

2020

## A Case-Based Tool Promoting Teacher's Reflection on Intercultural Encounters

Anuleena Kimanen

*University of Helsinki*, [anuleena.kimanen@helsinki.fi](mailto:anuleena.kimanen@helsinki.fi)

Tapani Innanen

[tapani.innanen@helsinki.fi](mailto:tapani.innanen@helsinki.fi)

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ro.ecu.edu.au/ajte>



Part of the [Bilingual, Multilingual, and Multicultural Education Commons](#), and the [Teacher Education and Professional Development Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Kimanen, A., & Innanen, T. (2020). A Case-Based Tool Promoting Teacher's Reflection on Intercultural Encounters. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 45(6).  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.14221/ajte.2020v45n6.1>

This Journal Article is posted at Research Online.  
<https://ro.ecu.edu.au/ajte/vol45/iss6/1>

## **A Case-Based Tool Promoting Teacher's Reflection on Intercultural Encounters**

Anuleena Kimanen  
Tapani Innanen  
University of Helsinki

*Abstract: This design-based study explores what kind of reflection in-service or student teachers produced in case-based discussion workshops, and how. Worksheets on the case and tasks facilitated discussion in small groups. In this study, the targets of reflection written on those sheets are analysed. Three levels and seven categories of reflection emerged, ranging from context and practices to principles and power relations. Most of the reflection was superficial or on the meso-level, the level of deepest reflection was reached to greatly differing degrees depending on the group or case concerned. Both some in-service and some student teachers needed scaffolding by the instructor, but certain tasks in the case discussion sheets could also serve as scaffolds. Intercultural competences are often defined as knowledge, attitudes and skills, and reflection produced by the case-based tool covers all the three areas.*

**Keywords:** cultural diversity; case method; design-based; reflection; teacher education

### **Introduction**

#### **A Finnish Research-Based Project to Develop Teacher Education**

Until recently, Finland has been considered a culturally fairly homogeneous Northern European society. The number of people living in Finland who were born elsewhere has increased from about 60,000 (1.2% of the population) in 1990 to about 370,000 (6.7%) in 2017 (Statistics Finland, 2018). Several “old” ethnic and/or linguistic minorities are established in Finland, including Swedish speakers, Sámi, and Roma, as well as “new” minorities due to recent migration, like people born in Russia, Estonia or Somalia (Saukkonen, 2013). Therefore, the new (2014) Finnish national curriculum talks about cultural diversity as affecting every student and as present within, not just between, individuals. Identities are described as multi-layered and dynamic. (Zilliacus et al., 2017.)

These larger societal changes place teachers in a new more intercultural setting, which presents a challenge for Finnish teacher education. In this context, a research-based development project called “Developing intercultural and inter-worldview sensitive teaching and counselling” (with the acronym KuKaS, abbreviated from the Finnish title) started in August 2017. It was one of the several teacher education development projects funded by the Finnish Ministry of Culture and Education from 2017 to 2019 and hosted by the Faculty of Theology in the University of Helsinki. The Faculty has close connections to teacher education, as one of the specialist options within the study programme is subject teacher training. The project researchers conducted various educational interventions in both initial

and in-service teacher training through different networks, ranging from 75-minute workshops to a 22-hour university course. A certain method was developed and used in all the training settings: a case-based discussion tool for promoting intercultural and inter-worldview reflectivity. This article presents the tool and the kinds of reflection its users produced.

### **Intercultural Competences and Reflection**

Competences needed by teachers or other professionals in a culturally diverse context are most often referred to as intercultural competences, and worldview diversity can be considered as part of the cultural diversity they address (Riitaoja & Dervin, 2014; Rissanen et al., 2016). These competences, according to many authors, consist of knowledge, skills and attitudes that enable appropriate interaction in culturally diverse contexts (Byram & al., 2001; Hernández-Bravo et al., 2017). In Deardorff's (2006) process model, intercultural competence consists of interrelated and cyclically developing attitudes, knowledge, comprehension and skills, as well as internal (informed frame of reference shift) and external (appropriate behaviour) outcomes.

Reflection seems to be a vital part of intercultural competences. Byrd Clark & Dervin (2014) even talk about a reflexive turn in intercultural education. In their analysis, reflexivity can take three forms: critical reflection that reveals power structures; awareness that entails becoming aware of representations and constructions; and hyper-reflexivity that goes beyond traditional ways of reflexivity. However, they mainly write from the point of view of research. The classical definition of teacher reflection comes from Dewey, and is formulated by Yost et al. (2000) as entailing open-mindedness towards alternative views, wholeheartedness to look at ourselves critically and responsibility to act based on acquired understanding, all of which are very important elements of intercultural competence.

Howard (2003) regards critical reflection as a prerequisite for culturally relevant education, and similarly Hunter et al. (2006) name self-reflectivity and openness as necessary steps for global competence, defined very much in line with intercultural competence. In Deardorff's (2006) model, elements of reflection are present in at least two components: openness in attitudes and self-awareness in knowledge and comprehension.

From another point of view, Bennett (1993) approaches intercultural competences through the concept of intercultural sensitivity, or an individual's ability to become aware of and adapt to diversity. This concept was initially used in the project, as can be noted in its name, but it was critically reviewed and rejected. Sensitivity seemed to be identified with certain cautious practices and uncritical compliance with any cultural claims. Educator interviews, conducted within the project (Kimanen, 2018), confirmed the notion that teachers' thinking is tightly knit together with practice. Teachers have to make decisions, often in complex situations, and constant negotiations on different aspects of cultural and worldview diversity take place in school communities. Reflection, especially in the Deweyan sense, seems to connect the necessity to both postpone judgement and act in an appropriate manner. However, intercultural sensitivity may well be a prerequisite for intercultural reflectivity, or part of it, redefining openness towards cultural diversity as the ability to see beyond first impressions and assumptions.

Openness or sensitivity to alternative views in intercultural interaction overlaps with self-reflectivity. For instance, educators' individual life histories may lead to certain interpretations and expectations that are easily left unquestioned (Clandinin & Huber, 2005). More generally speaking, maintaining the dominant culture as a norm may result from blindness to it (Nieto & Bode, 2012, p. 156). This links to avoiding cultural essentialism, the

tendency to interpret most actions of ethnically diverse students as dictated by culture (Fischer, 2011), whereas culture is not generally used in explaining the behaviour of the cultural majority.

In this article we focus on intercultural reflectivity, consisting of self-reflectivity and openness to diversity as well as critical reflection, although we recognize that reflectivity is only a part of intercultural competence. We believe that cultural knowledge can assist openness if used as a repertoire, together with other types of knowledge (cf. repertoire of skills, Allard, 2006, p. 336). Through reflection on different factors and perspectives, the educator is able to arrive at case-specific (not fixed) interpretations.

In education, reflection has been the dominant term, not only attached to intercultural encounters. It has been categorized in several ways. In some approaches, the main goal of reflection seems to be enhanced learning and teacher awareness of it, whereas in others, often labelled critical reflection, the aim is to enhance justice within education (Luttenberg & Bergen, 2008; Howard, 2003; Jay & Johnson, 2002). Reflection has been evaluated both in terms of depth and breadth. Regarding depth, according to Korthagen (2005), teacher reflection may consist of different nested levels: 1.) environment; 2.) behaviour; 3.) competencies; 4.) beliefs; 5.) identity; 6.) mission. In Korthagen's onion model, the first, outer levels represent the superficial level of reflection whereas the inner ones concern the teacher's core qualities. In some other approaches, depth is represented by critical, as opposed to technical, practical, or descriptive, reflection (Jay & Johnson, 2002; Luttenberg & Bergen, 2008). Concerning breadth, a variety of factors have been addressed: internal and external, past and present, or various fields of action (Luttenberg & Bergen, 2008). When reflection is required to encompass ethical dimensions or the social context of education, it comes close to critical reflection. Both critical reflection and self-reflection are important in intercultural reflectivity.

Some previous research has addressed developing reflectivity and other similar qualities in teacher education. For instance, Acquah & Commins (2015) have observed that self-reflection and critical reflection on course materials created dissonances in student teachers' minds, but also helped to resolve these dissonances. Yost et al. (2000) suggest that teacher education could enhance open-mindedness by seminar instruction, responsibility by engaging students in action research projects and wholeheartedness through self-evaluative writing assignments. Rissanen et al. (2016) concluded that improved self-awareness with theoretical reflection increased student teachers' empathy towards other worldviews, which in turn enhanced their positive relationship with diversities.

### **Case-Based Methods and Intercultural Reflection**

Case-based methods have been used and researched in teacher education for some decades. Case methods typically include either writing, discussion, or both. Usually a case is a written narrative of something that happened in teacher's professional activity, but it could be a video clip or a lesson plan. Case writing involves recollection and articulation of an instance selected based on the specific training goals and the situation at hand. Case discussion means collaborative reflection on multiple aspects of the case. Case methods are used, for example, to bridge practical and theoretical knowledge, enhance memory, activate learners, do justice to the complexity of educational practice and stimulate reflection. (Loughran, 2012, Schulman, 2004, Carter, 1999, Merseth, 1996.) These methods have also been used in teacher education for cultural diversity, providing multiple perspectives and nurturing awareness of one's own position and privilege (Kleinfeld, 1990; Brown & Kraehe, 2010).

In the design of our case-based tool, we drew on two perspectives on case methods. First, we wanted to address the concern that cultural knowledge would enhance stereotypes (e.g. Buchtel, 2013; Nieto, 1999). To strengthen the view that cultural knowledge is a part of an educator's repertoire of interpretations, participants were invited to think of a variety of possible explanations to the case. Second, we were committed to fostering reflectivity, so that judgements were withheld until the process of self-reflection, critical reflection (on power and privilege) and using one's repertoire of theoretical and experiential knowledge finished. Collaboration was considered vital to the tool. When participants in different stages of their careers and with different educational or experiential backgrounds and fields of expertise met, they were expected to add to each other's perspectives. Previous research shows that case discussions should be guided, otherwise they may create harmful interpretations (Levin, 1999). However, to engage all the participants we sought to design a tool that would enable dividing a group of teachers or student teachers into smaller groups of four to six people. Guidance was available, but the teacher educator was not present in every group all the time. Instead, the tasks were intended to guide the discussion to a deeper level of reflection, at least widening the participants' repertoires.

The research question addressed in this study is the following: What kind of reflection on intercultural and inter-worldview encounters do case-based discussion workshops produce, and how? This question is answered in qualitative terms. The answer, however, includes formulating certain criteria for reflection that can be included in intercultural competences, such as frequencies of 'superficial' and more desirable reflection.

## **Methodology**

### **Design-Based Research**

The study is closely connected to the research-based academic development project. For this setting, the design-based research (DBR) approach was chosen. Since the 1990's DBR has been used especially in education, teaching, and learning settings. It can be seen as a close relative to the action research model but, as Wang & Hannafin (2005) explain, DBR studies and develops a more a fixed design or model. The aim of these designs and the theoretical insights reached when evaluating them is broader than simply to solve local challenges (Anderson & Shattuck, 2012).

Juuti & Lavonen (2006) propose some conditions for DBR: 1) DBR is essentially an iterative process; 2) designing generates an artefact; 3) designing renders novel educational knowledge. The setting is – or at least can be – used in a pragmatic way to develop educational settings. In this article, we describe and analyse the results of the first cycle of the iterative process and present some reflection for the next cycle. The artefact is the tool for small-group case discussions described above, and evaluating it has produced knowledge about enhancing and assessing reflection. The research methods and data used here are typical of DBR: there are different types of data and they are analysed through different approaches (Anderson & Shattuck, 2012).

### **The Design of the Case-Based Tool**

The aim of our case discussions was to examine authentic cases experienced in culturally or religiously diverse school contexts. In this article, this kind of case-based discussion, preceded by motivation to approach cultural and worldview diversity and

concluding with remarks on the importance of reflection in teacher’s work, are called case discussion workshops.

In one of the first case discussion workshops we used a case from the first author’s own experience, and in two workshops the participants reported on their own cases. Before one workshop with numerous in-service educators, participants were asked to write their own cases as an advance assignment, and these were, with permission, selectively used in later workshops. For a case to be selected, it needed to contain enough information on the situation to enable discussion and be somehow multifaceted. The participants were asked to describe any situation they thought would involve cultural or worldview diversity, maintaining the anonymity of the people involved. There was no instruction on whether the solution should be included or not, and the degree to which a case can or should be ‘solved’ is, of course, a matter of interpretation. Participants were not asked to provide reflections on the case, but the wordings often convey the narrator’s thoughts.

The case discussions were always a part of a larger educational context for student teachers or in-service teachers. They were preceded by a short theoretical introduction and explicit instructions. Techniques were introduced to help the participants to question possible stereotypical thinking during the group discussion. The groups were handed an A3-sized case discussion sheet to structure the group work (Image 1).




Image 1. An original case discussion sheet used in a workshop (in Finnish)

The case is written in the middle, surrounded by at least the following tasks: “List alternative interpretations (Why did things go like this?)”, “List alternative courses of action (What should the teacher/school do?)”, “What emotions are involved in the case?”, “What questions arise from the case?” and “What assumptions came up in the discussion?” Listing alternative interpretations was stressed in the oral instructions. The idea was that the groups both discuss and write their answers; they discuss in order to share perspectives and write in order to articulate them.

The last question about assumptions was attached to the role of the observer. The groups were requested to choose an observer from among themselves whose duty would be to

point out assumptions, that is, claims that were not grounded in arguments. However, this worked well only in some groups, so it was omitted. Thus, we recognized the importance of ensuring that the most common assumptions and stereotyping were addressed immediately during the small-group discussions or in debriefing afterwards. Depending on the complexity of each situation, the groups worked for 20–40 minutes on a single case. The group discussions were always followed by a debriefing where the reflective nature of the technique and importance of postponing judgement were stressed, and possible key points in the case were featured.

### The Data and the Analysis

The data was gathered from five training case discussion workshops carried out in diverse settings (Table 1). The first author instructed all the workshops, assisted by the second author or other KuKaS project team members in workshops 1–3. In this article, the A3 case discussion sheets filled in by the participants are analysed. Returning the sheet to be included in the research material was voluntary. In Finland, ethical approval from a committee is not needed for this kind of research project. In all, 80 completed sheets were gathered from the workshops conducted during the spring term 2018.

Among the participants mentioned in Table 1, most of the student teachers were in practical training to teach religious education. The theology and education students were taking a course on worldview diversity in school, and many of the theology students planned to become subject teachers, but not all. The education students were primarily future classroom teachers. The in-service teachers, headteachers and counsellors were participants in a training conducted by the project. As we co-operated with their employer, this training was a compulsory part of their continuing professional development in co-operation with their employer, and not all of them were particularly interested in cultural diversity issues. The teacher educators, for their part, had chosen to participate in a training day organized by another project that invited us to cover worldview diversity.

Workshop number	Participants	Training context	Contents apart from case discussion workshop	Number of cases discussed	Number of participants (approx.)	Number of sheets
1	Student teachers and teacher educators	Pilot case discussion	Project presentation	1	5	1
2	Teacher educators	Part of a training day	Worldview and cultural diversity	1	60	12
3	Teachers, headteachers, and counsellors	Two training days	Cultural diversity, reflection, and skills	2, 3, or 4	100	52
4	Theology and education students	Course	Worldview diversity in school	2	20	8
5	Student teachers	Individual workshop	-	2	10	7

**Table 1. Case discussion workshops**

Not all of the cases in the workshops were the same, and obviously different cases provide different perspectives. In order to be chosen for discussion, a case had to provide enough background knowledge and at least some complexity, although the cases also had to

be concise enough to fit on the sheet. We sought to choose cases that provided different perspectives on cultural and worldview diversity: besides cases where diversity caused problems to be solved, we wanted to include cases where the narrator or their students learnt something about diversity.

As an example, we provide the case written by the first author. It shows how the narrator's conclusions are an inevitable part of the narrative. It is based on a true story, but some details may be incorrect due to the time that has elapsed. The names are pseudonyms and some genders have been changed.

*The case is about [annual] celebrations of independence [of Finland] at a lower secondary school. The school auditorium was so small that the independence festivities were held twice, for half the students at a time. "Janne" 's class was supposed to perform on both occasions. "Tuula" was the form tutor for Janne's class and responsible for the programme, and "Pirjo" also taught that class. When Pirjo brought Janne's class to the auditorium for the first celebration, Janne asked to remain standing on the side explaining that he could not stand up to honour the flag because he was a Jehovah's Witness. Pirjo allowed this. Janne stood next to the wall through the first part of the festivity: thus he did not specifically stand up to honour the flag arriving at the auditorium. In about a week there was a teachers' meeting where the form tutor Tuula wanted to discuss Janne's absence from the independence festivities without a valid reason. Pirjo was astonished. She said that she had sat next to Janne on the first occasion and witnessed him discreetly handling the issue with honouring the flag. However, it turned out that Janne's mother had taken Janne away from school after that, and Janne had not attended the second celebration.*

The participants' written entries on the case discussion sheets were analysed using Atlas.ti. Qualitative content analysis was used, combining data-driven and concept-driven approaches (Schreier, 2012). The analysis began with data-driven coding of the entries in the sheets. This inductive analysis inspired an adaptation of Korthagen's (2005) onion of reflection. It was converted into a pyramid of reflection (see below) that served as a coding frame for the final stage, deductive coding of each entry. Consistency of the coding was ensured by writing a code book and by two rounds of coding. If a certain idea was repeated in different sections of a sheet, it was coded only once, otherwise the same category could appear several times on one sheet. As always in categorizing, there were borderline cases. These were solved by creating certain baselines in the code book. To ensure reliability, borderline cases that could not be solved by simple baselines (for instance, when the attitude behind a certain entry was not clear) were not coded into categories that were particularly interesting for the conclusions, like critical and problematic reflection.

## **Results**

### **The Pyramid of Reflection**

When the entries on the discussion sheets were analysed, Korthagen's (2005) onion of reflection was re-formulated into a pyramid of reflection on encounters with cultural diversity. Like the onion model, our pyramid consists of deep and superficial targets of reflection (what is being reflected on), but it is oriented towards cases, that is, the interaction of diverse factors, not only the teacher's actions and thinking. Cultural and worldview diversity, other issues that avoid cultural essentialism, and concerns about equity have their places in the model. Critical reflection and self-reflection represent the deepest level of



reflection in this model (cf. Jay & Johnson, 2002), as they have been shown to play an important part in intercultural competence.




Figure 1. Pyramid of reflection on encounters with cultural diversity

The first two targets of reflection are on the superficial level: 1.) The context covers the motivations of the actors in the case, previous events and circumstances. 2.) The practices mean what the teacher or the school had done or should have done in the situation.

Level 3.) covers interpretations that seek to understand the actors' motivations in the case. This entails 3a.) actors' emotions, 3b.) social and developmental psychological interpretations, and 3c.) cultural and religious perspectives. Admittedly, explaining certain behaviour by a single factor can be regarded as essentialist. However, reflection on this level is usually deeper than on the first two, as it shows willingness to have empathy. The quality of reflection is better if several perspectives are considered. Thus, in our understanding the reflection on this meso-level becomes broad.

In our analysis, the last three targets are considered to be deep-level reflection. 4.) Reflection on principles addresses issues of equity and other instructions concerning the teacher's work. 5.) Reflection on one's own emotions raises the level of self-awareness. 6.) Critical reflection raises issues of cultural assumptions, stereotyping, and power.

For the purposes of this analysis, an additional category was formed, namely, problematic reflection which contradicted the training goals. This included insensitive words, essentialist and stereotyping thinking, generalizations, clearly ethnocentric claims, and assumptions. On all three levels there was a risk of problematic reflection, as is shown below.

Like any coding frame, this frame required the researcher to interpret and simplify to a certain degree. Sometimes rather insightful suggestions about motivation that were not covered by categories 3a.–c. had to be coded as context. The participants' notes were not always complete sentences which made it sometimes hard to fill in the gaps. On the one hand, the notes were responses to the questions printed on the sheet, but on the other hand these questions were sometimes interpreted in different ways, or the group discussion followed very different paths. Questions were particularly difficult to code because they sometimes contained a claim, and it was often difficult to know whether the participants wanted to make or question such a claim. Table 2 shows how the different targets of reflection are represented in the data.

Target of reflection	Frequency	Percentage
0. Problematic reflection	16	2.4
1. Context	172	25.5
2. Practices	190	28.2
3a. Actor's emotions	76	11.3
3b. Social and developmental psychology	29	4.3
3c. Culture and worldviews	76	11.3
4. Principles	48	7.1
5. One's own emotions	15	2.2
6. Critical reflection	52	7.7
<b>Total</b>	<b>674</b>	<b>100</b>

**Table 2. Frequencies and proportions of targets of reflection among the entries (N= 674)**

The sheets included specific questions about practices (2) and emotions (3a and 5), but were not explicit about whose emotions should be reflected on. Consequently, beyond the numbers above, there were five entries in which it was not clear who experienced the emotions described. Still, the high frequency of practices is probably affected by the educators' urge to solve the situations and evaluate practices.

Context and practices were the most prevalent categories. The context included a vast variety of ideas. Some of the entries produced possibilities not implied by the text like "Janne [the student absent from the celebration] had dentist or sth similar". Neutral explanations included "there was not enough information (the parents)". Understanding comments like "a new, insecure situation" were close to psychological interpretations, but there were also slightly judgemental comments like "the teacher is a 'nitpicker'" that were close to problematic reflection, but were interpreted as shorthand for personal preferences. Cases like the one of Muslim girls refusing to attend swimming lessons aroused interpretations that students may use religion as an excuse to avoid unpleasant activities. Participants mentioned this interpretation in wordings that were either judgemental and understanding, but also sometimes expressed it without an explicit attitude. A consistent solution, thus, was to code it as context, interpreting it as just one of the things an actor in a case wants to achieve.

Practices concerned, what the teacher did or did not do well, what the teacher should do, and what the school had not done or should do: "they did not talk to the family", "was the home informed about the celebration?", "the counsellor listened and encouraged", "[the teacher could] give an alternative assignment". Some solutions were based on the idea that somebody should support the individual teacher in the matters of cultural diversity, and on at least one occasion this was suggested as an internal effort: "The school could have a team that would familiarize with diversity issues, with representatives from minority groups." The in-service teachers mentioned cultural interpreters many times, and the municipality they worked in employs such experts. One student group suggested a "worldview expert" to every school leading the negotiations with the families.

Actors' emotions were often referred to by single words like "joy", "confusion", or "distress", but also in sentences or questions. "Are the Muslim students afraid of visiting a church?" "What was the student's stance?" "Why did she react like this?" "The parents experience the topic as dangerous." So, emotions were defined broadly here as feelings and emotional positions.

Social and developmental psychological issues also arose. Developmental psychology refers to certain emotions and behaviour that are labelled as typical at a certain age: "due to puberty swimming felt confusing"; "in third grade they did not question the teacher's stance". Social psychology entails, for the most part, group phenomena on different levels: "group pressure"; "I [the student in the case] also belong to this group"; "conflict between one's own wishes and the community".

Explanations concerning culture and worldview were sometimes general, like “the absence is linked with the worldview”, sometimes provided explanations, like “the impurity of pork” or “nudity a taboo”, and sometimes questioned generalizations, like “there are different cultures within a country”. Sometimes entries were normative, like “knowledge about characteristics of cultural spheres”, but there were also questions: “how do Jehovah’s Witnesses relate to the flag/national day?”

The reflections concerning principles ranged from pedagogical principles (e.g. “equal participation in school activities”; “taking different backgrounds into account is the goal”; “things are not black-and-white -> dealt with circumstantially”) to the law (compulsory education) and the curriculum. In fact, the curriculum was mentioned at least 15 times, also in relation to other targets of reflection. This reflects the Finnish educational system where teachers are trusted to conduct high-quality education guided by documents, not external control, and due to that trust, autonomy and competences provided by their initial education, teachers are highly committed to fulfilling their task (Toom & Husu, 2016). Sometimes the reflections pondered which of the conflicting principles the teacher should adhere to. “At times the student and the family have differing ideas about policies (e.g. eating secretly at school during Ramadan) – what is the teacher’s role and responsibility? Does one have to inform [the family]?” or “who is responsible in [this kind of] situations?” or “who does one negotiate with?”

Participants’ own emotions included: “interesting to know”; “this could happen to me, stupid feeling”; “irritation on behalf of the student, aggression”. One entry reflected the consequences of these emotions: “one’s own emotions complicate the objective handling of the case”. However, as this was not required in the task, how the participants dealt with their emotions is not explained. Did they think that certain emotions were justified and thus provided valid guidance in the cases or did they manage to change perspectives beyond their emotions?

Critical reflection also consisted of a wide range of ideas. There were connections to the socio-political realities outside school (e.g. “the impact of [Saudi-Arabian] politics”; “how do the girls [of the case] get to the swimming class for Muslim girls? – money, distance”) and questionings (e.g. “the school should have a common policy in similar situations – or should it?”; “Are these kind of outings relevant?”; “Would the teacher relate similarly to a Laestadian [a Finnish Pietist Christian movement] students absent from dancing classes?”) as well as reflections on assumptions (e.g. “what is about religion, what is about culture [in this case]?”; “is this about strictness or protecting the child?”). Power issues were sometimes mentioned (e.g. “participation, norms and excluding practices of the school”; “family’s expectations and school’s power”) and sometimes described and explained (e.g. “bringing the issue up makes it a problem”; “teacher’s knowledge about the student’s community norms defines the teacher’s relation towards the student”; “Our school’ -> what does it consist of, who maintains it, with which values?”) Entries coded as critical reflection were fairly usual in the data, and admittedly the definition was broad. However, all the types listed above represent the core goals of the training interventions and the case discussion tool.

Problematic reflection was scarce. It included ethnocentric assumptions that school practices are unambiguously good for the children (“Why don’t they understand their ‘own good’?”) and generalizations (“religions are always problematic”; “typical situation: unrealistic attitude of the parents -> also among Finns”). A certain hopelessness that contradicted the training goals was also coded as problematic (“The teacher can’t ask the student/the family how committed they are to the religious rules”). One of the cases contained two similar (restrictive) reactions towards sexual education, by a Muslim and a Christian family. In more than one sheet the Muslim and Christian student (or family) were reflected on separately. Admittedly, the situations probably were different, but certainly there

were issues that could have been relevant for both cases. Thus, this was interpreted as stereotyping. There were also some occasions where the student was held responsible, and this was considered inappropriate. As the examples show, the risk of problematic reflection was related to many targets of reflection, ranging from stereotyping thinking concerning religions and cultures to biased notions of educational principles and good practices.

If the levels of the pyramid are scrutinized, it can be noted that the surface-level reflection (Categories 1 and 2) amounted to 362 entries, meso-level reflection (Category 3) to 181 and deep reflection (Categories 4–6) to 115 entries. This shows that surface-level reflection was twice as usual as meso-level reflection, and that deep reflection was even more scarce, but clearly stronger than problematic reflection. Looking at the pyramid of reflection as a whole, some tensions between certain categories may be observed. Obviously, the problematic reflection is at odds with critical reflection, although the line between “critical” and “problematic” questioning was sometimes hard to discern. On top of that, critical reflection often deconstructed the principles reflected in Category 4. Although some principles provided grounds for flexibility and sensitivity, many constructed an obligation for the school to use its power to require a certain degree of uniformity. The curriculum and the concept of equality were used most for this purpose – and critical reflection questioned both assumptions of uniformity and blindness to power.

#### **Interplay between the Cases, the Tasks, the Participants and Reflection**

When the sheets are compared to each other it is evident that while some were rich in perspectives and approaches, others contained only a few notes derived from a single perspective. It may be concluded that the collaborative effort, the perspectives provided in the preceding lectures and the questions on the case discussion sheet did not always ensure diversity of perspectives – or motivation to produce and write them down.

Different tasks on the sheet produced slightly different reflection. However, the flow of the discussion differed in different groups, so similar observations could be found in different parts of the sheet. Although the assigning one member of the small groups with the task of identifying possibly ill-justified assumptions did not work, some critical observations were stated in the sheets. Especially the task to formulate questions guided the participants to postpone judgement, seek understanding, and sometimes also question assumptions. In other words, this task scaffolded expressing critical reflectivity. Some cases, even if they did not generate many interpretations, may have raised several questions or recognized emotions. If the case in itself seemed to be straightforward, these tasks provided an opportunity to find new perspectives on it. Sometimes, however, the instructor’s guidance was needed to keep the discussion going. Indeed, the high proportion of entries that addressed practices shows that the participants seemed to be primarily motivated to develop practice. As the idea of reflection is to postpone judgement and to act only after a thorough reflective process, it was crucial to pay attention to the other tasks as well.

The written entries, of course, only show what was written down, not what was discussed. On some occasions, the group discussion was lively, but the sheet was almost empty. Team members heard the participants tell their group members about other cases inspired by the case they had read. However, although those cases may increase the participants’ repertoire, only articulated conclusions and suggestions have the potential to enhance the level of reflection.

There was also a great deal of variation in the kind of reflection produced by different cases. This could be observed when approximately the same group of participants discussed more than one case, that is, in workshops 3 and 4. In the in-service training days (workshop

3), three cases were used (the fourth was narrated and written by the small groups). The first was a lengthy narrative of how trust increased between the teacher and a Finnish-Somali family. This case contained several small episodes, from an occasion where the teacher listened to the father's open reflection on the meaning of connection to his old home country and tense relationships with the Somali community in Finland, to the occasion when the student got permission to stay overnight on a field trip for the first time. The second case was about Muslim girls refusing to go to swimming classes. The third was the above-mentioned case of Muslim and Christian families' reactions towards sexual education. Of all the cases, the latter gained the biggest proportion of problematic reflection but also reflection on principles. The predominant perspective was that the rights of the child were being threatened by the adults. The case on swimming gained the most reflection on practices, so it was mostly addressed as non-desired behaviour that could be handled through adjustments to the school's practices. The social and developmental psychological perspectives were more frequent in this case than in the others. Almost half of the entries written concerning trust-building with the Finnish-Somali family addressed the emotions of the characters in the case. It also gained more critical reflection than the others: the participants wondered whether the teacher's efforts to get the whole class to go away overnight together every year were culturally sensitive.

The theology and education students (workshop 4) discussed two cases. The first was about a Jehovah's Witness in the Independence Day celebrations and the second was about a Muslim girl on a school outing to Helsinki. The school outing case contained several episodes: the vegetarian teacher and the Muslim girl both suffered from the fact that all the sandwiches contained ham, the girl did not want to enter the church and asked a surprising question about a (classicist-realistic and nationalist) statue with three naked men. The latter gained more entries concerning cultural and worldview issues, maybe because the beliefs of Jehovah's Witnesses were not as familiar to the students and, of course, because the Helsinki outing case contained three different cultural and religious issues. The school outing case was also more frequently reflected on from a critical and principle-based point of view. Apparently, the Finnish independence celebrations were taken for granted to the extent that they were not critically reviewed, so reflection on context and practices predominated.

When the student teacher workshop (workshop 5) is included, a comparison can be made between in-service educators and students. The clearest differences between the two groups is that teachers seemed to look at actors' emotions and social and developmental psychological issues more (8% of all entries) than the students (0%), whereas the students wrote down more interpretations based on culture and worldview (18%) than the teachers (7%). This probably stems from the fact that the majority of the students were theology students with expertise on worldviews and approaches related to them and that in-service teachers had more experiential knowledge about interaction with students and their families, so they were more familiar with the diversity of factors and situations.

## Discussion

This design-based study shows that written tasks can stimulate and guide case discussion in small groups towards reflectivity. The pyramid of reflection created on the basis of Korthagen's (2005) onion of reflection makes it possible to evaluate the depth of reflection within case discussions. Most of the reflections given by participants were superficial or on the meso-level, which is not necessarily a problem if they pave the way for deeper reflection. However, the level of reflection varied greatly between the small groups and to some extent also between the cases. Guidance and thorough discussion after group work are essential in

order to share the insights reached by the most advanced groups. Similarly, the use of different cases is important if intercultural and inter-worldview reflectivity is to be properly enhanced.

If intercultural competences are defined as knowledge, attitudes and skills (e.g. Byram et al., 2001; Hernández-Bravo et al., 2017), intercultural reflectivity is mostly identified with attitudes. Additionally, the case discussion tool extends towards knowledge and skills: Reflection on practices thus contributes to the development of intercultural reflective practice and, consequently, of relevant skills. Openness to cultural and worldview diversity cannot appear in case discussions if relevant knowledge is lacking, but sharing theoretical and experiential knowledge in small groups may increase the knowledge base. In all, the pyramid of reflection shows the wide scope of issues that may be relevant when developing intercultural reflectivity – but also the risk of falling into stereotyping, ethnocentrism or determinism. Self-reflection is only superficially touched on in our case discussion tool, although recognizing one's own emotions is a vital step towards recognizing their roots in cultural assumptions and personal life histories. Critical reflection could be further enhanced by showing the participants the pyramid of reflection and encouraging them to reflect on all levels.

Although reflection as a concept has reigned in teacher education for decades (Luttenberg & Bergen, 2008), teacher education does not seem to guarantee that in-service teachers have the capacity for critical reflection, even in small groups where insights can be shared. Both in-service and student teachers needed scaffolding by the instructor, but certain tasks in the case discussion sheets could also serve as scaffolds. Encouraging the participants to formulate questions and reflect on the emotions present in the cases seemed to fulfil that function, because the tasks were not too abstract but could be used as scaffolds to guide towards deeper reflectivity.

The pyramid of reflection also revealed certain tensions that are present when teachers encounter cultural diversity. The discussion did turn to certain principles but those principles were sometimes also questioned, and conflicts of interests and responsibilities were identified. Acquah and Commins (2015) observed that critical reflection both created dissonances and helped the students to resolve them. In our data, many questions remain unanswered and tensions unresolved. For the participants, this may have been distressing. From the perspective of reflection, however, questions are often more important than answers as they trigger new processes.

The amount of data in this study was not small but it was somewhat heterogeneous. Thus, it is important not to place too much emphasis on the comparisons and proportions. The pyramid of reflection can be used in teachers' initial and in-service training and to evaluate the level of reflection in discussions on intercultural and inter-worldview encounters. However, more research is needed to identify the properties that a case should have in order to enhance reflectivity in particular teacher education contexts.

## References

- Acquah, E. O., & Commins, N. L. (2015). Critical reflection as a key component in promoting pre-service teachers' awareness of cultural diversity. *Reflective Practice*, 16(6), 790–805. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14623943.2015.1095729>
- Allard, A. C. (2006). 'A bit of a chameleon act': a case study of one teacher's understandings of diversity. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 29(3), 319–340. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02619760600795155>
- Anderson, T., & Shattuck, J. (2012). Design-based research: A decade of progress in education research. *Educational Researcher* 41(1), 16–25. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X11428813>
- Bennett, M. J. (1993). Towards ethnorelativism: A developmental model of intercultural sensitivity. In R. M. Paige (Ed.), *Education for the intercultural experience* (2nd ed., pp. 21–71). Intercultural Press.
- Brown, K. D., & Kraehe, A. (2010). When you've only got one class, one chance: Acquiring sociocultural knowledge using eclectic case pedagogy. *Teaching Education*, 21(3), 313–328. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10476210.2010.500372>
- Buchtel, E. E. (2014). Cultural sensitivity or cultural stereotyping? Positive and negative effects of a cultural psychology class. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 39, 40–52. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2013.09.003>
- Byram, M., Nichols, A., & Stevens, D. (2001). *Developing intercultural competence in practice*. Multilingual Matters. <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781853595356>
- Byrd Clark, J., & Dervin, F. (2014). Introduction. In J. Byrd Clark & F. Dervin (Eds.) *Reflexivity in language and intercultural education: Rethinking multilingualism and interculturality* (pp. 1–42). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315879604>
- Carter, K. (1999). What is a case? What is not a case? In M. A. Lundeborg, B. B. Levin & H. L. Harrington (Eds.), *Who learns what from cases and how? The research base for teaching and learning with cases* (pp. 165–175). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Clandinin, D. J., & Huber, M. (2005). Shifting stories to live by: Interweaving the personal and professional in teachers' lives. In D. Beijaard, P. C. Meijer, G. Morine-Dershimer & H. Tillema (Eds.), *Teacher professional development in changing conditions* (pp. 43–59). Springer. [https://doi.org/10.1007/1-4020-3699-X\\_3](https://doi.org/10.1007/1-4020-3699-X_3)
- Deardorff, D. K. (2006). Identification and assessment of intercultural competence as a student outcome of internationalization. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 10(3), 241–266. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1028315306287002>
- Fischer, R. (2011). Cross-cultural training effects on cultural essentialism beliefs and cultural intelligence. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 35(6), 767–775. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2011.08.005>
- Hunter, B., White, G. P., & Godbey, G. C. (2006). What does it mean to be globally competent? *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 10(3), 267–285. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1028315306286930>
- Jay, J. K., & Johnson, K. L. (2002). Capturing complexity: a typology of reflective practice for teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 18(1), 73–85. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0742-051X\(01\)00051-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0742-051X(01)00051-8)
- Juuti, K., & Lavonen, J. (2006). Design-based research in science education: One step towards methodology. *Nordic Studies in Science Education*, 2006(4), 54–68. <https://doi.org/10.5617/nordina.424>



- Hernández-Bravo, J. A., Cardona-Moltó, M. C., & Hernández-Bravo, J. M. (2017). Developing elementary school students' intercultural competence through teacher-led tutoring action plans on intercultural education. *Intercultural Education*, 28(1), 20–38. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14675986.2017.1288985>
- Howard, T. C. (2003). Culturally relevant pedagogy: Ingredients for critical teacher reflection. *Theory Into Practice*, 42(3), 195–202. [https://doi.org/10.1207/s15430421tip4203\\_5](https://doi.org/10.1207/s15430421tip4203_5)
- Kimanan, A. (2018). Approaching culture, negotiating practice: Finnish educators' discourses on cultural diversity. *Journal of Multicultural Discourses*, 13(4), 334–347. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17447143.2018.1546309>
- Kleinfeld, J. (1990). The special virtues of the case method in preparing teachers for minority schools. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 17(1), 43–51.
- Korthagen, F. (2005). Practice, theory, and person in life-long professional learning. In D. Beijaard, P. C. Meijer, G. Morine-Dershimer & H. Tillema (Eds.) *Teacher professional development in changing conditions* (pp. 79–94). Springer. [https://doi.org/10.1007/1-4020-3699-X\\_5](https://doi.org/10.1007/1-4020-3699-X_5)
- Levin, B. (1999). The role of discussion in case pedagogy: Who learns what? And how? In M. A. Lundeberg, B. B. Levin & H. L. Harrington (Eds.) *Who learns what from cases and how? The research base for teaching and learning with cases* (pp. 139–157). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Luttenberg, J., & Bergen, T. (2008). Teacher reflection: the development of a typology. *Teachers and Teaching*, 14(5-6), 543–566. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13540600802583713>
- Loughran, J. (2012). Professional learning: Creating conditions for developing knowledge of teaching. In M. Kooy & K. van Veen (Eds.) *Teacher learning that matters: International perspectives* (pp. 47–63). Routledge.
- Merseth, K. K. (1996). Cases and case methods in teacher education. In J. Sikula, T. J. Buttery & E. Guyton (Eds.) *Handbook of research on teacher education* (2nd ed., pp. 722–742). Macmillan.
- Nieto, S. (1999). Culturally relevant teaching with cases: A personal reflection and implications for pedagogy. In M. A. Lundeberg, B. B. Levin & H. L. Harrington (Eds.) *Who learns what from cases and how? The research base for teaching and learning with cases* (pp. 179–196). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Nieto, S., & Bode, P. (2012). *Affirming diversity: The sociopolitical context of multicultural education* (6th ed.). Pearson/Allyn&Bacon.
- Statistics Finland (2018). *Population by country of birth 1990–2017: Foreign country, total*. [http://www.stat.fi/tup/maahanmuutto/maahanmuuttajat-vaestossa/ulkomailla-syntyneet\\_en.html](http://www.stat.fi/tup/maahanmuutto/maahanmuuttajat-vaestossa/ulkomailla-syntyneet_en.html)
- Riitaoja, A.-L., & Dervin, F. (2014). Interreligious dialogue in schools: beyond asymmetry and categorisation? *Language and Intercultural Communication* 14(1), 76–90. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14708477.2013.866125>
- Rissanen, I., Kuusisto, E., & Kuusisto, A. (2016). Developing teachers' intercultural sensitivity: Case study on a pilot course in Finnish teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education* 59, 446–456. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2016.07.018>
- Saukkonen, P. (2013). Multiculturalism and nationalism: The politics of diversity in Finland. In P. Kivisto & O. Wahlbeck (Eds.), *Debating multiculturalism in the nordic welfare state* (pp. 270–294). Palgrave Macmillan. [https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137318459\\_11](https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137318459_11)
- Schreier, M. (2012). *Qualitative content analysis in practice*. SAGE.



- Shulman, L. S. (2004) [1996]. Just in case: Reflections on learning from experience. In S. M. Wilson & P. Hutchings (Eds.), *The wisdom of practice: Essays on teaching, learning and learning to teach* (pp. 463–482). Jossey Bass.
- Toom, A., & Husu, J. (2016). Finnish teachers as ‘makers of the many’: Balancing between broad pedagogical freedom and responsibility. In H. Niemi, A. Toom & A. Kallioniemi (Eds.) *Miracle of education: The principles and practices of teaching and learning in Finnish schools* (2nd revised ed., pp. 41–56). Sense.  
[https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-6300-776-4\\_3](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-6300-776-4_3)
- Wang, F., & Hannafin, M.J. (2005). Design-based research and technology-enhanced learning environments. *Educational Technology Research & Development* 53(4), 5–23. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02504682>
- Yost, D. S., Sentner, S. M., & Forlenza-Bailey, A. (2000). An examination of the construct of critical reflection: Implications for teacher education programming in the 21st century. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 51, 39–49.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/002248710005100105>
- Zilliacus, H., Paulsrud, B., & Holm, G. (2017). Essentializing vs. non-essentializing students’ cultural identities: curricular discourses in Finland and Sweden, *Journal of Multicultural Discourses*, 12(2), 166–180.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/17447143.2017.1311335>

### **Acknowledgements**

This research was conducted within a teacher education development project funded by the Finnish Ministry of Culture and Education.