage actively in learning and to internalise the attitudes of researchers (Niemi & Jakku-Sihvonen, 2006). The Finnish curriculum aims to link theory and practice closely, to develop didactics, pedagogy, and content knowledge (Kansanen, 2007).

To wield the theoretical and pedagogical knowledge from courses, student teachers in Finland must meet a requirement for guided teaching practice, attending four teaching practice periods of roughly twenty-five ECTS in total. One vital principle of this integrative Finnish teacher training is to offer opportunities to
student teachers to visit schools as early as possible (Kansanen, 2007), which should help those student teachers become familiar with their future environments by observing groups of pupils and by being introduced to the nature of becoming a teacher, the goal being to motivate future educators to engage actively in pedagogical learning from the beginning to the end of their studies.

The number of total study credits varies slightly, depending on the place of study. The University of Oulu—for example—arranges four practice periods for a total of 25 ECTS, including one, “School experience 1” for first-year students, for two ECTS; two, “School Experience 2” for second-year students, for six ECTS; three, a theme-based practice for third or fourth-year students, for six ECTS; and four, “School Experience 3” for fourth or fifth-year students, for eleven ECTS. The duration of each practice period varies. Two calendar weeks are assigned for the first practice and six calendar weeks for the second. Different durations are available for thematic-based practice, depending on the educational institution or organisation, and six to seven calendar weeks are available for the final teaching practice. Pedagogical practice sessions occur usually at the Oulu Teacher Training School or, for non-Finnish speakers, at the Oulu International School. Other universities like the University of Oulu—for example, the University of Helsinki—require a minimum of twenty-five ECTS for class teacher practicums (University of Helsinki, 2016). The University of Jyväskylä allocates twenty-seven ECTS to teaching practice. Finnish teacher training and practice periods always stress links between the practice of and research in educational theory (Kansanen, 2007).

A strong academic emphasis on a research-based orientation in teacher training has meant that teacher education in Finland is an attractive programme, one of the most popular at universities in Finland (see Hökkä & Eteläpelto, 2014; Niemi & Jakku-Sihvonen, 2006). Competition is high, particularly for class teachers. Only ten to fifteen percent of candidates are accepted into Finnish teacher training. Student candidates for those programmes are diligent, highly motivated, and outperform many others in university entrance examinations (Niemi, 2000; Niemi & Jakku-Sihvonen, 2006; Sahlberg, 2007). One may also explain the attraction of becoming a primary school teacher in Finland in terms of the high academic level of the qualification, a “master’s” degree in education. The qualification does not only allow graduates to become teachers; it provides potential job opportunities in the public and private sectors (Kansanen, 2007; Sahlberg, 2007).
2.1.2 The primary school teacher training programmes at the University of Oulu

The University of Oulu, one of the two sites in this study, was established in 1958 and is one of the largest multidisciplinary universities among fourteen recognised by the Finnish Ministry of Education and by Culture Finland (The University of Oulu, 2014). The University of Oulu is one among eight universities providing teacher training in Finland and has long committed to educating teachers. The Faculty of Education in Oulu offers a number of programmes for becoming a teacher at different levels of schooling. The university has four programmes for becoming a primary school teacher, including general or broadly-based primary school teacher training, creative-arts-oriented primary school teacher training, technology-oriented primary school teacher training (TEKNO), and intercultural teacher education (ITE). The above programmes were all active when conducting this study. Of those programmes, the first three are taught mainly in Finnish.

Applicants to primary-school teacher training at the University of Oulu must demonstrate a certain grade level in the matriculation exam. Students chosen according to their matriculation certificates must take an entrance exam on selected textual material and are invited to personal interviews in which their social skills and motivation for teaching profession are observed interactively.

Prior to starting this research, I contacted every teacher responsible for the three primary-school teacher training programmes in Oulu; namely, broadly based, creative art, and technology-oriented. Those programmes offered general primary school teacher training, without a specific focus on global or inter-cultural topics. Of the three programmes, cooperation between teacher educators and student teachers—including communication in English—appeared most feasible in the technology-oriented primary school teacher training or “TEKNO,” which I chose as the target group for this study. I purposely did not select intercultural teacher education as it focuses explicitly on global awareness and on an intercultural understanding.

The principal subject in the TEKNO teacher training is educational science, including courses in educational learning, didactics, psychology, philosophy, and sociology. Also, several specific TEKNO courses relate to technology education. The programme offers a learning environment providing opportunities to understand information technology and technological teaching tools. One may understand technology education as skills and knowledge allowing learners to apply technological knowledge in daily life and in educational settings. It aims to
equip “every citizen” with skills and knowledge to help them cope with the
generation of technology (see Lindh, 2000, 2012, 2016) and with digitalisation. In
terms of a global perspective, TEKNO includes six ECTS on “diversity,” of which
three ECTS focus on special education and the other three ECTS on
multiculturalism or intercultural education, which is mandatory in the curriculum.

As compared to broadly-based primary school teacher training, one may
identify, in TEKNO, unique, distinctive characteristics. Besides technology, the
programme includes more courses on mathematics, the natural sciences, and
computer studies. The programme-specific TEKNO studies comprise seven credits
at bachelor level and thirteen credits at master level.

Another unique characteristic of TEKNO is that more male student teachers
attend the programme than other teacher training, a division that differs from the
general gender division of Finnish teacher training (Laheima, 2006). In that sense,
TEKNO is an exception to traditional Finnish teacher education, due possibly to its
orientation towards information technology, which male teachers often prefer and
use more actively in classrooms (Ilomäki, 2011).

2.1.3 New skills and competences demanded from Finnish teachers

Although Finland has traditionally been considered “homogenous,” that image is,
according to Jokikokko, “more a myth than reality” (Jokikokko, 2009). Besides the
migrant groups in Finland mentioned in Sub-chapter 2.1, other minorities live in
Finland, including Jews, Saami, Tatars, Russians, Romanies, and Swedish-Finns
(Koivukangas, 2002). Some scholars suggest that a traditional sense of
“Finnishness” still exists and is sometimes viewed implicitly as a norm
(Lappalainen, 2006; Pitkänen, 2008). A nation-wide challenge exists, therefore, to
develop a genuinely pluralistic environment that best reflects the growing volume
of migration to Finland (see Huttunen, 2005; Pitkänen, 2008). Finland’s ongoing
endeavour to embrace diversity was tested, in particular, during the “European
migration crisis” of 2015. How well minorities are accommodated and
acknowledged in Finland—and how successfully their educational needs are
considered—depends on the country’s current political climate. Both ethnic or
cultural differences and gender, sexuality, and religious beliefs comprise diverse
subcultures in Finland.

Examining recent educational strategies in Finland, the “Teacher Education
introduced a reform that explicitly addressed a need for teachers to “act as
responsible educators in a multicultural society” (Niemi & Jakku-Sihvonen, 2009). While Finnish teacher training has been praised for success in PISA results (Sahlberg, 2007), studies indicate concerns about equipping Finnish student teachers with adequate skills and knowledge for a growing multi-cultural information society (Niemi & Jakku-Sihvonen, 2009).

In practice, many teacher training programmes approach the cultivation of the intercultural competence of student teachers through individual course work, or by integrating intercultural themes across a curriculum (Jokikokko, 2009). Adding single courses may introduce students briefly to minority groups or special-needs children, in hope of raising the awareness of future teachers (Räsänen, 2000). “Theme projects” are a popular way to implement global education in teacher training. Such projects must be planned with care, as temporary experiences may lead to a “pedagogical tourism” that is problematic, since very brief encounters can raise stereotypical thinking (Järvelä, 2013; Räsänen, 2000). Intercultural competence is not only necessary for students who may strive to work in international settings: the skills in question are also vital for teachers working in relatively less diverse schools in Finland.

The national core curriculum in Finland does not play as strict a role as in many other countries. It provides a guiding framework through which schools and teachers develop their own curriculum. Pudas (2015) argues that decentralising curriculum development in Finland has not guaranteed the implementation of global education at a grassroots level in all schools. In the current Finnish system, schools and teachers decide whether or not to integrate a global justice perspective at a school level. Universities—including Finnish teacher training—have even more autonomy with their curricula content. I concur with Pudas (2009, 2015) that choices on global education should not be left to teachers and institutions; preparation must begin in teacher training. It is necessary, therefore, for teacher trainers and student teachers to reflect upon and reconsider skills, knowledge, practices, and attitudes, so as to provide a favourable learning environment for future global citizens.

2.2 Japan

The following sub-chapter will offer a historical overview of Japanese education and of the development of global education in Japan. It will discuss primary-school teacher training in Japan and—more specifically—teacher education at Hiroshima University.
General information about Japan

Japan is in East Asia and consists of five main islands; its approximately 130 million people live in roughly 377,962 km² (Statistics Bureau, 2017)—in other words, in almost the same area as Finland. Japan is a constitutional monarchy whose Emperor is its figurehead. The Prime Minister leads the government with members of a “National Diet” composed of a house of representatives and a house of councillors. In his cabinet, the Prime Minister selects a Minister of Education who heads the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (hereafter MEXT). The main responsibilities of MEXT include overseeing educational administration, developing uniform regulations and comprehensive guidelines, and allocating and supervising financial aid to local education boards (Koyama, 2008). Since the 1990s, educational reforms have sought to redefine “administrative” functions in the light of trends toward decentralisation; however, it has been argued that decentralisation remains indefinitely in transit—and that, in fact, Japan’s central government still maintains its authority over educational policies (Koyama, 2008).

As of 2017, 3,179,313 foreign nationals were residing in Japan with legal residence permits, approximately 2.5 percent of the entire Japanese population (Ministry of Justice, 2017), a relatively small number—as is the case for Finland, for which the corresponding value is roughly 4.5 percent. The largest and original migrant groups, the “old-comers” from China, at 28.3 percent, and South Korea, at 17.2 percent, migrated to Japan before and during the war. The “new-comers” (Tsuneyoshi, 2011) are from South Asia and Latin America, including those from the Philippines at 9.2 percent, Vietnam at 8.4 percent, and Brazil at 6.1 percent.

A historical overview of Japanese education

The development and prioritising of education in Japan has remained ubiquitous throughout the country’s history. Among various educational developments, one may identify three major phases of key Japanese educational reform; namely, during the Meiji period, from 1868 to 80; after 1945; and from the 1980s to the present.

Following the “Meiji” restoration in 1868, western education played an important role in Japanese education, reflecting an urge to modernise. Applying a pragmatic approach, the Meiji reformers tried, simply, to borrow what they held to be the best features of several western educational systems and to apply those
features to a Japanese context (see Shibata, 2008; Vardaman & Beauchamp, 1994). Consequently, the new Japanese education encompassed cross-cultural transfers, including a French-inspired, highly centralised administrative body; German ideas for elite public universities; English character education in schools; and an American model of elementary schooling and vocational education (see Tanaka, 2005; Vardaman & Beauchamp, 1994). Reforms for modernisation were promptly in effect; however, reformers began to feel that “certain western ideas (e.g., individualism) were not well suited for the Japanese environment, and they systematically began to slow down the process” (Vardaman & Beauchamp, 1994, p. 4). In summary, many elements comparable to western education appeared to be clearly visible in the development of Japanese education as early as in the 1870s.

Prior to 1945, Japan became a “warfare state,” extending wars and conquests to neighbouring countries, including China, Russia, and Korea (Inegawa, 1993). The Japanese imperial state viewed education, moreover, as a catalyst for promoting militarism and ultra-nationalism and to brainwash people into believing that sacrificing their lives for a nation is “supreme virtue” (Inegawa, 1993; Vardaman & Beauchamp, 1994).

Following the nuclear bombings in Hiroshima and Nagasaki in 1945, which meant Japan’s surrender in World War II, Japan began to move towards acting as a “peace state,” promising to reject war and the possession of any war potential, according to Article 9 of the 1946 constitution (Inegawa, 1993; NIER, 2012). As Americans believed that pre-war national education supported Japanese conquests, economy, and militarism, “unacceptable nationalist propagandas” in textbooks were removed and numerous teachers were dismissed after World War II (NIER, 2012; Vardaman & Beauchamp, 1994). Educational reforms occurred quickly to prepare a modern state, promoting development of a peaceful society and of the ideals of a democratic country.

In 1947, a “Japanese School Education Law” was implemented in order to ensure equal educational opportunities for all and to extend the duration of compulsory schooling to nine years (Tanaka, 2016). Following the implementation of the education law, a “Teacher Certification Law” was passed in 1949, to organise the certification of qualified teachers, aiming to alleviate chronic shortages of teachers by establishing an “open system” of teacher training. This meant that those training programmes were provided more “openly” at universities that were not oriented solely towards educating teachers—as long as those institutions offered teacher training approved by the Ministry of Education (see NIER, 2012; Okano & Tsuchiya, 1999; Tanaka, 2016).
From a more general perspective on Japanese education, a major educational reform in Japan’s history occurred in 1984, when the “Ad Hoc Reform Council,” under Prime Minister Nakasone, addressed a need for educational reforms to build a nation competitive and ready for vitality in the twenty-first century (Vardaman & Beauchamp, 1994). The prime minister’s statement meant that plans for internationalising education grew rapidly.

A growing multi-culturalism is relatively implicit in recent Japanese rhetoric on global perspectives. However, a growing interest in and a growing implementation of the internationalisation of higher education has become more prevalent in the country. “Internationalising” strategies have striven to increase the competitiveness of Japanese universities in the world university league. For example, the “Global 30 Project” (2009–2014) and “Top Global University Project” (2014) aimed to rapidly internationalise Japanese campuses and degree programmes, so as to enhance their attractiveness to potential students in other countries (Burgess et al., 2010; MEXT, 2014c). These strategies aspired to develop a global “jinzai” or human resource, the criteria for which includes technological competence, economic competitiveness, and proficiency in the English language—rather than promoting an exclusive commitment to dealing with diversity (Tsuneyoshi, 2011).

Global education developments in Japan

Following the 1974 UNESCO initiative (UNESCO, 1974), the promotion in Japan of “Education for International Understanding” or “kokusai rikai kyouiku” sought mainly—in its origins—to stress the importance of international relations and cooperation as inevitable to seeking world peace (Itou, 2011; Ueki, 2008). However, topics such as human rights, world conflict, the environment, and the development of education did not have a secure place in Japanese schools until the introduction of the “integrated learning lesson” or “Sougouteki na Gakusyu no Jikan” in 1996 (MEXT 1996). As part of the “Yutori” reforms, new lesson hours gave space in the Japanese school curriculum for interdisciplinary studies such as “education for international understanding” (see Ueki, 2008; Wada & Burnet, 2011). The student-centred “integrated learning lesson” supposedly pursued the achievement of a deep learning experience, over multiple disciplines. However, without fixed guidance on how to teach an integrated learning lesson, such interdisciplinary learning has caused debate and confusion among many in-service teachers (Kotani, 2009; Wada & Burnet, 2011).
Closely linked, but somewhat parallel to discussions of education for international understanding, Japanese advocates of global education and global citizenship education have argued that global education has a broader framework than education for international understanding, as global education commits to developing global citizens in a growing, interconnected, interdependent society (Otsu, 1994). Rather than propounding cross-cultural awareness exclusively, proponents stress the need for a global, holistic viewpoint (Hashimoto, 2004; Koseki, 2001). Embracing such a viewpoint, future citizens must be equipped to navigate complexity and uncertainty in an era of globalisation (Ishimori, 2010).

In the recent climate of Japanese school lessons, Fujiwara (2007) states that schools combine an international element and global education as two separate dimensions. Although in-service teacher training may present certain ideas of global education in theory, teachers find it challenging to develop lesson plans encompassing international topics and global education (Fujiwara, 2007). Reportedly, Japanese teachers also view as burdensome the allocation of time and resources to implementing activities beyond exchanging letters, inviting foreign guests, or learning different languages (Hashimoto, 2013; Ueki, 2008).

Policy-level discussion occurs on the methods and content of teaching integrated lessons with global perspectives. However, teachers in Japan must understand and reflect individually on the premises of globally-oriented education, so as to equip themselves with the means and knowledge to teach such topics in schools (Fujiwara, 2007; Ueki, 2008).

2.2.1 Becoming a primary school teacher in Japan

Becoming a teacher in Japan requires a teaching certificate from a higher educational institution offering teacher training accredited by the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science, and Technology (MEXT, 2014a). As of 2007, 575 four-year universities, 416 graduate schools, and 280 two-year junior colleges provide teacher training in Japan (MEXT, 2014b). Teaching in a Japanese primary school requires a bachelor’s degree with a minimum of 124 credits, including, besides teaching practice, extra studies in pedagogical and subject teaching, for roughly sixty credits (Lamie, 1998). By comparison to Europe’s ECTS system, in which each ECTS credit is worth twenty-seven working hours, each study credit in Japan corresponds to forty-five working hours—as outlined by the Japanese Ministry of Education (MEXT, 1996b).
Japanese teacher training consists of courses on subject knowledge and pedagogical skills in a four-year university programme (MEXT, 2014b). For their teaching practice, Japanese student teachers used to have to attend a minimum of two weeks practice at a local school (Lamie, 1998). Currently, Japanese teacher training provides teaching practice that lasts approximately four weeks (MEXT, 2005). The length of the practice depends on the availability of schools and on the guidelines of the host municipality. One would consider a teaching practice “lengthy,” therefore, if the practicum period were to actually last four weeks, since the average length is sometimes two weeks (Akimitsu, 2011; Himeno, 2003). In general, one might view teaching practice periods in Japan as rather brief when compared to Finnish standards.

Japan has three classifications of teaching certificates for primary school teachers, based on the graduate degree obtained. These include one, a “specialised” license with a Master’s degree; two, a “first” or “primary” license with a bachelor’s degree; and three, a “secondary” license for a junior college graduate (MEXT, 2014b; Tanaka, 2016). Fulfilment of the required credits at the institutions selected allows one to obtain a teaching certificate applicable throughout Japan. To begin as a teacher in a public school, a candidate must prepare for and pass an “employment examination” or “kyuoin saiyo shaken” for the specific prefectures in which he or she plans to teach. Private schools appoint the teacher of their choice independently. To teach at a private school, candidates must prepare for an examination set by the school of their choice (Okano & Tsuchiya, 1999). While evaluation criteria vary between prefectures or private institutions, becoming a teacher in Japan requires a teaching certificate from a teacher training programme and passing a prefecture-specific exam.

Since 2009, MEXT has required teachers to renew their teaching certificates every ten years, so as to maintain the quality of teachers (MEXT, 2007). Renewing licenses became a measure of assessing teachers’ advanced skills and knowledge—and for providing the necessary professional development training through local authorities.

2.2.2 Primary school teacher training at Hiroshima University

Hiroshima University, in east Hiroshima, is one of eighty-six national universities in Japan and is associated with a prestige status. In 1902, the Hiroshima teacher training school was established, the second institution in Japan to educate teachers. The Hiroshima Literature and Science University—and other schools—were
fundamental to the establishment of today’s Hiroshima University. Although the institute suffered greatly from the atomic bombing in 1945, reconstruction efforts have led the university to prosper again, with a popular reputation for teacher training in the west of Japan (Hiroshima University Bunshokan, 2008). Often compared to east Japan’s famous “Tsukuba” University for their reputation in training teachers, Hiroshima University has contributed notably to educational research in Japan and, in particular, to policy-making, curriculum development, and preparing skilled teachers, who attend teaching practice in elementary schools attached to the university (Hiroshima University Bunshokan, 2008). At Hiroshima University, practice consists of three periods: one, “Teaching practice I,” a mandatory half-day orientation in primary education; two, “Teaching practice II,” an optional full day in primary education; and three, “Teaching practice III,” a mandatory five weeks in primary education. In fact, Hiroshima University offers a series of teaching practices that are much more intensive than those at an average Japanese university (Hiroshima University, 2003).

Like the national matriculation exam Finnish students sit to graduate from high school, Japan has a “National Centre Examination” entitled “Setsu Shiken” (see “National Centre for University Entrance Examination, 2015”: Guest, 2012). The Japanese Ministry of Education encourages Japanese universities to employ diverse selection processes; their protocols vary slightly, therefore. When applying for primary school teacher training at Hiroshima University, the examination systems are, principally, a general entrance examination or “Ippan nyushi” and an admission-office, or AO, entrance exam. The majority of applicants sit the general exam—with a total intake of approximately 120—and choose between two “application terms.” The first application term or “zenki” demands scores from the centre exam and from the chosen university’s individual academic exam. The second application term—or “kouki”—requires scores from the centre exam and points from writing an essay. Hiroshima University has published a table detailing its admittance thresholds (Hiroshima University, 2016). Applicants to Hiroshima must submit pre-assigned reports to the AO examination, while those invited for the second round are interviewed and write an essay. Only finalists with sufficient scores from the centre exam are selected; approximately ten students in all, the selection made using their AO examination results.

The “Faculty of Education” and “Graduate School of Education” at Hiroshima University offer a range of training programmes in the following five clusters: one, “School education”; two, “Science, technology, and society studies education”; three, “Language and culture education”; four, “Lifelong activities education”; and
Fundamentals for Education and Human Development.” Elementary-school teacher training is offered under cluster one, “School education” (Hiroshima University, 2014a).

Hiroshima’s primary-school teacher training focuses on cultivating skills and competences necessary as a primary school teacher and on exploring goals, contents, methods, and evaluation in its curriculum, so as to build expertise and leadership in practice (Hiroshima University, 2014b). Among the aims stated for primary-school teacher training, the development of an interest in “international senses” or “Kokusai-kankaku” and in “Peace Education” or “Heiwa-kyouiku” are essential to fostering a proactive, independent attitude for scientific thinking (Hiroshima University, 2014c). A bachelor-level programme lasting four years with a graduation requirement of 130 credits, the Hiroshima programme includes general education for thirty-one credits, the basics of subject teaching for sixty-two credits, eight credits of teaching practice, subject teaching for thirty-one credits, and a bachelor’s thesis for six credits (Hiroshima University, 2014b).

The Hiroshima teacher training is structured into four steps: one, an introduction to primary school education and teaching, to gain a basic understanding of the subject; two, lessons on the philosophy of education, on society and policy, and on developmental theory, among other topics, in order to equip future teachers with basic knowledge and attitudes; and three, counselling, pedagogy, methodology, moral education, and the provision of practical skills and knowledge. The Japanese training concludes, finally, with a dissertation and a teaching practice (Hiroshima University, 2014b). For a bachelor’s dissertation, entitled “graduation research” or “sotsugyo-kenkyu,” students are assigned, under a supervisor, to a seminar group or “zemi,” an abbreviation of “seminar” in German. The supervisor provides guidance to help students move towards a bachelor’s dissertation. Research work intensifies during the fourth, final year of bachelor studies (Hiroshima, 2014b).

2.2.3 New skills and competences demanded of Japanese teachers

Japan’s multiculturalism—in a manner similar to Finland’s homogenous image—is often hidden by monocultural perceptions that are promoted by the media and by educational resources in Japanese society (Tsuneyoshi, 2011). Diversity in Japan means differences associated with gender, sexuality, the elderly, and the physically disabled; less attention is given to discussions of the rights of foreign-born nationals and ethnic minority groups, including—for example—ethnic Korean residents in
Japan (Burgess et al., 2010). Japan is sometimes described as a multicultural society with a tradition, in its conservative habits, of resisting an acknowledgement of minorities and foreign groups (Tsuneyoshi, 2011). Ethnic diversity in Japan is still invisible to an extent, since viewing “gaijin” or foreigners as “outsiders” remains a deeply rooted behaviour. However, diversity continues to grow in the society (ibid.).

The impact and implication of accelerated internationalisation trends became visible in Japanese teacher training also in August 2012, when the Central Council for Education of Japan asserted an urgent need for teachers to acquire “global perspectives” or “guro-baru na monono mikata” (Central Council for Education, 2012). This applied not only to teachers responsible for teaching the primary foreign language—in other words, English—but to other teachers at all levels (Central Council for Education, 2012; MEXT, 2013). Recent literature on Japanese teacher training expresses a prevailing belief that teachers need, increasingly, to develop their global perspectives (Takahashi, 2014).

Advocates of cross-cultural and international education have underlined a need for teachers to acquire the knowledge and competence necessary to prepare pupils for globalisation (see Hoshino, 2007; Nakanishi, 1993). Various categories of cross-cultural competence, as defined by Yamagishi (1992), have been used to argue that future teachers should have competences such as skills in global citizenship, international understanding, multicultural literacy, and cross-cultural literacy. Concurrently, in Japan, the terrain of preparing students for global perspectives in teacher education has long been unexplored by research (Hosoya, 2011).

Exploring the actual practices of Japanese teacher training, Machida (2007) examined the ongoing efforts of 446 Japanese universities that incorporate themes such as peace, security, and solidarity into a bachelor’s degree curriculum. Machida’s (2007) interviews and questionnaires indicated that only twenty to fifteen percent of the mandatory Japanese courses offered content relating to the above themes. The same study states that roughly forty to fifty percent of the universities sampled offered those courses electively to students in teacher training (ibid.). In Japan, many global and international topics are interwoven, to some extent, into social-science subject teaching and integrated learning lessons—or “sougou gakushu”—in teacher training. Just as school teachers find it challenging to develop lesson plans for global and international education under a strict national curriculum (Fujiwara, 2007), the incorporation of related themes when preparing future teachers, in teacher training, appears to be a persistent challenge for Japanese teacher educators.
2.3 Concluding remarks on the teacher training programmes in Finland and Japan

So far, Chapter 2 has discussed elements of Finnish and Japanese teacher training. Two distinctive characteristics of primary school teacher education remain to be deliberated upon, however; namely, practice periods and the degree structure of both settings.

Firstly, the length and content of the practice periods differ greatly between the two contexts. Generally, Finnish teacher training structures practice periods in a sequence. In Oulu, four teaching practices are organised into a basic two-week school “experience,” a six-week intermediate practice, a six-week thematic practice, and a final holistic eleven-week practice—for twenty-five ECTS altogether. One reason for these four practice terms is that the Finnish system stresses the integration of practice and theory. Multiple practice periods accompany theoretical knowledge from research-oriented studies, theory that is reflected in the process of becoming a teacher. Japanese teacher training usually provides one practice period of approximately four weeks, considerably shorter than the practice terms in Finland.

Secondly, the degree length and structure of primary school teacher training differ between the countries. Finnish teacher training programmes specify a three-year bachelor’s degree for 180 ECTS and a two-year master’s degree for 120 ECTS, in which student teachers major in educational science. To qualify as a primary school teacher in Japan, one must complete a bachelor’s degree for a minimum of 124 credits, including approximately sixty credits of pedagogical study.

Considering GP specifically, both countries have, on a policy level, expressed a need to observe global perspectives in schools and in teacher training. The countries differ in the emphases of the policy papers discussed. In Finland, gender, equity, intercultural education, and environmental education have inspired a significant amount of research. Japanese policy papers emphasise language abilities, international mindedness, and collaborative skills. Previous studies in both countries show that challenges exist in implementing these policies in schools and teacher education (see, for example, Machida, 2007; Pudas, 2015).
3 Theoretical framework of the research

This chapter reviews the theoretical framework of this study. I will summarise discussions of globalisation and its implications for education, so as to situate this research in relation to debate about the internationalisation of higher education and the growing needs of teachers. Secondly, I will present the different typologies in global citizenship education (GCE), showing that multiple approaches to global citizenship education exist. Among the typologies of global citizenship education, I will introduce Gaudelli’s heuristics (2009) as the comprehensive framework for this study. Thirdly, I will describe my justifications for choosing global perspectives as the central idea of this research—and will present Hanvey’s five aims of global perspectives, the second element incorporated into my theoretical framework. Finally, I will discuss critical pedagogy as a third element in widening one’s theoretical lens when engaging with global perspectives and global citizenship education.

3.1 Globalisation and its implication on education

Globalisation is a contested term, due to its complex, multi-dimensional nature (Robertson, 2006; Sen, 2002). Some praise globalisation and its impact in a positive light, arguing that globalisation connects people with diverse backgrounds and from different parts of the world—and that it provides greater opportunities and rewards for financial markets and for advancing information communication technology. An interconnected world also invites various actors to become involved in tackling and resolving global issues (Rhoads & Szelenyi, 2011). Conversely, some theorists claim that globalisation will widen the gap between rich and poor, as it differentiates between those able or unable to benefit from a market-based world economy (Rizvi & Walsh, 1998). Popkewitz and Rizvi (2009) echo this sentiment, arguing that the pervasive globalising process is accompanied by a differentiating, homogenising force. A thread that appears common among discussions of globalisation is that, as a term, it often describes global processes in a flow of goods, people, services, and knowledge, through increased mobility and advanced technology. Contestation exists, as mentioned above, on how to judge the impacts and implications of globalisation, but the phenomenon has certainly—to some extent—shifted our thoughts and everyday lifestyle.

Among a plethora of discussions on globalisation, I concur with Rizvi (2004) that it should not be impossible to imagine an alternative form of globalisation
standing on a democratic tradition, in which it—globalisation—does not wholly concern dominating a global market, supported by neoliberal ideals. Gaining a critical understanding of global interconnectivity and interdependence and of the asymmetries of social, political, and economic power can enable such a movement in global aims. To build a society balanced delicately in diversity, democracy, and social justice requires the development of critical skills and attitudes, allowing humanity to imagine collective futures as a whole (Rizvi, 2007). Recent discussions of “cyberdemocracy” (see Tapscott, 2016) exemplify how digitalisation offers alternative ways to achieve change. However, limited, uneven access to technology continues to increase social inequality.

As the rapid changes of globalisation have brought about movements in our views of the role of a nation state, and in our views of other concerned actors, one must acknowledge the inevitable impact of globalisation on the current climate of education. When I began this doctoral study in 2012, my interest lay, initially, in Finnish and Japanese internationalisation strategies in higher education, in response to a growing globalisation. However, after conversations with teacher educators and student teachers, who were as aware of and concerned by—though sometimes confused about—the impact of globalisation and internationalisation in relation to their students, this study became more focused in scope.

In our society, a growing complexity urges teachers not only to gain subject and pedagogical knowledge, but to acquire an awareness and understanding of a moral, ethical profession as teachers in a global world (Campbell, 2003). Viewing teachers and future teachers as key agents of change in today’s knowledge society (Hargreaves, 2003), this study aims to scrutinise student teacher views on global perspectives. Teacher training programmes are, therefore, the most suitable context for my study. The following sub-chapter will probe teacher education as part of a continually expanding internationalisation of higher education.

3.2 The role of the internationalisation of higher education in teacher training

Discourses on the internationalisation of higher education (hereafter HE) often occur in relation to globalisation (Blum & Bourn, 2013; Qiang, 2003). In response to a heightened demand for “global” universities, the scope of international activities has increased dramatically—and has accelerated institutional internationalisation in recent years (Altbach & Knight, 2007; Mairge, 2010). In return, the growing international activities of HE have given an impetus to
globalisation by increasing research cooperation, student mobility, and the number of other academic initiatives in action (Maringe, 2010). Knight (2004) defines internationalisation as a process of integrating an “international, intercultural or global dimension” into the functions of institutions. The internationalisation process is complex and extensive, making it difficult to get a proper picture of its width and depth (Rizvi & Walsh, 1998).

In underpinning differences in rationales for internationalisation policy, neoliberalism is often seen as the predominant drive that meets the demand of the global market economy. Khoo (2011) distinguishes “market-driven” from “ethically-driven” motives, which, she contends, are fundamental to internationalisation policies. Market-driven principles concern competitiveness and gaining an economic advantage in internationalising universities, while ethically-driven internationalisation engages with value-oriented, human-rights-oriented higher education.

Upon examining the implications of globalisation and internationalisation in higher education, one must acknowledge the consequences of these processes when training teachers to become citizens in a globalised world. The student teachers in both countries studied in this research prepare for their profession at universities. It is expected that globalisation—and the recent waves of migration—contribute to the entry of growing numbers of students from different backgrounds to local schools. In accordance with increasing numbers of adult migrations, the number of children with a foreign background continues to climb in both countries.

These rapid societal changes oblige teachers to accommodate a wider range of diversity, in terms of culture, language, ethnicity, and religion (Banks, 2001, 2004). This means, naturally, that teachers are required to meet the complex needs of pupils and their families, who may have a different social and cultural background as compared to those teachers’ own upbringing (Barry & Lechner, 1995). Besides culture, language, and religion, globalisation brings many other challenges. The question, “What is sustainable development?” concerns everyone alive on the same planet. In teaching local and global topics, school teachers are required to develop the necessary skills and competencies to be better equipped for discussions of local and global issues in classrooms (Scheunpflug, 2011).

Teachers are also responsible for teaching pupils about “positive contributions” through building democratic communities. It is crucial—therefore—that teachers receive opportunities to understand their situatedness in relation to others and to social, cultural, and historical factors (Andreotti, 2011). This also implies that teachers should become socially responsible global citizens themselves, in order to
teach pupils to become global citizens (see Andreotti, 2011; Banks, 2001). Educating all children, whatever their background, demands that new themes, topics, and approaches be considered in curriculum design and implementation. Such issues include—for example—global education, twenty-first century skills, and environment issues.

3.3 Three pillars of a theoretical framework

This study aims, principally, to conceptualise the global perspectives of student teachers in Finland and Japan, so as to gain new knowledge of the differences or similarities between the orientations of the two countries, which have different cultural and historical backgrounds. Interestingly, both nations have, in their policies, committed themselves to aspects of internationalisation. To define the ideas of global perspective, I rely on three theoretical approaches: one, Hanvey’s description of the aims of global perspectives; two, Gaudelli’s heuristics of global citizenship education; and three, critical pedagogy (see Figure 1).
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Fig. 1. Three perspectives of building a theoretical framework.

This study understands global perspectives as a broad frame of reference for discussing the global dimension in teachers’ minds and the necessities of teaching complex global phenomena and accommodating diversity in schools. This research treats “global perspectives” as an overarching concept for embracing various
discussions of skills, attitudes, competences, and dispositions that teachers are urged to acquire in an increasingly globalised era. My theoretical framework stands on three elements. The first element, Hanvey’s *global perspectives*, presents five aims to be considered as important to global educators. The second element, Gaudelli’s *heuristics model of global citizenship education*, offers a comprehensive framework, showing approaches and orientations in policy papers and curricula. Finally, I will discuss *critical pedagogy* (see Burbules & Berk, 1999; Freire, 1985; Giroux, 2004, 2006), which I consider to be a wider theoretical lens through which to engage with GCE and global perspectives. I will analyse Gaudelli’s typology and Hanvey’s perspectives in order to discover the role critical pedagogy plays in those ideas—and to decide if the concepts in question should be extended when studied from a critical theory perspective.

### 3.4 Defining global perspectives and the related concepts

Due to increasing waves of globalisation, it is clear that teachers in Finland and Japan are expected to respond to shifting needs created by rapidly increasing diversity in their schools and communities. Several ideas have been used to describe the contents, competences, and orientations needed for future teachers. I have chosen “global perspectives” because, though not necessarily a new idea, it is often quoted and referred to in many policy documents and strategy papers. However, the term suffers frequently from ambiguities.

In Japan, the impact and implication of accelerated internationalisation trends emerged in Japanese teacher training in August 2012, when the Central Council for Education of Japan asserted an urgent need for teachers to acquire “global perspectives” or “guro-baru na monono mikata” (see the Central Council for Education, 2012). This applied not only to the teachers responsible for teaching the primary foreign language, English, but to other teachers at all levels (Central Council for Education, 2012, p. 25). Recent literature on Japanese teacher training expresses a prevailing belief in a growing demand for teachers to develop global perspectives, in response to globalisation and increased school attendance diversity (Takahashi, 2014).

In Finland, around the same period, the Finnish Ministry of Education announced “Global Education 2010” (2017) and the “Strategy for the Internationalisation of Higher Education Institutions in Finland 2009–2015” (2009), referring to the importance of intercultural learning, sustainable development, and human rights education when preparing future teachers (Räsänen, 2007; Vesa, 2007).
who should act as a catalyst to ensure education for global responsibility. The latest Finnish curriculum reform of 2016, or—more precisely—from 2014 onwards, lists “cultural competence, interaction, and expression” as a broadly based competence necessary to pupils, obliging teachers to have adequate skills to teach those pupils.

In summary, this study argues that it is of vital importance to see “global perspectives” as an overarching idea that teachers should understand in order to realise it in their daily work. Besides defining the idea itself, some conceptual ambiguities appear to require scrutiny. To justify this argumentation, I will introduce discussions on the concept, on related views, and on Hanvey’s model in particular, which I will clarify further on the basis of this discussion.

Hanvey’s model of global perspectives

Hanvey is a researcher who used the term “global perspectives” as early as 1976 and 1982. Already, therefore, Hanvey’s categories included most of the elements that more recent researchers on global curricula and competences have included in that topic area.

Originally, the idea of “global perspectives” emerged in the United States, in the 1970s, as a response to a need for education to promote a globally oriented viewpoint. Waves of globalisation and shifts in the vision of an international system in the United States led to a call for a post-national perspective within a global community. As stated, the term “global perspective” was introduced by a global educator, Robert Hanvey (1976, 1982). Hanvey aimed to create a guiding framework for primary and secondary school teachers in the United States, justifying a need for global perspectives in terms of a transition from “pre-global” to “global” cognition. Hanvey explains that “pre-global cognition” stands on a linear theory that describes single causes and simple effects in a short time frame, whereas “global cognition” requires a consideration of long-term consequences that are “characterised by new knowledge of system interactions, by new knowledge in planning human action” (Hanvey, 1976, p. 166). Having to understand that certain resources are scarce and that a planet’s capacities are limited, global perspectives should guide actions via reasoned processes (Hanvey 1976).

Therefore, “global perspectives,” as defined by Hanvey (1976), are “modes of thoughts, sensitivities, intellectual skills and explanatory capacities” (p. 162) that will support pupils’ better understanding issues in a world of growing complexity and interconnectedness. This will result, subsequently, in “learning which enhances the individual’s ability to understand his or her condition in the community and the
world and improves the ability to make effective judgments” (Hanvey, 1976, p. 1). To attain such a global perspective, Hanvey (1976, 1982) defined five aims of global education; namely, one, perspective consciousness; two, state of the planet awareness; three, cross-cultural awareness; four, knowledge of global dynamics; and five, awareness of human choices (see Figure 2).

Fig. 2. Hanvey’s five aims for reaching global perspectives for teachers (1976), drawn by the author.

Hanvey (1976) contends that our actions are directed by our own perspectives, which are built into deep and hidden layers. Unrevealed elements of those perspectives must be mined in order to be recognised.

The first element, perspective consciousness, aims to encourage people to become aware of their own assumptions, by challenging what is taken for granted and by channelling people to realise how our perspectives build on cultural, social, economic, and many other factors, creating differences in perspective. This orientation—for instance—challenges ethnocentric, nationalistic views as the only starting point for action.

State-of-the-planet awareness, the second element of Hanvey’s model, asks people to become aware of world events and of emergent situations requiring
immediate attention. Hanvey (1976) asks for a critical stance towards the media, while asserting that access to a wide range of information can help one to understand global challenges such as environmental issues. Growing sources of information allow a person to become aware of a world outside local surroundings and to gain an understanding of world events via multiple media modes.

**Cross-cultural awareness**, the third element, asks people to understand how certain views and practices stem from cultures that differ from the personally familiar. The rationale for cross-cultural awareness is to encourage people to think beyond stereotypes and prejudices, to see the world through other eyes. Attitudes such as empathy, tolerance, and a sense of unity are important conditions for cross-cultural awareness.

**Knowledge of global dynamics**, the fourth element, asks for an understanding of the inter-relationships of aspects of world problems, with consequences locally and globally. Future citizens must be taught to understand the mechanics of events in the world in order to seek a change for the better.

**Awareness of human choices**, the final element, combines the above four forms of awareness. Having understood one’s own assumptions, global events, cultural perspectives, and global interrelationships, one must make choices that rest on those assumptions and knowledge. This concerns the choices that are being made and a realisation of the possible implications of those choices. Moving away from examining short-term impacts only, this dimension asks people to recognise the issue of sustainability—and to make a rational choice to consider the multiple aspects of an interconnected world.

**Global perspectives as defined by other educationalists**

Following Hanvey’s article in 1976, elements of global perspectives have often been referred to and extended as the explicit goals of global education. Besides global perspectives and its elements, many other concepts emerged to describe the educational challenges in the global world. That situation also created new study areas and fields of educational research, such as peace education, human rights education, development education, and environment education. These developments enable a transition from separate topics to a more holistic understanding that aims to educate students who participate actively in—and seek solutions to change—society, through a positive contribution (Chalkley et al., 2010). That transition will lead to the development of education for global citizenship (Kimura, 2000). Scholarly work from various fields should be
acknowledged and made visible, towards developing a conceptualisation of global perspectives, as illustrated in Figure 3.

Fig. 3. Educational fields contributing to the discussion of GP.

Besides specifying the fields that contribute to a discussion of GP, I have chosen three key concepts that, in their definitions, approach global perspectives and its five aims; namely, world-mindedness, international-mindedness, intercultural competence, global competence, and global dimensions.

World-mindedness and international mindedness

Merry Merryfield (1993), an advocate of intercultural education in the U.S., urges a strong prioritisation of global and international education in teacher training as a venue for developing “world-mindedness.” Merryfield grew her understanding of “world-mindedness” on the basis of global perspectives; one may regard the term as very close to a combination of global perspectives (Merryfield et al., 2008). The scaffolding of world-mindedness includes one, a knowledge of global interconnectedness; two, inquiry into global issues; three, skills in perspective consciousness; four, open-mindedness, as a recognition of bias, exotica, and
stereotyping; and five, intercultural experiences and competence (Merryfield et al., 2008: 8). Merryfield’s definition of “world mindedness” is as follows.

The habit of considering the effects of our decisions on people across the planet, when we care about how others view our nation, and when we use “us” to mean people from many places, not just our neighbourhood or nation (Merryfield et al., 2008: 7).

Merryfield (1993) argues that teachers require knowledge, recognition, and an appreciation of the viewpoints of others in order to develop world mindedness, which is essential for better understanding others, the planet, and ourselves. The growing interconnectedness of the world introduces more opportunities naturally for engagement in a global community, including in a global economy—for example, through business outsourcing; in international politics—for example, via migration policy; and via technological advancement—for example, through virtual collaboration. Further civic engagements as a global citizen include concerns for peace, human rights, social justice, and a global environment. James (2005, p. 321) contends that the skills, knowledge, and attitudes of “world-mindedness” are often considered equivalent to “international-mindedness.” James demands caution, however, suggesting that those two ideas are not necessarily synonymous.

In comparison to world-mindedness, one can understand “international-mindedness” as a broader idea that is “a part of the continuum that represents the development of self” (Skelton, 2015, p. 75). This means that international-mindedness indicates how a relation evolves between the “self” and the “other.” This realisation is crucial, I contend, to considering the continuous changes that occur in peoples’ lives in an globalised, integrated world. Skelton refers to Bennet’s intercultural sensitivity model (1993) as a tool that elaborates on different stages of one’s development, in terms of intercultural competence. In schools, international mindedness is often discussed as a goal of international education, particularly in the context of the International Baccalaureate (IB) programme (Haywood, 2015). The IB programme focuses on developing international-mindedness, in the sense that knowing, respecting, and understanding other cultures is important when seeking an international mindset. Meanwhile, it is sometimes problematic that international mindedness is “developed” only superficially, by discussing topics such as exotic food, flags, fashion, and festivals.

According to James (2005), global-mindedness requires not only an international understanding but an intercultural understanding that necessitates a
recognition of language, gender, religion, or other “frames of reference.” Global-mindedness must be accommodated by deep, reflective learning experiences, not only in the context of teacher education, but considering the overall development of children and youths. To ensure such learning experiences, students must be supported by teachers and other stakeholders—for example, by parents—so that the learning process becomes more engaging and interactive, which helps make new knowledge real to learners (Haywood 2015). World-mindedness also embraces the aims of global education, as exemplified by discussions of critical concerns, such as a global environment and conflict resolution. Andreotti, Biesta, and Ahenakew (2015) assert that ideas of global-mindedness must move, not only beyond the linear understanding of development, but beyond focusing merely on the capacities of an individual, to a deep consideration of the contextual factors at play—that is, the specific cultural and historical conditions. These authors define global-mindedness as “a multidimensional concept that is concerned with the ways in which individuals think about and engage with otherness and difference in contexts characterised by plurality, complexity, uncertainty, contingency and inequality” (p. 254). Moving towards contextual modes of engagement, one should not focus solely on shifting from one orientation to another. Instead, global-mindedness as an idea suggests “dispositions” that can manifest in complex, unpredictable ways (see Andreotti, Biesta, & Ahenakew, 2015).

Finally, it should be mentioned that, in summary, the understandings and definitions of the key concepts—for example, international-mindedness and global-mindedness—share a lot in their essence, although their focus and emphasis may vary depending on the speaker and context. Räsänen (2018) contends that “international” attends to the relations between nations and those in them, while “global” attends to the globe, to people, and to ecological issues. For Räsänen, these approaches are “pretty much the same,” although their emphasis might differ somewhat, researchers preferring one or the other. Moreover, Räsänen contends that, during increasing globalisation, “global-mindedness” has become more common, at least in western educational discourse.
Examining the above definitions of *international* versus *global-mindedness* shows that we are, indeed, dealing with very “complex,” “multidimensional” phenomena. That precise realisation has prompted the notion of researching such “slippery” ideas—and the implementations of those ideas—in the specific context of teacher education. This study records the results of efforts to find and combine influential theorists’ ideas of the key issues in global education.

**Intercultural competence and global competence**

In the same vein as global perspectives, intercultural competence highlights the skills, knowledge, and attitudes necessary to allow teachers to become global citizens able to make informed, rational choices. Intercultural learning and competence are essential to the professional development of teachers. The competences in question help educators to make connections between people (see Jokikokko, 2009; Merryfield et al., 2008; Mudimbe-Boyi, 2002). Jokikokko (2016) states that one may understand “intercultural competence” as an *ability to encounter diversity positively and respectfully*. Meanwhile, intercultural competence concerns, not only teaching in diverse schools or the knowledge to discuss different cultures in classrooms, but an engagement with the needs, values, feelings, concerns, and attitudes of student teachers (Yvonne & Ledoux, 2003).

Global competence—on the other hand—has been discussed more recently in a broader context of schooling. In 2018, the “Organisation for Education Centre for Development” (OECD) published a “PISA global competence framework” that defines global competence as “the capacity to examine local, global and intercultural issues, to understand and appreciate the perspectives and world views of others, to engage in open, appropriate and effective interactions with people from different cultures, and to act for collective well-being and sustainable development” (OECD, 2018, p.7). The OECD framework in question uses the phrase “competence” to refer to “a combination of knowledge, skills, attitudes and values” crucial in communicating with people with different backgrounds. (OECD, 2018, p. 7). In that sense, the meaning of “global competence” stands very close to “global perspectives,” which is central to this research. Like the “global competence” framework, global perspectives (GP), in this study, does not simply mean having certain ontological views of the world. The idea of “global perspectives” suggests a combination of skills, values, knowledge, and attitudes towards becoming socially responsible citizens who ask themselves to “take responsibility.”
Salzer & Roczen (2018) argue that the idea of “global competence” remains a young idea suffering from an ambiguous understanding, despite that, in 2016, the OCED was already planning to incorporate into PISA an element of “knowledge, skills and values.” The OECD’s development of a “global competence framework,” which had focused more closely on intercultural competence, has shifted towards critical thinking and a reflection on global topics (Salzer & Roczen 2018). As the global competence framework is designed to measure how young people are being prepared for a globalised world, one may assume that growing interconnectivity—and the complex nature of the world—urged the OECD as policy makers to consider, and value more highly, skills of critical thinking and reflection as tools necessary to future world citizens.

In summary, the OECD definition of global competence offers a broad framework for skills, values, knowledge, and attitudes for future global citizens, yet presents implications explicitly to educators. To prepare students for an increasingly complex, intercommoned environment, the OECD framework guides educators to reflect on learning goals, while helping them to readjust their curricula so that they can effectively support the growth of young people into socially responsible global citizens. Notably, although critics have viewed the OECD’s work to develop assessments for global competence as worthwhile and meaningful, further dialogue and re-evaluation is necessary, they contend, to ensure intercultural compatibility (Salzer & Roczen 2018).

**Global dimensions**

In the United Kingdom, studies of the global dimensions of teachers are lively. Shedding light on the voices of teacher educators, McGough and Hunt (2012) reported findings from a three-year project at the Institute of Education at the University of London exploring subject-specific and cross-curricular activities, so as to develop a “global dimension” in early teacher training. In their project, McGough and Hunt conceptualise global dimensions as follows:

The global dimension is a term used to define aspects of the subject-specific and whole school curricula that relate to people’s place within the wider-world and how they relate to others. The global dimension connects the local, national and global in a way that people are aware of how their actions have implications for others across the globe. The term the global dimension can be
used alongside other terms such as global learning, development education and global citizenship education. (McGough & Hunt, 2012, pp. 1–2)

The above project pursued possibilities to integrate a global dimension into teacher training and discovered that potential motivations grew among teacher educators if ideas of global learning were made more accessible to schools (McGough & Hunt, 2012).

**Global perspectives in higher education**

Endeavouring to understand global perspectives is not only specific to teacher training; it concerns higher education in general. For instance, Shiel (2013) spent many years exploring opportunities to incorporate environment-focused global perspectives into higher-education learning and curricula. Shiel defined “global perspectives” as “a super-ordinate term which embraces sustainable development” (Shiel, 2013, p. 31). Shiel’s idea of global perspectives focuses somewhat specifically on the environment, therefore, in relation to a knowledge of global dynamics.

In the UK, a “global perspectives” framework was built to pursue possibilities—through higher education, beyond an internationalised curriculum—of empowering students to engage actively with global issues in an interconnected world (see Bourn, McKenzie, & Shiel, 2006; Shiel, 2013). Bourn and Shiel (2009) refer to global perspectives, moreover, as a “potential framework” with which to align one, a promotion of internationalisation and two, sustainable development in higher education. That framework demands pedagogical attention, so that it promotes “different perspectives and approaches to learning and encourages social and political engagement through the concept of global citizenship” (Blum & Bourn, 2013, p. 44).

In summary, although certain educational spheres have used and referred to “global perspective(s)” and to related ideas such as “world-mindedness” and a “global dimension,” scholarly work on and discussions of these topics remain sparse and limited. While both the Finnish and Japanese educational strategies use the exact phrase mentioned, “global perspective,” employing related terms (see, for example, “global competence”), the notion of global perspectives suffers from ambiguity nonetheless.

I do not intend, in this study, to draw a universalised or generalisable fixed definition of global perspectives. Instead, I intend to explore how student teachers
in current teacher training see a growing need for global awareness—and how those students view the changing realities in their local schools, community, and experiences as relating to global perspectives in their teacher training.

3.5 Global perspectives and global citizenship education

To support the development of future teachers with global perspectives, future teachers who will have a ubiquitous influence on future citizens, this study argues that student teachers must become responsible global citizens themselves in order to teach pupils to become responsible global citizens. Understandings differ in what global citizenship means. I will refer, therefore, to scholarly work on global citizenship education. I will introduce models and typologies, in particular, that show different approaches and orientations to global citizenship education. I have chosen literature on global citizenship education rather than literature on global citizenship itself, in order to gain a holistic understanding of education discourses. I am aware that various scholarly works examine typologies of global citizenship (see, for example, Oxley & Morris, 2013; Stromquist, 2009). I chose a body of literature that provides a variety of approaches and orientations to global citizenship education; literature suited, therefore, to analysing the views of the student teachers in this study. The following sub-chapter discusses global citizenship education specifically, then narrows its focus to an exploration of Gaudelli’s model, detailing how I adjusted that model for use in this study.

3.5.1 Global citizenship education (GCE) and its development

Various ways exist to situate research fields such as global citizenship education (see, for example, Andreotti, 2006; Davies et al., 2005; Marshall, 2009; Osler & Starkey, 2003), global education (Davies & Pike, 2009; Merryfield, 2005; Pudas, 2015), citizenship education (see, for example, Kymlicka, 1995; Paramenter, 2006) and many other related, relevant fields. Some global educators view GCE as part of global education; others contend that global education is part of GCE. This is evidence of overlapping ideas across the related fields and that the outlining of boundaries in this case is—indeed—a complex task. One way of regarding the development of global citizenship education is that education for global citizenship is a new form of education. I will discuss this idea below in more detail. One may propose that GCE emerged from the two district fields in education, global
education and citizenship education (Davies et al., 2005). Substantial differences in focus and origin exist, however, between those two fields.

Citizenship education promotes community-based involvement or cognitive reflection in a classroom. Concerns for national issues were traditionally central to developing citizenship education, offering a solid ground to establish well-defined foci for civic education (Davies et al., 2005). Citizenship education is often seen as a more coherent field and maintains a higher level of legitimacy in school curricula than does global education.

Global education, on the other hand, according to Davies et al (2005, p. 84), orients towards the “affective,” emphasising political action on and in response to global problems that require immediate attention. It draws on wider parameters, focusing in an intensified manner on social justice. Global education is more fragmented than citizenship education; the approaches of organisations may differ at a grassroots level (Davies et al., 2005; Pudas, 2015). Global education also shares a substantial concern for environmental issues and for sustainable development.

Critiques of citizenship education and global education offer space for further dialogue to seek education for global citizenship, to respond to the changing nature of citizenship in a rapidly shifting world (Davies et al., 2005). Accelerated globalisation was influential when global citizenship education began to receive increased attention and to play a significant role in many countries (Davies & Pike, 2009). Davies (2006) also reflects critically on this issue, stating that, “we are all becoming global citizens whether we like it or not,” as a prevalence of interlocking political and economic structures bring “threats” and “opportunities” to our everyday lives (Davies, 2006, p. 9). Simultaneously, neither global education nor citizenship education can be compensated for simply by adding international topics or activities reminiscent of global education (Davies et al., 2005). Davies therefore recommends a continuous and carefully presented debate, so as to seek improved education in order to develop an understanding of—and to participate in—the changing nature of citizenship in a contemporary society (Davies et al., 2005). International scholars in global education, citizenship education, and other fields have promoted and contested attributes of the concepts of global citizenship education. The following discussion of approaches to global citizenship education is necessary, therefore, in order to clarify that multitude of rationales.
3.5.2 Different approaches of GCE

The growing interconnectedness of the world, as brought about by globalisation, has evoked altered patterns in societies around the globe. The development of post-national citizenship responds to changing realities in social and political dimensions—and to a shift in focus and sense of belonging from a traditional nation state to a global community (see Camica & Zhu, 2011; Osler & Starkey, 2003). To understand such a highly complex, still-evolving notion of global citizenship education, one should pose questions such as, “Where is one speaking from as a ‘global citizen,’ or a ‘global educator’?” (Andreotti, 2011, p. 307). I concur with Marshall (2009) that the highly complex nature of GCE demands careful consideration—and agree with Marshall on the importance of acknowledging different ways of understanding global citizenship education.

Various scholars, particularly in relation to critical perspectives, aimed to provide typologies for global citizenship education. To some extent, those typologies reveal differences and similarities that highlight overlapping elements of global citizenship education. Table 1 shows different typologies in global citizenship education.

Table 1. Scholarly work on typologies in global citizenship education.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Categories/Typologies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2) Global social-justice instrumentalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andreotti (2006)</td>
<td>1) Soft GCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2) Critical GCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce (2014)</td>
<td>1) Technicist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2) Humanist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3) Critical humanism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4) Post-critical perspectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaudelli (2009)</td>
<td>1) National</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2) Neoliberal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3) Marxist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4) World governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5) Cosmopolitanialism</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Marshall (2009) identifies two key dispositions in the UK global citizenship education curriculum; namely, one, technical-economic instrumentalism; and two, global social-justice instrumentalism. The first approach, technical-economic instrumentalism, promotes pragmatic, neo-liberal ways of understanding existing
legal rights, structures, and responsibilities. This type of global citizenship education focuses on equipping a labour force with appropriately adequate skills to compete in a global market economy and to encourage one’s economic contribution to local and global society. The second agenda, global social-justice instrumentalism, draws towards an active, affective commitment to fighting various kinds of injustice in a rapidly interconnected world (Marshall, 2009). Marshall (2009) stresses that a recognition of the dominance of the economic-instrumentalist idea is inevitable, arguing that the agenda of global social-justice instrumentalism should gain more attention.

As described by Andreotti (2006), one may identify different GCE orientations as “soft” and “critical” approaches. While “soft GCE” focuses on an awareness of global events and a cultural understanding, “critical GCE” concerns power issues, social injustices, and social inequality. Critical GCE underlines that comprehending economic and culturally rooted issues of asymmetrical power relations—and unevenly distributed wealth—is crucial to appreciating a critical stance. The soft approach represents mainstream views on global issues such as peace and poverty, whereas the critical approach remains, according to mainstream thinking, a minor discourse in global citizenship education (see Andreotti, 2006; Carr, 2014).

Drawing on the context of New Zealand, Bruce (2014) uses a GCE framework involving four approaches to global citizenship education, including technicist, humanist, critical humanist, and post-critical perspectives. The first two, technicist and humanist, coincide with liberal, neoliberal, and humanistic approaches to teaching global citizenship education. Critical humanism engages with the injustices and inequalities analysed in critical theory. Post-critical perspectives embody a pluralisation of knowledge and of post-structural and postcolonial applications for GCE (Bruce, 2014, p. 74)—in line with the critical approach introduced by Andreotti (2006).

Gaudelli (2009) identified five main discourses of global citizenship education. I will adjust his model later for use as the analytical tool of this study. Among multiple typologies, I found Gaudelli’s heuristics to be the most useful, suitable framework for this comparative research. Heuristics offer a comprehensive framework and were developed to rest on the political, epistemological characteristics of approaches to motivating an implementation of specific global citizenship education curricula. My adjusted model—as discussed—provides an interactive mapping of the five Gaudelli discourses, including the nationalistic, an important element to reflect upon when discussing tensions between traditional principles for providing education in a globalised era. Gaudelli’s model provides
the most suitable comprehensive framework for discussing the global perspectives of teachers in more detail. The following section will examine the details of the adjusted model.

3.5.3 Gaudelli’s heuristics of global citizenship education

I reviewed the heuristics model of global citizenship education created by Gaudelli (2009) and adjusted it for this study, which focuses specifically on the global perspectives of student teachers.

William Gaudelli and his heuristics of GCE (2009)

William Gaudelli, who published “Heuristics of Global Citizenship Education towards Curriculum Enhancement” (2009), is a global citizenship researcher and an associate professor of social studies and education at the Teachers’ college of Columbia University. A current director of the Columbia University programme in Social Studies Education, Gaudelli has published scholarly work on GCE, on teacher education, on curriculum practices, and on the pedagogy of visual media. Gaudelli, a former teacher with a background in political science, concentrates, in his current projects, on teachers’ critical awarenesses of social justice, on the state of the planet, on peaceful community, and on environmental sensitivity (see Sustainability Frontiers, 2016).

Gaudelli’s “Heuristics of Global Citizenship Discourses towards Curriculum Enhancement,” an article published in the “Journal of Curriculum Theorizing,” introduced his heuristics of global citizenship education (2009). When developing those heuristics, Gaudelli aimed, one, to offer clarity on the broad category of GCE; two, to provide meaningful ways to consider global citizenship; and three, to speculate on global citizenship curriculum efforts in each discourse (see Gaudelli, 2009, p. 69). Drawing his discussion from fields such as philosophy, the humanities, and political science, Gaudelli (2009) asserts that “curriculum scholars of all stripes” must reflect critically on the ideas of global citizenship and on its implications for schools, students, and communities (Gaudelli, 2009, p. 69). Gaudelli composed his heuristics to offer a better understanding of the approaches to GCE, combining aspects of curriculum development towards achieving GCE. His 2009 article explores the theoretical orientations that constitute each discourse in question, offering practical examples of current curricula, examples that reflect different orientations in the provision of GCE.
Gaudelli offered his heuristics to clarify GCE with regards to five discourses; namely, one, neoliberal; two, nationalist; three, Marxist; four, world justice or governance; and five, cosmopolitan. See Figure 4.

Fig. 4. Gaudelli’s heuristics model of global citizenship education (drawn by the author).

Gaudelli’s heuristics model depicts visions and motives emerging in discussions of global citizenship and in GCE curricular efforts, visions, and motives that reflect various political and epistemological assumptions. The X axis, a “tangible-imaginary” scale, represents the degree to which global citizenship is embodied in the designated processes and institutions (Gaudelli, 2009). The Y axis represents the degree of global citizenship, whether containing a competitive or cooperative attitude. In his original model, Gaudelli also offers his vision of the civic and of a citizen, showing how those visions become manifest in school curricula in relation to each discourse.

This comprehensive framework was developed to present a dialogic, interacting map of discourses, rather than to contest inherently conflicting views (Gaudelli, 2009). I concur with Gaudelli and Heliman (2009) that the interconnectedness of the globalised world reinforces meaningful discussions about
GCE in socially and culturally different contexts, local and globally. This applies to the global perspectives of teachers, in the sense that a growing need for future teachers must be explored, attending to the approaches and orientations surrounding student teachers in higher education.

Gaudelli, in his study, (2009) admits that his illustrated heuristics model, which shows confined categories, can neither promise that those categories are mutually exclusive nor offer a perfect illustration. Overlapping concepts and ideas make it difficult to draw strict or fixed borders between camps of thought. Different ideas are likely to be more nuanced in actual practice. Moreover, to represent heuristics discourses as equally weighted would perhaps be misleading, as nationalism and neoliberalism remain dominant in discussions of global citizenship education (Gaudelli, 2009). Gaudelli cautions readers that, while these heuristics map various visions of global citizenship, one should not assume that each disposition has equal standing—a view I have echoed when considering the model and in pursuing an analysis based on the model.

Adapting Gaudelli’s model as an analytical tool for global perspectives

Gaudelli (2009) presented five orientations of global citizenship discourse focusing on school curricula. I have adjusted those orientations into four camps—one, neoliberal; two, nationalistic; three, humanistic; and four, transformational—so as to build a tool with which to analyse the global perspectives held by student teachers. While the “national” and “neoliberal” orientations remain in my adjusted model, the remaining three discourses—“cosmopolitan,” “Marxist,” and “world governance and justice”—I have reviewed and adjusted for the reasons outlined below, in order to develop the most suitable tool with which to examine student teacher views of global perspectives in this particular study.

Firstly, Gaudelli acknowledges that “cosmopolitan” and “world justice and governance” (Gaudelli, 2009) contain overlapping ideas. Both discourses share concerns for humanity, such as securing peace, human rights, and sustainable development. The discourses differ, however, in how they seek to realise their visions and implement those goals. “Global governance and justice” stresses a need for improved international laws and additional legal frameworks, so as to achieve global rights and equality (Gaudelli, 2009). “Cosmopolitan,” in Gaudelli’s view, is supported by NGO actions at a grass-roots level. In terms of orientation rather than implementation of GCE, “world justice and governance” and “cosmopolitan” are
similar, cohering in their aim to achieve humanistic goals. I have built a new camp entitled “humanistic” in my adjusted analytical framework, therefore.

Secondly, the Marxist discourse described by Gaudelli (2009) contains critical attitudes towards globalisation and towards the normative in neoliberalism—critical attitudes shared by some forms of critical pedagogy. Concurrently, Gaudelli’s view of cosmopolitan principles marks concerns for social justice, for critically understanding global situations, and for committing to act to eradicate socially unjust practices. These two discourses display overlapping aspects of social justice and critique. Therefore, I have built a new camp entitled “transformational” in an analytical tool combining elements of Marxist ideals, critical pedagogy, and the critical stance of cosmopolitan discourse.

Thirdly, Gaudelli included three inner circles in his heuristics model; namely, a vision of the civic, of a citizen, and of a curriculum. Gaudelli’s discussion, in his 2009 article, began with a broader scope of what a global civic society might be, then moved to a narrower discussion of how a global citizenship appears and how actual curricula manifest such visions. Those inner circles, though not included in this study’s analytical tool, are discussed—to a certain extent—whenever relevant to this research. The analytical tool has four camps, as shown in Figure 5.

![Fig. 5. An adjusted analytical tool for global perspectives, based on Gaudelli (2009), created by the researcher.](image)

The following text explores the four discourses of Gaudelli’s model in greater detail.
Neoliberal orientation

The “neoliberal” orientation is a principle discourse in GCE, understood in its relation to individual employability and discussed often in terms of economic gain, capital growth, and as standing on the free market principle. Neoliberal thinking and a rapid development of information technology accommodate the pervasive force of globalisation ubiquitously (Friedman, 2000). Regarding the purpose of education, a neoliberal orientation aims to develop the skills and competence necessary to increase individual employability. According to a neoliberal sensibility, individuals should raise their productivity and contribute efficiently to economic development by gaining the appropriate skills that a market economy demands of them or guides them to obtain. Andreotti and Ahenakew (2012) label this neoliberal position a “technicist” approach, due to its “social-engineering” nature in economic production, measuring success as total life earning. Gilbert (2007) contends that the dynamic forces of globalisation support the pervasive force of a neoliberal orientation by preparing global citizens in a knowledge-based society.

In a neoliberal approach, teachers play an important role in cultivating pupil ability in the global market, their primary concern to equip pupils to become global citizens, capable of economically rational and individual choice towards economic success. This means that neoliberally-oriented global citizens must be able to seek efficiency, to facilitate effective communication, and to succeed in maximising profit using scarce resources. Under the slogan “support economic advancement,” the neoliberal stresses the importance of success, profit-making, and competitiveness.

The opponents of neoliberal discourse are among the advocates for cosmopolitanism and critical perspectives, voicing the importance of an ethical stance when engaging with neoliberal thinking (Khoo, 2011; Rizvi, 2007). In other words, as “powerful” as globalisation is, it does not alert profit-seekers drawn to and prioritising short-term economic gain to possible unethical conduct within economic development.

Nationalistic orientation

After the neoliberal orientation, the other major discourse in GCE is nationalistic rhetoric. The primary interest of a nationalistic orientation to GCE is prosperity and the development of a nation state, prioritising a relationship between a “sovereign” state and its “national” citizens—although nation-bound thinking appears to be
eroding with globalisation. Nationalistic ideals are still prevalent, however, in global citizenship discourse around the world. Nationalists see education as a vehicle to develop loyal citizens keen to contribute to national development. Historically, that orientation is commonly addressed as the *core* and *main purpose* of schooling. Nationalists contend that education still plays an important role in developing respect and loyalty for a “mother nation,” so as to unite people and act towards achieving collective goals (see Camica & Zhu, 2011; Paramenter, 2006). This approach demands a control of national borders and a management of territories, in order to protect one’s country and citizens from any threats and violent acts.

Teachers with a nationalistic orientation may prioritise the importance of national development—and of continuing a nation’s prosperity—when educating pupils and in becoming global citizens themselves. Such nationalistic thinking encourages teachers to remind citizens to remember their *national belonging* in terms of national culture, history, and identity, referring to the nation-state as a framework in which to view the world. The ultimate educational goals of teachers are, therefore, to maintain and fortify a nation state. Knowledge and awareness of a global arena is always drawn in comparison to national understanding and with a vision of contributing to national development. Drawing from the discourses of the nationalistic camp, a rationale for becoming a global citizen would require, as its first step, a committed national citizen devoted to assuring the prosperity of a nation and viewing that nation as globally central.

Critiques of the nationalistic orientation problematise the idea of “exclusive membership,” asserting that nationalism exemplifies a *rooted rationale* for causing divides between “inclusions” and “exclusions” in society (Zembylas, 2012). The ownership of national citizenship is constrained to the historical and geographical. National citizenship discourse remains ubiquitous today, as both civil and political structures remain in place (Pike, 2008). Moreover, collectivist nationalistic paradigms continue to resist the expansion of plural, heterogeneous, individualised perspectives in a globalised world. The closed attitude in question originated in a homogenous stance that hinders diverse, manifold perspectives in sovereign states (Kymlicka, 2003).

*Humanistic orientation*

The orientation of a humanistic stance promotes universalistic ideas, in order to achieve changes resting on ethical values and conduct in human development.
Humanists are profoundly concerned with rights for all, with respect for human dignity, equality, and world peace (see Nussbaum, 2002; Noddings, 2005). Globalisation has led liberal humanists to ubiquitously convey the realities of those in need—and to continue to call for urgent humane action. That humane action is driven by international organisations, who are the primary actors in realising ideal change for purposes of human development. For example, the United Nations and the European court offer a legal framework for protecting “universal personhood” (Gaudelli, 2009), whereas supranational organisations such as UNESCO are committed to providing “education for all.” This approach values the pursuit of opportunities and development for the betterment of everyone.

“Humanists” view the aims of education in terms of individual betterment and of a collective effort to achieve social harmony, both visions aligning with principles of humanistic ideals. As asserted by Peters and Burbules (2004), “moral perfectibility, social progress and personal autonomy” (4) are primary concerns in a provision of education. Where developing education-for-all is conditional, seeking ways to achieve ethical solidarity consensually is a crucial societal challenge. Should everyone be granted equal rights, preparing pupils to become active agents, to “make a difference” in the world, is the utmost purpose that may be promoted according to a humanist sensibility. Therefore, teachers with global perspectives drawn from a humanist vision acknowledge human rights issues actively, those issues including a treatment of peace, conflict, poverty, equality, and other global concerns (see Noddings, 2005; Nussbaum, 1996, 2002).

One may associate many versions of a liberal humanistic approach with global perspectives; see, for example, “world governance” or a grassroots, “bottom up” approach. It is also possible, however, to understand cosmopolitanism as an overarching discourse that represents individual and institutional humanistic ideas. In cosmopolitanism, global citizenship discourse concentrates also on values and morals relating to the growth of interconnectedness among people, nations, and cultures. It encourages teachers to engage with worldly, multifaceted issues and to prioritise human rights. Osler and Starkey (2003) contend that becoming a cosmopolitan citizen means acquiring a sense of responsibility towards a common future, seeking solutions to issues that arise actively and collaboratively. Cosmopolitan citizens concern themselves with human rights, peace, conflict, democracy, and development (Osler & Starkey, 2003). Poverty, climate change, and sustainable development are also examples of humanistic issues requiring the immediate attention of global citizens.
Seeing teachers as global citizens, from a humanist position, means thinking and acting according to an ethical, universalist concern for everyone. A primary concern for human rights, equality, democracy, and other humane aspects also relates to global perspectives as an idea. One should think and act proactively—according to a humanist stance—in order to achieve change for the many in need of support.

Meanwhile, one may challenge *cosmopolitan* approaches to global citizenship that presuppose “privilege” as a prerequisite to membership of a global community (Pike, 2008). National stability and universal human rights are fundamental ideas often taken for granted in current discussions about the cosmopolitan citizen (Pashby, 2013). Often, some nations do not adequately meet conditions such as national stability and the protection of human rights. Accordingly, some writers critique discourses of global citizenship education driven by a humanistic approach as insufficient, arguing that those discourses do not consider *structural* reasons for injustice and inequity. A number of scholars stress, therefore, that such global citizenship discourse originates from western, industrialised, English-speaking nations who already enjoy “prosperity and security” in contemporary world orders (Andreotti, 2011; Camica & Zhu, 2011; Paramenter, 2011; Pashby, 2011). Dhawan (2013) contends that a pervading interest in cosmopolitanism signals a possible imperative attitude; that is, unless one examines world dominance and asymmetrical power relations critically. Without critical scrutiny, global citizenship discourse may lead to another paternalistic “enlightenment” dialogue of the privileged—despite growing global efforts to the contrary.

*Transformational orientation*

The main principle of a “transformational” orientation calls for a redistribution of power and wealth. It challenges a world supported by a flow of capital and is critical of the struggles of the working class, struggles that have now become a “globalised” problem (Gaudelli, 2009). The transformational argues that, through a redistribution of wealth and power among people, a “proletarian domination” is ideal across borders, to reunite people struggling in the shadow of a global economy. In most parts of the world today, Marxist ideals are seldom found directly in schools (Gaudelli, 2009).

In the research context of teacher education, practices of critical theory are encapsulated in *critical pedagogy*. Marx, resting on principles of scientific socialism, held the view that education encompasses the exposure and eradication
of a “false consciousness” in the minds of the proletariat (Gutek, 1997). Marxism defines a “false consciousness” as the product of a dominant class ideology, imposed on a subordinate class. (236). In the Marxist view, human beings carry a social nature as a means to and mode of achieving economic production. Extending that argument, neo-Marxists assert that social institutions such as schools reproduce normative ideologies— institutions in which social, political, and ideological relationships are propagated in order to favour a dominant class (Gutek, 1997, p. 236). Education should serve, therefore, as a means of reducing worker alienation from their labour and its product (ibid).

From a transformational perspective, teachers mindful of global perspectives are aware of the consequences of a capitalist market economy and seek ways to deconstruct existing hierarchical relationships that hinder social equality. Educators with this perspective aim to problematise propagated social issues, in order to actively seek a more just society. This tenet values the ability to think and to act critically about perpetuated social inequalities. Freire (1985) promoted activism therefore—encouraging individuals to become self-reflexive and to connect to their “critical consciousness,” pursuing intellectual efforts to eradicate unjust and unequal practices (Freire, 1985, p. 87). This means that teachers with a critical humanist perspective will stress the importance of a critical reflexivity resting on an interrogation of the capitalist, the neoliberal, and activity in contemporary society. By understanding the political, historical, and socio-cultural relationships attributed to reproduced injustice and inequality, global perspectives encompass an ability to engage critically with the past—and to critique action that perpetuates the problematic.

Such an orientation may not embrace the reality of the dominant world capitalist society, wherein nations are obliged to compete to survive in a market economy. In such a climate, many followers of critical pedagogy face constraints in their practices, employability and economic-based measures being mainstream ideologies in educational institutions. Critiques of critical pedagogy converge around presupposed binaries; for example, around group binaries such as between those with power and those without power (Bruce, 2014). That distinction—between power and powerlessness—does not consider the complexities of power relations or ponder privileges that require more detailed scrutiny. This lack of assessment contributes to alienation or marginalisation, as perpetuated in the form of “othering” accentuated by Bruce (2014).

In summary, many different ways to develop a typology exist, as this subchapter has presented. I built the analytical tool in this study to examine the multiple
orientations to global perspectives—and to use it to analyse the understandings of
global perspectives held by the student teachers in Oulu and Hiroshima.

3.6 Critical pedagogy and global perspectives

In order to seek possibilities for the conceptualisation of global perspectives, I will
add “critical pedagogy”—written as “CP”—to the theoretical framework of this
study. “Global perspectives” and “global citizenship education” do not exclusively
suggest a competence or awarenesses required to become a member of a global
community. With growing global interconnectedness, the citizens of the future must
analyse and react to uncertainty and ambiguity in the world. In teacher education,
critical pedagogy can offer a lens through which to reflect upon and fight against
unjust societal structures. The following section discusses the development of CP.
I will also introduce Critical Global Citizenship (GCE), as developed by critical
theorists.

Critical pedagogy offers grounds for the idea that global perspectives highlight
the importance of teacher self-reflexivity. However, the willingness of teachers to
tackle problems is uncertain. CP also has a long tradition in multicultural education
and is interconnected to global citizenship education.

3.6.1 CP as the third theoretical perspective

Critical pedagogy has roots in critical theory and is inspired by the practices of
scholars at the Frankfurt School, who derived their ideas from Marxism, which
criticised capitalist economies. Capitalism, adhering to power and privilege, was
seen as perpetuating social inequality by upholding class systems and unequally
distributed wealth. Critical pedagogy also emerged from the collective responses
of “progressive educators,” who worked against institutionalised practices and
sought to recognise social injustices and inequality concerning power imbalances
and socio-cultural factors (see Burbules & Berk, 1999; Freire, 1970; Giroux, 2004,
2006). The primary concern of critical pedagogy lies in “social injustice and how
to transform inequitable, undemocratic, or oppressive institutions and social
relations.” Its ultimate goal is therefore to eradicate social inequality (Burbules &

Among an abundance of critical pedagogues, the historical development of
critical pedagogy can be traced to Paulo Freire (1970), whose thinking had
pervasive impacts on views of schooling. Freire called for a “critical consciousness”
to challenge the dominant powers, powers that suppress in order to raise the voices of the oppressed, and to encourage liberation towards social-justice-oriented education. Freire (1970) stressed that students must be taught to read the “world” by reading the “word,” meaning that it is insufficient to acknowledge that people hold certain views. Studies inspired by Critical Theory must understand what a “view” means, its origins and possible consequences (Alvesson & Skoldberg, 2000).

The foundation of Freire’s critical approach does not stop at understanding or recognising injustice: a critical person must be empowered to act towards democracy and social equality (Burbules & Berk, 1999; Giroux, 2006). Extending the lens of Critical pedagogy, teachers must provide the conditions necessary for students to engage with and understand the interrelationships between “power” and other agencies (Giroux, 2006). Critical pedagogy encourages students to acquire the skills and knowledge necessary for democratic practices and to participate actively in action for societal change (Banks, 2001). Critical pedagogy also stresses the importance of a praxis that engages in action and reflection, in a cycle that ensures meaningful and deep learning, valuable to teacher education specifically. Jokikokko and Järvelä (2013) assert that praxis remains a valid, useful concept in various educational fields, in teacher education in particular.

3.6.2 Critical global citizenship education

Pedagogical approaches conveying critical perspectives are discoverable among proponents of global citizenship education. Two key tenets of critical global citizenship education are one, a critical understanding of globalisation and interrogation of hierarchical power relations; and two, engaging with alternative perspectives by reflecting on their assumptions and situatedness (see Andreotti, 2006; Eidoo et al., 2011; Pashby, 2013).

Rizvi (2007) asserts that a critical awareness and understanding of the processes and consequences of ongoing globalisation allows learners to imagine collective futures and ethical solidarity as a whole. Having acquired critical skills and attitudes, future teachers will become global citizens who are able to critically view globalisation and social and political structures and relations. Those teachers should be encouraged, therefore, Rizvi contends, to observe and analyse processes of globalisation and to reject simplistic interpretations of globalisation. Their attitudes must incorporate a willingness to acknowledge power relations and to help unpack complexities attached to regional conflicts, migration, energy crises, and
other global issues. Such preparation should occur in teacher education in which comprehending one, the formidable force of globalisation, and two, existing inequalities and injustices, should lead to critical reflection.

Teachers must receive opportunities to understand their situatedness in relation to socio-cultural and historical backgrounds, states Andreotti (2011). I concur with Davies and Pike (2009) that global citizenship education does not solely concern global issue. It should also offer chances to search for one’s citizenship and to develop a critical consciousness. In order that student teachers can gain alternative perspectives, teacher educators should facilitate critical engagement consciously and should avoid “oversimplifications of global issues” (Eidoo et al., 2011). The approach described, rising from critical global-citizenship education, will help future teachers become aware of the positionality of others through understanding one’s own assumptions and inherited values, fostering respect among pupils in schools (Ambe, 2006).

3.6.3 Critical intercultural pedagogy and global perspectives

In the context of teacher education, the urge in critical pedagogy to recognise power structures, oppressions, and discriminations, locally and globally, has led to the development of multicultural and intercultural education (see Cochran-Smith, 2003; Merryfield et al., 2008; Nieto, 1994; Räsänen, 2000; Sleeter, 2001). Historically, preparing teachers for student diversity meant highlighting the educational policies in long-time multicultural nations, such as the United States. In the 1990s, Zeichner (1992) identified a widening gap between a white-female-dominant teaching force and “culturally disadvantaged” students—and discovered a failure to prepare teachers to tackle “different” or “difficult” pupils in classrooms, often resulting in disengaged students and a high dropout rate (Sleeter, 2001). Faced with predominant representations of white mainstream cultures, students from a minority background often lose motivation and deviate from “success” at school (Ambe, 2006). The construction of different world views means that the implications of teacher beliefs and attitudes will be clear and visible in classroom teaching (Depit, 1995).

In contemporary education, one of many challenges student teachers face is growing diversity among their future pupil populations (Banks, 2004; Sleeter, 2001; Zeichner, 1993). Waves of globalisation have led to a rise in migration, meaning that students from different cultural backgrounds are attending local schools. Consequently, a wider range of diversity exists—for example—in culture, language,
religion, and ethnicity (Banks, 2001, 2004). A teacher should accommodate the complex needs of students and their families, who may have social and cultural backgrounds that differ from his or her own (see Barry & Lechner, 1995).

Merryfield (2000, p. 440) claims that a critical consciousness regarding “how human differences are used by people in power to rationalize inequities, maintain privilege and promote their culture as superior” means comprehending complexities, alternative realities, and plural perceptions. To master multicultural education (hereafter ME) one must teach all knowledge critically and seek alternative versions of realities in classrooms (Nieto, 1999). Inviting debate and discussion in a classroom may lead to frustrations and complexities, as no one “correct” answer represents life as it is (Nieto, 1999, p. 229). Cochran-Smith (2003) sees “inquiry as a stance,” as an orientation essential to the education of teacher educators, essential to invoking the chance to “unlearn” long-held assumptions and to build contextualised, culturally sensitive pedagogical practices.

A further examination of preparing students for multicultural classrooms and of effective teaching in an era of globalisation revealed the shortcomings of teacher education, which fails to provide deeper knowledge of local and global issues and of world orders in relation to social justice and inequality (Barry & Lechner, 1995; Merryfield, 2000).

Some scholars (see, for example, Khoo, 2011; May & Sleeter, 2010) have argued that multicultural education—as applied in the United States—has not addressed power asymmetries and social injustices properly. Therefore, they contend, “Critical Multicultural Education” is necessary. Teaching for and about a global world no longer involves building simple relationships between nation states. Rather, it urges an engagement with complex agency relationships (Fujikane, 2003). Gilbert (1997) states that, without a careful analysis of multi-layered socio-economic issues in relation to one’s personal constructs, simply “being there” may not result in an awareness of the interplay and interrelations between global and domestic diversity.

When striving to cultivate students with intercultural skills in teacher training, it is vital one view preparation as a continuous process (see Cochran-Smith, 2003; Jokikokko & Järvelä, 2013; Pudas, 2015; Räsänen, 2007) requiring a long-term, comprehensive outlook. In some contexts, “multiculturalism” has not been considered properly; consequently, some students consider it “irrelevant” to their future teaching (Ambe, 2006). All teaching should, I contend, be considered intercultural in nature, as pupils have various micro-cultural identities, regardless of their social, cultural, or historical roots (Norberg, 2000; Räsänen, 2000; Zeichner,
Gollnick and Chinn (1998) convey this nuance also, maintaining that diversity includes sub-cultures such as gender, religion, and social class, although the term—*diversity*—is often associated only with ethnic or linguistic differences.

In conclusion, it is important—I contend—that all teachers acquire global perspectives including a critical consciousness and intercultural competence. Both more diverse or less diverse societies tend to marginalise certain cultural or socio-economically suppressed groups. Consequently, teacher education is vitally important in preparing future educators who will fight for and defend social equity.

### 3.6.4 CP’s contribution to my theoretical framework

My theoretical framework consists of three elements chosen specifically to develop an analytical tool with which to examine student teacher views of global perspectives. I have enriched and supplemented Gaudelli’s *heuristics* model and Hanvey’s *aims of global education* with the ideas of critical pedagogy. This study examines Hanvey’s global perspectives, discovering the scope and content of Hanvey’s presentation to be quite comprehensive. Although a relatively old theoretical construct originating in the 1970s, Hanvey’s perspectives have been used widely and have been enriched by many later researchers. Hanvey’s ideas encompass many characteristics of critical theory, stressing *one*, an awareness of global perspectives and *two*, that global education should have immediate practical aims. However, I would like to enhance the visibility of the critical aspects of Hanvey’s work. Accordingly, I have added two perspectives to his thinking; namely, *one*, the necessity for action to achieve change, and *two*, the need to challenge power relations; see Figure 6 below. As I have discussed in terms of Gaudelli’s typology, critical pedagogy rests clearly in a critical humanistic orientation.

In Gaudelli’s heuristics model—a comprehensive framework displaying a variety of global citizenship education discourses—a critical perspective is partially visible in the Marxist camp, as illustrated. As I discussed when adjusting the model for this study, it is challenging to find Marxist ideals realised in current educational settings. I converted the Marxist camp, therefore, into a “transformational” camp, so that it reflects meaningful pedagogical elements concerning student teachers—elements such as action and reflection. The rationales for a critical humanistic position include *critical attitudes* and a *critical reflexivity* towards understanding the critiques, injustices, and power relations of neoliberal approaches.
Hanvey’s model, which presents five aims of global perspectives for teachers, displays some interconnectedness to critical pedagogy. For example, a “perspective consciousness” is an awareness that the views of others differ considerably from one’s own, while an “awareness of human choices” means comprehending the long-term consequences of individual or collective activities. However, Hanvey’s five aims do not sufficiently reflect certain fundamental aspects of CP, such as the need—in action—for change and critical engagement with concerns of power, equity, and social justice. In the light of critical pedagogy, I have extended my model to include two additional aims, to act for change and to challenge power relations.

Fig. 6. The theoretical framework built for this research.

Some elements of these two additional aims overlap with my earlier aims as stated. However, these new aims make explicitly visible the importance of a commitment to and responsibility for social justice and equality.
3.7 Research on student teachers and global perspectives

In teacher education research, evidence indicates that authorising the voices of student teachers is key to identifying gaps and possibilities for further developing global perspectives in teacher education.

From the perspectives of critical pedagogy, Giroux (1989) asserts that discourses of student experience illustrate how students build meaning into their lives, and that those discourses can be “a referent for critique” (147), aiding in a search for further conducive practices in teacher training. Applying a critical pedagogy, which “addresses, affirms, and critically analyzes the experiences, histories, and categories of meaning that shape the immediate reality of students’ lives” (Giroux, 1989, p. 146), I argue that student teachers must become active agents in order to navigate potentially complex, intertwined global issues and diversity in a classroom. Some research reports also stress the importance of student perceptions in developing teacher education.

Philpott and Dagenais (2011) studied the narratives of new teachers in a Canadian context, scrutinising how new teachers experience issues concerning social justice in actual classrooms. While teaching conditions impacted how well those teachers worked to achieve equity, some teachers could apply their knowledge and experience to the practice of social justice as early as in their pre-service training (Philpott & Dagenais, 2011). It also became apparent that new teachers’ views of social justice strongly influence whether or not—and how—they developed particular types of activity to support their promotion of equity in their schools.

In the United Kingdom, Holden and Hicks (2007) examined student teacher views of global issues and studied the motivations of those student teachers to teach global-related themes in classrooms. It was commonly observed—and was a prevalent phenomenon—that student teachers recognised the value of education in widening horizons, preparing pupils for a global community. Moreover, teachers with previous enriching experiences appeared to commit more strongly to teaching global-related topics. One might understand such a tendency in terms of differences apparent in the students’ levels of confidence, motivation, and assumed knowledge. Many students echoed the overflowing anxiousness found in Barry and Lenchner’s (1995) study, expressing a need for more guidance and knowledge in order to teach complex, sensitive global themes effectively (Holden & Hicks, 2007). The controversial nature of global-related themes means that student teachers tended to
indicate a lack of knowledge and confidence in teaching global themes effectively in classrooms (Davies, 2006; Holden & Hicks, 2007).

In some contexts—for example, in Japan and Korea, where subject teaching is the utmost priority for teachers—teaching student teachers to reflect critically or to acquire intercultural competence is not seen as particularly important, as long as they follow the curriculum assigned (Zeichner, 2006). Sugunro (2001) contends that most teachers possess an adequate competence to teach in their subject areas, although a lack of skills, knowledge, and attitudes confines their teaching in diverse classrooms. These ideas were published some time ago. However, even today, the argument that in order to achieve skills and subject knowledge enabling the teaching of global issues, we need opportunities that help student teachers to grow continually as globally-oriented educators, is particularly relevant (Jokikokko, 2009).

In a comparative study of Finnish and Japanese pre-service teachers, Talib and Hosoya (2008, 2009) reported differences in the attitudes of those teachers towards intercultural sensitivities and towards the building of personal and professional identities, as identified through the study’s questionnaires. Talib and Hosoya’s findings illuminate possible correlations between the teaching profession and student teacher attitudes to education; specifically, between the power of education and the role of a teacher—suggesting that the student teacher perceptions reflect their societies (Talib & Hosoya, 2008). I concur with Talib and Hosoya (2008) that student teacher views are an important source for understanding social realities and for identifying the challenges and opportunities to be pursued in teacher education.

In conclusion, examining the perceptions of student teachers is critical, I assert. Student teachers acquire knowledge in teacher training, during which they are expected to develop an adequate ability to guide future global citizens (see, for example, Ambe, 2006). To ensure teacher education that meets learner demands, but aligns with the changing needs of a society, student teachers’ views must be a central source for the development of teacher training. To gain a deeper knowledge of student teacher perceptions, this study has developed a multi-layered theoretical framework combining multiple theoretical insights that complement each other. I have used this theoretical framework as an analytical lens through which to compare the student teachers’ views of their studies in Oulu, Finland and Hiroshima, Japan.
4 Methodology

This chapter discusses the comparative case study approach and its mixed methods. I will first introduce the background of the comparative approach and its relation to this comparative study of the views of student teachers.

4.1 Comparative approach

This study’s main research methodology is comparative. My research questions seek to explore the different varieties and approaches in the conceptualisation of global perspectives in Finland and Japan—an aim that guided me to use a comparative approach. Comparative education research is a contested arena; the concept, forms, styles, methods, contexts, and approaches of comparisons are complex. Accordingly, I will begin by offering a brief overview of comparative education as a field of research, so as to elaborate on its complexity. I will then discuss a case study approach as applied to an examination of the perceptions of the student teachers in teacher training in Oulu and Hiroshima.

A brief history of comparative education

Scholars in East Asia, Western Europe, and North America acknowledged comparative education as a new discipline in the 1960s and in the early 1970s (see Bray et al., 2007; Cowen, 2014; Crossley, 2012). The primary role of comparative education was to explore potential “educational transfer” (Cowen, 2014; Rappleye, 2006) and to import practices from elsewhere in the world, so as to support reforms in educationalists’ home countries (Steiner-Khamsi, 2000; Watson, 2001). In the late 1970s and 1980s, the identity of comparative education was often questioned concerning its expansion and regarding blurred boundaries that failed to define it as a discipline (Watson, 2001).

In the 21st century, comparative education has regained confidence as a “field of study” in its own right, as waves of globalisation have reinforced the interconnectedness of the world, asserting the value of comparative research that accommodates “contextual sensitivities” (Crossley & Jarvis, 2001, p. 407). Today, one may understand a comparative educational design or approach, broadly, as a mode or framework of study in which two or more cases are contrasted meaningfully, in order to enhance an understanding of social phenomena (Bryman, 2012). A comparative approach explores parallels—and sometimes paradoxes—
through systematic investigation (Azarian & Petrusenko, 2011). Comparative education is a common international research field, particularly with respect to cross-cultural or cross-national studies exploring educational values, practices, and perceptions in a comparative manner. International standardised reports and measures—such as PISA, TIMSS, and PIRLS—generate interest in new knowledge and in unique experiences, so that others in need of improvement might study “best” practices in more detail. Comparative education contains diverse orientations that focus on elements of comparative research, including histories, political agendas, and social and economic dimensions.

In its diversity, the field of comparative research comprises two approaches; one, individualising or “interpretative” comparisons and two, generalising or “variable-based” comparisons (see Haydu, 1998; Tilly, 1984). While the common use of a comparative approach is in generalising comparisons that aim to identify causal relationships across cases, individualising comparisons value a context-specific understanding.

This study employs an individualising comparison that contrasts two cases meaningfully in order to identify the specific futures of the teacher training programmes selected. Such a comparison offers insights into the assumed perceptions and distinct elements of each case, in an individualising manner (Tilly, 1984). This research compares two cases in two contexts: for that reason, I will elaborate in more detail on my case study approach.

A case study in comparative research

One may understand a “case study” as an approach that facilitates exploring a phenomenon in a particular context, drawing on a variety of data (see Baxter & Jack, 2008; Crossley & Vulliamy, 1984; Stenhouse, 1979). A comparative case study does not aim merely to discover differences and similarities that would otherwise remain unrecognised in a single case study. By comparing cases, a comparative case study strives to provide possibilities to identify practices on a micro level, so as to offer knowledge of immediate realities in educational settings.

According to Stenhouse (1979), a comparative case approach offers the chance to gain a better understanding of schooling and education by embracing insights and realities in educational institutions. This implies that insights gained from a comparative case study may serve as creative sources, guiding its readers “beyond the reach of prediction,” to the generation of pragmatic solutions in the contexts selected (see Stenhouse, 1979). Stenhouse (ibid.) reminds us also of the complexity
in comparative education, in which detailed descriptions and observations contribute to critical interpretation of data. In any single or multilevel comparative research, a “case,” a unit of analysis, requires careful consideration so as to build a systematic, fundamentally sound comparative study (see Bray et al., 2007; Baxter & Jack, 2008). Researchers often determine cases in terms of a particular location, community, or organisation (Bryman, 2012). This study treats teacher training at the University of Oulu and Hiroshima University as individual cases, as “learning organisations” (Somekeh & Michaela, 1997) that are part of the teacher education situated in the given contexts. Rather than a national, cross-national, or international comparison, this study focuses precisely on the perceptions of the student members of the learning organisations in question. To conduct a rigorous case study, one must also obtain and develop a full, balanced, and deeper comprehension of the social reality—and subjects—in question (see Bray & Thomas, 1995; Bryman, 2012; Hantrais, 1996; Haydu, 1998; Piattoeva, 2010a). Chapter 2 offers information, therefore, on the backgrounds of the two contexts discussed throughout this study.

**Towards building a sound comparative case**

A primary concern of comparative researchers is obtaining deep, proper knowledge of the research contexts at hand. A comparative approach between two—or multiple—diverse contexts requires understanding “the inherent macro-contextual factors in each place,” which greatly influence the educational values, structures, and perceptions of stakeholders (Manzon, 2007, pp. 111–112). When similarities are evident in the selected contexts, comparisons must be accompanied by a careful consideration of the social, cultural, political, and historical factors that have shaped the development of education significantly in the contexts selected. Context-specific descriptions are important to enrich an understanding of the particular educational reality; inadequate understandings risk misleading interpretations of the data (Manzon, 2007). While acknowledging contextualised outcomes in a case study approach, some findings may resonate more broadly with experiences elsewhere (Kelly et al., 2014).

Countries can learn from each other through sound comparisons, although one must not borrow education directly from another context. Takayama (2010) provides, as an example, a case in which Japanese policy-makers referenced Finland’s success in PISA 2003 in order to legitimise an agenda for new educational reform in Japan. Some Japanese policy-makers narrated the Finnish “miracle”
misleadingly, associating it with the market, competition, deregulation, and entrepreneurship—and with a human capitalist view of schooling that serves the agenda of Japanese neoliberally-oriented reform favourably (Takayama, 2010). Unlike some Finnish scholars, who show a critical awareness of market-based rhetoric and managerial-oriented changes in their current education (Ahonen & Rantala, 2001; Rinne et al., 2002), certain Japanese educators praise an ongoing neoliberalism, which, they claim, is the key driver in Finland of successful academic outcomes, of quality in education, and of contributions to further economic development. Such uncritical references—by those insufficiently familiar with the system to which they refer—can be problematic. Takayama (2010) stresses that an inadequate recognition of “particularities” and a lack of context-based discussion should be avoided locally and internationally.

Another challenge of employing a comparative approach relates to how one treats and understands “culture” in a research context (Piattoeva, 2010b). Mark Mason (2007) explains that comparative researchers must treat “culture” with caution, or they may otherwise join a process of “stereotyping, of treating culture as monolithic, and of overstating its influence in a hybrid world characterised by complex interactions and influence” (p. 166). To pave paths towards sound comparative research, one should gain an understanding of context-specific information and of discussions relating to the central research topic. One should also have cultural understanding and experiences in those contexts, particularly when building claims that embrace multiple dimensions—for example, the social and cultural—of the phenomena studied. One must also acknowledge that comparisons do not necessarily aim to draw generalisations or to arrive at universally applicable solutions. Therefore, research outcomes cannot simply be removed from their contexts to answer questions arising from a different setting.

Stake (2006, p. 126) discusses the contribution of a comparative study as follows:

“Generalization may not be all that despicable, but particularization does deserve praise. To know particulars fleetingly of course is to know next to nothing. What becomes useful understanding is a full and thorough knowledge of the particular, recognizing it also in new and foreign contexts.”

In summary, for any level of comparative education research to engage with the complexity of these particular contexts is a challenging task. Nevertheless, a careful consideration of the contexts in question, accompanied by detailed descriptions,
offer chances to identify elements that may not be apparent to policy makers, for example (Crossley & Vulliamy, 1984).

### 4.2 Mixed methods

This comparative case study applies mixed methods to arrive at diverse knowledge, providing opportunities to understand varying ideas, conceptions, world views, and assumptions (see Creswell, 2003; Johnson et al., 2007; Tashakkori & Teddlie, 2008).

A mixed method combines qualitative and quantitative analyses in order to embrace multiple dimensions of the phenomena examined—which, in this study, are the views of the student teachers in Oulu and Hiroshima. Morgan (1998) shows that in mixed-methods research, studies involving two types of approach present a challenge when coordinating outputs carefully. One practical solution for overcoming that challenge is to identify a “principle method” (Morgan, 1998, p. 367), alongside which the other method is follow-up or preliminary, used to offer links between the findings of a study. The principle method of this research is qualitative interpretative, as most of its significant findings—drawn from the student perceptions—came from data that was analysed qualitatively. The principle methodology of this study is that of a comparative case study. Its main interest is qualitative. However, this study also uses numerical data as a first step in qualitative data gathering. I used a qualitative interpretative approach to gain a better understanding of the contexts and complexities of the experiences voiced by student teachers in Oulu and Hiroshima.

I collected multiple data sets that were all triangulated, meaning that those data sets should support and complement each other (Denzin, 2012; Moran-Ellis, 2006). Applying different methods and combining findings adds not only to the validity and reliability of the data, but to discussions of diverse contexts (see, for example, Ivankova et al., 2006). One instance of such a contribution in this study is my combining of additional data from field notes, policy papers, and teacher educators, in order to answer research question three, which asks that I explore different means of supporting global perspectives in teacher training. I have used multiple data to answer all my research questions.

Creswell (2003) asserts that potential biases exist among scholars towards different methodological preferences. Some scholars may seek, principally, to grasp an overall statistical mapping of results, whereas others are drawn more to in-depth qualitative analyses of data. While knowing the challenges involved, I
considered mixed methods to be the most suitable approach to engaging meaningfully with the multiple data sets from my two contexts.

In summary, I chose mixed methods on the basis of three characteristics; one, engaging with the multiple dimensions of global perspectives; two, the complimentary nature of employing two methods; and three, a wider engagement with an audience in different contexts. Having explored the strengths of mixed methods in their contribution to this study, it is crucial—I contend—to reflect on theoretical and philosophical debates that have implications for the handling of multiple data generated through different means (Moran-Ellis et al., 2006).

Employing mixed methods is often justified by pragmatism, which demands one use methods that best offer information about complex real-life phenomena. Among the bulk of authors writing on pragmatism, Peirce (1992) and Dewey (1938, 1948) are classical pragmatists engaged in discovering practical and empirical solutions to better understand phenomena (Benton & Craib, 2011; Johnson & Onwuegbuzie, 2004). Peirce (1992) conceptualised an “object” as a total of practical bearings. In other words, Peirce contends, our knowledge of objects is conceived via practical relationships to those objects. For Dewey (1948), who viewed objects of knowledge as the outcome of inquiry, any theory of knowledge always concerns itself with relations between actions and the consequences of experience. Knowledge itself does not offer truth or certainty necessarily. Rather, actions, as the outcomes of inquiry, or what Dewey called “warranted assertions,” serve as grounds for beliefs (Dewey, 1941/2008; Morgan, 2014). Pragmatists believe that our knowledge of objects can emerge only in practice. Therefore, “what is true is what works” (see Benton & Craib, 2011; Dewey, 1920/2008). Pragmatists assert that the nature of ontology, of the social world, stands on a pluralistic view that embraces multiple viewpoints, positions, and realities, acknowledging that knowledges differ in how we engage with the world (Biesta, 2010). Proponents of mixed methods rely often on pragmatism, which invites multiple viewpoints, standpoints, positions, and perspectives (Johnson et al., 2007). I concur with Morgan (2014)—and contend that the fundamental principles and philosophical assumptions of pragmatism suit the forming of workable approaches for this comparative study.

Regarding the nature of epistemology or warranted social knowledge, pragmatism and its emphasis on experience have implications for the different epistemological standards—in other words, for post-positivism and constructionism—in the nature of inquiry. Pragmatism treats different approaches as “social contexts of inquiry or a form of social action,” rather than as
philosophical stances (Morgan, 2014). Pragmatism values everyday experience derived from active, continual interactions between belief and action, rather than as a static or fixed process (ibid.). This study examines student teacher perceptions so as to illuminate real-life experiences and possible practices for reconsideration and improvement in teacher training, on the basis of knowledge from qualitative and quantitative analyses.

Pragmatists always ask ethical questions when pursuing an inquiry, questions such as, “Which goals are most meaningful and which methods the most appropriate when answering research questions?” (Morgan, 2014). Pragmatism contends that all elements of research demand moral, political, and value-laden decision-making (Denzin, 2010; Johnson & Onwuegbuzie, 2004). It asks that researchers commit to making meaningful decisions, aiming to unpack actions and beliefs by understanding experience in a particular context. This study also considers ethical dimensions. I analyse the two teacher training programmes in order to contribute to developing the ethically responsible teachers of the future. My research questions guided my choice of methodology—in this case, a mixed-method approach—to best suit the gathering of relevant data and information with which to answer those questions.

In summary, pragmatism is a philosophical foundation that can support not only mixed methodologies, but every scientific research approach pursuing alternative interpretations of social reality, seeking a value-laden strategy and a methodological and epistemological pluralism, aiming to discover changes for the better (Johnson et al., 2007). The following section presents my research process in more detail.

4.3 The research process

I began this doctoral study in 2012 with a planning phase, focusing on literature from previous studies on teacher training that concerned global and intercultural education. My research questions and ideas were formed through my continuous building of a theoretical foundation. I examined literature on comparative research and mixed methodologies, in order to design and refine this study’s design.

During the developing and piloting phase, I identified the focus of this research—the student teacher perceptions—and its potential data sets. Online questionnaires were developed to gather the first data set. The language of those questionnaires was finalised as English and Japanese, the author’s working languages. Because the Finnish student teachers spoke English but I could not
communicate in the language, a compromise was unavoidable. The questionnaires were piloted with non-target groups in Finland and Japan, in order to test their workability. In Finland, students at the Intercultural Teacher Education programme (N=14), exchange students at the faculty of education (N=13), and student teachers at the fine-art-oriented programme voluntarily completed the online questionnaires. In Japan, students at Yasuda Joshi university (N=17) attended my pilot study. I revised the questionnaire on the basis of the responses I received in that pilot study, before sending the final tool to my target groups.
The first data collection phase began in 2013, when student teachers at the University of Oulu and Hiroshima University answered online questionnaires for this study. Sub-chapter 5.4. offers further details about the research participants. All the responses were gathered and managed via the online platform.

While waiting for the questionnaires to be completed, I became acquainted with more literature on the emerging needs and competences required by teachers in increasingly diverse classrooms. In this constructing phase, I encountered Gaudelli’s heuristic model (2009), which helped me to gain insights into the
academic camps in a global citizenship education discourse. I later combined that heuristic model with ideas of critical pedagogy—see, for example, Freire, Giroux—and with the aims of Hanvey’s “global perspectives” (Hanvey 1976). I developed a preliminary rubric to use as an analytical tool in this study. Sub-chapter 4.8 will examine that rubric and its coding rules in closer detail.

I analysed the responses from the first analysing phase quantitatively and qualitatively, uploading the quantitative data into the SPSS software platform and the qualitative data into NVivo. To examine the qualitative data, I read the student responses in order to gain a general idea of their responses, then began to group those responses preliminarily, according to areas drawn thematically, following the coding rules. To retain the original meanings as voiced by the students in question, I analysed the Japanese data in its original language, instead of translating their answers prior to analysis.

Reviewing the literature and the findings from the online questionnaires helped me, again, to build interview questions in the reflection and constructing phase. The interview was semi-structured so as to allow students to express their perceptions in a more thorough, personal manner.

The second data collection phase began in July 2014, when I had the opportunity to visit Hiroshima University for my research. I held individual interviews with the Japanese student teachers over two days, from 24.7.2013 to 25.7.2013. The Finnish student teachers participated in interviews later, during their autumn semester from 29.11.2013 to 9.12.2013. Semi-structured interviews explored rationales and experiences, aiming to examine the student perceptions for my data in more detail. All the interviews were recorded.

Once all the data was collected, I transcribed each interview and acquired text for the second analysing phase, so as to gain a thorough understanding of student views on global perspectives and of their experiences in teacher training. Analysis began again with my reading all the data to gain a sense of the breadth of the responses. Subsequently, I conducted a preliminary analysis of two participants from each university, testing that preliminary analysis against the rubric. My examination then continued for the rest of the data.

In the spring of 2015, I continued to pursue the synthesising and concluding phase, in order to combine the findings from my different data sets and to discuss the implications of my research outcomes. In this phase, I began to translate the Japanese responses into English, enabling a comparison of the results from both contexts. Those translations have shortcomings. Some grammatical forms likely do not have equivalents. Also, different syntactical styles are among the most difficult
features to transfer from one language to another (Ericikan, 1998). I considered the above aspects, therefore, in order to assure the quality and accuracy of the translations in terms of ideas, style, meaning, connotations, and key vocabularies (Ericikan, 1998, p. 544).

After collecting the main empirical data, the online questionnaires and interviews, I analysed interviews with teacher educators, interviews conducted in the second data collection phase. I did not expect to interview teacher educators initially when planning this study. However, interviews seemed a natural choice when appraising how to collect information about the teacher training. I decided, therefore, to record interviews with the teacher educators, in order to supplement my data. To gain a more holistic picture of the environments surrounding both programmes, I examined policy papers on teacher training in both countries. In summary, the responses from my online questionnaire, the first data collection, served as a foundation on which to devise questions for the semi-structured interviews, the second data collection. The data was later supplemented by interviews with teacher educators and by policy documents from Finland and Japan.

The final phase, a revising and finalising phase, reflected on the doctoral research as a whole, empirically and theoretically. I revised the manuscript continuously and updated contextual information.

4.4 Research participants

The professors in each respective education programme, the technology-oriented primary school training in Finland and the primary school training in Japan, informed their students of the purposes of the questionnaires, following which students volunteered to participate. A link to each questionnaire was sent through a communal email address to the student teachers in Oulu and Hiroshima. Forty-five responses were recorded, consequently, at the University of Oulu and ninety-nine at Hiroshima University.

To ensure the anonymity and confidentiality of the participants (Corti et al., 2010), so personal information would not be disclosed, the student teachers participating in the questionnaires were given numbers randomly, starting with the initial of each institution; namely, H1–H99 and O1–45 for the questionnaires and H1–H10 and O1–O6 for the interviews. I will use these numbers to report the findings of this study. To protect interviewee anonymity and confidentiality, the numbers of the interviews and questionnaires do not match.
Choosing the participants to interview

I conducted semi-structured, individual interviews so as to explore student teacher perceptions in more detail and—more specifically—to examine student teacher justifications and experiences relating to global perspectives and intercultural competence in the teaching profession. The interviewees, a number of whom had completed the online questionnaires, volunteered to participate.

Prior to the interviews at the University of Oulu, I sent the students in the TEKNO teacher training programme an email inviting them to attend individual interviews; their lecturer had told them, in his lectures, to expect this request. Initially, only two students showed an interest in attending. They remarked that English, the language of the interviews, might constrain some TEKNO student participation. Before 2014, English language teaching began in Grade Three at Finnish comprehensive schools—and later in Grade Two, with a new national core curriculum for basic education in 2014. However, all the courses in the TEKNO teacher training use Finnish. English language proficiency varied among the student teachers. Accordingly, I sent another round of emails to the student mailing list, informing them of the option of requesting an interpreter, so that the interview could occur in the language of their choice. Six students—four males and two females—attended interviews. While no-one requested an interpreter, I noted that some participants struggled to find appropriate English words. Therefore, I gave more time in each interview, when necessary, to clarifying ideas or statements, ensuring that the content was in line with the thoughts of each participant.

At Hiroshima University, lecturers told the student teachers about the possible interviews. Those student teachers, in turn, could sign up voluntarily to attend. Of the students volunteering, ten were invited whose schedule did not conflict with the dates of my visit to Hiroshima University. All those asked to attend were in their third year of teacher training, five males and five females in total. I held each interview in Japanese, the native language of the students and interviewer.

The gender balance is nearly similar among the two groups; namely, five females and five males in Hiroshima, two females and four males in Oulu. Most of the students in the TEKNO teacher training were male, meaning that more male students attended the interviews in that setting. Note that the Finnish participants were from different study year groups, while the Japanese participants were all in the same year of teacher training. I explore this difference when discussing the student teachers’ experiences of teacher education; the first-year students may have had fewer chances to reflect on their experiences of teacher training.
One might also state that the student teachers who volunteered to participate in the interview may have had an interest in, or prior experience with, intercultural issues—an interest or experience that led them to sign up for the interviews. I will consider this point carefully when analysing their perceptions.

4.5 Data collection and analysis

Figure 8 illustrates the research process of my data collection and analysis.

![Fig. 8. Stages of data collection and analysis.](image)

A sequential mixed methodology, sometimes called a “sequential form,” denotes cases in which one data type provides a basis for the collection of another data type (Cameron, 2009). A sequential mixed methodology uses multiple data collections and analyses in a sequence (Tashakkori & Teddlie, 2008). In the design of my study, responses gathered from my online questionnaire, the first data collected, served as a foundation on which to build questions for the semi-structured interviews, the second data collected. Subsequently, the data was enriched via interviews with teacher educators and with policy documents in both countries. This sequential process in a mixed methodology allowed the author to grasp, firstly, an overall picture of student views of global perspectives in the contexts at hand and, subsequently, to more deeply explore ways of understanding global perspectives in relation to teacher training.

4.5.1 The online questionnaire

The questions in the online questionnaires included closed-ended and open-ended questions, so as to collect data in a quantitative and qualitative manner. Each questionnaire contained ten questions on the “Survey Monkey” online platform. I pursued a mix of close-ended and open-ended questions—as attached in Appendix
for two reasons. Three close-ended questions sought to grasp potential patterns in student perceptions, as relating to global perspectives. Those close-ended questions offered students, in both contexts, the chance to draw an overall picture, while extracting differences and similarities among their views. Open-ended questions, by contrast, aimed to explore student ideas of global perspectives through fields of written text, in which they provided rich content. The space for written answers was confined to a maximum of one-hundred characters on the “Survey Monkey” platform, so student teachers had room to elaborate without feeling overwhelmed.

As this study aims to explore student teacher views in primary-school teacher training at the University of Oulu and Hiroshima University, purposive sampling (Teddlie & Yu, 2007) was applied to the questionnaire participants. The collaborative professors at Hiroshima University were helpful in distributing links to my online questionnaires. The Japanese students taking part in those surveys were attending a mandatory social-science subject pedagogy class at the time, in their third year of primary school teacher training. In Finland, I made contact with every primary school teacher training programme available. The lecturer from the technology-oriented programme agreed to ask student teachers to complete the survey. The student teachers in the Finnish group were attending technology-oriented primary school teacher training and were in different years of the programme.

The online questionnaires, again, included ten questions. Of those ten questions, two questions in particular focused on internationalising higher education, which I had considered initially to be the main focus of my research. Later, I narrowed the scope of this study to focus more specifically on teacher education. Therefore, my analysis does not include the students’ responses to the two questions on internationalisation. I developed the content of the following survey questions—see Table 2—to serve my three main research questions.
Table 2. A list of survey questions by category.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conceptualisations</td>
<td>Understanding global perspectives</td>
<td>In your understanding, how would you describe what “global perspectives” is in teacher’s profession?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purposes</td>
<td>Understanding the aims of global education/global citizenship education</td>
<td>What would you say are the aims of teaching global related issues, global education and/or global citizenship education to pupils in your future class, in your own words?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQ2. How do student teachers in Oulu and Hiroshima view the significance of global perspectives in relation to their profession as teachers?</td>
<td>Relevance: Perceptions of the significance of global perspectives in relation to their future teaching</td>
<td>Do you think that “global perspectives” is valued for your profession and therefore will help your career development as a teacher?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visibility</td>
<td>Perceptions of the internationalisation of higher education in daily life and in a home university</td>
<td>Thinking of the ongoing internationalization of higher education in Finland, which “internationalizing” activities are visible in the daily life at your home university?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQ3. How does teacher education support the development of global perspectives, according to the student teachers in Oulu and Hiroshima?</td>
<td>Overall level of support: The role of teacher education in developing global perspectives</td>
<td>To what extent do you agree that teacher education helps you to cultivate “global perspectives”?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The role of various aspects: The particular elements of teacher training</td>
<td>Which aspects of your teacher education have supported your “intercultural competence” and constructing a “global perspective”?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other opportunities: Outside teacher education</td>
<td>What are other activities, experience or people that have helped you to gain “global perspective” outside of teacher education?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expectations: The skills and knowledge student teachers hope to gain in the programme</td>
<td>What sort of knowledge and skills in relation to global perspectives should you be able to master after having completed this education program?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Under the first research question, the survey questions explored student teacher ideas of global perspectives and examined the aims of teaching global related issues, in terms of global education and global citizenship education. These two questions were open-ended, allowing the student teachers to describe their understanding freely.
For the second research question, the questions aimed to gain knowledge of how relevant global perspectives were perceived by the student teachers in relation to their future teaching. Besides conceptualising global perspectives, my aim was to gain knowledge and to discover any gap between the reality of teacher training and the local contexts at hand.

Finally, for the third research question, I posed a variety of survey questions to gain a multi-layered understanding of how student teachers view their current training and describe lack and opportunity in developing global perspectives. Therefore, the survey questions included queries regarding overall support, specific elements, opportunities outside teacher training, and expectations for the programme.

4.5.2 The interviews

The semi-structured interviews with student teachers

The second data-collection phase employed semi-structured interviews comprised of predetermined themes and questions (DiCicco-Bloom & Crabtree, 2006). One reason for using a semi-structured interview in this comparative research was to build on discoveries in my previous phase. Besides, semi-structured interviews allow a systematic use of chosen themes and offer space for new topics to arise (Barriaball & While, 1994).

I considered it important that the interviews in this study offer a certain flexibility in adopting and changing phrases while maintaining the meaning and essence of each question in a “standardised” structure, so as to facilitate comparisons at a later stage (Barriaball & While, 1994). A semi-structured interview does not only offer an interviewer a certain choice of words; it provides space to use suitable probes (ibid.). Therefore, individual opinions and experiences were explored in depth and were followed by clarifying questions. Prior to the interviews, I prepared an interview guide (see Appendix 1) in order to use the limited interview time effectively, in a systematic and comprehensive manner, while keeping the interactions lively and focused on my research themes (Hopf, 1997, p. 2004).

One should consider the danger of social desirability in the context of any individual interview (Barriaball & While, 1994); specifically, that an interviewee may have answered using “preferred” social responses. To overcome this potential
problem, I used various interactive icebreakers to break tensions and barriers while maintaining rapport with the student teachers. Each student was also given a brief overview of this doctoral study at the start of the interview—and was informed of the confidentiality of the data and that only the researcher would handle the data. Each interview lasted approximately forty minutes and was recorded using a voice recorder.

4.5.3 Additional information

The semi-structured interviews with teacher educators

In addition to the questionnaires and interviews with student teachers in Oulu and Hiroshima, this research included semi-structured interviews with teacher educators, in order to answer research question three in particular. Research question three asks for an exploration of how teacher training supports the development of global perspectives.

This study’s principal data came from those student teachers who shared their perceptions of their teacher training. Concurrently, however, it was crucial to gather perspectives from the teacher educators who build, design, and provide teacher training for teachers and future teachers specifically. The primary focus of this study is student teachers, but when discussing teacher training, the voices of teacher educators may help in understanding student perceptions—and by offering additional contextual information. I conducted many lengthy discussions with staff members during the research process. However, four systematic interviews, each lasting approximately sixty minutes, were held with professors, experienced teacher educators. Of those interviewed, two were from Oulu and two from Hiroshima. Data gathered from those teacher educators was examined and used supplementarily, therefore, in order to gain more information about policies, curricula, and institutions. This data was collected to enrich and elaborate on the other findings of this research.

Policy papers concerning the internationalisation of higher education

To avoid showing micro-level findings on global perspectives in teacher training exclusively, it was important to explore the macro-level educational climate through the lens of the contexts chosen. Chapter 2, above, studies the
internationalisation policies in each country. My “Discussion” chapter examines policy papers when reflecting on the findings of this research. The two policy papers analysed most profoundly in this study are “The strategy for Internationalisation of Higher Education Institutions in Finland 2009–2015” (FNBE2009) and “Higher education required for the globalisation era (Reports)” or, in Japanese, “guro-baruna Jidaini motomerareru koutou kyouiku no arikata nit suite” (Central Education Committee, 2002). The Finnish paper was the latest strategy document published on the internationalisation of higher education in Finland at the time of my data collection. Recently, a newer internationalisation strategy on Finnish higher education was published (The Ministry of Education and Culture 2017).

**Collaboration with teacher educators and field notes**

During this study, I had numerous discussions and correspondence with teacher trainers in Finland and Japan, who shared their insights. Collaborator support was extremely important to conducting a comparative study on the two contexts in question, particularly because Oulu and Hiroshima are physically distant from each other. The discussions with teacher educators were not recorded, but they contributed to the development of this study, enriching the data, providing information about each context, and supplementing my interpretations.

Although the duration of my visit to Japan was somewhat limited, I observed four lectures and three seminars and had face-to-face discussions with professors, researchers, and teacher educators from Hiroshima University, Hiroshima City University, the University of Shizuoka, and the University of Nagoya—while visiting Hiroshima University. Those researchers, who were also teacher trainers, shared their experiences of teacher training and of higher education at Japanese universities. Some of that discussion happened on the basis of the “interview guide” for student teachers. I took eight pages of notes during the conversations, although they were not recorded on tape.

I had a great deal of professional support from the University of Oulu. Many discussions covered topics such as teacher training, global education, intercultural education, the internationalisation of higher education, and many others. As in Japan, I did not record the interviews. However, the discussions were important for developing meaningful dialogue about Finnish teacher education—and proved fruitful and enriching towards the interpretation and the conclusions of my results.
I kept a research diary during the research process, which consisted of approximately two-hundred pages altogether.

4.6 Data analysis

The following section discusses quantitative content analysis and qualitative thematic analysis.

4.6.1 Quantitative content analysis

To analyse the quantitative data collected from my closed-ended questions, I chose a quantitative content analysis (Rourke & Anderson, 2004) so as to capture an overall picture of student perceptions and to test statistical differences between the groups using a quantitative content-analysis model (Rourke & Anderson, 2004), examining trends and frequencies in the data. This analysis was applied in order to capture an overview of the student views on global perspectives and to collect information about their perceived experiences of teacher training.

Table 3 lists three closed-ended questions that were used to collect data for research questions two and three.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Questions</th>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>Questionnaire</th>
<th>Expected knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RQ2: How do student teachers in Oulu and Hiroshima see the role and significance of global perspectives in relation to their future teaching profession as teachers?</td>
<td>[Relevancy] Perception on global perspectives in relation to their future teaching</td>
<td>1) Do you think that “global perspectives” is valued for your profession and therefore will help your career development as a teacher?</td>
<td>To what extent student teachers value GP and/or see it as relevant for their future teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQ3. How does teacher education support the development of global perspectives, according to the student teachers in Oulu and Hiroshima?</td>
<td>[Overall level of support] The role of teacher training in developing global perspectives</td>
<td>2) To what extent do you agree that teacher education helps you to cultivate “global perspectives”?</td>
<td>Whether or not student teachers view the role of teacher training as significant in developing global perspectives</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (hereafter SPSS) I analysed statistically the questionnaire responses to the above closed-ended questions. That quantitative content analysis enabled a calculation of the means percentages and standard deviation of each closed-ended question. I then used an independent “t-test” between the two student groups, to examine the statistical significance of the difference between them.

Note that this study, in its early stages, employed this statistical data in order to arrive at an overall picture of global perspectives—and to ascertain how student teachers view the idea and phenomenon in question, in relation to their teaching career. These statistical findings helped in guiding the qualitative phase of this research, therefore, and enabled the author to examine areas that require further exploration. When comparing the two cases, the t-test—which measured the statistical significance of differences and similarities—was crucial to my analysis, inviting further discussion.

More specifically, the first closed-ended question asked if student teachers consider the importance of learning about global perspectives. To develop the qualitative phase of this research, it was essential to first obtain a general picture of student perceptions of GP as a whole, in both contexts. A rapidly changing world affects the life of every person on the globe. As a consequence, I contend, the question on the future life and work of student teachers is highly relevant.

The second closed-ended question concerned the role of teacher training in developing global perspectives, according to the views of the student teachers. My statistical analysis helped to pinpoint differences and similarities in the views of student teachers on the teacher education they were attending. Since the selected teacher training in Oulu and Hiroshima did not focus in particular on intercultural
education, I compared the responses to explore the perceived reality of general primary-school teacher training in the two contexts.

Finally, the third closed-ended question examined the importance of various elements of teacher education; specifically, to what extent student teachers regard those elements as helpful towards the development of global perspectives. The statistical overview and “t-test” results have indicated—and helped to identify—potential areas to be explored more closely in the qualitative phase of this study. Those elements included exams, peer support, assignments, curricula, and professor knowledge. The statistical overview guided the qualitative interview phase, which aimed to comprehend the learning experiences significant in developing the global perspectives of the student teachers in question.

4.6.2 Qualitative thematic analysis

To analyse the qualitative data gathered, in this study, via open-ended questions in questionnaires and through semi-structured interviews, I used a qualitative thematic analysis (see, for example, Attride-Stirling, 2001; Boyatzis, 1998; Guest et al., 2012; Thomas & Harden, 2008). A thematic analysis is “a way of seeing” that is used to sense relevant patterns—and to discover relevant themes in a series of transcripts (Boyatzis, 1998). Thematic analysis, a method very commonly used in qualitative research, guides studies to capture the complexities of meaning in their respective data (Guest et al., 2012; Thomas & Harden, 2008). One may understand a “theme” in this context as a thread or category of significance or as an item of interest concerning the research questions (Braun & Clarke, 2006).

The process of thematic analysis can be exploratory or inductive, in which case themes emerge from the data. Alternatively, one might analyse data via pre-assigned theoretical lenses. Sometimes, a thematic analysis may apply to both inductive and deductive approaches (Fereday & Muir-Cochrane, 2006). This study stands principally on a deductive approach, using the theoretical framework as built. I used a rubric—developed for thematic analysis—to identify thematic areas offering knowledge of the pre-assigned themes. Those themes rested on theoretical frameworks built on Hanvey’s global perspectives, on Gaudelli’s heuristics, and on critical pedagogy. My analysis aimed to identify trends and reoccurrences systematically, in relation to global perspectives.

Considerable time was spent developing the preliminary rubric necessary to build a solid understanding of the themes of this study. The rubric was then revisited and revised in a cyclic process, as my understanding of theoretical aspects deepened.
Meanwhile, my thematic analysis was not limited to the pre-assigned categories, but included other categories, so as to leave space for themes that were unexpected or needed further exploration. Table 4 shows an overview of the rubric.

Table 4. Research rubric used in the qualitative thematic analysis of this study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preassigned theme</th>
<th>Coding rules</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hanvey’s global perspectives and critical pedagogy</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. <em>Perspective consciousness</em></td>
<td>Being aware of their own assumptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. <em>State-of-the-planet awareness</em></td>
<td>Challenging what is taken for granted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. <em>Cross-cultural awareness</em></td>
<td>Becoming aware of world events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. <em>Knowledge of global dynamics</em></td>
<td>Gaining an understanding of world events via multiple media modes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. <em>Awareness of human choices</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. <em>Action for change</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. <em>Challenging power relations</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gaudell’s heuristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. <em>A neoliberal orientation</em></td>
<td>Recognising views and practices from different cultures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. <em>A nationalistic orientation</em></td>
<td>Valuing empathy, tolerance, and a sense of unity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. <em>A humanistic orientation</em></td>
<td>Understanding the interrelationships of different aspects of world problems and phenomena</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. <em>A transformational orientation</em></td>
<td>Realising consequences at local and global levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Others</strong></td>
<td>Combining the above four forms of awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recognising the issue of sustainability in making rational choices considering many elements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acting for equity and social justice, as a grassroots activist seeking alternative realities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Realising privileges, power imbalances, questioning socio-cultural factors that lie behind things</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Others</strong></td>
<td><em>Items that did not fit into the pre-assigned themes</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The above table, on the basis of the theoretical framework developed, displays a number of defined codes. With those codes in mind, I began to examine every sentence and statement that appeared important in relation to global perspectives—and/or relevant to discussions of teacher training. I did not code every element of each text; rather, I reviewed the sentence as a whole. Here, as an example of a qualitative analysis, is a response from a student describing global perspectives:

“Recognising efforts from foreign countries and understanding the differences. Based on the reality in Japan, it’s about referring to practices in other countries in order to extend Japan’s strength.” (H15)

The student relates the suggested goal, *obtaining global perspectives*, to increasing the strength of the Japanese nation. One may interpret that perception as a sign of nationalistic thinking. While learning from other countries is important, advancing one’s country—rather than regional or global development—seems a priority, according to this student. This passage is coded with the message “extend one’s nation” under a “nationalistic orientation.” The following, again, exemplifies a qualitative analysis.

“Everyone has the same basic needs they are trying to meet. It is about teaching ecological values and respect for diversity. It is about teaching that there is no right or wrong way to live...It is teaching empathy and higher understanding of yourself and others.” (O27)

The above passage by the student teacher was coded for inclusion in a *humanistic* orientation. The patterns of a humanistic orientation are visible in this student’s strong sense of universal rights for all, as reflected in use of the terms “empathy” and “universal needs.” Table 5 summarises the above examples.

**Table 5. An overview of two examples in a qualitative analysis.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data extract</th>
<th>Main theme</th>
<th>Coded for</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Recognizing efforts from foreign countries and understanding the difference. Based on the reality in Japan, it is about referring to practices in other countries, in order to extend Japan’s strength</td>
<td>Nationalistic orientations</td>
<td>1. Extending one’s nation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Everyone has the same basic needs they are trying to meet. It is about teaching ecological values and respect for diversity. It is about teaching that there is no right or wrong way to live...It is teaching empathy and higher understanding of yourself and others.</td>
<td>Humanistic orientation</td>
<td>1. Universal needs and equality 2. Empathic thinking</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As these examples show, I looked not only for the associated words in each case, but for patterns and meanings embedded in these passages. One should remember that a theoretical framework serves as a guiding analytical tool. However, I also tried to keep my eyes and mind open for anything that did not match my pre-set categories. Data that did not appear to fit any pre-assigned themes was coded under “Others,” so that I could examine it further at a later time.

Once my initial coding was devised, I reviewed each item of data under the pre-assigned codes, to check if I had categorised those items similarly. I also checked if any data had remained outside the themes of my developed rubric. I considered that rubric—which I developed according to Hanvey, Gaudelli, and critical pedagogy—in order to provide a satisfactory tool for the analysis in this study. However, in that process, new categories emerged, particularly when analysing the rationales offered for learning GP in teacher training.

My next step was to review the themes and coded data under each theme using the NVivo data analysis software. Those themes were adjusted and rephrased as necessary, so that they reflected the entire content of the data. I also considered it important to explore relations between the main themes and sub-themes of the data. For example, data coded under a “humanistic orientation” theme contained two sub-themes, “humanistic ideals” and “acceptance of difference.” The following chapter will present the findings of this study.
5 Findings

This chapter summarises the findings of my research on Finnish and Japanese student teacher views, including one, student teacher ideas on global perspectives (GP); two, student teacher views on the significance of GP for future teaching in primary schools; and three, student teacher views on the presence of GP in each teacher training programme. Each sub-chapter in this chapter presents findings pertaining to one research question. I discuss the results of the interviews and questionnaires together. Table 6 revisits my research questions.

Table 6. List of research questions and data used to respond.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research questions</th>
<th>Data analysed</th>
<th>Sub-chapters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RQ1: How do student teachers conceptualise global perspectives in relation to their future teaching, in Oulu and Hiroshima?</td>
<td>-Questionnaires (open-ended items)</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQ2: How do student teachers in Oulu and Hiroshima see the role and significance of global perspectives in relation to their profession as teachers?</td>
<td>-Questionnaires (closed alternative items) -Interviews</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How does teacher education support the development of global perspectives, according to the student teachers in Oulu and Hiroshima?</td>
<td>-Questionnaires (closed alternative items) -Interviews</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sub-chapter 5.4, the concluding part of this chapter, will discuss the ethics, validity, and reliability of this doctoral study. Chapter 6, “Discussion,” will combine all the findings of this research and will consider them in more detail, ending with the concluding remarks of this study.

5.1 RQ1: Conceptualising GP

This section focuses on the student teachers’ conceptualisations of global perspectives. The findings for the first research question, “How do student teachers conceptualise global perspectives in relation to their future teaching?” will be presented using an illustrated map, Figure 9, and via discussions on each cluster identified. These clusters are one, an “aim of teaching global perspectives,” two, “advancing the country and country as a point of reference,” three, a “value-base
and acceptance of difference,” four, a “critical and reflective attitude,” and five, an “implicit neoliberal thinking.”

Fig. 9. A mapping of this study’s findings, including the student teachers’ views of Hanvey’s goals, with the addition of critical pedagogy in the centre of the illustration—and Gaudelli’s approaches in the outer circle.

The views of the student teachers in this study often combined more general aims, rather than identifying with one single theme; for example, with a nationalistic orientation exclusively. Therefore, in the above analytical framework, arrows represent “clusters,” drawing linkages between more general aims and specific orientations—for example, towards advancing the nation. This particular part of the analysis is not intended to illustrate statistical evidence, but to depict the variety of student teacher perceptions in relation to my aims and orientations.

The boxes in the middle of Figure 9 represent views evident in both sets of data, Finnish and Japanese. The dotted arrows in grey—for example, “advancing the country”—indicate views that were only identifiable among Japanese student teachers. The arrows in brown with straight lines—for example, a “critical and reflective attitude”—are perceptions captured only among Finnish student teachers.
**GP aims common to both cases**

Many student teachers shared their ideas using general or somewhat abstract descriptions. Reflecting on my analytical model, which incorporates Hanvey’s definitions of GP (see Sub-chapter 3.3.2), two aims—“perspective consciousness” and “cross-cultural awareness”—were associated commonly with GP in the views gathered from the Japanese and Finnish student teachers.

Reverberations of Hanvey’s first aim, “perspective consciousness,” are evident in the perceptions of student teachers in both cases. GP was conceptualised in Oulu, for example, as, “Knowledge and understanding about own values and way of life and their connection to history of one’s own country” (O40). Many student teachers in both groups echoed perspective consciousness, stressing that GP as an idea means not only understanding one’s own context, but acquiring perspectives that are “multidimensional,” “broad,” “diverse,” “multi-faceted,” “wide,” and “holistic”—for example, one Japanese student remarked that “It [GP] is a multidimensional view and a way of thinking that incorporates not only a view from Japan but from the world” (H69).

One may identify a mix of descriptive phrases among the perceptions of both the Finnish and Japanese student teachers. However, the views they expressed mostly lacked an articulation of the complexities of what GP really means for a teacher. Such results resonate with Castro’s (2010) findings on pre-service teacher views of cultural diversity; specifically, with Castro’s discovery of an uncritical engagement that potentially limits a teacher’s critical consciousness. General, even simplistic notions may indicate that a student teacher lacks a comprehension of diversity, difference, and a contextual politics of knowledge, which are essential to developing a critical consciousness (Bruce, 2014). In this case, although the students’ views on Hanvey’s aims are positive as such, a tendency to oversimplify should—I contend—be amended through ethics and citizenship education to address their future teaching.

“Cross-cultural awareness,” another aim, was commonly, similarly identifiable in both cases, in the ideas of the Finnish and Japanese student teachers. On understanding others from different cultures, a Finnish student teacher stated that global perspectives are, “Knowledge about different values, thinking and actions among people from different nations. Understanding about why people have different opinions and practices” (O40). One Japanese teacher defined global perspectives as to “view other culture, without cultural stereotypes” (H19) and another as to “understand and accept other’s perspective from their point of view
without culturally constrained view of other cultures” (H21). These views cohere with Hanvey’s definition (1976, 1982), according to which a cross-cultural awareness encourages a person to learn from the perspectives of others in terms of different values, thinking, or practices, prompting that person to ponder beyond stereotypes and prejudices (Hanvey, 2004).

One might expect that different levels of cross-cultural awareness exist. Milton Bennet (1993) often discussed such levels in relation to different stages of intercultural sensitivity. Nonetheless, teacher attitudes to challenging stereotypical thinking and cultural generalisation are crucial to acknowledging the complexities of the globalised world and developing an appreciation for diversity (Merryfield, 2002).

The aim cross-cultural awareness can be found to similar extents in the views of both the Finnish and Japanese student teachers in this study, with the exception that the Japanese student teachers frequently mentioned “Japan” or their “own country” when describing global perspectives. See, for example:

“Without being bound by typical Japanese customs and culture, it’s the ability to understand goodness and become familiar with different cultures.” (H53)

“To understand the culture of other countries and understand Japanese culture in relation to the rest of the world.” (H31)

“To accept the culture of multinational, and also to respect the Japanese culture.” (H60)

“Not to get caught up in a Japanese way of thinking and Japanese culture. So it’s important to learn about foreign countries!” (H75)

Remarkably, such frequent references to a nation state or country were prevalent only among the Japanese student teachers. I will revisit and discuss this distinctive characteristic of response under the cluster “advancing the country.”

As compared to the above two aims—“perspective consciousness” and “cross-cultural awareness”—the student teachers associated a “state of planet awareness,” “knowledge of global dynamics,” an “awareness of human choices,” “action for change,” and “challenging power relations” more rarely with GP. Table 7 summarises their responses as they relate to the aims listed.
Table 7. A summary of planet awareness, global dynamics, human choices, action for change, and challenging power relations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aims</th>
<th>Oulu</th>
<th>Hiroshima</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State of planet awareness</td>
<td>-An awareness of international and national issues and of global events and phenomena</td>
<td>-Interested in the events of the world, in the mechanisms of the world economy and societies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of global dynamics</td>
<td>-Understanding interconnectedness and its implications in the globalised world</td>
<td>-Understanding the value of international cooperation for our lives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness of human choices</td>
<td>-Understanding our responsibility for sustainable living and environment, making rational choices</td>
<td>-Determining whether to agree or disagree based on various factors, making rational choices and acting with responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action for change</td>
<td>-Acting to improve things</td>
<td>(No data was coded here)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Acting towards the prevention of racism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenging power relations</td>
<td>(implicit)-Critically considering the current situation in Finland and other cultures</td>
<td>(No data was coded here)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although one might observe similar signs of the first three aims—of a “state of planet awareness,” a “knowledge of global dynamics,” and an “awareness of human choices”—in the Finnish and Japanese contexts, the last two aims, “action for change” and “challenging power relations,” were detectable among the Finnish student teachers only. For example, one Finnish student teacher described global perspectives in relation to multiculturalism as follows: “Teachers should value multiculturalism and not be afraid of it (like many Finns are). They should talk about it in class and make multiculturalism a normal thing for children (that’s how racism could maybe be prevented)” (O#7). As critical pedagogy supports this particular aim, “action for change” requires an active, critical engagement that may contribute to eradicating perpetuated issues such as racism.

Regarding the other critical aim, “challenging power relations,” only one interviewee, as shown below, identified that aim as implicitly carrying the essence of the theme at hand. This Finnish student teacher expressed critical questions that might support engaging with and resolving power imbalances.

“[Global perspectives is about] teaching children how their actions affect the whole world. It is teaching how other cultures live. It is critically thinking why
we live like we do? What connects everyone? It is teaching that there is no right or wrong way to live” (O#27)

This particular statement shows signs of a critical attitude that seeks to examine historical and socio-cultural factors, in order to understand inequality and power relationships in the world. The Japanese student teacher data showed no signs of critical aims such as action for change or challenging power relations.

Now that I have shown how the perceptions of the student teachers in this study reflect Hanvey’s GP aims (see Sub-chapter 5.1), the following text will focus on the clusters observable in the data, clusters that connect intimately to Gaudelli’s four orientations of global citizenship.

A nationalistic orientation: Advancing the country and nation-state as a point of reference

Among the voices in the two groups, only the Japanese student teachers expressed an understanding of global perspectives that indicated signs of a nationalistic tendency and included references to national identity. One Japanese student teacher defined their understanding of global perspectives as follows:

“Recognizing efforts from foreign countries and understand the difference. Based on the reality in Japan, refer to practices in other countries where needed, in order to extend Japan’s strength.” (H15)

A concern for the advancement of the nation is reflected in the rationale for GP in several student perceptions. Another Japanese student stated that,

“Japanese education is not everything and there are different curricula in foreign countries. It is about considering and taking ideas from abroad in order to create better Japanese education.” (H9)

Another Japanese student teacher stressed that a knowledge and understanding of one’s nation and national identity is a prerequisite to obtaining global perspectives.

“It starts from having a deep understanding of one’s own country and one’s national identity. Then, from a globally oriented view, global perspectives can be developed when one can once again discuss their own country.” (H78)
Explicitly and implicitly, the Japanese student teachers viewed global perspectives as necessary to contributing to national advancement and to improving national education by borrowing and implementing good practices from abroad. In some part, this echoes the sentiment shared by Banks (2004), who stressed that developing national and cultural identifications among students and teachers contributes to the growing of reflective identities in global communities. In other words, argues Banks, global perspectives may not be constituted without students’ knowledge of their own country or a sense of national and cultural identity. Contrary to the views of the Japanese students, the above nationalistic tendencies—including references to national identity—were not visible among the voices of Finnish student teachers, as I will explore below.

Also, reoccurring patterns occurred among the Japanese student teachers, who often voiced phrases such as “Japan,” “my/our own country,” and “Japanese identity” when describing their understanding of global perspectives. At the beginning of my analysis, I did not expect such a high frequency of this type of GP description. However, of 99 qualitative responses in the Japanese questionnaires (skipped responses=10), thirty-seven Japanese student teachers used one or more of the above terms—for example “Japan” or “country”—as a point of reference when making statements about global perspectives. By contrast, only two Finnish student teachers out of forty-five respondents (skipped responses=4) referenced “Finland” when discussing global perspectives.

Such references to one’s country are not explicit signs of a nationalistic tendency. However, reocurring references to a “nation state” show that the Japanese student teachers tended to conceptualise global perspectives in a vision bounded by the territorial sphere of that nation state. Interestingly, an emphasis on “Japan” or a “Japanese identity” is also implied in various Japanese educational policy papers. Japanese cultural nationalism is supported by a myth of homogeneity and uniqueness represented in national education policies. As Parmenter (1999) argues, “the assumption of national homogeneity provides the foundation for the country’s emphasis on the role of education in developing students’ self-awareness as a Japanese person and emotional attachment to the nation” (p. 456). Various Japanese strategies—including plans for the internationalisation of higher education, and curriculum guidelines (see for example MEXT, 2011)—repeat references to developing self-awareness as a Japanese person. Moreover, the policy documents in question encourage potential exclusion and assimilation, but also see globalisation and growing interconnectivity as rationales to promote nationalistic
policies, stressing the culture and traditions of one’s own nation in the era of a global market-based economy (see Aspinall, 2010; Parmenter, 2006).

**Neoliberal orientation: Represented only implicitly through nationalistic signs**

Neoliberal orientations have been described as a “major discussion” in the discourse of global citizenship education (Gaudelli, 2009). Therefore, I incorporated them into my adjusted analytical tool (see Figure 6). Neoliberal orientations did not arise explicitly in the student teacher perceptions. However, an implicit link to nationalistic tendencies was evident among the responses of the Japanese student teachers. The primary goals of neoliberal thinking are economic gain and the growth of capital on the basis of free-market *laissez faire* (Friedman, 2000). Despite the growing interconnectivity of the global markets, the legal framework of nation states remains a relevant basis for many transnational companies and their economic activities. Therefore, the student teacher ideas of global perspectives that align with nationalistic thinking—for example, in “extending Japan’s strengths” (H15)—connect implicitly to neoliberal orientations. As the Finnish student teachers did not demonstrate any nationalistic signs in their ideas, I could find no evidence of any neoliberal tendencies in the Finnish data.

**Humanistic orientation: Humanistic ideals and an acceptance of difference**

Humanistic ideals were much more visible among the voices of the Finnish student teachers and were less explicit among the voices of the Japanese student teachers. Therefore, the student teachers in Oulu showed humanistic principles *explicitly* when describing their understanding of global perspectives. Many Finnish student teacher answers began by acknowledging a positive, humanistic attitude towards difference; for example, through the concerns of a global perspective:

“Realizing that various schooling systems differ from one another on many scales. Global perspective means you appreciate what you have and try to make it better there and everywhere else.” (O39)

The concerns of liberal humanists include the advancement of everyone, as reflected in the above statement, “make it better [in Finland] and everywhere else.” In summary, this study identified humanistic-related ideas in its student responses;
namely, “unity,” “co-operation,” “equality,” and “empathy.” The key principles of humanistic ideals are embedded in the Finnish student perceptions. For example, global perspectives are as follows.

“Ability to find a common ground with people who think differently so that co-operation in unity is possible.” (O40)

“To try to learn from others and make co-operation with one another...At least in equality which I consider very important. Though I do not deny our problems with student comfort in school.” (O6)

“It is sense of empathy in cultural understanding.” (O17).

According to liberal humanists, unity and co-operation are important collective principles for overcoming conflict between different cultures, regions, and religions in the world (Pike, 2008). Universal goals such as social equality and human rights are important to obtaining a humanistic perspective and promoting benefits for everyone on the earth. Ideals of empathy and compassion are often incorporated into human rights education and multicultural education. Developing a nation requires the immediate attention of those with better conditions. Developed countries should take actions towards making a better world (Hanvey, 2004; Nussbaum, 2002).

The following excerpt of the views of a Finnish student teacher also expresses humanistic sentiments from a global perspective.

“Everyone has the same basic needs they are trying to meet. It is about teaching ecological values and respect for diversity. It is about teaching that there is no right or wrong way to live... It is teaching empathy and higher understanding of yourself and others.” (O27)

By comparison, the Japanese student teachers conceptualised GP via expressions that contained more implicit humanistic ideas, using relatively simple, general descriptions of “accepting” or “respecting” others. See the following example.

“It is about trying to understand and accept people coming from abroad who have a different language and culture, even though it is not easy to communicate…. It is about realising how cooperation with foreign countries is essential in our lives.” (H36)

The distinct difference between the Finnish and Japanese student teachers in relation to humanistic orientations is, I contend, that Finnish student teachers
referred to liberal humanistic ideals such as unity, empathy, and equality that are well-known from international declarations, whereas—as in the above quote, H36—Japanese student teachers more clearly addressed international human and cultural interrelations.

Considering the humanistic orientation and a clear difference between the two student groups, one should note that the Finnish core curriculum stresses humanistic ideals, including equity, human rights, democracy, and sustainable development (Finnish National Core Curriculum, 2014). Conversely, the “Strategy for the Internationalization of Higher Education Institutions in Finland 2009–2015” is more complex in this respect. That plan has some neoliberal goals, such as to export Finnish education. However, it also pursue some humanistic goals such as global responsibility and respecting diversity. I have shown that the emphasis of the Japanese policy papers lies more clearly in advancing their “own” nation.

A transformational orientation: Critical action and reflection

Before analysing the data, I feared it might be impossible to find signs of a transformation-facing orientation among the voices of the student teachers. I was concerned that the key principles of critical humanists—such as a “redistribution of wealth and power”—might be too challenging for student teachers to explore or relate to, when asked to discuss global perspectives in their teacher training in the limited writing space of the questionnaire.

Critical humanistic orientations consider critical pedagogy and education-for-all to be essential ideas. The views of the student teachers, as captured in their responses, displayed critical and reflective attitudes. For example, one Finnish student discussed critical humanism as follows.

“It is teaching to children how their actions affect the whole world. It is teaching how other cultures live. It is critically thinking why we live like we do, what connects everyone.” (O27)

As this Oulu student states, to be engaged critically as a teacher means encouraging students to seek diverse, alternative views of cultures and ways of life—even globally (cross-reference Burbules & Berk, 1999; Cohran-Smith, 2003; Merryfield, 2002). Advocates for critical global citizenship education also encourage students and teachers to examine and understand historical, political, and socio-cultural connections critically, in relation to the reproduction of perpetuated issues in
society (Eidoo et al., 2011). The following is another example from the Finnish data set.

“Global perspective would be to try to learn from others and make co-operation with one another. But today everybody seems to be focusing so much about learning from Finland that we don’t really know how we could learn from others. And perhaps I have been brainwashed too that our system is potentially the best” (O6)

While the above quote evokes the famous “Finnish miracle of PISA” (Simola, 2005), this student teacher’s critical, reflective attitude suggests that “global perspectives” potentially involve a challenging of normative thinking and presuppositions—which, again, demands contextual reconsideration by seeking alternative views (see Burbules & Berk, 1999; Cohran-Smith, 2003). Among the Japanese students, no clear signs of critical or reflective views were evident in the voices of the student teachers in Hiroshima. Chapter 6, “Discussion,” will reflect on the above differences in more detail.

**Summary of the findings for RQ1**

The findings for RQ1 reveal that the student teacher perceptions in this study were similar and different both in and across the clusters. In many respects, the ideas of the student teachers regarding global perspectives reflected Hanvey’s model (1976, 1982), while perspectives derived from critical pedagogy, such as “action for change” and “challenging power relations,” were less visible. Of Hanvey’s aims, the most dominant in the data were a *perspective consciousness* and *cross-cultural awareness*. Hanvey’s remaining aims—a state-of-planet awareness, knowledge of global dynamics, and an awareness of human choices—were mentioned by the student teachers but were much less visible in the data in both cases.

Conversely, remarkable differences were evident between Finnish and Japanese student teacher perceptions with reference to Gaudelli’s model of global citizenship orientations. In summary, Japanese students expressed nationalistic tendencies more often than their Finnish counterparts, who stressed humanistic principles. Neoliberal and transformational orientations were more difficult to detect in all the data.
5.2 RQ2: The significance of GP in the teaching profession

This section presents the findings of this study in response to the second research question, RQ, “How do student teachers in Oulu and Hiroshima view the significance and the role of global perspectives in relation to their profession as a teacher?” My presentation is in two parts. I first offer a statistical overview of the students’ views on the importance of GP (see Sub-chapter 5.2.1). I then present findings based on the qualitative data, as relating to the rationales of GP for teachers (see Sub-chapter 5.2.2).

5.2.1 The statistical overview: The importance of GP for future teachers

A quantitative content analysis (Rourke & Anderson, 2004) calculates statistical figures such as mean values and standard deviation, in order to show the distribution of data and average scores. Independent t-sample tests identified statistically significant differences in the two student teacher groups. I computed all my statistical data using SPSS. Table 8 summarises the SPSS analysis of the statistics, including mean values, standard deviations, and significance levels from independent t-tests.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q</th>
<th>University¹</th>
<th>N²</th>
<th>Skipped</th>
<th>Mean³</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Levene’s Test (sig)</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means (sig, 2 tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GP valued for teaching career</td>
<td>UOULU</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>.738</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HU</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>.601</td>
<td>0.759</td>
<td>0.498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¹HU: Hiroshima University, UOULU: University of Oulu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>²N=45(UOULU), N=99(HU)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>³Scales (1-4): Strongly agree (4), agree (3), disagree (2), strongly disagree (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The statistical data shows that student teachers in Oulu and Hiroshima have observed and agreed, to a similar extent, that global perspectives are important to teaching (UOULU=3.17, HU=3.25, P=0.498). The P-value calculated in the t-test is insignificant (P<0.5), indicating that no statistically significant difference exists between the two cases. In other words, both groups view global perspectives as similarly relevant and important when considering their future teaching. These
statistical results contributed, therefore, to the construction of my semi-structured interviews, which aimed to explore the students’ perceptions in greater depth. The following section will present findings from the interviews regarding student teacher rationales for perceiving GP and its significance to teachers.

### 5.2.2 Qualitative results on the rationales for the significance of GP

Through my semi-structured interviews, conducted to explore student teacher rationales for valuing GP in more detail, I identified a breadth of perceptions in both settings. As Figure 10 shows, one might group, again, the views of the student teachers in this study according to Hanvey’s global perspectives—and locate them in Gaudelli’s model of orientations. However, certain categories emerged from the data; specifically, reflecting on a *changing school environment* and on *uncertainty about the future*.

![Fig. 10. Mapping rationales for the significance of GP.](image)

Therefore, the following text will discuss the four rationales previously mentioned; namely, *one*, a “cross-cultural awareness,” *two*, a “perspective consciousness,” *three*, “knowledge of global dynamics,” and *four*, an “awareness of one’s own
choices.” It will also consider two other rationales, a “changing school environment” and “uncertainty about the future.”

At this point, I should state that—on the basis of my theoretical framework for GP—I have analysed the findings of this study, in response to research question one, using the rubric and discussing each theme independently in the previous section. For research question two, which focuses on the role and significance of global perspectives in relation to the teaching profession, I coded most of the data using a combination of Hanvey’s five aims and Gaudelli’s four orientations. This was, I contend, a relatively natural coding process. The student teachers shared their views of rationales for global perspectives, not only by describing the possible goals of teaching GP, but in the language of their views, which indicated an orientation towards a consideration of global perspectives. For example, I coded the perceptions of some student teachers under the aim “cross-cultural awareness,” although I had also coded the same data under a “humanistic orientation.” The following text will discuss the findings for research question two.

A cross-cultural awareness rationale in a humanistic orientation

The Finnish and Japanese student teachers most often specified Hanvey’s goal of “cross-cultural awareness” as a rationale for the importance of teaching GP. The Finnish student teachers described the nature of the teaching profession in terms that cast acquiring GP as a necessity. According to that description, the duty of a teacher is to guide pupils to become aware of different cultures, practices, traditions, and ways of thinking:

“A teacher has to understand there are different kind of people from different cultures and how they are used to.” (O5)

These student teachers’ emphases on the professional and pedagogical roles of teachers align with the sentiment proffered by Banks (2004); namely, that a teacher must be prepared to accommodate a wider range of diversities and be ready to teach students about the complexity of diversity. Another Finnish student teacher shares a similar view on the rationale for diversity, referring to teaching roles as follows.

The most important mission for school teacher is to try to help children to start to take into account other people better so that all would be equal … if you (we) could live in unity, we would all create something much better.” (O1)
The views of this student teacher offer an example of Hanvey’s “cross-cultural awareness” that contains humanistic ideals of “unity” and “equality” (see Noddings, 2005; Nussbaum, 2002). Reflecting on these humanistic concepts, the Finnish students in question argued that GP is necessary, not only to guide pupils to better understanding different cultures, but to bring people with different backgrounds together proactively for solidarity. Another Finnish example echoes an essential element of a humanistic orientation as relating to cross-cultural awareness.

“You don’t have to think them <pupils from different backgrounds> separately but they are like one pupil among others and it doesn’t matter whatever they look like or where do you come from” (O6).

The voices of these Finnish student teachers display a positive attitude and open-mindedness towards difference and diversity. However, the humanistic attitudes of those student teachers may be subject to critique for risking “color-blindness,” “ethnocentrism,” or “Eurocentrism,” unless they acknowledge and reflect critically upon the complexities of interconnectivity and unequal power relations (see Castro, 2010; Gilbert, 1997; Taylor, 2011).

Conversely, the student teachers in Hiroshima did not indicate obvious signs of explicit humanistic values in terms of unity, equality, and solidarity; rather, they reflected on GP when considering how to interact with different cultures. One Japanese student teacher gave an illuminating example of observing a weekend craft workshop, reacting to an attendee not originally from Japan with surprise and a sense of responsibility.

“I sometimes go to primary school and there was a child from (nation A) and I thought, ‘wow, they’re here!’ For the child, it must be difficult to learn Japanese and not easy to get used to Japanese friends, but I felt that, having the child around, we could make something meaningful happen… Because Japan’s an island, we don’t have encounters with other countries. So I think it’s important to teach pupils and give them opportunities to learn about different cultures in schools.” (H3)

This rationale for the importance of GP is that it appears to provide teachers with the necessary skills to contribute to meaningful learning opportunities with pupils, so that those pupils can gain knowledge of different views and practices, when entering contexts that are unfamiliar—in this case, knowledge of Japanese culture and society. I contend that the student’s (H3) explanation of why Japanese people “don’t have encounters with other countries” shows a relatively narrow view of
cultural interaction. That Japan is an island or Finns live in the periphery of a continent only explains a small part of how their respective citizens understand how to relate to “different cultures.” Hanvey (2004) is cautious of the commonly repeated idea of “understanding others,” arguing that such an understanding may not necessarily mean that people deeply and genuinely understand cultural diversity and differences. From a critical pedagogy perspective, the cross-cultural awarenesses of student teachers are inadequate unless accommodated by a sense of critical consciousness (Castro, 2010).

In summary, the student teachers in this study regarded GP as important for their future teaching, offering them the chance to encourage pupils to learn about different views and practices from cultures other than their own, allowing those pupils to see the world through the eyes of others. Consequently, one of the most popular rationales for GP was “cross-cultural awareness,” which stresses comprehending and becoming aware of different cultures—and which many Finnish students combined with a humanistic ideal.

**Perspective consciousness rationale in a nationalistic orientation**

“Perspective consciousness” in Hanvey’s model meant an awareness of multiple realities and manners of understanding the world. However, among Japanese student teachers, a perspective consciousness was linked to a nationalistic orientation. For example, one student teacher from Hiroshima stated:

“There are different kinds of systems for elections and pensions in Japan and having to compare the system with other foreign countries could provide an opportunity to realise the characteristics of the Japanese system and the weakness of the Japanese system. To be able to discuss such comparison, teachers themselves must have the competence to explain, but also to have their own opinions.” (H7)

As a rationale for attaining global perspectives, teachers are expected to possess adequate knowledge about national systems, so that they can make adequate comparisons with teaching practices from different contexts. Such comparisons do not aim merely to understand different teaching practices; they also ask that one differentiate one’s national system from other national systems, followed by a search for any areas for improvement—through critical reflection. Student concerns for the well-being of a nation can embody implicit signs of neoliberal thinking, according to which a nation state offers a relevant legal framework for
economic activities in a global market. This GP rationale, a *perspective consciousness* linked to one’s own nation, was only evident among the Japanese student teachers. The Finnish student teachers attending interviews did not connect perspective consciousness in any explicit manner with a nation state when discussing rationales for the importance of GP.

**Awareness of a global dynamics rationale in a neoliberal orientation**

Another theme only detected among the responses of Japanese students was an “awareness of the global dynamics rationale” as part of a neoliberal orientation. Some Japanese student teachers saw GP as a means for pupils to advance successfully in an increasingly globalised labour market. One Japanese student stated that:

"In this era, we must educate a large number of human resources (‘jinzai’) who’ll take off [to work] in foreign countries." (H#4)

In other words, according to this thinking, teachers play an important role in cultivating “global-mindedness” in pupils, so that those pupils prosper in an ever more interconnected global economy. Here is another example of perceptions situated in a neoliberal orientation:

“Japan’s top class in the world for technical aspects. It’s important for Japan to support developing countries or respect different cultures when hiring foreigners in Japan. I’d like to contribute to developing such people [or pupils] who can understand such things.” (H#40)

One Japanese student remarked that the management of a diverse labour force is one reason to teach global perspectives. The above quote displays the relatively direct connotation that “global” offers Japanese student teachers an essential neoliberal element. A sense of urgency when observing that globalisation is changing the ethos of local economies was a significant motivation for the Japanese student teachers interviewed to become concerned about the development of global perspectives. Here is another example.

"In the modern age, which is a super information society, globalisation progresses further. Therefore, we must have a global sense. Also for Japan to be strong in the world, it’s necessary to know the world and disseminate Japanese strengths to the world.” (H#42)
The excerpt shows that, in the views of the Japanese student teachers, a neoliberal orientation and a national orientation were closely related. As discussed, the GP rationale of a “perspective consciousness” in a nationalistic orientation, and the GP rationale of an “awareness of global dynamics” in a neoliberal orientation, were visible only among the responses of the Japanese student teachers. These are unique outcomes that show how future teachers in Japan currently view the role of global perspectives in teaching, which—in their estimation—coincides with a persistent neoliberal drive in globalisation.

**Awareness of the global dynamics rationale in a transformational orientation**

The previous chapter, Sub-chapter 4.4, discussed the profiles of those attending the interviews in this study. I did not enquire about their prior work experience before holding those interviews—and did not explore that experience in any way. However, it became clear during the interviews that some Finnish student teachers in the technology-oriented programme had work experience before embarking on the teacher training programme at the University of Oulu. Reflecting on the impact of globalisation and on the rationales for global perspectives, student teachers with prior work experience shared critical views of globalisation, suggesting that their work experiences were part of why they believed global perspectives are important to teachers. One Finnish student teacher explained that a past incident triggered critical reflection on the importance of GP:

"Well, on the globalization, I have quite strong opinions. But my previous employer was, you might know, <Multinational Company A> and that was the brutal example what the globalization is when money means everything and human being means nothing.” (O3)

Another Oulu student shared similar views, reflecting on personal previous work experience and linking that experience to rationales for teaching GP:

"In that work place where I was working in <workplace B>, I felt that I can give for myself something more than just being <previous occupation C> that I would like to do that kind of work where I can feel like I really help some other people and I would like to do that kind of work where I can see that, things are going... in the last job, everything is dancing around the money, money, money, money, money.” (O2)
It is clear, I suggest, that these student teachers drew on prior knowledge of interrelationships and of elements of globalisation to reflect critically on globalisation while expressing certain humanistic values. Their life experience and the consequences of a global market economy led them to understand mechanisms and multiple realities existing in the contemporary world order (Merrifield, 2000). As reported, prior life experience often affects how teachers build and design classroom learning for pupils (Johnson & Ochoa, 1993).

In summary, only the Finnish student teachers showed critical perceptions that involved critical ideas of globalisation. No Japanese student teacher shared this type of critical view. These Finnish student views may also represent the aims “action for change” and “challenging power relations,” which I added to Hanvey’s model.

The rationale of awareness of choices being made

Among Hanvey’s aims of global perspectives, an awareness of human choice emerged from the data but was not linked by the student teachers to any of Gaudelli’s global citizenship orientations. One Japanese student teacher viewed global perspectives as important in broadening one’s world view:

“Global perspectives may help to understand the cultural and religious features of countries and those may not necessarily be international issues. But if I’m faced with a situation to make a decision in life, I feel that a different kind of thinking and attitude may contribute to broadening the width of options. Regardless of whether one is in their own country or abroad, global perspectives might help broaden one’s perspective <in general>…if it could be part of my own view.” (H5)

This quote asserts the importance of global perspectives towards the realisation of a wide range of possibilities and the perception of global views as a source for rational decision-making, whether in a local context or abroad. A number of student teachers did not discuss an awareness of human choices specifically as relating to pedagogy or to teaching in an educational context. Rather, they considered an awareness of human choices in general terms, as a transferable skill. This rationale was apparent, however, in only one Japanese student teacher interview, H5 (see the above quote). Of the Finnish student teachers, some displayed evidence of the same rationale and some had even made important career choices after becoming aware of global issues.
The rationale of a changing school environment

Reflecting on growing migration and increasing diversity, many student teachers viewed global perspectives as important in responding to rapidly growing diversity and in accommodating pupils from surrounding societies. One Finnish student teacher reflected upon this idea as follows.

"There are some foreign people coming in and there are some pupils that have, for example, parents who cannot speak Finnish or English and it can be difficult to support and tell them how their kids are doing at school...I think it also is very important as a teacher to communicate with parents as much as possible and that develops trust between parents and teachers.” (O4)

The primary interest of many teachers regarding global perspectives is the changing reality of school communities, who are urging teachers to support pupils and families with different backgrounds. The above student teacher (O4) continues by elaborating on migration as a topic, sharing thoughts on social equality in Finland. Note that this data was gathered just before the “European migrant crisis” began in 2015.

“Between foreign people, we are pretty closed in that kind of way, for example, it is very hard to get into Finland. If you come to escape from the war, refugees, we take a very little amount of refugees and we have a lot of rules here…I kinda see that we take little refugees and it’s kinda good thing because always it complicates things. It doesn’t really matter how many people come here because there are problems there, somewhere.” (O4)

The situation in Europe has changed dramatically since 2015, when the numbers of migrants and asylum seekers increased rapidly. One may observe that heightened flow of people in Finland also. The “problems” to which the student refers no longer occur “somewhere” but are now—as implicated—in the “here” of Finland. In 2016, the City of Oulu had one state reception centre for asylum seekers, while the Finnish Red Cross had three reception centres. The quote suggests that migration did not exist in the everyday reality of student teachers before 2015. Recently, however, migration has begun to impact their immediate reality much more directly, with future teachers expected to accommodate a growing diversity in schools.

Similarly, one Japanese student teacher discussed a growing diversity in Japanese schools as a rationale for teaching GP.
“There’ll be an increase in pupils with a foreign background in classrooms due to the increase in workers from abroad. Their children could be attending a public primary school. Those children, since their parents aren’t Japanese, would have a different environment to grow up in, as they’d go to a Japanese school with a Japanese environment. So it’s important to understand their environment, but also to think of ways to support them, so they can adapt to Japan.” (H6)

In the voices of these student teachers lies an underlying conviction that teachers and schools should function as mediators between pupils, families, and local communities. James Banks (2004) notes that the crucial goal of teacher training is to prepare future teachers with adequate skills, knowledge, and perspectives for the community in which they teach. Student teacher views reflect the current changes that they see in the dynamics of the social environment of their pupils. Therefore, student teachers view global perspectives as important in order to appropriately fulfil demands set by the teaching role to support the integration of foreign pupils at local schools.

**A lack of rationale: Uncertainty about the professional future**

While—in both cases—most student teachers explicitly addressed the rationales for GP in their future teaching, few student teachers discussed the uncertainties of future working conditions or their own competence in applying GP in a classroom. One Finnish student teacher commented on global perspectives by saying, “It is important but I am not yet sure how does it apply in my work and what do I do” (O3). Although the student teacher in question agrees that global perspectives are important, that student found it challenging to imagine how one might incorporate and actualise global perspectives in teaching practice. Similar evidence exists regarding students and teachers from other contexts, who feel they have neither the knowledge or confidence necessary to engage in global learning (Holden & Hicks, 2007).

Many intercultural educators assert the importance of global and intercultural awareness, not only for those working in an intercultural or international environment, but for everyone living in an era of globalisation (Räsänen, 2000). A Finnish student teacher planning to teach in a suburb shared the following dilemma.

“If I get a teacher job from there (suburb D), do I really in my daily work face people from other countries?” (O1)
During the interviews, the student teacher in question explained that diversity is important in teaching, but that not all teaching jobs in Finland offer the challenge of teaching pupils from different national backgrounds. Again, I gathered this data prior to the “migrant crisis” in Europe. The immediate reality that student teachers face in Finnish society today has changed considerably—and will no doubt continue to change with one-and-a-half generation and second-generation school-age children in Finland.

Within the data gathered through my interviews in Hiroshima, one Japanese student teacher expressed a view in a sceptical tone of voice, questioning the need for global perspectives for teachers, remarking that GP are necessary “ONLY if there is a need to teach those to students” (H2). Japan’s education system is highly centralised. The Japanese Ministry of Education (MEXT) determines curricula, creates teaching materials, and designs learning for school education (Arani et al., 2012; Parmenter, 2006). Therefore, pedagogical content knowledge is very highly prioritised in teacher training. Little room is left for the provision of “extra” studies—for example, for intercultural education.

One may also infer that some of the Japanese student teachers thought of global perspectives as a package of information to be “taught” to pupils, requiring fixed pedagogical skills and teaching know-how. This contradicts claims by global and intercultural educators that a global-perspectives mindset should be embedded and integrated into teachers’ skills, attitudes, competence, and disposition (see Ambe, 2006; Räsänen, 2000; Sleeter, 2001). Exploring rationales for GP revealed that some Japanese student teachers tend to see a need for GP “content” and for a static knowledge of GP, rather than viewing GP as requiring active learning and continuous reflection.

Another Japanese student teacher shared his view that having global or different views may lead to difficulties in “surviving in an organisation of teachers” (H1). The participant explained that the reality for teachers in primary schools is that they appear to inherit a traditional school culture—that, effectively, an “old school” does not welcome “new” perspectives. While student teachers can participate actively in intercultural events on campus and may study foreign languages proactively, the interviewee expressed relatively strong feelings on the dilemma of old versus new, while airing worries over future teaching. An “old school” ethos was also apparent in references to certain schools in Jokikokko’s (2005) study of teachers who had graduated from the Oulu Intercultural Teacher
Education (ITE)\(^3\) some years earlier. According to Jokikokko, graduates from the ITE programme struggled to actualise their visions in the schools in which they teach. Despite reforms in contemporary school environments and despite changing dynamics in pupil backgrounds, the reality of traditional school cultures may not, even in 2018, be open to a greater emphasis on global perspectives—or to alternative visions of human difference and diversity.

5.2.3 Summary of the findings for RQ2

The statistical findings of this study indicated that both student groups, Finnish and Japanese, agreed on the importance of global perspectives, which have resonated with long-time advocates of global and intercultural education in teacher training over the past decades (see Cochran-Smith, 2003; Holden & Hicks, 2007; Jokikokko & Järvelä, 2013; Merryfield, 2000).

Regarding the rationales for attaining global perspectives through education, student teachers in both contexts considered GP as highly important in many respects. Moreover, students in both contexts justified the importance of GP by referring to cross-cultural awareness in a *humanistic* orientation. While the future teachers considered GP important, some differences were evident in how those student teachers specified rationales for teaching GP. Japanese teachers were the main expressers of the rationale of “perspective consciousness” in a nationalistic orientation and of the rationale of an “awareness of human choices.” Only certain Finnish student teachers identified the rationale of an “awareness of the global dynamics in a transformation orientation.” Student teacher reflections on a changing school environment and uncertainty about the future were apparent in both sets of data, which is natural, I contend, considering the professional challenges these students know await them after graduation.

5.3 RQ3: Teacher education for global perspectives

I will present the findings and responses to research question three, “How does teacher education support the development of global perspectives, according to student teachers?” I will do this, firstly, through a statistical overview (see Sub-

---

\(^3\) The Intercultural Teacher Education (ITE) programme is a five-year programme focusing on multicultural issues and on the development of intercultural educators, with a strong emphasis on ethics throughout the programme. See http://www.Oulu.fi/edu/intercultural_teacher_education
chapter 5.3.1) and then via discussion of the qualitative results (see Sub-chapter 5.3.2). I also discuss my four interviews with four teacher educators, two from Oulu and two from Hiroshima.

### 5.3.1 Statistical overview of the role of teacher education

Table 9 offers a statistical overview of student views on the role of teacher training in relation to the development of global perspectives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaire items</th>
<th>University</th>
<th>N² skipped</th>
<th>Mean²</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Levene’s Test (sig)</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means (sig, 2 tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher training supports GP</td>
<td>UOULU</td>
<td>45 0</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>.573</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HU</td>
<td>99 0</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>.648</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting factors</td>
<td>UOULU</td>
<td>41 4</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>.711</td>
<td>.374</td>
<td>.418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Curriculum</td>
<td>HU</td>
<td>97 2</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>.664</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting factors</td>
<td>UOULU</td>
<td>41 4</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>.771</td>
<td>.928</td>
<td>.668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Professor knowledge</td>
<td>HU</td>
<td>97 2</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>.669</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting factors</td>
<td>UOULU</td>
<td>41 4</td>
<td>3.00**</td>
<td>.837</td>
<td>.112</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Peer support</td>
<td>HU</td>
<td>97 2</td>
<td>2.51**</td>
<td>.843</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting factors</td>
<td>UOULU</td>
<td>41 4</td>
<td>2.39*</td>
<td>.666</td>
<td>.337</td>
<td>.056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Exams and assignments</td>
<td>HU</td>
<td>97 2</td>
<td>2.13*</td>
<td>.731</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*the highest mean scores at a significant level of >0.05, **at a significant level of >0.01

1HU: Hiroshima University, UOULU: University of Oulu

When students were asked to rate their perceptions of the role of teacher training in the development of global perspectives, the results of a t-test for equality of means indicated a significance level of less than 0.05 (UOULU=2.89, HU=2.37, P=0.000). This means that student teachers in Oulu agreed that their teacher training programme supported the development of their GP at a comparatively higher mean value, whereas the student teachers in Hiroshima saw the role of teacher education as relatively less relevant in cultivating GP.

To explore different aspects of the teacher education, the student teachers were asked to share their views of particular elements of teacher education; namely, the
curriculum; professor and lecturer knowledge; peer support and discussion; and examinations and assignments. The results show that both the Oulu and Hiroshima student teacher groups considered, in a similar manner, that their curriculum supported the development of global perspectives to some extent (UOULU=2.46, HU=2.36, P=.418), given that the mean value is just below the average score of 2.5. One may note also that the student teachers in both programmes agreed strongly, and in a similar fashion, that the knowledge and expertise of their lecturers aids in the development of GP (UOULU=2.83, HU=2.77, P=.668).

As regards student teacher views of the usefulness-to-GP-development of peer support and classroom discussion in each teacher training programme, the t-test showed a statistical difference between Oulu and Hiroshima at a significance level of 0.01 (UOULU=3.00, HU=2.51, P=.002). While the student teachers in Oulu agreed strongly on the importance of peer support in developing global perspectives, the student teachers in Hiroshima viewed peer learning in classrooms as less relevant. In relation to their beliefs about the GP gain potency of exams, materials, and assignments, students in both groups showed some statistical differences just short of a significance level of 0.05 (O=2.39, H=2.13, P=.056). One may infer, therefore, that the Finnish students viewed exams and assignments as relatively more helpful in gaining global perspectives, whereas the Japanese students tended to see exams and assignments as comparatively irrelevant to the development of global perspectives.

On the basis of the interviews in this study, the next section offers a more detailed analysis of student teacher perceptions of teacher training, in relation to the development of global perspectives.

5.3.2 The role of teacher education in cultivating global perspectives

In the qualitative part of this study—that is, in the interviews and open-ended questionnaire questions, the views of the student teachers in this study offered insights into how they perceived the role of teacher training in relation to the development of global perspectives. The student teachers at the University of Oulu and Hiroshima University expressed their views on a variety of opportunities and challenges they saw as hindering or accommodating the development of GP. The views of the student teachers appeared to indicate certain “keys” in learning and developing global perspectives. The following section discusses the following five factors connected to GP: one, instructional practices; two, beyond teacher education; three, peer influence; four, career visions; and five, critical voices.
1a) Instructional practices in Oulu

In alignment with the statistical overview in Sub-chapter 5.1, according to which the Finnish student teachers emphasised the role of teacher training as relevant and important in the development of global perspectives, the Oulu interviewees shared examples of the diverse opportunities they had seen as useful in their training programme. Some student teachers remarked that the “Intercultural Education” course was helpful in developing global perspectives. One student teacher describes that Intercultural Education course as follows.

“Go through different conflicts that might appear in the classrooms and so there could be difficult situation if you have like this in the room and how would you manage, and there are some, something about racism we have spoken and what is racism and our stereotypes and how the immigrants are integrated to the society and school systems.” (O6)

The Oulu Intercultural Education course—3 ECTS before 2017 and 5 ECTS after 2017—is offered to student teachers as a compulsory course in the university’s primary school teacher training. The student teacher told me it enhanced their understanding and practical knowledge of cultural diversity. Another Finnish student teacher reflected on the topics discussed during Intercultural Education, topics such as “sexual orientation,” “religions or beliefs,” and “minorities like Gypsies.” At one point during the course, the student teacher group had staged a play to present prejudices and examine “how to balance with those prejudices so that we could deal better with other people” (O1). Exploring different concepts of culture, Intercultural Education in Oulu incorporates diversity-related themes such as gender, religion, and sexuality. The Finnish student teachers found the course useful, providing opportunities to unpack cultural assumptions and exercise critical reflection.

In its goals, the Intercultural Education course does not aim to show “the right approach” to dealing with diversity in class. It aims, rather, to invite student teachers to reflect on their own practices by offering them theoretical knowledge of culture and diversity (Weboodi, 2016). Educators share first-hand experiences, stories that guide future teachers to reflect critically on different ways to accommodate diversity. In the same course, student teachers designed lesson plans to be implemented in different forms in the seminar; those lesson plans included drama presentations. Teaching methods are an important element for consideration, given that appropriate delivery of a multicultural education course reportedly
makes a more direct and significant impact on the attitudes of student teachers than
the content of the course (cf. Brown, 2004).

Similarly, some student teachers referred to another Oulu course,
“Multiculturalism,” 3 ECTS, a course that belongs to the discipline of early
childhood education, as helpful towards developing GP. One Finnish student
teacher remarked that Multiculturalism focused more closely on different cultural
groups locally than on discussions of global issues. Students also remarked that
lecturers from minority cultures were extremely helpful in precipitating
engagement with issues of diversity in classrooms. One Finnish student reflected
on the course in a particularly positive light, saying, “I don’t know how to explain
this, but it was really eye opening” (O3). Discussions of cultural minorities offer
insights into the ongoing challenges for teachers in Finland. A student teacher’s
view of social reality reveals how readily some discussions are concealed behind a
social “taboo.” Teacher training offers an opportunity to engage in dialogue
about—and look behind—social boundaries that are unhelpful in pursuing GP.

Another course that Finnish student teachers mentioned as useful in the teacher
training was the “Religion” course. As part of their mandatory studies, student-
teacher members of the Lutheran or Russian Orthodox Church must complete the
Religion course, for 2 ECTS, in order to fulfil requirements for graduation. One
Finnish student teacher described the course as follows.

“We were talking about different religions and how to as a teacher meet or
handle that kind of issues in the classrooms, because there are different students,
also Finnish, there are from different families and that kind of things we talk
about in that course, that was useful and really interesting.” (O2)

In Finland, religion is mandatory at comprehensive school if a pupil is a member
of either of the two Finnish national churches. Pupils from other religious
backgrounds are offered classes from the representatives of their own denomination.
Pupils from non-religious homes have “ethics” or civic lessons. The didactics in
religious education may provide opportunities for student teachers to reflect on
religion-related intercultural perspectives.

Outside compulsory primary school teacher education courses, students can
take optional courses—for example, at international programmes, such as
“Learning & Educational Technology Research” (LET). A Finnish student teacher
referred as follows to the usefulness of that course in developing global viewpoints.
I took minor studies in educational technology in a course that was international. There were students from more than ten countries. Twenty-five credits there so that I can include that to my study.” (O1)

According to the views presented this far, the Finnish student teachers at the University of Oulu saw such coursework as useful towards the development of GP, stating that it combined theoretical discussion with a practical understanding of how to apply knowledge inside and outside the classroom. These instructional practices and opportunities encouraged the critical reflections of student teachers in the lectures and helped them compose a more practical, realistic picture for their teaching in future classrooms. Some international programmes—see “ITE,” “LET,” and “EDGLO,” on the Oulu University website—provide open access to courses, offering chances to communicate and collaborate with a high number of exchange and international students, from a variety of different countries. To conclude, the Finnish student teachers appreciated their learning experiences within the courses of the Finnish teacher training programme, which they described as offering helpful opportunities to develop global perspectives.

The two teacher educators interviewed from the Finnish teacher education programme offered a view of a context that resembles that described by the student teachers. Those teacher educators considered GP to be important, although they discussed GP mostly in relation to international networks and to new forms of technology. They also asserted that students have opportunities to develop their intercultural competences in the compulsory course content of the teacher training, in many optional courses, and through multiple free exchange programmes and international projects.

1b) Instructional practices in Hiroshima

As compared to the relatively positive responses from the Finnish students, the Hiroshima student teachers’ descriptions of the role of their teacher training—as concerning the development of global perspectives—were varied in tone. When I asked the Japanese student teachers for examples of study content that they perceived as helpful in developing global perspectives, they specified pedagogical and subject-oriented social study courses, among other subjects. One student teacher reported the following.

“Different teachers perceive social studies differently and there are different factions. Also, it was discussed that in Japan, education is more knowledge-
and it’s different abroad. It was the first time learning about a difference between Japanese education and education in the world, so I think it was helpful.” (H1)

The student teacher continued by stating that a series of lectures on pedagogy and pedagogical knowledge in social studies—for a total of four credits, with assigned study hours equivalent to approximately six ECTS in Finland—helped to create a “moment” in which to imagine how to deal with global issues. Social studies or “shakai-ka” is a subject in Japanese primary school teacher training that aims to

“…facilitate pupils’ understanding on social life; to nurture an understanding of, and affection toward, our land and history; and to nurture the fundamental capacity as a responsible member of the community who is capable of forming a peaceful and democratic nation/society that thrives in the international community.” (NIER, 2012)

Hiroshima University incorporates the pedagogy of social studies into its obligatory courses in its primary school teacher training programme. Student teachers in Hiroshima remarked that the discussions and watching videos of classroom teaching abroad were helpful in the social studies course. However, opportunities were not limited exclusively to learning about foreign countries and their pedagogical practices. Another student teacher offered the following example, describing a lecture on special education.

"Immediate issues such as a developmental disorder or learning disability are discussed by teachers who are experts in special education. These lectures included different characteristics of disability, different ways to support pupils, and the kinds of attitude teachers should have. Not sure if it can be about interculturalism but there is such a course in the curriculum of the faculty." (H8)

The above quote—and others—suggest that the Japanese student teachers found these social study courses useful, offering an approach to diversity that, resting on practical and theoretical perspectives, aimed to tackle the “immediate” problems of schools today. Moreover, the student teachers gave many references to a lecture provided in a mathematics course in the primary school teacher training. Two students shared the following views:

“I attended a lecture by a graduate student who is now studying in Japan but used to teach mathematics at primary school in Africa. It was very interesting. That kind of opportunity sometimes exist... In the lecture, it was mentioned
that some developing countries perceive education as a waste because it might not necessarily connect to employment. But still, it gave me a chance to realise once again that education is important to increase options in life and to experience the joy of learning.” (H4)

"I had no idea that there is such a fundamental difference in mathematics in foreign countries and my thoughts were overthrown. I was so surprised how different it could be from what I studied about Japan.” (H3)

These student teachers viewed “new” knowledge from contexts unfamiliar to them as an important element of global perspectives, as an element that engaged with their curiosity and prompted deeper reflection at later times. The student teachers also described other useful opportunities, including courses offered outside the Faculty of Education. The following is an example of such a case:

“...I attended a lecture at the Faculty of Integrated Arts and Science, and we discussed international cooperation. The teacher, who has been to many countries, introduced many activities. I’ve been interested in international cooperation since I was in junior high school. It’s not that I am going to do something, but I have been reading. Although I am just ‘taking in’ knowledge, I got to know about the involvement of Japanese people in such programs and also about situations abroad.” (H3)

The courses in question were mentioned in a few other student perspectives on the Hiroshima Faculty of Integrated Arts and Science. A common thread was that these courses offer opportunities to gain “completely different ways of thinking” (H6) or a “sub-point of view” (H8) towards one’s interests. Although the courses these student teachers describe are not part of primary school teacher training directly, it is clear, I contend, that the topics discussed—for example, energy and the environment—might create tensions between mainstream and alternative views, requiring them to challenge previous ways of thinking.

In summary, it was surprising to observe that the students interviewed in Hiroshima provided examples from courses outside the Hiroshima Faculty of Education. We may conclude, on the basis of the above experiences, as reported, that teachers of any subject matter might—in principle—add a global perspective to their instruction. The above interview extracts may serve as a point of reflection for reconsidering the possibilities of current teacher training, which this discussion will explore.
The two teachers interviewed at the Japanese education programme stressed that the identity of Hiroshima University—situated in a historically memorial city—impacts peace teaching and education greatly in the university as a whole. Concurrently, the Hiroshima teacher educators asserted that university lectures and seminars generally avoided tackling questions without answers and eschewed the conducting of discussions in classrooms. They also stressed that Hiroshima University does not have any structural approach to requiring or encouraging the incorporation of GP into their courses or curriculum. However, opportunities exist even for Hiroshima professors aware of GP to obtain new perspectives; for example, through learning with exchange students or via short visits to schools in America.

2) Beyond teacher education in Oulu and Hiroshima

Continuing the discussion on acquiring global perspectives, some Finnish students stated that teacher training at the University is not the only place to develop global perspectives; personal growth can occur everywhere.

“Education is not the only one to develop myself. I can do it everywhere. And of course, that’s good that we have a long school [education] and we have time to develop our thinking. Methods could come from school, but knowledge is coming from everywhere.” (O2)

Another student teacher expressed the view that classroom learning is insufficient for acquiring global perspectives, which, instead, should be experienced and can be internalised via several sources.

“I don’t think it [GP] can be taught. It comes from outside of the courses. It comes from teachers, it comes from other students, exchange students. You can be told but it doesn’t change your mind…you have to learn it at first hand.” (O3)

The above perceptions, which addressed learning opportunities outside teacher training, were shared by two student teachers in Oulu who both had work experience prior to starting a teacher training programme. Many studies have reported that student teachers’ prior experience with cultural diversity influences their disposition (Adams et al., 2005). As evidenced, diverse life experiences before teacher training can potentially—or even greatly—affect how student teachers approach teaching in future classrooms (Johnson & Ochoa, 1993; Jokikokko, 2010).
Most of the student teachers at the Hiroshima University attend universities immediately after graduating from high school—or spend a year or two in prep schools or “Yobikou” if the University does not admit them right away. One Japanese student teacher asserted that teacher training is not the only place to develop global perspectives:

“It might be that the first opportunity is provided by lectures but it <GP> is more likely to be awakened outside lessons, when people with a vague but similar kind of thinking gather around people with such a perspective.” (H5)

The above example corresponds with views expressed by several other Japanese interviewees, who had participated in study tours organised by Hiroshima University. In “cross-cultural-immersion” or field-based experiences, student teachers are usually given opportunities to foster greater cultural sensitivity (Sleeter, 2001; Causey et al., 2000). Such new experiences challenge students’ own assumptions and pre-acquired knowledge, requiring them to engage in a cycle of reflection. Hiroshima University is the only current organiser of these programmes, which include study tours. Its Faculty of Education organises tours to the United States; however, those tours are only available to graduate students (Hiroshima University GPSC, 2016).

3) Peer influence in Oulu and Hiroshima

When the student teachers described their experiences in teacher training, some mentioned the role of their peers in the programme in question. Two Finnish student teachers explained the dynamics of the group’s studying together as follows.

“The happiest thing is that everyone who is in this education, they have applied, and it’s not so easy to get in here <teacher education> so everyone is motivated, and it doesn’t matter how old you are because everyone is here for the study and for their own interest…also that someone has worked before and everyone is thankful for the experience that we can share with each other...Everyone has something to give each other. That works very well that there are different age people in the classroom.” (O2)

“There are some things that you can learn from somebody who has been working for 15 years at a place, they have different views of things and of course, they are older. Actually, it is nice to learn, even though they are older
and more experienced with life, but they are not arrogant and they also are very interested in what we think, so that was cool to see.” (O4)

As I have demonstrated, the profiles of the student teachers in Oulu and Hiroshima differ clearly. Specifically, some of those interviewed in the Finnish group were older and have prior teaching experience. However, those student teachers viewed these differences in background and experience as an asset when moving to embrace different perspectives. The students in Oulu also stated that, because jobs in teacher education are highly competitive, students are usually very motivated in their studies.

The student teachers in Hiroshima expressed views of peer influence that differed slightly from those of the Oulu student teachers. Reflecting on their learning environment and on the views of the other classmates, one Japanese student made the following critical remark about the other student teachers.

“The atmosphere among student teachers is like “just” attending courses to fulfil the requirements—and do whatever in your private life." (H8)

A Hiroshima student offered another critical comment, declaring that not all students in teacher training have an interest in global or intercultural topics.

“I’m interested in things like that, so I enjoy listening about them [topics] but others around me aren’t interested in the existence of different societies or worlds and I see their attitude. Before thinking about changing courses to develop international understanding, I think there’s a need for other kinds of opportunities.” (H1)

These Japanese student teacher voices reflect the quantitative findings of this study (see Sub-chapter 5.3.1), which show that, while student teachers in Oulu agreed strongly that peer support contributes valuably to the development of global perspectives, the student teachers in Hiroshima regarded peer support and dialogues as comparatively less relevant (O=3.00, H=2.51, P= 0.002). Each perceived role of peer support, a general ethos, and the general atmosphere in teacher training offers insights into attitudes towards global-related or intercultural-related topics of education. One should note that—according to the Finnish student teachers in this study—peer support and motivational atmosphere contribute positively to the development of GP in Finnish teacher training. The following section will consider that finding, elaborating on the career visions of the student teachers in each case.
4) Career visions of the student teachers in Oulu and Hiroshima

In the interviews, the student teachers discussed their plans for teaching after graduating from teacher training. When I first began to gather interview data in Hiroshima, the interviewees were attending their third year at university and had begun job-hunting in accordance with the recruitment process in Japan. I used my question about student career plans, therefore, as one of several “ice-breakers” to aid in discovering differences in career visions between the two groups.

At the time of the interviews, all the Finnish student teachers (N=6) stated their career vision as certain, declaring specifically that they would become a primary school teacher after completing the teacher training programme. By contrast, only one of the ten Japanese interviewees (N=10) displayed a firm vision of becoming a primary school teacher. The rest of the Japanese student teachers interviewed were unsure. Some stated that they would probably become a teacher, not at a primary school but at a junior high school or high school; the remainder were unsure if they would pursue a career in teaching at all.

Exploring career visions is not part of my principal research question. The data in this study does not offer an adequate basis on which to confirm or generalise about student career plans. However, one may still acknowledge a potential difference between the career plans of the two groups, a difference that, for example, requires further examination on how contrasts in career planning relate to a student teacher’s motivations and views on global perspectives. The qualitative findings of the previous section on peer support and atmosphere in classes may relate to the career visions of student teachers and to their motivations for attending primary school teacher training.

5) Critical voices: Opportunities to develop the teaching of GP

The individual interviews in this study included critical and frustrated voices from the student teachers in Hiroshima, voices arguing—for example—that the current Japanese teacher training is not relevant to the development of global perspectives:

“I don’t find any classes or lectures useful in that sense. There are no such courses at Hiroshima University. In private, lecturers might talk about their attendance at conferences abroad and tell us about the experience. But there are no classes that help us, students in the faculty of education, to proactively develop global perspectives.” (H5)
“There is no [such course] in the primary teacher education. Right now, I’m studying for a teaching certificate in social studies for junior high and high school. Then, finally, we discuss other countries and talk about current affairs in geography and history. That’s pretty much it and it doesn’t really impact my own perspective.” (H10)

“Even if I’d like to learn something new or different, or try to gain knowledge in other fields, learning outside primary teacher education is quite limited.” (H4)

Several Japanese voices overlap in claiming that the current Japanese teacher training is fixed or limited, that the curriculum does not allow space for learning about global perspectives or choosing other subjects. Besides the above comments on the Hiroshima curriculum, the Japanese student teachers referred to the knowledge of the teacher educators, for example, as follows:

“The teachers and professors are, in my opinion, well, it’s difficult to find words—quite fixed, to my understanding. So there are no lectures that talk directly about other cultures or global perspectives. It’s up to us to study about them.” (H8)

Another Japanese student remarked as follows.

“Since much of the ordinary teaching at the University is studying by listening to lecturers, in that sense, a perspective like that isn’t really developed, but I do learn different perspectives and understandings by talking to exchange students or having discussions with friends.” (H6)

While Japanese student teachers problematised the current Japanese teacher training curriculum and a passive or traditional style of learning, they also shared their insights on structural issues of the current Hiroshima teacher training programme:

“In the Faculty of Education, the curriculum’s fixed with pedagogical studies, lectures, and school practices. Later you take the qualification exam and become teachers. The path’s already decided and it’s fine as long as you don’t get side-tracked with friends. I guess the curriculum must be implemented accordingly, and it’s difficult to change anything or incorporate global perspectives when there are 150 students.” (H8)
“I’ve heard there are relevant courses at the faculty of Integrated Arts and Science or the literature department. But it’s rare for students to take the course if it can’t be counted at the faculty of education. If it’s overlapping with a mandatory course, they’ll definitely take the course with credits that can be counted (towards the degree).” (H5)

“In primary school teacher education, we learn how to plan lessons according to the national curriculum and review knowledge in primary schools. We learn about the knowledge that’s necessary for primary school teachers and I understand that this is extremely important, but... I feel that things could be changed, for example, if there was more time to think in pairs, or we could hear opinions from teachers. Then it might be easier to digest the idea.” (H2)

As these student teachers make evident in their perceptions, one structural issue in large Japanese universities is the necessity to accommodate roughly one hundred and fifty students in every cohort of Japan’s primary school teacher training. Therefore, the provision of smaller-sized classes that enable small group discussions or interactive seminars is a challenging task. In such a learning environment, opportunities are more limited for students to develop their global perspectives, as evidenced by the perceptions of the student teachers in this case. Certain studies are counted as necessary towards graduating in a degree, while other studies, from different disciplines and study programmes, will not be considered towards that degree. Therefore, student teachers determine their proactivity by taking action to participate in other courses or activities, in order to develop their global perspectives.

Contrary to the views of the Japanese student teachers, the teacher educators in Hiroshima expressed concerns for those attending teacher training programmes, who appear to “self-regulate” and do not share opinions openly in classrooms. One should keep in mind that the limited breadth of data gathered from the teacher educators means that this statement must be considered with caution. Nonetheless, the two teacher educators in Hiroshima happened to attest—in similar terms—that, while they make a conscious effort to encourage their student teachers to reflect not only on global facts or issues, but on background views and contexts, some student teachers tend to lack critical thinking skills and hesitate to engage actively with their peers. Therefore, the structure of the present Japanese teacher training curriculum affects how readily Japanese student teachers can learn GP. Socio-cultural issues may hinder the creation of opportunities to grasp GP, issues due to Japan’s learning culture.
Reflecting on global perspectives for teachers, one Japanese student teacher pondered as follows.

“After all, the teachers’ words might have contained some relevance, but I might not have realised it...I wish there were more opportunities for lectures, like the one about mathematics in Africa. Also, there are many exchange students, so it’d be nice to incorporate them into our courses, so that it might make some difference.” (H9)

Here one can observe again that an integration of themes with a global perspective is possible in most subjects—in this case, mathematics—if one considers such aspects important.

Moreover, the teacher training in Hiroshima seldom provides for interactions with exchange students specifically in its curriculum. Student teachers in the current Hiroshima programme view collaborative learning with exchange students as a realistic strategy for developing global perspectives in teacher training. One Finnish student echoed this sentiment.

“There are these exchange students and all of them go through these intercultural situations. It would be nice if we had also some exchange students to go our classes” (O6)

Most classes in the University of Oulu’s technology-oriented teacher training programme occur in Finnish. This means that, unless student teachers choose optional courses from different disciplines and programmes, those student teachers have fewer opportunities to learn and interact with students from abroad. Nonetheless, many optional courses are available in the faculty, courses that exchange students attend with local Finnish students. One should note that the views expressed by the Finnish student teachers did not address any other element they considered to be “hindering” their chances of developing global perspectives. Ample possibilities also exist at the University of Oulu to travel abroad, through Erasmus and through bilateral agreements with every continent.

5.3.3 A summary of RQ3 findings

My third research question examined the views of student teachers on the role of teacher training in relation to the development of global perspectives. From the findings derived from the interviews and questionnaires in this study, student teacher perceptions differed on the role of teacher training as relating to the
advancement of global perspectives. Both student teacher groups, Oulu and Hiroshima, considered their training significant to the development of GP. In terms of the specific elements of GP, the students agreed on the importance of the curriculum and of professor knowledge in supporting development of global perspectives. Peer-support and evaluation tools—exams and assignments—were viewed differently. The Finnish student teachers viewed support through peers, exams, and assignments as helpful towards developing global perspectives, whereas the Japanese student teachers saw such support mechanisms as comparatively less relevant.

The semi-structured interviews were conducted to collect student teacher insights in order to facilitate the discovery of possibilities to improve the teacher training in question. One may conclude that both programmes contain obvious opportunities that are—without a doubt—useful to student teachers. In relating to GP, the Finnish student teachers found courses on theory, experiential learning, and practical insights useful, while the Japanese student teachers reported that engaging with new or different knowledge from unfamiliar contexts encouraged them to reflect more closely on issues related to global perspectives. The student teacher perceptions also offered insights into elements that probably restrict their chances of developing global perspectives while studying; for instance, student teachers in both cases suggested that their faculty did not offer enough chances to interact and learn collaboratively with exchange students.

According to student teachers in Finland and Japan, the insufficient opportunities to develop GP while studying concerned, not only the content of their learning—for example, in relation to global topics—but how issues of that type were discussed. In that respect, peers may play a significant role in open debate about GP, given one, that teacher training encourages peer support and two, that study group sizes allow classroom interaction. When examining differences in the role of exams and assignments, one might explore how students understand different forms of evaluation. The scope and nature of evaluation forms in Finland is particularly wide, intended to serve the learning process. In Japan, exams and assignments mostly measure and control the result of learning and the effectiveness of teaching—and are not necessarily seen as a part of the learning cycle.

Moreover, the student teachers in this study suggested possible ways to reconsider the use of current resources and to provide opportunities for developing teacher training programmes so that enough space is created to develop global perspectives. I will now discuss differences and similarities in the students’ views
in more detail, offering recommendations that I hope will be of general interest to institutions other than Oulu and Hiroshima.

5.4 Validity, reliability, and research ethics

Issues of validity in mixed methodology

Evaluating the validity of any mixed methodological research is a complex task; studies developed by multiple mixed methodologists have debated the difficulties of such evaluations (see Collins et al., 2006; Johnson et al., 2007; Johnson & Onwuegbuzie, 2007; Tashakkori & Teddlie, 2010). The complexity of establishing validity in such cases arises from parallel discussions of the criteria for quality in quantitative and qualitative research. In positivist and post-positivist paradigms, research quality is benchmarked in terms of validity, reliability, and objectivity, whereas, in a qualitative camp, the term “trustworthiness” is often used to replace the routine label “validity” (see Collins et al., 2006; Creswell, 2009; Guba & Lincoln, 1994). In the mixed methodology paradigm, Onwuegbuzie and Johnson (2006) offer a useful framework for assuring what they call a “legitimisation” of mixed methodological findings. This framework extends the original evaluation criteria developed by Tashakkori and Teddlie (2003) for “continuous legitimisation,” specifying nine validity types of legitimisation typology, including sequential, conversion, inside-outside, sample integration, commensurability, weakness minimisation, paradigmatic mixing, multiple validities, and political validity (Onwuegbuzie & Johnson, 2006). The table below explores elements relevant to this study, in order to overcome challenges resulting from having to combine the complimentary aspects of quantitative and qualitative research—and in order to assure the validity of this study (Onwuegbuzie & Johnson, 2006). The following text will highlight the key discussion in relation to legitimisation criteria such as sample legitimisation, weakness minimisation, inside-outside legitimisation, and paradigmatic mixing.

One legitimisation criterium suggested by Onwuegbuzie and Johnson (2006) is sample legitimisation, which evaluates the extent to which the relationship between the quantitative and qualitative sampling designs produces a quality integration of data and findings. In my research, the first data collection—composed of questionnaires—was employed to map out overall student teacher perceptions. The second data collection—the interviews—involved a relatively
small numbers of participants. However, this study does not aim to develop statistical generalisability; rather, I focused on gaining an understanding of the variations of perceptions in the group selected. The integration of data and findings was drawn carefully and the findings were contextualised for the chosen sample group.

As discussed in “weakness minimisation” (Onwuegbuzie & Johnson, 2006) quantitative results should be treated as indications, helping—in this case—to map out the student perceptions of global perspectives as a whole. The qualitative data gathered through the interviews and questionnaires helped me to explore the student teacher views more deeply. The small number of questions in the questionnaires in this study is a weakness of this research. It is certain, I contend, that allocating more time to the individual interviews would have provided more space for participants to elaborate on the topics discussed. The findings of this study might have been strengthened, given second or third rounds of interviews with the same participants—or by my inviting more participants to be individual interviewees. On the other hand, systematic interviews with relatively few participants offered advantages in being able to include certain qualitative items in the questionnaires. Meanwhile, I repeatedly kept in mind one, the conducting of coherent semi-structured interviews and two, the clarification of any concepts unclear to my understanding.

While collecting my data, I continued to pursue ongoing discussions with teacher educators in both contexts, an activity crucial to conducting a comparative study of this type, as discussed in “Inside-outside legitimization” (Onwuegbuzie & Johnson, 2006). An “inside-outside legitimization” concerns the extent to which a researcher presents accurately and utilises appropriately insider and observer viewpoints for purposes that include description and explanation. In many ways, this study of two cases in two countries presented many challenges, one of which was the difficulty of exploring voices and insights in local contexts. My background and networks helped me to establish essential professional relationships and to secure many open opportunities for discussions with collaborators in the Finnish and Japanese teacher training. In particular, those discussions in both contexts helped to assure the relevance of this study and contributed to the credibility of its findings. Without any of that support, it would have been impossible to build and develop a comparative study of teacher training.

*Paradigmatic mixing* (Onwuegbuzie & Johnson, 2006) is an effective legitimatising tool for ensuring that the principles and ideologies of mixed methodology and pragmatism agree. I consider paradigmatic mixing an appropriate
package for this research, therefore, offering potential pragmatic and theoretical knowledge about teacher training.

While I gathered a large quantity of data in my first phase of data collection using questionnaires, substantially fewer participants attended the individual interviews in the second phase of this study—as discussed in “sample legitimisation.” My qualitative data aimed to explore student perceptions more deeply and to discover possible areas for reconsideration in teacher education, in order, if possible, to suggest improvements to the quality of those areas through the teaching of global perspectives.

Reliability of comparative research in any qualitative study

This comparative study understands reliability in terms of the elements contributing to the credibility of this research (see Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Shenton, 2004). Those elements have comprised a descriptive study flow accompanied by detailed information on methods, on each context, on the data collected, on the research process, and on systematic ways in which the data was analysed and interpreted. I have discussed my position as researcher openly, in order to help the reader follow each step taken (see Sub-chapter 4.3).

In the context of this comparative study, it is important—I contend—to discuss reliability in two respects; namely, one, in terms of the timing of the data collection, and two, in terms of keeping up with the latest changes in educational policies. One may consider, in a critical light, that my data was gathered from 2012 to 2014, although the publication of this dissertation was arranged in 2017 and 2018. “Surely,” it may seem incumbent to ask, “the situations of the teacher training courses in these contexts have changed substantially in the interim?” While the situation surrounding higher education and teacher education has changed or developed slightly, collaborators at both universities have confirmed that no major changes have occurred in either setting. The internalisation of higher education has not slowed or decreased. The venues for teacher training at each site have not relocated. Discussions of ICT, migration, and education for sustainable development in both contexts continue and grow in breadth and mass, both institutions adapting teacher training accordingly at the time of writing this study.

In Finland, the latest national curriculum, made in 2014, was implemented in 2016. Schools in Finland are expected to attend more closely to intercultural competence (FNBE, 2015). Finnish teacher training will be expected, therefore, to
respond to the growing demands to prepare future teachers for diversity by increasing accessibility to global education courses.

In Japan, several universities have been chosen to become funded recipients of the internationalisation strategy entitled “Top Global University in 2015” (MEXT, 2014d). Hiroshima University, as one of those recipients, is currently implementing new active learning methods, study periods in quarters, and the orientation of research via an international consortium (Hiroshima University, 2016a). Therefore, evidence exists that internationalising initiatives are continuing to grow in the Japanese educational sphere.

**Limitations of the questionnaires**

Since I had the opportunity to collect data at an early stage of this study, use of the cost-free online questionnaire platform, “Survey Monkey,” was ideal and feasible. The online platform was also ideal for gathering responses from the two contexts, Finland and Japan, because it required less manual work by my collaborators in the contexts selected.

Conversely, the disadvantage of using a free subscription at Survey Monkey was the limited numbers of questions—ten questions in total; see Appendix 2 and 3—and I was forced to make the difficult decision to leave out demographical information concerning the informants, such as their genders, so as to accommodate more essential questions about global perspectives for this study. If more items and questions had been incorporated into the questionnaires, I might have developed further inferences; for example, by examining the correlation between certain perceptions and descriptive information such as age, gender, birthplace, and reasons for attending teacher training.

Despite the limitation in the number of questions in the online platform, that platform contributed to this study, helping me to collecting the views of more than one hundred and fifty students in two diverse contexts, Oulu and Hiroshima. Without my online questionnaire, it would have been impossible to systematically collect and secure that quantity of data, given the limited resources and capacity of one person’s independent study. No danger of manual error existed, as all the responses were gathered and managed in the online platform, ensuring that it was impossible to misread participant choices or handwriting.
Limitations of the interviews

Considering the interviews in this study in general, the following elements are, I contend, obvious candidates for evaluation: the number of interviews, any language issues pertaining to the interviews, any time spent considering discussions with experts at the research sites, and the actual empirical work that might be conducted at those sites as a result of this study (Kvale, 2007). My research in Oulu and Hiroshima involved challenges to be faced and addressed.

I had a limited opportunity to collect data at Hiroshima University, when the first semester of the year neared its end in 2013. The Japanese student teachers who signed up voluntarily for an interview and who were available during my research visit became interviewees (N=10). At the University of Oulu, the number of interview participants was limited at the time of the data collection (N=6). Four systematic interviews were conducted with students at teacher training in Oulu (N=2) and Hiroshima (N=2). Given more resources, this study might have included more interviewees and participants, which might have added to the strengths of my findings. I have drawn careful conclusions from the research findings nonetheless, conclusions enriched with contextualised discussions in the contexts chosen.

As noted in Sub-chapter 4.4., “Research participants,” my working languages were English and Japanese. I considered having a Finnish to English interpreter during the interviews and suggested the use of an interpreter to the Finnish participants. However, none of those participants requested that interpreter, so I held all the interviews in English. During those interviews with Finnish students, I noticed occasionally that some participants were searching for English terms with which to describe their thoughts. I ensured, therefore, to allocate more time when necessary to clarify interview ideas or statements.

While conducting this study, I was not located at the University of Oulu or at Hiroshima University. However, I used every opportunity available to observe courses at the teacher training programmes when at either research site. I contacted teacher educators actively at both institutions to continue correspondence and discussion about teacher education. I enhanced the validity of my interpretation using “peer validation” (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009), testing the validity of the study with fellow scholars familiar with the interview themes, particularly in teacher training. I published some articles reporting the preliminary results of the data (Uematsu & Nagata, 2015; Uematsu-Ervasti, 2016). These opportunities—or, more specifically, interactions and research discussions with teacher trainers in the
field—have helped me to contextualise the results of this study and to further interpret its findings.

Research ethics

Regarding confidentiality and informed consent, it is crucial that studies ensure participant anonymity (see Fontana & Frey, 1994; Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009). I chose the target groups for study at the beginning of the research process. Therefore, I began by holding face-to-face or virtual discussions with the instructors in each teacher training programme, requesting voluntarily participation from their student teachers. After explaining the scope of my research to those instructors, they informed the student teachers about my topic and methods of data collection.

The course instructor in Oulu informed the students about my study and the interviews and I emailed their course mailing list, requesting volunteers to interview. Similarly, in Hiroshima the course instructor informed student teachers about my research and the interview schedule for my research visit. Of the Japanese student teachers who volunteered to be interview, those whose schedule matched the days of my visit ultimately attended, the course instructor helping to organise the interview schedule. In each interview, I explained the confidentiality of the study and told students that their instructors would not have access to the coming transcripts.

At the beginning of each interview, I introduced myself, my background, and my position as a researcher, stating the purpose of my research—to explore the incorporation of global perspectives by teachers in future classrooms. The student teachers were informed that their voices would be recorded and the tapes used for research purposes only; the data would be confidential. If the student agreed with those conditions, that student would sign a consent form (Appendix 4). I also asked if the students had any questions for me at the beginning and end of the interviews.

Note that I provided two different links to the questionnaires, one for the University of Oulu (O), the other for Hiroshima University (H). The online questionnaires did not require student teachers to enter their names to take part. To protect the anonymity of the participants in my quantitative and qualitative studies (Corti et al., 2000), the student teacher interviewees and questionnaires were given numbers randomly during the data analyses, starting with the initial of each teacher education institution—in other words, H1–H99, O1–45 for questionnaires; H1–H10, O1–O6 for interviews. I have also used these codes to report my findings. All
the names and places mentioned in the interviews have been removed in order to minimise the chance of harmful consequences to the participants.
6 Discussion

To synthesise theoretical and empirical discussion on student teacher views and ideas concerning global perspectives, this chapter will discuss this study and its key findings, offering final conclusions. I will also discuss those findings in political and socio-cultural contexts, given that one may understand the student teachers’ perceptions as a reflection of society and of teacher education in the contexts studied. The views of these student teachers can also be used, therefore, to plan pedagogical improvements to global citizenship education at a university.

6.1 The research process

This study was inspired by the author’s experiences of several countries and specialisation in international affairs, which raised many questions. I chose the two teacher training programmes, in Finland and Japan, on the basis of my lengthy experiences in those two contexts. Both countries had stated their educational goals clearly in their internationalisation strategies, with an emphasis on increasing international activities in higher education. Until recently, both countries have been considered nationally homogeneous, expressing closed attitudes towards diversity. This study belongs to comparative research whose aim is not to generalise, but to observe the phenomena studied from a particularistic viewpoint. It—this study—stands methodologically on mixed methods, acquiring quantitative and qualitative data while emphasising the qualitative.

My specific research questions were:

1. How do student teachers conceptualise global perspectives in relation to their future teaching, in Oulu and Hiroshima?
2. How do student teachers in Oulu and Hiroshima see the role and significance of global perspectives in relation to their profession as teachers?
3. How does teacher education support the development of global perspectives, according to the student teachers in Oulu and Hiroshima?

The main body of data was gathered from students in two teacher training programmes in Oulu and in Hiroshima, using questionnaires and interviews. Additional data included systematic interviews with four teacher trainers—two in Oulu, two in Hiroshima—as well as less formal interviews and discussions with
other staff members. The teacher education curricula and national policy papers in each setting were examined, to establish a wider frame for this study.

I analysed the student teachers’ conceptualisations using an analytical tool incorporating Hanvey’s global perspectives (1976, 1982) and Gaudelli’s heuristics of global citizenship education (2009), enriched by critical pedagogy. The process of analysis was predominantly deductive therefore, although two new categories emerged when analysing rationales for teaching GP.

6.2 Conceptualisations of global perspectives – Research question one

The empirical findings of this study show that student teacher ideas of global perspectives were—in the contexts of teacher training in Oulu and Hiroshima—partly similar and partly different. In terms of Hanvey’s aims for global perspectives, those aims most frequently mentioned and connected to GP by the student teachers, in both Finland and Japan, were “perspective consciousness” and “cross-cultural awareness.” Hanvey has presented other aims, some of which were also apparent in the student teachers’ views in these contexts. However, the students did not reference those aims as frequently as the above two examples. Critical aims, such as “action for change” and “challenging power relations,” were evident among the views of the Finnish student teachers—who believed that a “change-of-action” attitude is vital and that GP helps to develop the critical consciousness of school pupils, offering pupils tools with which to tackle perpetuated issues, such as racism. “Challenging power relations” was only evident in the perceptions of one student teacher, who raised critical questions that might challenge power relations. This was not, however, a phenomenon common among the responses of the other student teachers.

Examining the findings of this study through the lens of Gaudelli’s orientations reveals that the students’ views in Oulu and Hiroshima did not coincide to the extent prescribed. The Oulu student teachers, in their data, tended to associate GP more explicitly with a humanistic orientation, referring to ideas such as unity, equality, and empathy. This may be—at least partly—due to a long tradition in the Finnish education system of stressing the importance of human rights, peace education, and development education. Certain policy papers, such as the “Global Education Programme 2010” and the “Education for Global Responsibility Project 2007–2009” may have contributed also to the progressive approach of Finnish global
education initiatives. The values emphasised by those initiatives appear to align with the views of the Oulu student teachers.

The responses of the Japanese student teachers showed signs of Gaudelli’s *nationalistic* orientation: they shared an understanding that GP should contribute to the advancement of the nation. Japanese student teachers referred frequently to the nation-state or to “our country” as a point of reference when conceptualising global perspectives. The findings of this study indicate that a nationalistic orientation and border-bounded thinking was evident in the ideas of the Japanese student teachers. Such signs of a nationalistic orientation among the views of the Japanese student teachers align with the Japanese ministry’s guidelines and strategies, which continue to stress the development of student self-awareness as a “Japanese person” (Parmenter, 1999, 2006). This reflects the genealogy of Japanese education and rests on the idea that the country still upholds the significance of national advancement and the development of loyal citizens through education.

My findings to the first research question show that how the student teachers understood GP was most probably affected by each country’s socio-cultural history and internationalisation policy, including educational values. These findings align with on-going discussions (see, for example, Andreotti, Biesta, & Ahenakew, 2015), in the sense that global-mindedness *must* move beyond a linear developmental understanding and not focus exclusively on individual capacities.

One may also examine these findings as related to Gaudelli’s orientations, from the perspective of a critical pedagogy. Firstly, a humanistic orientation, observable in the responses of the Finnish student teachers, may prompt the question, “Is a humanistic orientation enough to eradicate issues such as racism and the reproduction of the dominant knowledge and unequal power relations?” (Taylor, 2011; Gilbert, 1997). Critical pedagogy encourages one to move beyond simply celebrating multiculturalism, to gaining a critical awareness and acting towards a just and fair society (Alvesson & Skoldberg, 2000). One may achieve that awareness and fair society—argue proponents of critical pedagogy—by engaging actively with issues related to *one*, structural power relations, *two*, injustices in society, and *three*, intertwined sociocultural factors (Giroux, 1989). This dilemma is linked to the contents of the teacher education in question, to whether or not a teaching curriculum allows for deliberation on often very demanding global issues. I will consider these topics in more detail in the next discussion of the rationales of teaching global perspectives.

Secondly, certain signs of Gaudelli’s nationalistic orientation, as indicated by the Japanese student teachers, might encourage further divisions between those
included and excluded. Standing on principles of critical pedagogy, nationalistic tendencies may jeopardise plural or alternative perspectives that are crucial to critical pedagogical practices. One should not ignore the embedded cultural nationalism or “closed attitudes” (Kymlicka, 2003) visible in the Japanese case; rather, those attitudes should be reflected upon in the light of discussions of solidarity and ethical thinking in a broader global community.

Finally, as indicated, my findings show that the notions of global perspectives held by the student teachers suffer from a lack of conceptual clarity. These findings echo what researchers in global citizenship education have already reported on the definitions of global citizenship and global citizenship education (see, for example, Augustine, Harshman & Merryfield, 2015). Some ambiguity in this study may result from how the data was collected. The ideas I had asked the student teachers to define and elaborate upon may have required a clearer introduction. On the other hand, that “ambiguity” might also indicate that the students had not considered the issues in question deeply during their studies, before the data was gathered. Besides, one should note that it is not always necessary to achieve universally accepted definitions. However, the topics under scrutiny must be contextualised, as we know that all knowledge is situated.

6.3 The significance and rationales of GP in teaching work – Research question two

The findings of this study show that the student teachers in Finland and Japan acknowledged—in a similar manner—the importance of global perspectives to the teaching profession. Since the 1990s, researchers around the world have argued with increasing vigour that teachers and pupils should be prepared for global citizenship. This statement remains valid, even after thirty years (Levy & Fox, 2015). The quantitative findings of this study led to my qualitatively exploring rationales for regarding global perspectives as highly important to future teachers. I will therefore elaborate on some insightful perceptions shared by the student teachers in this study and suggest some guiding pedagogical principles.

Student teachers in both contexts expressed the view that cross-cultural awareness is one of the most commonly expressed rationales for the significance of global perspectives to teachers. A cross-cultural awareness, paired with Gaudelli’s humanistic orientation, stresses the idea that values must be incorporated into pedagogical practices. Knowledge or understanding of cross-cultural contents is insufficient, therefore (Freire, 1970). The first “guiding principle” of teacher
education for GP is that student teachers must be equipped with the adequate skills and knowledge to facilitate ethical, culturally sensitive global learning in pupils.

In the responses of the Japanese student teachers in this study, a “perspective consciousness” and “awareness of one’s choices”—with evidence of Gaudelli’s “nationalistic orientation”—are the evident rationales for the development of GP. However, those rationales do not necessarily include a “critical consciousness” or “an attitude of seeking socially just practices in an active manner,” unless the student teachers in question were to acquire a critical understanding of globalisation or hierarchical power relations—or were to seek perspectives other than their own (Eidoo et al., 2011). It is vital, I attest, that a perspective consciousness and an awareness of one’s choices be accompanied by critical engagement with student views and situatedness. These should be incorporated in more detail into the development of teaching global perspectives in the context as depicted.

One theme apparent only among the views of the Japanese student teachers was an “awareness of the global dynamics rationale” as part of a neoliberal orientation. Some Japanese student teachers viewed GP as means for pupils to advance successfully in an increasingly globalised labour market. The growing diversity in Japanese society casts GP as useful when working with colleagues from multiple backgrounds. Many of the Japanese student teachers discussed the idea of “global” in relation to neoliberal motivations—and as it may reflect or relate to the current Japanese economy.

Some of the Finnish students’ views indicated critical attitudes towards globalisation, attitudes one might associate with Gaudelli’s critical “humanistic orientation” (Freire, 1970), or with a “transformation orientation” in this study. Experiencing the consequences of neoliberal activities in Finland, some student teachers reflected critically upon—and questioned—capitalist, market-based policies that continue to reproduce unjust, unequal power structures in contemporary societies. That those perceptions were gathered from Finnish student teachers with prior work in the teaching industry suggests the importance of experience outside or prior to teacher training. The third “guiding principle” of teacher training for global perspectives is the importance, even for those without prior experience, of being given experiences within the training programme that help to secure an understanding the dynamics of the globalised world, in relation to local settings and gaining alternative critical perspectives (Burbules & Berk, 1999). One might obtain such experiences, for example, through internships, teaching practices, and chances for voluntary work in diverse contexts. Opportunities for intercultural learning contributes to comprehending “difference”
through “eye-opening moments.” Experiences of studying abroad and living in unfamiliar contexts have been shown to provide students with realisations concerning their own presumptions—and with transformative memories (see Merryfield, 2000; Wilson, 1993). Such exercises, combined with continuous critical reflection, would contribute to the development of global perspectives in teaching (Merryfield, 1993).

Also, student teachers in both cases suggested that rapidly changing social realities had informed them of a growing need for teachers to be aware of the importance of acquiring global perspectives. The number of pupils and families from different backgrounds is rising in both Oulu, Finland and Hiroshima, Japan, which—according to these students—is an important, even emotional driving force that affects the motives and demands experienced by student teachers towards developing GP. As the fourth guiding principle for teacher education, one should provide opportunities for interactive dialogue that might lead student teachers to discuss and critically reflect upon their role in a future inter-connected world. This would increase their competence considerably when teaching diverse classrooms. Teacher training programmes should provide even more opportunities for student teachers to engage independently and collaboratively in critical reflection on global perspectives in their future work.

### 6.4 Student teachers’ perceptions of GP in their teacher education

– Research question three

The statistical findings of this study show slightly diverging views on the role of teacher education in the development of GP. The Finnish student teachers tended to see their teacher training as slightly more relevant than the Japanese student teachers’ views of their own teacher education. The differences were the largest when assessing the role of peer groups or of student evaluation—such as, for example, exams and assignments, which Finnish students considered to be more significant for learning GP. In my semi-structured interviews, both groups of student teachers had a more detailed knowledge of the elements that limited or supported their opportunities for learning.

Reflecting on the educational settings of Finland and Japan, one may conclude that the histories and socio-cultural contexts of both countries have impacted the structures and practices of teacher education. In Hiroshima, where teacher training should follow a strictly outlined national curriculum, teacher educators are careful to equip student teachers with curriculum-essential subject knowledge and teaching
methods. While the Japanese student teachers declared several pedagogical practices taught in their training programme to be helpful and successful, critical voices were evident. The Japanese students interviewed stated that the fixed sets of their curriculum timetable do not provide opportunities, necessarily, to “think deeply” or allow for chances to explore interests further—explaining that, for example, taking a course in another discipline is difficult if that discipline is not part of the national primary teacher training curriculum. Little room appears to exist in which to develop the critical consciousness of Japanese student teachers or to provide them with chances to engage critically with issues such as the complexities of interrelation in a globalised world. Once the Japanese student teachers become teachers in schools, they will teach lessons such as “integrated learning,” in which global citizenship education can be implemented. However, it may be doubtful that student teachers in Japan are prepared adequately to tackle global issues: Japanese teacher educators can choose to offer their students chances to discuss and learn about complex global issues—but often leave such topics unexplored (Kakuta, 2015). Future teachers may find it challenging to facilitate global citizenship education in their teaching if they have no passion, experience, or motivation with which to implement inspiring education in global citizenship.

Conversely, the Finnish student teachers offered positive insights into Finnish academic culture, which seems to be a more flexible setting, allowing student teachers to choose courses from different programmes. Those courses helped the Finnish student teachers to gain knowledge and develop perspectives by learning with peers from different disciplines, which appeared to be important in acquiring multiple perspectives. The Finnish student teachers also stressed the positive role of learning methods—for example, group work, drama, or discussion—more intensely than their Japanese counterparts, considering such learning methods as useful in allowing theoretical discussion to be accompanied by practical examples of the application of knowledge inside and outside classrooms. Such “essences” of instructional practice are shared across teacher training in Finland (Tryggvason, 2009). Finnish teacher educators tend to value student reflection and critical thinking, intending that their students will be able to justify their future pedagogical decisions (Tryggvason, 2009). From a critical pedagogical perspective, an essence of praxis was explicit in the training as discussed by the Finnish student teachers, who valued the learning experiences in question, describing them as helpful opportunities to develop global perspectives.

Besides instructional practices, student teachers in each setting displayed different attitudes to the pedagogical skills of teacher educators and to the roles of
their peers and of career visions. In summary, the student teachers in Oulu showed a positive attitude to their close relationship with their teachers, who encouraged discussion and reflection on developing GP. Such close teaching was enabled by organising studies in smaller groups, which, at the time of this study, was more common in Oulu than in Hiroshima. Among other positive aspects, according to the Oulu student teachers, was that their classmates in the TEKNO programme came from different backgrounds, a breadth of origins that contributed positively to the diversity of the group and to understanding different views. For the Finnish student teachers, it was evident that engaging in their classes—and in collaborative learning—had helped them to develop global perspectives. The Finnish participants also stated that, in Finland, student teachers are highly motivated because the teaching profession is extremely popular among graduating high school students. The two teacher educators in Oulu stressed the importance of hands-on experiences in learning processes—or “learning by doing.” In Finnish teacher training, multiple teaching practice periods reflect the importance of theory and practice, as compared to the Japanese teacher training system, in which practice teaching sessions are more limited.

The Japanese student teachers shared the view that current Japanese academic culture rests on the idea that teacher educators should be seen as “holders of the expert knowledge,” while student teachers are to be viewed as “static receivers of knowledge.” In Japan, interactive participation between students and teachers is limited in lectures due to high class sizes and due to a traditional lecture style still implemented in some courses. This lack of engagement and the design of present Japanese learning environments in teacher training—which do not permit “a real-world approach” or project-based learning (see, for example, Augustine, Harshman and Merryfield 2015)—may have hindered chances for student teachers in Japan to develop global perspectives. Moreover, most of the Japanese student teachers interviewed shared a relatively vague vision of their future teaching. Not all of them were considering actually becoming primary school teachers.

A clear distinction was evident, therefore, between the student teachers in the Finnish teacher training and those in the Japanese teacher training programme. As current university teacher training in Japan accommodates students with diverse career goals, “meaningful learning” must be provided for everyone, whatever their future plans. Some Japanese pre-service students reported that some presentations had been given on teaching practice overseas, which sparked their curiosity and introduced “completely different ways of thinking” about education. Regardless of future plans, more “immersion” experiences or simulated, engaging activities in
classrooms would contribute to broader perspectives and open-mindedness. My interviews with teacher educators in Japan make plain that efforts have been made to engage university students in diverse practices in Japan and abroad. However, more flexibility should occur in offering student teachers a choice of alternative ways to specialise.

As critical theories contend, while curricula and instructional content are important, the dynamics of a learning group are also significant in developing GP. The positive views of the Finnish student teachers show that a relatively diverse background and a highly supportive learning environment are helpful when examining issues from multiple perspectives, aiming for deeper, more critical thinking. The student teachers at Hiroshima University enrolled in teacher training immediately after graduating from high school, meaning that, in terms of prior experience, their group dynamics were somewhat homogenous as compared to the dynamics of the Finnish students.

Conversely, students in the Japanese teacher training programme, roughly 180 per cohort, attend from all over Japan, meaning that their groups are typically larger and more diverse in geographical origin. However, the structural challenge of teaching large groups does not necessarily encourage students to engage actively in learning, meaning that more innovative learning and teaching is necessary. One must consider group dynamics carefully, therefore, when aiming to contribute to meaningful learning experiences for student teachers, in developing GP. However, when planning global education, no single factor alone guarantees optimal outcomes—although each may contribute to a successful learning experience. Global education experts recommend a comprehensive approach to reaching global intercultural competences (Järvelä, 2011; Räsänen, 2007).

In summary, the academic culture at universities in Finland is more encouraging for students, due to its teaching methods, ideas about learning, and important structural factors. In Japan, the teacher training curriculum appears constrained by tendencies towards centralisation. Moreover, structural and sociocultural aspects affect views of the general role of teacher training in both countries, particularly in relation to global education. Student teachers in Finland and Japan shared the view that opportunities exist for them to develop GP. However, those opportunities are still—to some extent—inadequately supported and require further attention from teacher educators and students themselves.
6.5 Contribution to the field

This section discusses the contribution of this study which, alongside its results, offers an analytical framework developed to study global perspectives and for application in comparative education.

Theoretical framework for global perspectives

One key contribution of this study is its adjusted, developed theoretical framework, which helped the author to map out the ideas and rationales of the student teachers regarding global perspectives. My model was adjusted from Gaudelli’s (2009) heuristics of Global Citizenship Education, which presents minor and dominant discourses of GCE. My framework also incorporated the five aims of Hanvey’s global perspectives (1976, 1982) and two goals from critical pedagogy, engaging meaningfully with the views shared by student teachers in Finland and Japan. This analytical tool is not useful solely for the identification of different student views; it also shows the tensions between and manifestations of the discourses of global perspectives.

Drawn from a theoretical foundation, my adjusted analytical tool might be put to an extended use. Given the ongoing internationalisation of higher education (see, for example, Altbach & Knight, 2007; Ninomiya et al., 2009), one might use this tool as a theoretical framework with which to examine university teacher and lecturer ideas of global perspectives. This model is a reflective tool for individual and collective learning in teacher training and for other studies of global citizenship education. When engaging with policy texts, it provides an analytical lens through which to situate educational policies and documents in their leanings toward certain orientations. Moreover, adding another theoretical element would turn this two-dimensional model into a three-dimensional model, depending on one’s research questions and goals.

Comparative education in teacher education

Increasing numbers of international research projects involve multinational members and research contexts, as an interconnected world provides mobility and technology for conducting such research (Appelt et al., 2015). This study was directed by one researcher with prior knowledge of and experience in both contexts investigated. My knowledge and experience of an insider’s position, having lived
and studied in both research contexts, and an outsider’s position, having observed
the phenomena in this study from a position outside each research context, helped
me to better understand the settings researched.

A comparison or examination of the “mirror effects” of the diverse contexts in
this study offers insights into elements of those settings that might otherwise have
remained unrecognised or undiscovered. As Chapter 6 has discussed, one such
“hidden element” is structural issues in the given contexts. For example, student
perceptions of GP appeared to be influenced to an extent by one, differences in
freedom and authority and two, differences in freedom in the curriculum of the
teacher training programme. Similarly, student views reflect global education
policies and contextual ideas of internationalisation somewhat.

Comparing these two cases made the importance of context even more apparent,
since the students, in the two settings of teacher training in Oulu and Hiroshima,
displayed partially different orientations—those differences being variations in the
signs of a humanistic or nationalistic or neoliberal orientation. While the two
contexts differed, my comparison of Finnish and Japanese teacher training
confirmed that student teachers in societies with a growing diversity seem to
understand a demand that future teachers have the skills and competence to meet
that diversity. This study’s comparative approach offered space in which to reflect
on mutual learning patterns in teacher training. To secure space for reflection is a
principle aim of any comparative research.

As I attested when discussing the validity and reliability of my findings, a
qualitative-oriented mixed methodology—as used in this research—poses
questions of subjectivity versus objectivity (Alvesson & Skoldberg, 2000). I have
attempted to overcome such limitations using multiple methodological approaches.
This study’s comparative design exemplifies the principle of particularisation more
closely than the principle of universality. In particular, by comparing the teacher
training in Oulu and Hiroshima, this research shares findings from two educational
contexts in which English is not the first language. Currently, English-speaking
western countries produce the bulk of research on global citizenship education and
intercultural teacher training (Levy & Fox 2015). By interweaving my findings
from two data sets, the first from a Finnish university, the other from a Japanese
university, I was able in both settings to investigate teacher training that is
committed deeply to education, but which face challenges in developing globally
responsible future teachers.

This study also helped to highlight the extreme usefulness of knowing local
networks, languages, and sociocultural backgrounds when seeking access to
appropriate data with which to produce meaningful research. The crucial nature of these resources in this study has implications for comparative research in general. It is vital, I contend, to establish adequate support, including effective support networks, in a comparative research context. A comparison of two diverse contexts is always challenging. It presents a particular challenge if only one researcher is conducting the study. One should also consider the use of appropriate, innovative instruments for comparative studies, instruments that acknowledge the uniqueness of the contexts compared (Johnson et al., 2007; Morgan, 2014).

6.6 Future research and concluding remarks

Reflecting on this small-scale comparative study, I contend that it would be meaningful to continue this research on a much larger scale, involving the scrutiny of substantially more data. A larger comparative study exploring cross-national, cross-regional, and cross-cultural differences and similarities would advance an even more diverse mapping of global perspectives—and offer even more room in which to reflect on the further development of teacher training. Another possibility would be to explore more deeply the meanings people assign to the key concepts in this study. Yet another interesting possibility would be to conduct joint research in a cross-cultural, multi-lingual research group, so as to provide a deeper comprehension of cultural and educational contexts.

The prospect of considering the findings of this study more pragmatically, to discover how one may cultivate global perspectives and a critical reflectiveness more explicitly in teacher training, and in a socio-culturally nuanced manner, is exciting. Synthesising my findings, derived from quantitative and qualitative empirical data, may lead to the development of meaningful practices through which to better prepare student teachers for a more diverse school environment. Such practices might be realised as part of an “action research” design for teacher training (see, for example, Perrett, 2002), a design in which teacher educators, student teachers, and in-service teachers take part. Such research might begin with an “action plan” detailing one, the gathering of material and instruments with which to build theory content for lessons; two, the implementation of lessons through experiential activities and reflective exercises; three, the evaluation of lessons through pre-structured measures; and, four, critical reflection on any practices subject to further revision.

A research-based development of practices for teaching global perspectives asks for “blended” learning that fuses virtual and face-to-face collaboration,
resulting potentially in deeper reflection and in a deeper learning experience for course participants (Nicolson & Uematsu, 2013). Such a blending of study methods would, I suggest, offer chances for teacher educators from other contexts to engage in dialogue and to co-create practices reflecting multiple perspectives. Existing studies have already reported on the effectiveness of blended learning and “flipped classrooms” in teacher training and university education in Japan (Kondo, 2015; Leis, 2016; Shigeta, 2014).

Future research projects might offer, not only interviews and questionnaires, but observations and ethnographical approaches. In teacher training, developing a contextualised means of implementing global perspectives might provide innovative pedagogical possibilities to teacher educators. Establishing such projects would be a worthwhile experiment within action research.

This study has mentioned Intercultural Teacher Education (ITE) at the University of Oulu. The ITE programme seeks to prepare future teachers with an intercultural understanding and a knowledge of the global skills and dynamics necessary to accommodate pupils from different backgrounds. During the final stages of this study, Hiroshima University launched a new teacher training programme entitled “Global Teacher Education Programme” (Hiroshima University, 2016b). That new Hiroshima programme aims to equip teachers with the skills and competence to facilitate the development of the “global-mindedness” of future school pupils. As a point of study, a research project might examine the ongoing implementation of such intercultural teacher training in different contexts, engaging in fruitful discussion and providing opportunities to reflect on diverse manners of educating ethically responsible teachers.

From the beginning of this study, I have had a varied audience in mind. By using a mixed-method approach, I set out to offer knowledge to quantitatively-oriented and qualitatively-oriented scholars in international global education. I hope that the theoretical framework of this study will interest researchers in global education in particular, who might use it as a basis for adaptation and further development. I have compared two educational institutions—one in Oulu, Finland, the other in Hiroshima, Japan—in a breadth of scope that I hope will engage readers in both contexts. In 2019, Finland and Japan will celebrate their hundredth anniversary of diplomatic relations. Comparative dialogue between Finnish and Japanese educators is expected to continue.

I have ended this study by exploring how teacher training relates to socio-cultural contexts. I hope this study will inspire any researchers and practitioners curious about developing teacher training through cross-cultural dialogue. This
study began as research on global perspectives in teacher training. It ends by disclosing the deep manners in which notions of teaching global perspectives are rooted and embedded one, in ideas of teachers’ roles in a society; two, in fundamental ideas of teaching as a profession; and three, in philosophies of teaching, learning, and the nature of teacher training.
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Appendices

Appendix 1. Interview guides

Topics for the individual interviews (English)
1. The year of study
2. The programme of the study/seminar
3. Agree/disagree about the importance of global perspectives
4. Recent examples of realising the importance of global perspectives
5. Reasons why GP is important for teachers
6. Changes in the local society, local schools
7. Experience in teacher education
8. The role of teacher education in development of global perspectives
9. Career visions for the future
10. Reasons for choosing the teacher education programme
11. Understanding of the aims of global citizenship education
12. Learning experience in teacher education
13. Interaction and discussion in teacher education
14. Expectations for teacher education

(Japanese)
1. 学年
2. 所属学部
3. 異文化能力やグローバルなもの見方は、必要か
4. 最近起きた出来事などで、その必要性を感じた場面
5. なぜ教員にとって GP は必要なのか
6. 住んでいる地域や学校での最近の変化
7. 教員養成課程での経験
8. GP を構築する上での教員養成課程の役割
9. 将来のキャリアビジョン
10. 教員養成課程を選んだ理由
11. グローバル市民教育の目的
12. 教員養成課程での学びの経験
13. 教員養成課程内でのやりとりや議論
14. 教員養成課程に対しての期待・望む事
Appendix 2. Questions in the questionnaire (English)

1. To which extent do you agree that teacher education helps you to cultivate “global perspectives”? (Scale: strongly agree, agree, disagree, strongly disagree)

2. Which aspects of your teacher education have supported intercultural learning such as cultivating “intercultural competence” and constructing a “global perspective”? (Double scale: curriculum, knowledge of lecturers, classroom discussion & peer support, assignments & exams with most definitely, definitely, not really, definitely not)

3. What are other activities, experience or people that have helped you to gain “global perspective” outside of teacher education? (Double scale)

4. Thinking of the ongoing internationalization of higher education in Finland, which “internationalizing” activities are visible in the daily life at your home university? (Multiple choice)

5. Do you think that “global perspectives” is valued for your profession and therefore will help your career development as a teacher? Please explain the choice of your answer (Scale: strongly agree, agree, disagree, strongly disagree and open-ended)

6. You have been asked questions related to “global perspectives.” In your understanding, how would you describe what “global perspectives” is in teacher’s profession? (open-ended)

7. What would you say are the aims of teaching global related issues, global education and/or global citizenship education to pupils in your future class, in your own words? (open-ended)

8. How comfortable are you to discuss and teach global related issues in curriculum such as global education and global citizenship education right now? (Scale)

9. What are the challenges that you might face as a teacher dealing with global issues in your subject and teaching global education and global citizenship education in your future classroom. Please rate how challenging are the following tasks when teaching primary school children. (Double scale)

10. What sort of knowledge and skills in relation to global perspectives should you be able to master after having completed this education program? Please give some examples of specific knowledge and skills in your opinion! (Open-ended)
Appendix 3. Questions in the questionnaire (Japanese)

1. あなたは現在所属している教育学部または教員養成課程が、『異文化間能力』の育成や『グローバルなものの見方』の構築に、どれぐらい役に立っていると思いますか。

2. 教育学部または教員養成課程において、具体的にどの側面が『異文化間能力』の育成や『グローバルなものの見方』の構築に役立っていると思いますか。

3. 大学における教育や授業以外で、あなたの『異文化間能力』の育成や『グローバルなものの見方』の構築に役立っていると思う経験、人との出会い、活動等はありますか。以下から、どの項目がどれくらい役になっているかお選びください。

4. 現在諸大学において高等教育の国際化が進められています。あなたの大学では、どの様な国際化が目に見える形で進められていますか。以下の項目についてお答えください。

5. 『異文化間能力』の育成や『グローバルなものの見方』の開発は、あなたの将来の職業（教師、教育者）において評価されるものであり、またキャリアを形成するうえで役に立つと思いますか？

6. これまでの質問のなかに、『グローバルなものの見方』がでてきましたが、詳細についての定義は提示されていません。あなたは、将来の職業（教員、教育者、またはその他）において、『グローバルなものの見方』とはどの様なものだと思いますか。あなたの考えを下の欄に記入してください。

7. 教育上の新しい取り組みとして、グローバル教育や地球市民教育（グローバルな問題やグローバルな内容に特化した授業）が世界的に紹介されていますが、これらを生徒に教える目的は何だとお考えになりますか。なんのためにそのような取り組みがあるか、あなたの考えを書いてください。

8. もしあなたが今グローバル教育や地球市民教育などの授業に参加することになったら、どれくらい自信をもってグローバル関連の議論に参加することができますか。

9. 仮に将来、あなたの担当教科でグローバル教育や地球市民教育の授業を通じてグローバル関連の内容を担当教科で教えることがになった場合、以下のどの項目が難題（チャレンジ）として浮かび上がると思いますか。小学校の生徒に教える場合を想定しながらあなたの考えを教えてください。

10. 『異文化間能力』や『グローバルなものの見方』の構築という意味で、あなたは現在所属している教育学部や教員養成課程を修了した際、どのような知識やスキルを習得するでしょうか。具体的にどの様な能力や考え方を得られると思うか、例を挙げて説明してください。
Appendix 4. Consent form for interviews

Consent form for interviews (English)

Researcher’s name: Kiyoko Uematsu
Institution: Faculty of Education, University of Oulu
Research project: Doctoral Research

I have read and understood the information below.

The data collected through this interview will not be used for purposes other than research.

It will not be available for others except the researcher and what is discussed during the interview will be confidential.

Name:
Email address:
Date and Signature:

Consent form for interviews (Japanese)

面談調査協力の同意書

研究者名：植松希世子
所属: オウル大学教育研究科
研究区分：博士課程後期

下記の条件を理解し、陰田ビュー調査に協力することに同意いたします。このインタビューを通じてご提供頂いた情報は、本研究以外の目的で使用されることはありません。又、ご提供頂いた情報は、研究者以外の第三者が触れることはありません。また個人名ができることはありません。
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