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Abstract

The overall objective of this thesis is to examine in what way ethical theory and ethical analysis can contribute to further understanding of the ethical challenges of the multicultural classroom. Based on the fact that the world is going through a process of globalization and migration, the education-system and daily praxis of teaching is put in front of new ethical challenges. The teacher in the multicultural classroom is on a daily base confronted with various dilemmas regarding for example conflicting duties, universal and conflicting values and citizenship. Martha Nussbaum´s theory of world citizenship is used as an analytical framework for the thesis and student interviews from upper secondary school is used as a complementary perspective to Nussbaum´s theory. The research questions of the thesis are: Can the theory of World Citizenship Education, when structured and analyzed, give guidance for teaching citizenship in a multicultural classroom? Is it a plausible theory confronted with the ethical challenges of the multicultural classroom? In what way can a student perspective from a multicultural classroom try the relevance and present a complementary perspective to the theory of World citizenship education? The theory and the interviews are analyzed and structured out of the research questions and by the three ethical challenges of universal values, conflicting values and sense of belonging.

The conclusion of the thesis states that, even though Nussbaum´s theory does have some constraints, it is to a large degree applicable and possible to relate to the ethical challenges of the multicultural classroom and as a guide for teachers. The theory is plausible in some aspects because it presents reasonable arguments on the necessity of educational reform in an interconnected world and because it makes educational proposals of instrumental worth of the teacher. The theory is however not plausible in other aspects because; the universal values presented are to vague and not specified which makes the theory difficult to use in practise, it does not pay enough attention to the conflicting perspective of the ethical challenges in classroom nor the pedagogical importance of social inclusion when discussing conflicting values and finally the theory demonstrates a contradiction regarding how to act as a teacher about sense of belonging and recognising identity of the students. The interviews demonstrate similar but also different responses to the ethical challenges in comparison with the theory. The students recognize the existence of universal values across cultural borders in a similar way as Nussbaum, even though the values put forward are of another character than Nussbaum´s. They do however present a sceptical view towards the idea of a world citizenship and stresses the importance of bringing up discussions about nationhood, migration and belonging without being afraid of breaking any taboos. At the end the thesis presents some practical guidelines for the teacher in the multicultural classroom that follows logical out of the conclusion. The final discussion highlight the fact that the challenges of the multicultural classroom in Sweden will likely continue, and emphasizes the potential of using ethics as an analytical tool for further developing a professional teaching approach.
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1. Introduction

It is both wonderful and very challenging to be a teacher. The daily work of the teacher is for example full of ethical challenges. The last six years I have been working in a multicultural upper secondary school, in the north of Stockholm, with students from a wide range of different ethnical, religious and cultural background. During my work as a teacher I have been confronted with a lot of pedagogical dilemmas of ethical character. The reason for writing this thesis is my desire to bring some ethical analysis into the daily work of the teacher and to examine in what way ethical theory can contribute to the understanding of the challenges that are present in a multicultural classroom. A lot of the pedagogical and moral decisions by the teacher are made in situations where one might not have much time to reflect over how to respond to the ethical challenges. This work is my attempt to do some ethical analyses of pedagogical and ethical dilemmas so that when confronted with them, I hope to be able to make more deliberate moral decisions and act in a more professional way as a teacher. I also hope that the thesis will be possible to use for further discussion and guidance about the multicultural classroom and its challenges.

I was once in a discussion with some of my students regarding child rearing and corporal punishment for children. The students participating in the discussion were from several different ethnical, religious and cultural backgrounds and it appeared (to my surprise) that approximately half of the students had a positive or understanding attitude towards corporal punishment as a method of child rearing in specific situations. Some of the students did also mention or insinuate that they had been subject to corporal punishment as a part of their upbringing. In Sweden corporal punishment has been forbidden in law since 1979 and the attitudes in the Swedish society has the last decades demonstrated a strong negative attitude towards using corporal punishment in childrearing (Social och Hälsovårdsnnytt 2001). I was then a bit surprised by the attitudes of the students and I suddenly found myself in the middle of a classical teacher’s dilemma. Should I strongly and loudly reject the idea and argue for the irrationality of corporal punishment or should I more carefully sit down, discuss and try to understand the motives of the students and demonstrate my tolerance to their opinions?

This is one example of a pedagogical dilemma which is an expression of a major ethical dilemma concerning the different and sometimes conflicting duties of the teacher. At one hand the teacher has the duty, according the curriculum\(^1\) and as a civil servant, to recognize identity and encourage respect and mutual understanding across different cultures and traditions, but at the other hand, the teacher also has the duty to represent and promote the values of the Swedish society and to foster students to become good citizens with

---

\(^1\) In the Swedish curriculum for upper secondary school (Lpf 94) it is stipulated that: “The internationalization of Swedish society and increasing cross-border mobility place great demands on people’s ability to live together and appreciate the values that are to be found in cultural diversity. The school is a social and cultural meeting place with both the opportunity and the obligation to strengthen this ability among all who work there.” (Lpf 94 p. 4) For further discussion see also chapter 2 about citizenship, education and the multicultural school in Sweden.
respect to the classical liberal values. A second major ethical question that will be examined further in this thesis is whether there are any fundamental and universal values that are to be found across different cultures? Are the different values of the classroom to be seen as in conflict and fundamentally incompatible or as differences possible to bridge through mutual understanding? A third ethical question that will be examined is when conflicting values do occur, to what extent should one as a teacher tolerate values that are in opposition of the Swedish curriculum? Is recognition of minority groups and encouragement of different cultural background a way moving towards a common citizenship or does recognition of minorities instead inhibit further steps towards fellowship and mutual understanding?

When trying to analyse the ethical challenges of the multicultural classroom it is important to state that the major values of the Swedish society not in any way is to be seen as one homogenous liberal culture or that “foreign” cultures of minority groups in any way is homogenous and to be seen as always in opposition to a “the Swedish culture”. It is however still notable that the multicultural classroom do generate a variety of questions and ethical dilemmas for the teacher that are in a need of further investigation.

In 1996 The American Philosopher Martha Nussbaum published an essay “Patriotism and Cosmopolitanism”. In this essay she argues for abandoning the traditional idea of an education that aims at developing a national citizenship where primer moral allegiance is to your fellow citizens of the country. Instead she stresses the necessity of a cosmopolitan education for world citizenship where the primer moral allegiance is to the community of humankind. In 1997 she further develops here philosophical argumentation about education for world citizenship in the book “Cultivating Humanity – a classical defence of reform in liberal education”. In this book she holds that, to educate world citizens, education should aim for developing the student`s capacities of critical examination of oneself and ones tradition, to see oneself as human beings bound to all other human beings and an ability to think what it might be like to be in the shoes of a person different from oneself.

In this thesis I will take my point of departure out of three major themes that I identify as ethical challenges of teaching citizenship in a multicultural classroom. The three themes are universal values, conflicting values and sense of belonging. The themes contains crucial questions all related to the challenges of teaching citizenship and are to be explained more in detail later on. My intention is to examine these challenges by using Martha Nussbaum`s theory of world citizenship as a theoretical base complemented with interviews of students from a multicultural class in upper secondary school. In this way I hope to give some ethical

---

2 In the Curriculum it is stated that: “The school has the important task of imparting, instilling and forming in pupils those values on which our society is based. The inviolability of human life, individual freedom and integrity, the equal value of all people, equality between women and men and solidarity with the weak and vulnerable are all values that the school shall represent and impart.”(Lpf 94 p.3).

3 The term “citizenship education” will be further developed in chapter 2. In a general meaning it refers to the task of the school to fostering good democratic citizens.
contribution in to the pedagogical discussions on teaching citizenship in multicultural classrooms.

1.1 Objectives and premises

The overall objective of this thesis is to give an ethical contribution to further understanding of the challenges of teaching citizenship in a multicultural classroom. Based on the fact that the world is going through a process of globalization and migration, the education-system and daily praxis of teaching is put in front of new ethical challenges. Recognising this, in what way do we need to rethink and change what we teach in classroom? Do these new circumstances somehow provoke new needs for what we teach in classroom to educate the youth for better understanding of a globalized world?

This work will examine what implications the societal changes could have for the teaching of citizenship in the multicultural classroom. The intention is not to deliver a specified content on how to educate for citizenship in the right way. The intention is instead to see in what way ethical theory complemented by interviews of students can give guidance for further understanding and of teaching citizenship in a multicultural classroom.

By structuring and analyzing Martha Nussbaum’s theory of World Citizenship Education⁴ out of the ethical challenges of the multicultural classroom I will evaluate if it is a plausible theory to use for teaching citizenship in multicultural classrooms. I will also try the relevance of her theory of world citizenship education and present a complementary perspective on the ethical challenges by using interviews of students from a multicultural classroom. To accomplish the objective described above I will use the following questions:

1. A) Can the theory of World Citizenship Education, when structured and analyzed, give guidance for teaching citizenship in a multicultural classroom?

   B) Is it a plausible theory to use confronted with the ethical challenges of the multicultural classroom?

2. In what way can a student perspective from a multicultural classroom try the relevance and present a complementary perspective to the theory of World citizenship education?

Through the thesis I have chosen three ethical challenges as a structure when analyzing the theory and the interviews. The themes universal values, conflicting values and sense of belonging stems from some of the basic ethical challenges one can meet when teaching citizenship in multicultural classrooms and will be explained more in detail further on.

---

⁴ The “Theory of World Citizenship Education” has not got its name from Nussbaum herself. The name is used in this thesis as a term for her philosophical contribution on this topic published in “Patriotism and Cosmopolitanism”(1994) as well as “Cultivating Humanity” (1997) This will be further discussed in chapter 3.
1.2 The multicultural classroom

In the last 15-20 years the process of globalization and increased immigration has led to a development towards a Swedish multicultural society (Roth 1999). Many Swedish schools can today be seen as an arena and meeting place for individuals and groups originated from different cultural contexts of the world. When different cultural groups are represented in a society, values, traditions and behavior sometimes get into conflict. The majority culture might in different ways be challenged by one or several minority cultures. In school this can be evident when groups or individuals come into conflict with the liberal values that are put forward in the curriculum of the Swedish school such as human rights, freedom of speech and religion, equality of gender etc.

It is important to note that there is no single meaning of what the multicultural society or multiculturalism refers to. For some multiculturalism refers to a changed society as a result of an increased immigration where different ethno cultural groups meet and seek for recognition. For example the case of Sweden after the Second World War (Kymlicka 2002, Roth 1999). Others refer multiculturalism to the fact that group identities based on region, age, gender, class and sexual disposition have been paid more attention the last years (Kymlicka 1995). In this way it is possible to understand multiculturalism in both a descriptive and a normative sense.

The British researchers Gerd Bauman acknowledge that “A Multicultural society is not a patchwork of five or ten fixed cultural identities, but an elastic web of crosscutting and always mutually situational identifications” (Bauman 1999, p. 118). When examining the multicultural society and specifically the classroom, it is of great importance to state that cultural groups themselves are internally plural and that symbols and values are open to negotiation and are changeable depending the context (Hylland-Eriksen 2001, Jackson 1999). Because of this plurality within cultural groups as well as because of the existence of internal social hierarchies it might also be difficult to find a legitimate and fair representation of cultural groups. Meaning that when we are talking about the interrelation between different cultures it is an evident challenge to determine what or who is to be regarded as a legitimate representative of one particular culture. One can also note that there is an ongoing debate in contemporary political philosophy between liberals and communitarians weather the individual act morally autonomous and precede the group or if the morality of the group precede the individual (Kymlicka 2002). Since multiculturalism will be discussed and examined all through this thesis it is important to keep in mind the difficulties mentioned above when in a legitimate describing values and the interrelation between cultural groups.

In this thesis the term multiculturalism will be used primarily as a term for a society where several different ethno cultural groups meet but also in the meaning that group identities seek for recognition and are paid more attention in the society. It is assumed that it do exist common patterns of values and symbols within cultural groups but also an acknowledgement of the plurality within groups and that the individual do have the ability to
act autonomous. The ethical challenges that are described in this work will focus on the interplay between different ethno cultural groups and the norms of the society in a multicultural classroom.

When discussing the multicultural society it is also important not to view, for example, “Sweden before multiculturalism” as a single and homogeneous culture in opposition to “Sweden after multiculturalism” as a plural and heterogeneous culture. Since all majority cultures are internally plural you will find common understanding as well as controversies and conflicting values also in the majority culture “before multiculturalism”. It is crucial not to see the interaction between cultural values and identities into one single division of ethno-cultural character. Cultural identity can be of different character and the same kind of questions, research and analysis that are put forward in this thesis out of an ethno-cultural perspective, can of course also be done in classes consisting solely of students with traditional Swedish ethnical background. Interaction of cultural groups and their values can also be studied by the perspectives of for example gender, classes, geographical factors, ages, subcultures etcetera.

1.3 The ethical challenges of the multicultural classroom

The ethical challenges of the multicultural society are to be described in many different ways and out of various perspectives. The role of education in a multicultural society has been frequently discussed the last years both in an international and a Swedish context (see for example Roth 1999, Jackson 2003, Ljungberg 2004, Marshall 2009). One reason is probably that education does play a fundamental role in western democratic societies. School do have a fundamental role in identity-forming, and education can be an important tool for shaping the kind of citizens that a liberal and democratic society asks for (Roth 1999). Another probable reason why multiculturalism in schools often is debated is because schools are important public meeting places and obvious arenas were ethical challenges of the multicultural society do appear and are demonstrated. The school can in this way be viewed as a micro cosmos of the society.

One fundamental challenge to the multicultural society is how the public and the majority society should respond to claims and demand for recognition by minority groups. This challenge can take many forms and the ethical questions of this kind have been discussed by several scholars and philosophers the last years (Kymlicka 1995, 2000, 2002, Taylor, Gutman, 1994). Many modern democracies today contain significant minority groups that make claims on recognition for culture identity and group rights in terms of language, religions and ethnicity, values and so on. Is it possible for a liberal society to affirm this diversity and still maintain a common citizenship of a liberal democracy? In what way is this done? Should a liberal society for example respect minority groups who advocate values that are illiberal? If a liberal society fails to recognise the identity of minority cultures is the society then letting citizens down and risk to exclude or discriminate them? Can the individuals of the minority cultures be represented as equals when public institutions and the majority of the society do
not recognise their identity? Is it possible to point at a specific moral limit where the claims of minority groups and their request for recognition are impossible to reconcile with a liberal society? Is it possible to somehow find consensus about moral values between different cultures in a pluralistic society?

The general ethical challenges of the multicultural society, described above, are all to be found and reflected in various ways when looking at the educational system in a liberal society. Some of the most frequently debated ethical challenges of multicultural school’s in Sweden and western democracies are topics as civic education, teaching of ethics, clothing, eating traditions, position of minority language, teaching of mother tongue, independent religious schools (Roth 1999, Ljungberg 2004).

This thesis focuses on the ethical challenges that appear specifically in the multicultural classroom regarding citizenship education and in relation to the acting of the teacher. The teacher’s duty as a civil servant is obviously to shape and educate individuals to become good citizens. There is however a need for putting light on several dilemmas and ethical challenges that the teacher on a daily bases need to confront. The ethical challenges of the multicultural classroom are in this work structured in three parts. The three ethical challenges, as mentioned before, are universal values, conflicting values and sense of belonging. The structure and choice of ethical challenges has been developed through inspiration of what is written earlier by scholars on this topic, by the interviews that are presented in this work and my own experience as a teacher in multicultural classrooms.

**Universal values;** The question that rises in a multicultural environment is how people from different ethno-cultural backgrounds are able to agree upon certain values or norms (Roth 1999). Are there any values that could be claimed to be universal and to be found across the borders of nationality and culture? The next question that rises is what universal values and norms should then be thought by school to shape good citizens? Are there any values that are necessary and not negotiable to a liberal democrat society? What abilities and capacities ought to be included in the citizenship education of a liberal democratic society?

**Conflicting values;** Even if it is possible to find some fundamental and universal values between people of different ethno-cultural background, it is a fact that conflicting values sometimes occur in a multicultural classroom. When conflicting values do occur in classroom, how should one as a teacher act? To what extent shall one as a teacher promote the liberal democratic values of the (Swedish) curriculum and to what extent shall one accept and tolerate values that are in opposition of the (Swedish) curriculum? If one as a teacher tolerates values that are illiberal (in the name of the liberal democratic society) there is a risk that the fundamental liberal democratic values such as the equality of human beings, right to not be oppressed, freedom of speech etc. will be undermined. On the other

---

5 Se specially the discussion and debate about the teaching of Christian ethics in Swedish schools in the beginning of the 1990:s (Roth 1999).
hand, if one as a teacher does not recognize and “tolerate”\textsuperscript{6} divergent values and opinions of the student, which is an important part of their identity, there is a risk of social exclusion. It will then be even more difficult to include the students in the education to becoming good citizens and promote the liberal democratic values of the society. The paradox of tolerance is formulated in an essential way by Karl Popper: “unlimited tolerance must lead to the disappearance of tolerance. If we extend unlimited tolerance even to those who are intolerant, if we are not prepared to defend a tolerant society against the onslaught of the intolerant, then the tolerant will be destroyed, and tolerance with them” (Roth 1999). Are there any moral limits of tolerance that can serve as guidance for a teacher to be able to educate a good citizen?

Sense of belonging: Human beings are to a large extent influenced by their collective identities, even though in different ways in different situations. When one as a teacher meet students from different ethno-cultural backgrounds one always have to make a choice weather one should recognize and highlight the collective identity of the students or not. Is the recognition of cultural background important for moving towards a common citizenship or does recognition instead inhibits further steps for fellowship and mutual understanding? Is the sense of belonging to the national citizenship or ethno-cultural group to be seen as in opposition to a world citizenship or is it possible to see them as complementary?

1.4 The teacher

Since the teacher is a major research object of this thesis I would like to present some of my assumptions about being a teacher. My perspective of the teacher, all through this thesis, is that the teacher should be looked upon as a tool for fulfilling the aims of a liberal education. The teacher has professional duties as well as responsibilities that come with being a civil servant. Duties and responsibilities to fostering democratic citizens and provide education so that everyone regardless social and economical background have more equal possibilities do develop their own capacities and to take part of the society.

It is also made an assumption in this thesis that the teacher has an important role to play in terms of pedagogical leadership in classroom. Because of the pedagogical leadership the teacher also has a moral obligation as a professional to deal with the different types of ethical dilemmas that might appear in classroom. This means that all the acting of the teacher is a way of expressing norms and values of the democratic society (Colnerud 1995). Even though the teacher does play an important pedagogical role in classroom, one need to recognize that other factors outside school such as family and friends are perhaps even more important determinants of socialisation and construction of values (Giddens 2007).

In discussions about education I sometimes meet people that do get surprised by the fact that the daily work of the teacher is guided by several fundamental policy documents. This is a matter of course for teachers but is something that is not always recognised outside

\textsuperscript{6} For a further discussion on the meaning of tolerance see later on. As well Roth 1999, quotation by Karl Popper p. 63 Roth 1999
school. Even though one should regard the teacher as a professional tool for fulfilling the aims of the liberal education one also need to recognise that the teacher cannot always act in accordance with the curriculum in all situations. First of all the teacher is not a machine. There will always be situations when the teacher act instinctively which might not be in accordance with the curriculum or the professional duties of the teacher. The lack of time to make well-considered decisions in specific situations is one reason. Feelings such as anger, fear or sympathy might be another obstacle to make well-considered decisions.

Secondly the curriculum and the professional duties might be very difficult to interpret and evaluate. Even if the preconditions for making a well considered decision is very good it might be impossible to judge in a particular situation how to act since the policy documents and professional duties is almost impossible to evaluate. As an example one can use the conflicting duties of demonstrating tolerance towards student with deviant attitudes to strive for mutual understanding and multiculturalism on the one hand and demonstrating non-acceptance as a statement of defending the liberal values of the curriculum on the other hand. When this happens, and it does, how should a good teacher act? And what is the right thing to do according the curriculum? In the strive for being a good teacher the ethical dilemmas are several, are for real and are a fundamental part of the daily work.

The above mentioned obstacles for making well considered judgments in the daily work do stress the necessity of having time for professional reflections about duties and responsibilities of the teacher. Since a lot of the ethical challenges of the classroom passes by very quickly, it is necessary to sometimes take a step backwards and do some reflections on the ethics behind. This thesis is my way of having time for professional reflections about the ethical challenges of the teacher.

1.5 Method and structure

Method
When studying ethical and moral realities it is possible to make a difference between descriptive ethics and normative ethics. A descriptive method engages with exploring, describing and understanding a moral phenomenon without evaluating if it desirable or not whiles the normative method engages with evaluating the moral phenomena and make normative claims about how it ought to be (Collste 2002). In this thesis both a descriptive and a normative perspective will be used. Descriptive, in the sense, that I will analyze and structure the theory of Nussbaum. With the eyes of the teacher I will read her theory to find out what she writes about the ethical challenges of teaching citizenship in multicultural classroom. I will also use a descriptive perspective when conducting the interviews of students and studying how moral values are expressed in a multicultural classroom. The thesis does also have normative ambitions, in the sense, that it will evaluate the theory of Nussbaum and its applicability to the ethical challenges of multicultural classrooms.
Three ethical challenges are presented and used as tools when structuring and analyzing the theory of Martha Nussbaum. In this part, where the theory of Nussbaum is being structured and analyzed, the method can be seen as a qualitative text and argument analysis. (Esaiasson, Giljam, Oscarsson och Wängnerud, 2006 s.233) When reading Nussbaum I have tried to focus on the essential parts in the texts concerning cosmopolitan values, world citizenship and the three ethical challenges and form it to a whole. It is important to note that her theory was written as an argumentation of reform in liberal education for the teaching of world citizenship in a context of higher education in the United States. The ethical challenges of a teacher in a multicultural Swedish context do of course have some other preconditions even though I would emphasize that many of the fundamental questions and ethical challenges remain similar.

To present a complementary perspective to the theory of Nussbaum I have conducted interviews with seven students. The intention is to use qualitative group interviews as a method to display examples of ethical reasoning in a multicultural classroom. The interviews are of empirical character in the sense that I try to understand and illustrate a moral reality in classroom. My intention and ambition is however not to find empirical evidence of the moral reality of a multicultural classroom but instead to illustrate the moral reality of a multicultural classroom. The intention with the interviews is instead to try the relevance of Martha Nussbaum’s theory and use the interviews as a complementary perspective. The reason I do not have a strict empirical ambition and demonstrate the results of the interviews as evidence of a moral reality is because it is impossible to exclude a broad range of uncertain factors within the scope of this thesis. Some of the difficulties by doing empirical research of moral reality are to exclude irrelevant external factors and to ensure the representativeness of the answers. (For example why culture and ethnicity should be the dominant factor of moral values instead of educational background, economic and social preconditions, place of living etc)

The empirical method of interviews is not very common in philosophy but do exist in the tradition of applied and professional ethics (Colnerud 1995). Colnerud recognize a general skepticism in empirical social and behavioral science towards empirical studies on moral phenomena but argues for that moral phenomena also can be studied through empirical methods (Colnerud 1995). Brante as well as Colnerud emphasizes that the study of controversies in moral issues can give access to moral phenomena that otherwise are not visible. By analyzing moral conflicts underlying norms can be revealed. (Brante 1992, Colnerud 1995 s. 57) In the interviews I have, to some extent, used the method of critical incident7 by focusing on and discussing examples of moral conflicts in classroom. The method of the interviews will be further discussed in chapter 4.

7 The method of critical incident I used by the work of Colnerud and Brante. For more reading see Brante 1992 and Colnerud 1995.
There are some problematic aspects with studying moral phenomena that one has to keep in mind. One general aspect is to raise the question of who’s moral that in reality is being observed (Colnerud 1995, Jackson, Boostrom, Hansen 1993)? Depending on what questions you raise you will find different answers and realities whether you doing text analyses or qualitative interviews. There is always underlying premises by the researcher and a risk in qualitative research that the questions and the results sometimes tell you more about the researcher than the object of research itself (Esaiasson 2004). Because of this I have tried to be clear about my intentions, questions and perspectives of this work so that the reader can follow the process in a satisfying way. Another important aspect to keep in mind about the interviews is the risk of me as a teacher to have impact on the student’s answers. There is a risk that the students do answer the questions so that they believe the answers will fit into the expectations and norms of me being there teacher and as a representative of the school. To delimit this risk I have chosen students that I taught previous semesters but do not teach this year. In this way the student are not in an obvious position of dependence of for example grading. In chapter 4 there is a more detailed discussion about avoiding sources of error.

Disposition

The thesis can be viewed as divided into three mayor parts. Part one consists of chapter 1 and 2 and is to be seen as an introduction to the topic. Chapter 1 contains objectives, premises, background of the topic, analytical questions in terms of the ethical challenges and a methodological discussion. In chapter two there is a review of the general concepts and history of citizenship and education. Part two consists of chapter 3 and 4 and is to be seen as the mayor analytical part. Chapter 3 is a theoretical examination of Nussbaum’s Theory of World citizenship. It contains a theoretical background about Nussbaum’s theory of World citizenship followed by an examination of the theory out of a multicultural and teaching perspective. Chapter 4 presents the results and analysis of the student interviews as a complementary perspective to the former theoretical part. Part three consist of the conclusions of the thesis as well as a discussion.
2. Citizenship education
The last decade’s, education for citizenship has been at the agenda when discussing education systems in many democracies including Sweden (Jackson 2003, Roth 1999). With citizenship education one can mean a broad range of things and the intention with this chapter is to give a brief background of how the concept and role of citizenship education has developed through the years and how it can be understood. It will also explain in what way the concept will be used in this thesis.

2.1 The liberal project of education
In the classical work Democracy and Education John Dewey wrote about education as a necessity of life. He explained it as follows:

“Society exists through a process of transmissions quite as much as biological life. This transmission occurs by means of communication of habits of doing, thinking, and feeling from the older to the younger. Without this communication of ideals, hopes, expectations, standards, opinions, from those members of society who are passing out of the group of life to those who are coming into it, social life could not survive” (Dewey 2005 p. 3). “What nutrition and reproduction are to physiological life, education is to social life” (p.9).

John Dewey wrote this in the beginning of twentieth century in a time when many liberal democratic nation states still was under construction. He among several other philosophers in the classical liberal tradition like John Locke, Adam Smith and John Stuart Mill emphasized the role of education in the building of the society and national state. Also in contemporary liberal societies public education has been seen as a fundamental institution to develop common values and components that build and cement the democratic national state (Feinberg, Mcdonough p.1). From the beginning the liberal educational project was a condition to overcome different religious and cultural backgrounds, create unity as well as equal and free citizens within the state. A vision for the liberal national state was to lift the individual above their cultural background and education was the mean to achieve it. The ideal liberal teacher, in this perspective, is one who is blind to racial, ethnic, religious or gender differences and is able to treat everyone alike (p.4).

Adam Smith and John Stuart Mill is among those who argued for state intervention only when needed and was clear about the principle of allowing the state only to control those features of social life that the private citizen would not find profitable to undertake. In case of how to construct the educational system they also feared the homogenizing influence and an inefficiency of government schools and stressed the importance of in different ways also use a private system of education (Mill 1974, Smith 1998).

Today the traditional liberal purpose of public education and the promoting of a certain sets of values of the nation state are questioned in different ways. Public education is by some
seen as a mean of the modern state for colonization and oppression to groups and individual inside as well as outside the national state (Feinberg, Mcdonough p.1). If schools for example are educating for a positive view on a homosexual lifestyle and equality of men and women even though the local community or groups have opposite views, then this ought to be seen as a kind of oppression and intrude of the parents influence over the upbringing of their children.

Contemporary liberal philosophers like Will Kymlicka and Charles Taylor have captured some of the critics to the classical liberalism brought up by communitarians. They argue that the individual flourishing takes place in a specific cultural context. Collective formations and minority groups might be a precondition to achieve the flourishing of individuals and for other liberal values are to be exercised. When this cultural context and solidarity within the group is threatened by a majority society the state has a responsibility to give special protection to these collective formations and for example cultural and linguistic heritage (Kymlicka 1995, Taylor 1992). Regarding education this perspective does not promote the ideal of a colorblind teacher, as the classical liberalism do, and instead it promotes the culturally sensitive and aware teacher. The teacher is supposed to understand the character of the culture of the students.

The globalization and the societal changes that come with it, for example, multicultural communities, increased interplay between groups, globalized political institutions etc. is another important factor for questioning the traditional purpose of public education. Is it still possible for the liberal – democratic state to morally justify the traditional purpose of forging a cohesive national identity or have the globalization rendered this purpose as obsolete and not in coherence with a changed society? Should the liberal education instead aim at fostering a sense of global citizenship?

2.2 From national to post-national citizenship

There are several ways in how to define citizenship and explaining its meaning and function. During history philosophers and political theorists have been giving the term different content and meaning. From the ancient world to the contemporary era there are although some commonalities to be found, namely explaining citizenship as some certain sets of common attributes. This means a certain reciprocity of rights against, and duties towards the political community (Held 1995, p.66).

One classical interpretation of citizenship from the post-war era is presented by T. H. Marshall and explains the conception of citizenship as a matter of ensuring that everyone is treated as a full and equal member of the society. Marshall divides these possessions of rights into civil, political and social rights. To ensure these rights, according to Marshall, this requires a democratic welfare national state (Marshall 1965 “Class, Citizenship and Social Development”, Kymlicka 2002 p. 287). A perspective different from the more institutional
one described above the concept of citizenship also contain a sense of belonging and membership to society (Jackson 2003).

The Post War conception of citizenship has however come under attack from several directions in the last decade. One critical perspective argues that we need to supplement the passive acceptance of citizenship rights with citizenship responsibilities and virtues (Kymlicka 2002 p.288). An influential proposal and example of these virtues are divided into general, social, economic and political virtues. Jurgen Habermas are among the scholars that focusing the citizenship on the processes of deliberation and opinion formation preceding voting. This represents a more deliberative model of democracy and makes it even more urgent to stress the importance of civic virtues. In this model the citizens are assumed to act in public with the goal of mutual understanding and not to act strategically for personal benefit (Habermas 1979, Kymlicka 2002 p. 291).

Another critical perspective to the classical Post War conception of citizenship, has developed at the same time as the discussion about globalization to what might be called a “post-national citizenship” (Chidester 2003). The idea to link the active citizenship with liberal nationalism are criticized by the objection that it ignores a changing society and the need for a more cosmopolitan or transnational conception of democracy (Kymlicka 2002 p.312). The liberal project of nation-building and national citizenship might have been effective in promoting democracy at a national level but due to the processes of globalization we now need a more global conception of democratic citizenship. One reason for strengthening a cosmopolitan citizenship and the international institutions is the belief of a global conception of justice and a need to transfer resources from the citizens of rich countries to the citizens of poor countries. Another reason is to be able to deal with issues as economic globalization, common environmental problems and international security.

There is also a risk that the model of democratic transnational citizenship could have negative consequences for democratic citizenship on a domestic level. If decision-making and public debate to a large extent is put away from the citizens they will not find it
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8 The virtues presented by Galston 1991 are; general virtues like courage, law-abidingness, loyalty; social virtues like independency, open mindedness; economic virtue like: work ethic, capacity to delay self-gratification, adaptability to economic and technological change, political virtues: capacity to discern and respect the rights for others, ability to evaluate the performance of those in office., willingness to engage in public discourse.

9 There is a broad range of different concepts on citizenship that could be named as “post-national”. They have in common that they recognize claims of rights to transcend national borders but do differ quite a lot in what they put into the term citizenship. Some of the concepts that have been presented are World Citizenship (Nussbaum 1994), Cosmopolitan citizenship (Held 1995, Koh Chor Tan 2004) and Global citizenship (Bauböck 1994) Some others examples are feminist citizenship, ecological citizenship, consumer citizenship, media citizenship and others. For further reading see Chidester 2003.
meaningful to participate in the public deliberation. Therefore the success of transnational democracy may be dependent on the health of national democracies. Transnational political institutions will work best if their rules and decisions are debated and ratified within national democratic forums (Kymlicka p.315).

2.3 Citizenship and education

As presented previously, the discussion of how education can contribute to a common citizenship has been present since the building of the liberal national states. The responsibility of the public school in many western democracies has been to foster a citizen where patriotism and nationalism have been a natural overall objective (Lorentz 2004). The purpose of many national curriculums in Europe, that was constructed during the middle of the nineteenth century, was to create a united national culture that in line with the demands of the national state. Since the beginning of the 1990:s there is a renewed interest for the relation between education and the process of socialization. The multicultural and globalized society has contributed to the increased interest for questions regarding education and citizenship emphasizing factors as identity, plurality, democracy and citizenship in a multicultural context.

In a general meaning one can say that citizenship education in the western democratic welfare-states refers to the task of the school to fostering good democratic citizens. Several different concepts are however used to describe what content the education should have to fostering students to become good citizens (in a multicultural society). Nussbaum uses mainly the term “teaching world citizenship” when discussing what role and content the education should have in a multicultural society. Some other frequently used concepts are Citizenship education (Jackson 2003), Value education (Colnerud and Thornberg 2003) and Multicultural education (Roth 1999).

All these concepts have in common that they promote a teaching that aim at fostering a good democratic citizen. By pedagogical methods, approaches and activities the intention is to stimulate or affect the student to incorporate some certain sets of virtues or norms necessary for a citizen in the present world. It can cover issues as for example perspectives on national, religious, ethnical, and cultural identity and history, Human Rights, critical thinking, responsibilities and duties. Fundamental to the concept of teaching world citizenship, citizenship education and multicultural education is that the education of citizens must include other perspectives than the majority culture and to reach beyond the borders of the nation-state.

The citizenship education can occur both as curriculum in itself and as a part of a wider curriculum. It concerns different subjects such as history language, civic education, geography and so on. It is possible to see how different countries have used different constructions of how citizenship education is put forward in the curriculum (Jackson 2003). In this thesis I will use the term citizenship in a general meaning as described above but to a great extent also use Nussbaum’s concept of teaching world citizenship since here theory is
a point of departure and framework. In the next chapter her concept will be further developed and explained

2.4 Citizenship, education and the multicultural school in Sweden

In the introductory section in Swedish curriculum for upper secondary school (Lpf 94) one can read the following about the fundamental values and the task of the school;

“The Education Act (1985:1100) stipulates that all school activity shall be carried out in accordance with fundamental democratic values and that each and everyone working in the school shall encourage respect for the intrinsic value of each person as well as for the environment we all share (Chapter 1, §2 and §9). The school has the important task of imparting, instilling and forming in pupils those values on which our society is based. The inviolability of human life, individual freedom and integrity, the equal value of all people, equality between women and men and solidarity with the weak and vulnerable are all values that the school shall represent and impart. In accordance with the ethics borne by Christian tradition and Western humanism, this is achieved by fostering in the individual a sense of justice, generosity of spirit, tolerance and responsibility.” (Lpf 94 p. 3)

This quotation quite well concludes what values and task that the school has in relations to the students. The education shall also support “the development of pupils into responsible persons who actively participate in and contribute to vocational and civic life.” (Lpf 94, p. 5).

About the recognition of the multicultural Swedish society and an interconnected world the curriculum states; “The internationalization of Swedish society and increasing cross-border mobility place great demands on people’s ability to live together and appreciate the values that are to be found in cultural diversity. The school is a social and cultural meeting place with both the opportunity and the obligation to strengthen this ability among all who work there.” (Lpf 94 p. 4)

Caroline Ljungberg acknowledges in her dissertation “The Swedish school and multiculturalism – a paradox?” (2004) that the task of the Swedish school to foster democratic citizens have been at the agenda since the Second World War (p. 75). She states that the fostering task of the school however contain several paradoxes that not very often are up to discussion. Questions as what fostering is - what democracy is - and how these concepts can be interpreted by different perspectives. One paradox is ideas and perspectives of homogeneity and unity in the Swedish tradition on the one hand and the picture of the Swedish society as diverse and pluralistic. How is it possible to both promote and recognize the universal democratic values of the Swedish society and at the same recognize and embrace a pluralistic and multicultural society? (p.77) She states that the idea of homogeneity is not possible to reconcile with multicultural pedagogics.

It is possible to note several public debates the last years regarding the multicultural society and education about religious education, clothing, celebrating end of term, minority languages, minority rights, sectoral legislation etc. (see for example Roth 1999, Aftonbladet
It is also possible to note an increasing interest for pedagogical focus the multicultural implications on pedagogics in Sweden under the concept of multicultural or intercultural pedagogics. (Ljungberg 2004, Lahdenperä (2004), Lahdenperä and Lorentz 2010) Characteristicly of the multicultural pedagogics is for example to gain greater insight about oneself, a skill to look from others point of view, possibilities for the student to better identify with the teaching content, to give the student cultural alternatives and insight that it does not exist one right way to live (Ljungbeg 2004 p. 110). Even though increased focus on multicultural pedagogics in sweden the last 20 year it has not, according to Ljungberg made a breakthrough in Sweden. This because the perception of a specific swedish culture which is not reconcilable with a multicultural pedagogics (p. 113).

2.5 Summary of chapter
This chapter addresses how the concept of citizenship and education has developed in a historical context of the liberal democracies as well as how the concept of citizenship education can be interpreted.

It begins with describing how different philosophers of the liberal tradition like John Locke, John Dewey, Adam Smith and John Stuart Mill emphasized the fundamental role of education in the building of the society and the modern democratic nation state. One vision of the liberal project of the nation state was, with the help of education, lift the individual above their cultural background. Contemporary liberal philosophers like Will Kymlicka and Charles Taylor have instead argued for a cultural sensitive education that recognizes cultural identity of minority groups. Along with the process of globalization and increased immigration the multicultural society has put the role of education under new circumstances.

The chapter demonstrates how the concept of citizenship has developed from a traditional national citizenship, where everyone is supposed to be treated as full and equal members of the society with certain civil, political and social rights relative to the nation state, to a post-national citizenship, where membership and rights are to be looked upon as beyond the nation state and instead in relative to a global community and political institutions.

It is noted that the concept of citizenship education can be understood in various ways but in a general meaning one can say that I refers to the task of the school too fostering good citizens. The intention by the school is to stimulate or affect the student to incorporate certain sets of virtues or norms necessary for a citizen in the present world. In the last section it is demonstrated that the multicultural society has influenced the curriculum of Swedish schools, pedagogical research and public debates.
3. Cultivating humanity – a theory of world citizenship education

This chapter is a description and analysis of Martha Nussbaums theory of world citizenship education. In the philosophical tradition and during history there have been several attempts to present theories and ideas of citizenship that reach beyond the borders of nationality as well as what this could mean in educational terms. The choice of Martha Nussbaum’s theory of world citizenship as a framework of this thesis is primarily because her theory is applicable to the ethical challenges of the multicultural classroom. Here theory is a suitable combination of ethical theory and pedagogical proposals of teaching citizenship. Her theory also concerns the classical but still present debate about cultural relativism and universalism which is of central concern in multicultural classrooms. Another reason is the fact that there has been paid less attention to her contribution to pedagogical philosophy, in compare with for example her writings on the capability approach and as classist in ancient philosophy, which makes it even more interesting to explore. Because of these reasons I hope that the choice of Nussbaum’s theory might contribute to further perspectives on the topic of teaching citizenship in multicultural classrooms.

In this chapter Martha Nussbaum’s theory will be presented and analyzed through the eyes and questions of a teacher in multicultural classrooms. In what way can Nussbaum’s theory of world citizenship give guidance for describing, understanding and teaching moral values in a multicultural classroom? Is the theory of Nussbaum plausible when applying it to teach citizenship in multicultural classrooms?

The chapter first presents a short introduction to the philosophy and writings of Martha Nussbaum and a general description and comment of the content in her theory. In commenting Nussbaum’s theory some alternative and critical philosophical perspectives also will be used. The world citizenship theory will then be presented and analyzed in the context of a multicultural classroom through the questions and ethical challenges; universal values, conflicting values and sense of belonging.

At the end there will be an argumentation (comment) and conclusion about the plausibility and relevance of Nussbaum’s theory for teaching world citizenship in multicultural classrooms.

3.1 A brief introduction to Martha Nussbaum

Martha Nussbaum is the Ernst Freund Distinguished Service Professor of Law and Ethics at the University of Chicago The Law School. Previously she has been teaching at Harvard

---

10 It can be discussed whether Nussbaum’s writings about world citizenship are to be named as a theory in a strict meaning. According to Timmons (2002) a Moral theory “attempts to provide systematic answers to these very general questions of what to do and how to be.” (p.1). It has a practical aim of providing a decision procedure for making correct moral judgments and a theoretical aim of providing moral criteria that explain the underlying nature of morality. An applied moral theory investigates the morality of specific actions and practices and could be seen as an application of the principles of a moral theory into real-world moral problems. Nussbaum’s theory is not obviously structured and systematic in the way it is presented but since it fulfills several others criteria of a an applied moral theory I have chosen to use the term theory in the thesis.
University and Brown University. Here major philosophical interest concerns ancient Greek and Roman philosophy, political philosophy and ethics. (www.wikipedia.org 13/5 2010, keyword: Martha Nussbaum) As a writer Nussbaum has been very productive and published a wide range of literature on different philosophical topics. Some of the most recognized are *The Fragility of Goodness: Luck and Ethics in Greek Tragedy and Philosophy* (1986), *Cultivating Humanity: A classical defense of reform in liberal education* (1997), *Sex and social justice* (1998), *Women and human development: the capabilities approach* (2000) and *From Disgust to Humanity: Sexual Orientation and Constitutional Law* (2010). Together with the economist Amartya Sen, Nussbaum developed the capability approach during the 1980:s which culminated in the publication *The Quality of Life* (1993). In this approach Nussbaum and Sen argues for universal Capabilities (substantial freedoms), such as ability to live to old age, engage in economic transactions, or participate in political activities to be the constitutive parts of development. Nussbaum also further developed this approach in several of her later publications.

### 3.2 The theory of world citizenship education

The following part is a general description of Nussbaum´’s theory of World citizenship according to her two publications “Patriotism and Cosmopolitanism” (1994) and “Cultivating Humanity – a Classical Defence of Reform in Liberal Education” (1997). It is divided into a presentation of the sources, an overview of the concepts of, cultivating humanity cosmopolitanism, world citizenship education and her arguments for world citizenship education.

#### 3.2.1 The sources

In 1994 Boston Review published Martha Nussbaum´s essay “Patriotism and Cosmopolitanism”. In her essay she defends the moral position of cosmopolitanism where our highest allegiance must be to the community of humankind beyond the borders and goals of the nations. The first principles of our practical thought must respect the equal worth of all members of the world community. She also argues for that cosmopolitan values and world citizenship rather than democratic or national citizenship should be the focus for civic (citizenship) education.

The Essay provoked a debate among scholars and 29 different responses from different philosophical perspectives were published in the Boston Review. Later on in 1996, eleven of those together with five additional contributions were published in the book “For love of country?” (1996, Edited Joshua Cohen).

In 1997 Martha Nussbaum published the book “Cultivating Humanity – A Classical Defense of Reform in Liberal Education”. In this book she develops her perspectives, argumentation and experiences about education for world citizenship. The book is written out of her 20 years experience of teaching at Universities in the United States and the fact that she did not agree with the overall situation reported in books about higher education in the United States. Her overall approach in the book as she describes it: “My own approach was, and is,
philosophical. I intend to argue for a particular norm of citizenship and to make educational proposals in the light of that ideal.” (p. ix)

In the book she mixes philosophical argumentation on world citizenship education together with practical examples of how world citizenship is taught at some different universities in the United States. Her point of departure is the ancient Greek philosophy and Socrates idea of the “Think Academy” where Socrates argued for a new role of education where critical thinking about moral norms, making distinction between convention and nature as well as constructing arguments heedless of authority are put in contrast to a conservative patriotic education. Throughout the book she describes the historical idea of world citizenship and traces it back to philosophers as the Greek cynic Diogenes, the Stoics as well as the modern liberalism represented by Adam Smith and Immanuel Kant. In the book she explains how teaching world citizenship could be formulated in the curriculum of education today by stressing the importance of studying non-western cultures, African-American Studies, women studies, study of human sexuality and the role of literature as narrative imagination.

Looking at the writings of Nussbaum about teaching world citizenship her aims can be described as both practical and theoretical. Here intention as described above is both to make educational proposals and argue for a particular norm of citizenship. In her description of teaching world citizenship in Cultivating Humanity she gives practical guidance of how to make correct moral judgment concerning teaching citizenship in liberal education. She gives advises, guidance and examples of how to act for fulfilling the aim of teaching world citizenship. She also provide with theoretical moral criteria’s by presenting arguments for why one should act as a citizen of the world with the highest allegiance to the community of humankind. In this sense it could be said that her writings are to be seen as a moral theory (Timmons 2002). But because here theory investigates a specific practice, namely education and its role, her theory, according to Timmons, ought to be seen above all as an applied moral theory. Her practical intention with Cultivating Humanity is clearly demonstrated by several specified examples from teaching world citizenship at universities in the United States. In my analysis I have however chosen not to focus on her teaching examples from the universities but instead on the theoretical and argumentative parts in the book.

3.2.2 Cultivating humanity, cosmopolitanism and world citizenship education

The concept cultivating humanity (cultivation of humanity) origins from the Greek philosopher Seneca and the stoic notion of an education that is “liberal” in that it liberates the mind from the bondage of habit and custom, producing people who can function with sensitivity and alertness as citizens of the whole world”(Nussbaum 1997 p. 8) Nussbaum uses the term in her book Cultivating Humanity when describing the necessary reform in liberal education to enable students to become world citizens. (p. 9) In Patriotism and Cosmopolitanism Nussbaum uses the concept cosmopolitan education when arguing for the students to be taught world citizenship. In Cultivating Humanity she does not use the concept of cosmopolitan education but instead frequently uses the concept of world citizenship and cultivating humanity. There is no obvious distinction between the three
concepts but in this thesis world citizenship along with cultivating humanity primarily will be used since these are the concepts used in Cultivating Humanity which is the mayor source of this thesis.

**Cosmopolitanism**

As one of the first and most important historical roots to the philosophical ideal of the world citizen, Nussbaum describes the Stoics of ancient Greek and Rome. Diogenes the cynic declared “I am a citizen of the world” and by this meant that he refused to be defined by his local origins and group memberships as a Greek. The Stoics further developed his view of the Kosmou politès (world citizen) describing and arguing for that every person dwells in two different communities. The local community of our birth, and the community of human argument and aspiration. The second community is to the stoic’s the fundamental source of our moral obligations. According to this “We should regard all human beings as our fellow citizens and neighbors (…) We should not allow differences of nationality or class or ethnic membership or even gender to erect barriers between us and our fellow human beings, we should recognize humanity wherever it occurs and give its fundamental ingredients, reason and moral capacity, our first allegiance and respect.” (Nussbaum 1996 p.7)

The Stoics who hold that good education should include education for world citizenship stated three grounds; first, the study of humanity is valuable for self-knowledge because of that we see ourselves more clearly in relation to other reasonable people; second, we will be better able to solve our problems if we see them through a world community of justice and reason; third, the stance of the Kosmou politès is intrinsically valuable because “it recognizes in people what is especially fundamental about them, most worthy of respect and acknowledgement: their justice and goodness and their capacities for reasoning in this connection.”(p.8) The Stoics also stresses that to be a citizen of the world you don’t have to give up your local identification. Instead they see individuals as surrounded of concentric circles. The first one encircles the self, the next takes in the immediate family, then follows the extended family, neighbors, fellow city dwellers and so on. The largest circle is symbolizes the humanity as a whole. Our task as world citizens is to “draw the circles somehow toward the center” (Hierocles, 1st-2nd CE in Nussbaum 1996 p. 9)

When introducing cosmopolitanism in *Patriotism and Cosmopolitanism*, Martha Nussbaum takes her point of departure in the Indian writer Rabindranath Tagore’s novel “The home and the World”. She refers a discussion between the young wife Bimala and her husband, the cosmopolitan Hindu Landlord Nikhil. Bimala tries to persuade Nikhil to join the nationalistic movement of Bande Mataram (Hail Motherland) but Nikhil dismisses (rejects) her proposals with the following:

““I am willing”, he said, “to serve my country; but my worship I reserve for Right which is far greater than my country. To worship my country as a god is to bring a curse upon it.””
As an American Martha Nussbaum has experienced the principle of giving the American citizenship a special salience in moral and political deliberation. Nussbaum means that the specifically identity of American citizenship are used as a power for motivating political action. Nussbaum opposes this view and continues in the same line as Nikhil and declares: “this emphasis on patriotic pride is both morally dangerous and, ultimately, subversive of some of the worthy goals patriotism sets out to serve” (p. 4) For example the goal of national unity in devotion to worthy moral ideals of justice and equality. Giving support to nationalist sentiments risk to subvert the values that holds a nation together, because it “substitutes a colorful idol for the substantive universal values of justice and right” (p. 5). Instead Nussbaum argues for that goals of justice and rights would be better served by the very old ideal of cosmopolitanism where the person’s allegiance is to the worldwide community of human beings. To give our first allegiance to the world wide community is the only way to also give first allegiance to what is morally good.

Obviously Nussbaum distances herself very clearly from patriotic and nationalistic sentiments to build a nation. In this way she differ a lot from the tradition of school curriculum with roots from the nineteenth century, where the building of national states on the grounds of patriotic and nationalistic sentiments has been emphasized (Lorentz 2004) A tradition that Nussbaum herself noted have got a renaissance in public discussions on American character and education the last years (Nussbaum 1996 p. 4). Her position that patriotic pride is both morally dangerous and subversive to the goals they are set to serve, have been one part in her theory that have been strong rejected by philosophers like Charles Taylor (1996), Hilary Putnam (1996), Sisela Bok(1996).

Taylor does agree with Nussbaum argumentation on the importance of cosmopolitanism but he also means that a democratic modern state cannot do without patriotism (1996 p. 119). Both cosmopolitanism and patriotism is necessary to build the society. To succeed with the project of a free, democratic society it requires strong identification and participation on their part of their citizens. This participation requires not only a commitment to the common project but also a special sense of bonding among the people working together Taylor argues.

Hilary Putnam (1996) asking a rhetoric question in a respond to Nussbaum, do we really need to choose between Patriotism and Universal reason? She means that actual reasoning is always situated with one or another historical tradition, we cannot recognize the universal values that Nussbaum presents without having them debated out of our own tradition. Putnam stresses that we don’t need to choose between patriotism and universal reason, “critical intelligence and loyalty to what is best in our tradition, including our national and ethnic traditions, are independent” (p.97)

Sisela Bok also argues that our local settings are necessary to be able to move beyond to a cosmopolitan view, but rejects Nussbaum’s standpoint that our fundamental allegiance should be to the world wide community of human beings (p. 43). In a commentary to the
debate Amartya Sen means that the perspective of Bok and Nussbaum does not have to be irreconcilable. To have a fundamental allegiance to the world wide community does not have to mean that one have an exclusive allegiance to the world wide community. Instead Sen sees a possibility that both Nussbaum and Bok do admit the existence and necessity of the local setting. Sen do however stress the importance of a pluralistic perspective where multiplicity loyalties can exist and one can chose what loyalty that should be of primer concern.

In Nussbaum´s reply to this criticism she states that cosmopolitanism does not deny that we should give special attention to our local setting in terms of family and nationhood. She acknowledges that we cannot act only outside our local setting. This does not however mean that the local settings are of greater moral worth. Instead it argues for that we need to recognize the equal moral worth of all human beings. As I will demonstrate later on in this chapter, under the heading sense of belonging, it is however possible to note an ambiguity in her writings on this point. It is not obvious in what way and to what extent Nussbaum means one can recognize and encourage the local allegiance.

**World citizenship and capacities of the citizen**

According Nussbaum the classical ideal of the world citizen, and cultivating humanities along with it, can be understood in two ways. A more sterner version (a) and a more relaxed version (b):

a) “...a citizen whose primary loyalty is to human beings the world over , and whose national, local, and varied group loyalties are considered distinctly secondary”(1997 p.9)

b) “however we order our varied loyalties, we should still be sure that we recognize the worth of human life wherever it occurs and see ourselves as bound by common human abilities and problems to people who lie at a great distance from us.

Even though Nussbaum sympathize with the first more sterner version it is the second and more relaxed version she discusses in her writings (p. 9). In Cultivating humanity she develops what this conception of world citizenship would mean in terms of what to learn. She identifies here three capacities that are essential for the cultivation of humanity today.

The first capacity is about critical examination of oneself and ones tradition, for living an “examined life”\(^\text{11}\). This means living a life that don´t accept believing in authority simply because of tradition or through habit as well as a questioning all beliefs and accept only those that survive rational demands of reason and justification (p.9). For this requires training in the capacity of reason logically and to test what one reads or says stays for consistence of reasoning, correctness of fact and accuracy of judgment. Democracy needs

\[^{11}\text{Referering Socrates concept of “the examined life”, aiming at learning youth to think critically about their social origins, its norms and to construct arguments on their own and not to blindly accept aouthority.(Nussbaum 1997 p.1)\]
citizens who think for themselves rather than simply following authority. These capacities are a precondition to achieve real deliberation and to fulfill the democratic citizenship (p.10).

_The second capacity_ stresses the ability for citizens to see themselves as "...not simply as citizens of some local region or group but also, and above all, as human beings bound to all other human beings by ties of recognition and concern."(Nussbaum 1997 s.10) Nussbaum points at the fact that we very easily think of ourselves in group terms, e.g. Swedish first and human beings second or other kind of groups. This leads to that we neglect needs and capacities that link us to fellow citizens living in other parts of the world or who look different from ourselves. Cultivating Humanity in today’s interlocking world would involve “understanding the ways in which common needs and aims are differently realized in different circumstances.”(p.10) Making this possible the student need to have a great deal of knowledge about e.g. non-western cultures and minority groups within their own society.

_The third capacity_ of the world citizen Nussbaum calls the narrative imagination. An ability to think “what it might be like to be in the shoes of a person different from oneself, to be an intelligent reader of that person’s story, and to understand the emotions and wishes and desires that someone so placed might have.” (p.11). We should and cannot therefore be uncritical. Every time we try to imagine another perspective we will also judge in the light of our own perspective. The first step to understand the world from another person’s perspective is even though essential to be able to make a reliable judgment.

Except from these mayor three capacities Nussbaum also mentions the capacities of scientific understanding and economics as something of great importance. She also choose to not describe all the capacities a good citizen might need, instead she focus on what she think are the areas of current urgency and controversy and the ones associated with the humanities and social sciences such as philosophy, political science, religious studies, history, anthropology, sociology, literature, art, language, culture and so on.

In Nussbaum’s concept of world citizenship she focuses mainly on the virtues of the citizens. Even though she writes both implicitly and explicitly about the universality of human rights and the equal worth of human beings she do not present rights as fundamental parts in her concept of world citizenship. It is also notable that her concept of world citizenship ought to be seen as “non-institutional” or “non-constitutional”. The traditional concepts of citizenships do imply duties and rights of a membership in a national state in relation to social and political institutions. To assure duties and rights the classical notion of citizenship stresses the need for institutions of the state. (Smith, Mill etc.) Nussbaum’s concept of world citizenship does hardly at all speak about any concrete proposals of cosmopolitan or world institutions. This is also criticized by for example Elaine Scarry and Amy Gutman in their response to Nussbaum.

Scarry (1996) argues that Nussbaum’s notion of world citizenship, relying only on sentiments, is impossible without complemented by constitutional structure to uphold the
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cosmopolitan values. Scarry confront Nussbaum with the difficulty of imagining other people. According Scarry, Nussbaums concept of world citizenship does rely only on people’s ability to imagine other people (third capacity). People do however in reality have great difficulties in imagining others. As examples she states that; it is impossible to hold rich multitudes of imaginary characters simultaneously in the mind; our imagination of others often turn into a exercise in self-reflection and self-identification, rather than reflection upon and identification with people different from oneself; imaging others often lack anchor in material and historical reality. A cosmopolitan citizenship therefore need to be complemented by political and social institutions to guarantee the rights of the citizens.

Gutman point at the fact that democratic citizens in the national state do have institutional means at their disposals for claiming rights, justice and equality, that solitary citizens of the world do not. (Gutman 1996 p. 71)

Gertrud Himmelfarb states that the world citizenship in reality has “little meaning expect in the context of a state” (Himmelfarb 1996 p. 74) and criticize the idea of a stateless community, as Nussbaum seem to propose. “If nationality, as she says, is morally irrelevant to the cosmopolitan ideal, so is the polity that defines the nation, and so is the idea of citizenship. And so too is all of history.” (p. 74).

In a response to Nussbaum, Michael W McConnell (1994) is skeptical towards her educational proposal to teach the students that their fundamental allegiance is as citizens of the world and that citizenship of, for example, the United States is “morally irrelevant”(second capacity). He means that Nussbaum’s cosmopolitanism may turn out to be more destructive than constructive and it’s likely to “undermine the coherent moral education, which in the real world is rooted in particular moral communities with distinctive identities” (p.79). He argues ,in the same tradition as Edmund Burke and Aristotle, that moral education do have to begin by the close ties, characterized by for example love, to family and the near surroundings to be able to do good. This is also the case in the classroom, the moral education has to build on the loving relationships in the community and the source of strength lies in the affections that begin in the near surrounding.

3.2.3 World citizenship education
The starting point of Nussbaum’s argumentation for a reform in liberal education is from the perspective of higher education in the United States. She recognizes that there is about a change within American universities. Students are now thought history and culture of non western peoples and of ethnic and racial minorities in the United States in a new way. But she notes that these changes have been criticized and questioned from some directions and want to argue of the importance of a new liberal reform.

“Todays teacher are shaping future citizens in an age of cultural diversity and increasing internationalization. Our country is inescapably plural. As citizens we are also increasingly called upon to understand how issues such as agriculture, human rights, ecology, even business and industry are generating discussions that bring people together from many
nations….A new curriculum is an attempt to produce adults who can function as citizens not just of some local region or group but also, and more importantly, as citizens of a complex interlocking world.” (Nussbaum 1997 p. 6)

Nussbaum emphasize the long historical relation between liberal education and citizenship in the western philosophical by referring to Socrates concept of “the examined life”, Aristotele’s notions of reflective citizenship, and to the Greek and Roman Stoic notions of a liberal education. She means that the idea about a well educated citizen of the world also had great influence on later western thought about education, e.g. David Hume and Adam Smith as well as Immanuel Kant and Thomas Paine and the other founding fathers of the United States (p. 9). Liberal education, due to this tradition, is that higher education is a cultivation of the whole human being and she means that some education that ostensibly seem “liberal” do focus too much on technical and vocational education instead of cultivation of the whole person.

The content of world citizenship education
In her writings she is not very specific about the content of world citizenship education. Instead she presents examples of how different universities in the United States have been teaching world citizenship the last years. She does however present some of the characteristics that world citizenship education should contain. First of all she declares that:

“The process of coming to recognize the humanity of all people should be a lifelong process, encompassing all levels of education.”(p. 66). In classroom and teaching this means to nourish an attitude of mutual respect. She is very clear about that education for world citizenship is something that concerns all educational levels and need to begin early at the basic levels. Of course do the content have to be adjusted to each level (Nussbaum 1997 p. 69).

Education for world citizenship must be a multicultural education. This means an education that acquaints students with fundamentals about the histories and cultures of many different groups. This would include the major cultural groups of each part of the world as well as ethnic and racial, social and sexual minorities within their own nation. Language, history, religious studies and philosophy plays an important role. Respect for another through awareness of cultural difference is essential for making dialogue possible. A detailed understanding of one unfamiliar tradition and some rudiments about other tradition is good enough for knowledge about one’s one limitations.

Education for world citizenship should devote more attention and time for traditions and history of their own because it is in that sphere that they will operate. Nussbaum means that we would be “absurdly misguided if we aimed at giving our students an equal knowledge of all histories and cultures.” If we would attempted to give our students equal worth and knowledge of all histories and cultures this would imply a ridiculously superficial result and a very poor knowledge about one’s own history and background in which the major part of
their action will be undertaken. It is though really important that education of one’s own history and culture are presented in a way that puts it in a broader context of the world where western cultures are one part.

Education for world citizenship needs to begin early. When children engage in storytelling they can tell stories about other lands and other peoples. Education for world citizenship must develop sympathetic understanding of distant cultures and of ethnic racial and religious minorities (1997 p. 69).

**Arguments for world citizenship education**

When looking at the arguments of Nussbaum for teaching world citizenship it is obvious and explicit that she had a lot of inspiration from the Stoics. The Stoics, as described above argued for world citizenship because the study of humanity is valuable for self-knowledge, we will be better able to solve our problems if we see them through a world community of justice and reason and because it recognizes in people what is especially fundamental about them, most worthy of respect and acknowledgement.

In “Patriotism and Cosmopolitanism” Nussbaum offers four arguments for making world citizenship the focus for civic education; *Through cosmopolitan education, we learn more about ourselves; We make headway solving problems that require international cooperation; We recognize moral obligations to the rest of the world that are real and that otherwise would go unrecognized; We make a consistent and coherent argument based on distinctions we are prepared to defend.*

Her argumentation will not be analyzed in detail since much of her arguments do appear in other section of this thesis but some things can be worth to mention. In her argumentation she put forward the capacity of knowing oneself as something of great importance. The reason is that she acknowledges that knowing oneself is fundamental to be able to make rational deliberation, which in itself, to Nussbaum, seem to be of intrinsic value. Not many people would argue against that knowing oneself is a negative capacity? There is however several philosophical arguments that do not agree that knowing oneself obviously lead to knowing others. (Se for example Scarry and Himmelsfarb)

She also put forward the fact that we all live in a globalized and interconnected world and that we all need the capacities of world citizenship to better solve problems and recognize our moral obligations. The great majority of scholars will today agree on that we live in a globalized and interconnected world. But as the debate that followed demonstrated, many philosophers would disagree that Nussbaum’s “sentimentbased” and “non-institutional” proposal of cosmopolitan citizenship do not have to lead towards solving the challenges of globalization and increasing the respect of human rights and values (Barber, Gutman, Himmelsfarb).

**3.3 World citizenship education in a multicultural context**
Above a general description of the theory of world citizenship education was presented. This part will focus on a more specific description and examination of the theory in a multicultural context. The intention is to clarify Nussbaum’s contribution to some of the crucial questions of teaching world citizenship in multicultural classrooms. The intention is also to clarify and structure her theory in a multicultural context to be able to apply here theory in a better way out of a teacher’s perspective. Does her theory seem to be applicable in multicultural classrooms out of a teacher’s perspective?

The examination of the theory is made out of the ethical challenges of universal values, conflicting values and sense of belonging.

3.3.1 Universal values
One of the crucial questions of teaching citizenship in multicultural classroom is whether it is possible or not to identify some fundamental and universal values across cultures and minority groups. If possible to identify what are these values? These questions can be understood as descriptive in its character and are important because it can paint a picture helping the teacher to better understand the character of morality in classroom. Should one as a teacher have the presumption that people from different cultures have a common morality? In that case what are these fundamental values? Another closely related question is about what universal values that ought to be educated in a multicultural classroom. What values should one as a teacher strongly claim and defend as universal and on what grounds? These questions are more likely to be understood as normative in its character. What is Nussbaum’s notion of cosmopolitan and liberal values and what are her universal claims?

Reading Nussbaum it is obvious and explicit that her philosophy stems from a liberal tradition concerning fundamental and universal values as well as the role of education in society. The title of her book “Cultivating humanity – a Classical Defend of Reform in Liberal Education” tells a lot of her perspective. In line with the liberal tradition she has a universal claim when arguing for a universal model of teaching world citizenship and that this model could be applied in all liberal and democratic societies. It is also possible to see that she has universal claims in the sense that some values are universal and to be found in different cultures and traditions.

Identifying universal values?
The first question to be examined is what fundamental and universal values are to be found in different traditions and cultures according to Nussbaum? Her claim of universal values, in a descriptive sense, is recognizable in different pieces of her writings. When arguing for the three capacities of the ability of critical examination, the ability to see oneself as human beings bound to all other human beings, and the ability of narrative imagination she mean that closely related notions do have many sources in many traditions and to be found in India, Africa and Latin America. (1997 p. 11) She does not however get into detail explaining what traditions she refers to. Another example of her universal approach is to be found in the introduction to Patriotism and Cosmopolitanism. In this introduction she holds that most
of us are brought up to believe that all human beings have equal worth. At least the world’s major religions and most secular philosophies tell us so even though our emotions do not believe it. (p. xii 1996) She means that our emotions do constrain our ability to have compassions outside our local setting but that compassion outside the local can be educated to get into harmony with our moral nature. Other values that she claims to be universal are justice, right and reason. She also rejects the “dominate current thinking” that “the East” values order whereas “the West” values freedom, and that “the East” values community whereas “the West” values the individual. She means that the concepts of order, freedom, community and individualism have such a broad range of connotation that one have to be specific to be able to judge whether it belong in a culture or not. She gives several examples where one can find the opposite of what is supposed to be eastern and western and claim that “dismissive attitudes to non-western cultures is based to at least some degree of uninformed normative chauvinism” (1997 p. 144).

To be able to evaluate Nussbaum’s claims of the universality of liberal values it is necessary to go into detail to these specific traditions. But even though it is possible to trace the ideas of world citizenship and liberalism to different traditions, it is important to note that it is not a sustainable argument of the moral worth and universality of world citizenship. As well as it is possible to find Indian, African, and Latin American traditions that support the liberal ideas of world citizenship, it is possible to find traditions of India, Africa and Latin America that support ideas such as primacy of the tribe, clan or nationality or to accept authorities and conventions without critical examination. Nussbaum gives many examples and demonstrate deep knowledge about different cultural traditions of the world but she does not give specific answers to what specific traditions of universal values she refers to. In this way it is difficult to evaluate her argument. Her universal claim on for example “justice and right”, “justice and reason”, “reason and the love of humanity” are criticized by Gertrude Himmelsfarb stressing that these values in fact, predominantly, perhaps even uniquely, are western values (Himmelsfarb 1996 p.75).

It is also important to make clear that even though it would be possible to demonstrate sources of the liberal ideas in the traditions mentioned above, it is questionable as a moral argument. The recognition of liberal ideas in different traditions would be a pedagogical instrument in arguing for a liberal reform in education but the factual existence of an idea is of course not the same as giving the idea an essential moral value. Claiming world citizenship to be of essential moral worth it is necessary to demonstrate stronger arguments.

Applying Nussbaum’s reflections to a multicultural classroom one can note a difficulty in that her claims on universal values are presented on a quite abstract level, without being more specific. Because of the possibility to interpret values such as justice, rights, reason in such many ways, as Nussbaum also notes, means saying nothing in reality. In a multicultural classroom you will for sure find several students from different cultures that will agree on
the universality of justice presented in a general meaning but getting into detail and defining
the term you will likely find more disagreement among the students.

What universal values ought to be educated?
The next thing is to clarify what universal values are fundamental to the theory of world
citizenship and ought to be educated in a normative sense? In her writings she does not
explicitly declare a set of basic values that are fundamental to world citizenship and ought to
be educated in terms of certain rights, justice, democracy and so forth. Instead she focuses
on the capacities of the ability of critical examination, the ability to see oneself as human
beings bound to all other human beings, and the ability of narrative imagination that are
fundamental to world citizenship and a “true” liberal education (1997 p. 8) The importance
of independent reasoning and a genuinely critical and deliberative culture are consistently
paid a lot of attention in her writings (1997 p. 66).

From a pedagogical point of view Nussbaum’s emphasis on certain capacities\textsuperscript{12} seems
appealing and concrete. Critical examination of one self and one’s tradition is a good way to
learn about oneself as well as about other traditions that are represented in a multicultural
classroom. Succeeding in critical examination along with students in a multicultural group
would most likely lead to mutual understanding because it helps you to see traditions and
cultures from above and out of different perspectives. Together challenging traditions,
reason logically and questioning authority will probably strengthen the community of
students as well as starting question of uncertainty which is a good start for a learning
process. Her concept of narrative imagination is well applicable in a multicultural classroom.
Because you have students from other cultural background close, you will probably find it
even easier to imagine the other.

To clarify the substantive and underlying fundamental and universal moral values of world
citizenship it is necessary to identify and deconstruct different parts in Nussbaum’s writings.
Values that are possible to identify when looking at her writings is the importance of
democracy, justice, human rights and dignity, as well as equality (1997 p. 65) Democracy as a
fundamental value is something she refers to regularly in cultivating humanity (1997 e. g. p.
27, p. 65) when she talks about the heritage of Socrates and the importance of deliberative
judgment to create a desirable society. Justice, equality and rights are values that are
universal and can be understood as something desirable and necessary for a good society.
(1996 p. 5) For instance she writes about the importance of citizen’s ability of being critical
against unjust action (1997 p. 65) and considers justice as “worthy moral idea” of the nation.
(1996 p.4) Further development or definition of what she mean with justice are not
presented in these particular writings but are to be found in other materials of Nussbaum
(For example Frontiers of Justice: Disability, Nationality, Species Membership (2006)).

\textsuperscript{12} Not to mix up with the concept capabilities that she has been writing about in other works (Nussbaum 1993
and 2001).
Nussbaum emphasize inalienable, substantial and universal Human rights (1996 p. 5, p. 13), as necessary for “a world in which nations interact all the time on terms (let us hope) of justice and mutual respect” (1996 p. 6) Her notion of rights are not specified more than that she stresses the importance of recognizing basic human rights in more general terms for all human beings (1996 p.6) and for instance mentions freedom of speech (p.6) as important for a truly deliberative culture. Respect of the human dignity is central all through her writings and to Nussbaum it is of greatest importance to identify humanity in each person and citizen regardless borders of nationhood. (1997 p. 67) About equality she writes that “one should always behave so as to treat with equal respect the dignity of reason and moral choice in every human being” (1996 p. 8).

One problem and possible weakness with Nussbaum’s perspective on substantive fundamental and universal values is that she uses very general concepts and terms of what is supposed to be educated in classroom. When she emphasizes the importance of for example justice and equality she is not presenting any further explanation of what she mean. It is understandable that she, within the scope of these materials, cannot present a fully developed theory of justice or equality. But since justice and equality are concepts that can be understood in broad range of ways it will be very difficult to use them in education in a fruitful way if not more specifically defined. If you present or use a very vague concept of justice in classroom you will probably have a major support for the idea but in practice no one knows what they agree upon. If justice would be presented in a more specified way you will probably find much more disagreement. When not having concepts like this specified it is almost impossible to relate and make a judgment.

A similar criticism against Nussbaum’s theory is raised by Benjamin Barber. He means that she overestimate the possibilities of World Wide allegiance and cosmopolitanism. “What we require are healthy, democratic forms of local community and civic patriotism rather than abstract universalism and the thin gruel of contract relations.” (Barber 1997 p. 31.) According Barber Nussbaum to quick rejects the benefits of civic patriotism and focus too much on abstract universalism that will not contribute to the community. Taylor, Sen and Appiah argues in response to Nussbaum for the importance of both patriotic and cosmopolitan values and that they do not have to be in opposite.(Appiah, Taylor and Sen 1997)

3.3.2 **Conflicting values**

As described in the previous part Nussbaum presents some fundamental and universal values that are possible to find across cultures. In multicultural classrooms it is however obvious that different values sometimes gets into conflict with each other. When this happens, how should one as a teacher act? To what extent shall I as a teacher tolerate and accept values that come into conflict with the fundamental liberal values of the curriculum and society? Is it possible to draw a line when you meet values that seem unacceptable and as well how to act when you meet values that on one hand you really need and wish to
understand and at the other hand have to neglect as non-acceptable? What is Nussbaum’s contribution to this?

Although the Swedish society, and the Swedish classroom, is multicultural, conflicting values in school can be understood and studied in various ways. Perspectives as for example sex, age, socio-economical background of the students can be of great interest for understanding conflicting values. Even though this thesis does focus on the ethno-cultural perspective it is important to note that a traditional “Swedish classroom” cannot be regarded as a homogenous classroom put in contrast to a multicultural and heterogeneous classroom. The traditional Swedish classroom was of course “multicultural” in different aspects also before the processes of migration and globalisation.

Conflicting values can mean the tension between classical liberal values of the curriculum and contrasting values of for example ethnic or religious minority-groups. Concerning questions as; role and function of family, conflicting rights such as between freedom of speech and freedom of religion, child rearing, relations to authorities, Individual or group responsibilities etc. In classroom this is not mere a philosophical dilemma to discuss but also a question of pedagogical dilemma of how to in a good way achieve dialogue, mutual understanding and shape desirable citizens. If one as a teacher demonstrate too much of tolerance and acceptance to conflicting values without criticism there is a risk of erosion of the values promoted in the curriculum as well as not doing my work as a teacher and civil servant.

On the contrary, if I loudly criticize the conflicting values I risk not to achieve the mutual understanding of cultures stipulated in the curriculum as well as a risk of social exclusion of the students belonging to minority groups. It is also very important to note that the expression of conflicting values as well as social exclusion have a lot to do with identities and sense of belonging to groups. Different classrooms with the same preconditions in terms of cultures and traditions can develop in very different ways depending group processes and sense of belonging to minority groups. The dilemmas of conflicting values and universalism versus relativism are an old philosophical discussion but are also an unavoidable reality for teachers in multicultural classrooms.

Looking into the writings of Nussbaum she does not pay too much attention to the fact that values can get into conflict. As described before she identifies a range of universal values across cultures and therefore she do not emphasize that values also do get into conflict. Her general confidence to common moral values is something she also has been criticized for (Barber and Himmelsfarb 1996). It seems that her opinion rather is that emotions are the primary cause of conflicts, and not the moral nature of human beings or culture itself (1996 p. Xiii) She recognize that people from different backgrounds sometimes have difficulties in seeing each other as fellow citizens. This is because actions and motives require a patient effort of interpretation and that becoming a world citizen you need to be a sensitive and empathic interpreter to recognize the common humanity. (1997 p. 63)
Culture and conflicts
First of all she makes clear that cultures are not monolithic or static (1997 p. 117). When studying or discussion non-western or western culture it is of great importance to remember that they contain many strands, evolve over time and do not flow in one single direction. We should not oversimplify the understanding of “eastern” and “western” culture. When we study, meet or trying to understand another culture that seem strange to us she identifies two different ways of interpretations. The first she calls descriptive chauvinism and this consist in “recreating the other in the image of oneself, reading the strange as exactly like what is familiar”. (1997 p. 118) Very often this leave aside what one regard as alien. This interpretation she regards as relatively common in teaching about foreign culture but also note that it is a simplification and an incorrect description. Descriptive romanticism is to be seen as the opposite and consist in “viewing another culture as excessively alien and virtually incomparable with one’s own, ignoring elements of similarity and highlighting elements that seem mysterious and odd” (1997 p. 124). To Nussbaum this perspective also is incorrect and could lead to “disastrous errors in our encounters with others” (1997 p. 124). Instead she promotes that good teaching and understanding of cultures should be based on the idea of real culture (1997 p. 127). Real cultures are plural not single in that it contains diverse regions, classes, ethnic and religious groups, and distinctive men and women within each group. Real cultures contain argument, resistance and contestation of norms in the sense that when we study a culture we have to look in to the voices of resistance to the dominant norm. In real cultures, what most people think is likely to be different from what famous artists and intellectual think. Real cultures have varied domains of thought and activity. Real cultures have a present as well as a past.

Once we have described and tried to interpret a culture we are able to moving on to evaluate it and reasoning of how to act towards the different or “the other”. Nussbaum offers three different ways in evaluating cultures. The first she calls normative chauvinism and this consist in that “the evaluator judges that her own culture is best, and that insofar as the other culture is unlike it, it is inferior” (1997 p. 131). The second she calls normative arcadianism and this consist in imagining the other as untouched by the vices of one’s own culture. The normative image of “the East” is a reverse image of whatever is found wrong and constraining in one’s own culture. The third she calls normative scepticism and this perspective “simply narrates the way things are, suspending all normative judgment about its goodness and badness.” (p. 131) This position is however not the same as toleration and Nussbaum stresses that we cannot demonstrate tolerance by avoiding evaluating and taking a stand. Nussbaum find all these three perspectives problematic in different ways and demonstrates an incorrect relationship to the cultures. The best way to avoid these pitfalls, according to Nussbaum, is to think in terms of common human problems. There are some situations that all human beings do meet in their daily life, because of being humans. Examples of this are mortality, food, drink, sex, planning their life etc. Beginning with these
common problems will allow us to recognize a shared humanity. We shall not assume that we all share the same understanding of all problems but “there is enough similarity and overlap” (p. 131) in these problems that we can organize our teaching around them.

What does this analytical framework then mean for understanding conflicting values in multicultural classroom? What she presents here seems to be very useful tools for describing, understanding and interpret culture in classroom. It helps me as a teacher categorize my own interpretation, understanding and acting towards different cultures. It could also be an important tool for the students to clarify and structure their understanding of different culture. Even though her definitions and perspectives might seem theoretical and abstract for the students in the first place I believe that these tools can be helpful when applied to the teaching in the right way.

Nourishing mutual understanding but take the conflict?
Nussbaum declares that one important stance for a world citizen is never to see an opponent in a value - conflict as an “other” or an impossible alien (1997 p. 65.). You should always try to look behind for example anger, hatred and honour and to recognize the common sharing of certain human goals and purposes and as well seek empathy. It is of great importance for education to not support or encourage hatred or anger towards individuals and cultural groups because of conflicting values (p. 66.)”The process of coming to recognize the humanity of all people should be a lifelong process, encompassing all levels of education.”(p. 66). In classroom and teaching this stresses the importance of nourishing an attitude of mutual respect (p. 66). She means that a curricula that seek to foster respect and mutual understanding is perfectly compatible with maintaining freedom of speech and the openness of a genuinely critical and deliberative culture ( p. 66).

But the importance of mutual respect and empathy should not exclude the importance of clarify a liberal position and to be critical to unjust actions, policies, and character of people who promote them. She declares that; “World citizenship does not, and should not, require that we suspend criticism toward other individuals and cultures” (1997 p.65) Good teaching should not be uncritical (1997, p. 144) and she refuses the “hands off” attitude (1997 p. 137) to criticism of topics that might be of a sensitive nature. (p. 137) “When we refuse to make judgments that we make freely in life with our own fellow citizens, we seem to be saying that this form of life is so alien and bizarre that it cannot be expected to be measured by the same set of standards”. (p. 138) and this is not a way of demonstrating tolerance but instead another way of being patronizing. On the account of Nussbaum the dilemma of promoting liberal values and at the same time demonstrate tolerance and imagination is of special interest since she is claiming the universality of world citizenship which include tolerance, understanding and imagination of the other and study of other cultures(Nussbaum 1997 e.g. p. 11).
What guidance does she give for how to act as a teacher when conflicting values occur in a multicultural classroom? Because of Nussbaum’s universal claim of fundamental values she does not focus very much on differences between cultures or conflicting values. She does give advises on how to improve the possibilities to recognize a shared humanity. This we can do by being aware of classical pitfalls when we evaluate culture, to focus on common human problems in the organisation of our teaching, to always recognize the common sharing of human goals. She is also very clear about that we should not avoid criticism towards individuals and cultures that involve limitations of liberty or promotes unjust actions. Her lack of conflicting perspectives might however be a weakness in her theory applied to the multicultural classroom since it do not confirms well with the reality in classroom. Even if the multicultural classroom not is to be looked as characterised by conflicts it is obvious that conflicts do occur. She tend to see the possibilities of common universal values but almost ignore the fact that values also get into conflict when cultures meet. Because of this her theory will be a weak guidance when confronted by conflicts.

The pedagogical dilemma of conflicting values and social exclusion
She does however not discuss “taking the conflict” out of a pedagogical perspective and in terms of social inclusion or exclusion. In philosophical and academic debate clarifications of arguments of not avoid criticism to limitation of liberty is one matter of course. In a pedagogical situation it is however necessary to take into consider reactions and the dynamic processes of the class. For the teacher, one of the main factors of succeeding education is to maintain a positive dynamic process of the group. When social exclusion of individuals or subgroups occurs or relations between the students and the teacher break, the preconditions for succeeding education dramatically decrease. As a teacher you have to take into account how your approach and argumentation are understood by the students and what kind of reactions that will follow. I do agree with Nussbaum that some values are not negotiable and that you should not avoid criticism to unjust or non-liberal actions but I also recognize the necessity of taking into account of how this is done, to avoid social exclusion in classroom. This is something that Nussbaum has not brought up for discussion. (se also next chapter) She does not discusses the relation of promoting liberal values and the risk of social exclusion which is a very fundamental factor of the multicultural classroom and education for citizenship. A very strong and delimited concession of citizenship might risk excluding individuals and groups as recent pedagogical research demonstrates (Marshall 2009, Philippou, Keating, Hinderliter, 2009).

Nussbaum demonstrates an ambiguity or even a contradiction when she at the one hand do want to recognize the universality of morality by mutual understanding and imagination but at the other hand stresses the importance of remark stop when actions delimits liberal rights or are unjust. She is not very clear about this. By her writings it is difficult to find any clear guidance on what values the teacher has an obligation to defend liberty. When someone rejects the idea of justice? When someone questions the right of freedom of speech talking about religion? The conclusion of this would be that imagination and mutual understanding
is the goal to the certain point when the promoting of universal liberalism seem necessary. Still remain however the crucial question; where, and on what values, is the point when mutual understanding ends?

3.3.3 Sense of belonging
One crucial challenge of the multicultural classroom is how one as a teacher should relate oneself and the students to the question of nationality and sense of belonging. One obvious intention with citizenship education is to shape good and well functioning democratic citizens. But to what extent should one as a teacher recognize other nationalities or cultural belonging then the major nationality as for example Swedish? Is recognition of cultural background important for moving towards a common citizenship or does recognition instead inhibits further steps for fellowship and mutual understanding? Is it possible to have a sense of belonging to one nation and also be a citizen of the world?

Sense of belonging as a dilemma
Nussbaum theory of world citizenship builds on the basic assumption that we should shape world citizens instead of citizens of a country. Her position do origin from an American point of view where she recognize patriotism and special salience to the American people has come to play an important role in moral and political deliberation. She believes that emphasis on patriotic pride is both morally dangerous and subversive to national unity and the ideals of justice and equality (1996 p. 4).

Nussbaum describes two different notions of world citizen. In the more sterner version the citizen has its primary loyalty to human beings of the world over and the national, local, and varied group loyalties are considered distinctly secondary. (1997 p.9) In the more relaxed version the citizen do not order the different loyalties, instead the important thing is to recognize “the worth of human life wherever it occurs and see ourselves as bound by common human abilities” (p.9) Nussbaum admit herself primarily to the more relaxed version even though some of her thoughts in the theory seem contradictory on this point.

In “For love of Country” Nussbaum referring Aristotle; “if we want our life to contain strong passions- for justice in a world of injustice, for aid in a world where many go without what they need – we would do well to begin, at least, with our familiar strong emotions towards family, city, and country.” (2002 p. xii) According to Nussbaum our compassion begins with the local (p. xiii) but our concern should not stop with these local attachments. (p. xii) In this example it seems that se admit that the local have some kind of primacy at least in practice to be able to move on to a world perspective. In Cultivating Humanity she refers the Stoics that stressed “to be a citizen of the world one does not “need to give up local affiliations, which can frequently be a source of great richness in life” (p. 60)We can see ourselves as surrounded by a series of concentric circles. The first one is drawn around the self, the next one takes in ones immediate family, then follows the extended family, and then in order, one´’s neighbor, one´’s fellow city dweller, one´’s fellow countrymen and finally that of humanity as a hole. The task of the world citizen would be to ““draw the circles somehow
towards the center,” making all human beings like our fellow citizens.” (p. 60) She continues that “each of us should take our stand where life has placed us”. (p. 61) When studying language, history, literature, ethics and so on we there for need to take the start in our own local setting.

In “Cultivating Humanity” on the contrary, she stresses that education for world citizenship should not promote “students and educators to define themselves primarily in terms of local group loyalties and identities.” (p. 67) In this part she argues a cross-cultural studying should not be motivated on the ground of affirm identity to minority groups (p. 67) The affirmation of minority groups, even though it is common, is divisive and subversive of the aims of world community. Nussbaum means that recognition of minority groups neglects commonalities and “subvert the demand for equal respect and love, and even demand for attention to diversity itself. The demand for inclusion should not be based on local group identity. “Only a human identity that transcends these divisions shows us why we should look at one another with respect across them.” (1997 p. 67)

There are several things to consider in her positions on recognition of identities. Firstly her positions seem to be somehow contradictory. At the one hand she admit it is arguable that you should recognize your local setting to be able to see the commonalities human beings of the world, but on the other hand she dismisses the student and educator to define themselves primarily in terms of local group loyalties and identities. One could argue that starting in the local setting regarding knowledge and out of a pedagogical point of you is not the same as define oneself primarily in terms of local group identities. But is it possible to do this distinction? Is it possible to educate local tradition, history, literature or ethics without starting processes of group loyalties and identity?

Another challenging part of the multicultural classroom is the existence of several local settings. Since a lot of the students do origin from other countries it means that they all have different local settings. History, culture, literature, music are some of the local realities they have. The major question still remains and get perhaps even more complicated. Should one as a teacher encourage the study of all different local settings to be able to further on educate them towards world citizens? Is this possible to do without recognising their identity? I do not think so. The other alternative is not to work with the different local settings of the students and choose one local setting. For example what is stipulated by curriculum in terms of history, literature, traditions in Sweden. In a classroom where at least half the students do origin from other parts of the world this should be seen as rather assimilation then recognition.

Out of a pedagogical point of view some kind of start in the local settings are unavoidable because one need to start close to the setting of the student to gain success. In a multicultural classroom this has to imply that one somehow also recognise the existence of several local settings. When starting in the local settings it is probably unavoidable to also affirm identity and loyalty to the different groups. But as Nussbaum emphasize, the
identification and loyalty should not stop there. Reasoning in the same direction as the Stoics, one will find it possible to have a sense of belonging to several groups at the same time. A student can regard oneself as Iraqi, Swedish and world citizen. The recognition of multiple identities and citizenship is something that also has been discussed and acknowledge in both philosophical and pedagogical research. (Taylor 1996, Jackson 2003, Ljungberg 2004, Marshall 2009.)

Another crucial pedagogical aspect that was discussed in the previous section about conflicting values is about the social inclusion and exclusion. The risk of not recognise the identity of citizenship to others than the major citizenship is social exclusion of minority groups. A social exclusion would make it even harder in promoting and educating for the fundamental values of the curriculum. Following the arguing from for example Taylor, it would then be better to recognise all different citizenship along with the citizenship of the curriculum. Different citizenships do not need to be contradictory; they can work in a parallel way. This regards of course also the world citizenship which means that this can be added without neglecting other citizenship.

Summarizing Nussbaums position on recognition and sense of belonging her theory demonstrates contradictory positions. She presents reasonable argument and emphasize the importance of developing recognition and loyalty to human kind wherever it occurs. But on the question of whether one as a teacher should recognize and encourage the local identities of the students it is difficult to find any distinct guidance.

She neglects the positive aspects of patriotism and national movement in for example United states. Just as there are negative aspects it is possible to se positive aspects...se Benjamin Barber p. 30. According Barber Nussbaum to quick rejects the benefits of civic patriotism and focus to much on abstract universalism that will not contribute to the community.

3.4 Summary of chapter
This chapter describes and analysis Martha Nussbaum´s theory of world citizenship education out of the ethical challenges of the multicultural classroom. It contains a brief introduction to the work of Nussbaum as well as a general overview of the theory of world citizenship education. Her theory is then analyzed through the ethical questions of universal values, conflicting values and sense of belonging.

One of the basic assumptions of the theory is Nussbaum´s rejection of the idea of patriotism, where the primer allegiance is to the national state, as something morally dangerous. Instead she argues for cosmopolitanism where the primer allegiance is to the world wide community of human beings. She argues for a world citizenship education that highlights the capacities of; critical examination of oneself and ones tradition, for living a examined life; the ability for citizens to see themselves as (...) not simply as citizens of some local region or
group but also, and above all, as human beings bound to all other human beings”; the capacity of narrative imagination.

It is possible to note that her proposals of world citizenship education has been responded and also rejected by several philosophers in the debate that followed. Some of the responses as for example by Charles Taylor, Hilary Putnam, Sisela Bok, Amartya Sen, Gertrud Himmelsfarb, Elaine Scarry are presented in the book “For love of country?” (1996). The criticism come out of different philosophical perspectives but the major criticism is pointed towards Nussbaum´s claim that patriotism and cosmopolitanism have to be seen as two inconsistent poles and that the cosmopolitanism has to be prior to patriotism.

The analysis of the theory demonstrates that Nussbaum´s concept of world citizenship focuses mainly on the individual virtues of the citizens, and not on rights or responsibilities of the citizen in relation to social and political institutions as in the traditional liberal concept of citizenship. Regarding World citizenship education Nussbaum declares that education for world citizenship should be a lifelong process, encompassing all levels of education and that it must be a multicultural education which means an education that acquaints students with fundamentals about the histories and cultures of many different groups as well as take a starting point on the traditions and history of the local setting. From a pedagogical point of view Nussbaum´s emphasis on certain capacities seems both reasonable and well applicable to the multicultural classroom.

The analysis of her theory, regarding universal values, states that her universal claims of the classical liberal values such as equal worth of human beings, justice, reason and right are presented in a general way and are not specified. Because of the possibility to interpret these values in such a many ways it makes it difficult to try the universality and relevance of the theory for teaching citizenship in a multicultural classroom. Without further specification, in reality these values mean everything and nothing.

Regarding conflicting values the analysis demonstrates that Nussbaum does not pay much attention to the fact that values sometimes get into conflict, which is a weakness when applying it to the reality of the multicultural classroom where conflicting values do occur. She does however present valuable analytical tools and advises about how a teacher can improve the possibilities of recognizing a shared humanity and common values across cultural traditions. She also makes clear that the teacher should not avoid criticism when liberal values are being violated. The theory still leave questions unanswered about; where, and on what values is the point when mutual understanding ends and the teacher should persist in defending the liberal values? Out of a pedagogical perspective it is also notable that the theory not at all pays attention to the significance of social inclusion and exclusion in classroom for succeeding in educating for world citizenship.

13 Not to mix up with the concept capabilities that she has been writing about in other works (Nussbaum 1993 and 2001).
The analysis notes that Nussbaum’s demonstrates an ambiguity and contradiction in her theory regarding the question of sense of belonging. At one hand she rejects patriotism and that the teacher should affirm the identity of minority groups in classroom but on the other hand she recognize that the education have to take its point of departure in the local settings of for example history, tradition, language. In the chapter it is argued for that it is impossible to start in the local without somehow also affirm the identity of minority groups. Out of a pedagogical point of view it is necessary to use identity or the local setting for succeeding in educating citizenship.
4. Interviews as illustration of the ethical challenges

The intention with this chapter and the interviews is to get some kind of representation and reflection of how discussion and opinions are expressed in a multicultural classroom from the perspective of the student. The interviews are to be seen as a complementary perspective to the theoretical analysis of Nussbaum’s theory of teaching world citizenship in examining the ethical challenges of the multicultural classroom. The chapter begins with a description of how the interviews were conducted as well as a methodological reflection. After this the results are presented, analysed and arranged under the headings of the three ethical challenges; Universal values, conflicting values and, sense of belonging. Finally there is a summary of the chapter.

4.1 Method

The interviews are of empirical character in the sense that I try to understand and illustrate a moral reality in classroom. My intention and ambition is not to find empirical evidence of the moral reality of a multicultural classroom but instead to illustrate the moral reality of a multicultural classroom in relation to the ethical challenges and Nussbaums theory on world citizenship. In this way the interviews can contribute to the mapping of values and opinion as well as increase the understanding for the ethical challenges of the multicultural classroom. It is important to say that the answers and opinions that the student’s demonstrates in the interviews are complex. When reading the presentation of the interviews you will find a lot of internal differences among the students as a group.

Colnerud (1995) and Brante (1992) argues for that moral phenomena can be studied through empirical methods and emphasizes that the study of controversies in moral issues can give access to moral phenomena that otherwise are not visible. By analyzing moral conflicts underlying norms can be revealed. (Brante 1992, Colnerud 1995 s. 57) In the interviews I have, to some extent, used the method of critical incident by focusing on and discussing examples of moral conflicts in classroom.14

The students I have chosen for the study do all belong to the same class and are from the second year in upper secondary school. It is a class that I previously have been teaching but do not teach anymore. I have made an active choice in picking students that I personally know because of the importance of establishing trust when discussing topics that might be personal in character (Cohen, Manion, Morrison 2007, p. 374). To personally know them also increases the possibility to build trust, make the interview non-threatening and adapt to their level of language. A negative aspect with knowing the students before is that they might think of me as primarily a teacher and representative of the school. There is a risk that they deliver answers that they expect me wanting to here because me being a

---

14 The method of critical incident I used by the work of Colnerud and Brante. For more reading ses Brante 1992 and Colnerud 1995.

15 See appendix for question sheet
representative of school and in a position of grading their performance. Since I do not teach them anymore they are however all aware of that the interviews will not be any basis for their grades. Before the interviews I also tried to be very clear about that their answers will not be a part of any examination, nor handed over to someone else. I emphasized that I hoped them to be as honest as possible and speak out there mind and that it does not exist any right or wrong in a traditional meaning.

The class is multicultural in the way that about half of the students do have one or two parents that are born outside Sweden. They origin from many parts of the world such as South and North of Europe, North, East, and West Africa, Middle East and Asia. To be counted as an immigrant (statistically, SCB) in Sweden you need to have at least one parent that are born outside Sweden. Almost every one of the students with foreign background in this class is born in Sweden or has lived their entire life in Sweden as second generation immigrants. It is of course important to be aware of this and note that if the interviews would have been conducted with the first generation immigrants the answers could have been different.

I decided to use the method of group interviews (focus-groups) and constructed two groups of students for two group interviews at one hour each. One benefit of group interviews is that it can generate a wider range of responses than in individual interviews. (Cohen, Manion, Morrison 2007 p. 373) Another benefit, which is of great importance in this case, is that the respondents can interact with each other and that it is “possible to detect how the participants support, influence, complement, agree and disagree with each other” (p. 373) In this way the interview is yielding a collective more than an individual view. (Cohen, Manion, Morrison 2007, It is then possible to reveal structures of thoughts or deep seated values in the common discussion. (Esiassion, Giljam, Oscarsson, Wägnerud 2007 p. 362) It is also recognised the interviewer tend to influence the respondents and the interview less in a group interview in comparison to an individual group. One risk with the group interview is that it may produce “group think” and discouraging individuals that have different views to speak out, in comparison with individual interviews.

To select respondents I divided the class into two groups, where one group consisted of students with both parents born from Sweden and the other consisted of students with at least one parent born outside Sweden. After this I arranged a lottery and constructed two groups of four people where every group (1 and 2) consisted of two students with Swedish background and two students with an immigrant background. This was also the only factors when selecting respondents.

The interviews took place the 30 of April and 5 May in a group room and were recorded by a digital recorder. The students were prepared in advance in what the mayor subject of the interview was. Two of the questions (question 3a, 3b, and 4a, see appendix question sheet) about conflict situations in classroom and fundamental and universal values was also handed out in advance for them to be able to think of the questions by their own in advance. The
The interview was semi structured in the way that the question sheet was the guiding tool but still it was space for the students to discuss and develop their discussions in different directions. Since my intention is to have a representation or reflection of the classroom it was important that there was as much interaction as possible between the students and as less intervention as possible from me as an interviewer.

After recording, the interviews were summarised by writing down the discussions roughly. A selection of information was then done by sorting the relevant information into the categories of universal values, conflicting values and sense of belonging. It is of course important to note that there is always a risk of misinterpretation of the student’s answers as well as me presenting the results in a wrong way. In my interpretation and presentation of the results I have tried to be as honest and listening (lyhörd) as possible to the intentions of the students as well as to the objectives of this study.

When conducting these interviews it is necessary to make some ethical reflections of research. First of all I have tried to be very clear about the preconditions and intention with the interviews. The interviews were voluntary and all respondents did themselves agree on participation. It was also very clear that the student did have the possibility to cancel the interviews anytime they want. Everyone of the respondent have full anonymity in the way that their name have been changed to other names and that their class only are mentioned in very general terms which makes it almost impossible to trace.

4.2 Presentation of the interviews
The results of the interviews are being structured under the headings of the three ethical challenges of universal values, conflicting values and sense of belonging. The following respondents (alias) were participating in the interviews:

**Group 1:**
Joakim, 17 years old, born in the south of Stockholm, Sweden, been living his entire life in Sweden, both parents from Sweden.
Josefine, 17 years old, born in Skåne in the south of Sweden, been living her entire life in Sweden, both her parents from Sweden.
Mervat, 17 years old, born in Sweden, living here her entire life, both parents from Iran.

**Group 2:**
Klara, 18 years old, born in Sweden, been living in Sweden her entire life, both parents from Sweden.
Emelie, 17 years old, born in Sweden, been living her entire life in Sweden, both parents from Sweden.
Farida, 17 years old, born in Sweden, been living her entire life in Sweden, both parents from Egypt.
Nahid, 17 years old, been living her entire life in Sweden except from one year in USA(4-5 years old), both parents from Iran but lives with stepfather born in Sweden.
4.2.1 Universal values

Are there any universal values to be found across the borders of nationality and culture and ought to be taught in classroom? Are there any values that has to be defended because we live in a democracy?

My question to the students was if it exist common moral values that everyone in the class can agree upon? Farida answered that “Yes these kind of basic such as wrong to steal and lie”(13.10) and Nahid agreed and complemented with “wrong to kill”(13.15) and continued that it might not be the case that you always follow them in reality. In the other interview Joakim believed that everyone would agree upon “kill someone” or “hurt other people” (20.00) Josefine believed that everyone can agree upon to “treat everyone as you wish to be treated yourself”(21.10) and “not to be offended” Mervat, “I believe we think quite the same, we are in the same age, most of us are raised here in Sweden and then it is like that” (21.40) Josefine; “It can be discussions because of different traditions but everyone believes more or less the same(...)What differs is that you get other perspectives.”

My next question was if there are any fundamental moral values that the students and the teacher have to defend because we live in a democracy? Farida expressed that “democracy, freedom of religion, freedom of speech, discrimination and racism” (15.19) are something important and Klara agreed that in this cases you should say it’s wrong. Emelie means that it is always someone who starts telling its wrong and then others follows. (16.15) Both Farida and Nahid do state that the teacher should not be too tuff and only stick to fact.

Having a look on the students’ answers it seems that the students do think and experience that there are some values that everyone can agree upon in the classroom and might be universal. A multicultural classroom cannot be seen as a representation of the world but still it is one arena where different cultures meet. When identifying values, the students focus on quite concrete moral values or duties such as not to kill, hurt other people, lying, stealing etc. Comparing this with the universal values of world citizenship theory it is notable that Nussbaum does focus on more abstract ideas of universal values such as justice, rights, equality etc. She does not at all mention the more concrete examples given by the students. One can ask why there is this difference between the universal values of Nussbaum’s philosophy and the student. Farida did however express more abstract moral values such as democracy, freedom of religion and speech, etc. This does not have to imply that she means that everyone agrees on these values across cultures. It could instead mean that she is good at codifying the central values of the curriculum and Swedish society and in practise answering what is stipulated by the Swedish curriculum. Their discussion about that always someone in the class will oppose if the liberal values are being violated, might also be interpreted that the liberal values the mentioned in the discussion is generally accepted.

4.2.2 Conflicting values
Is it common to have conflicts about moral issues in classroom and how am I as a teacher supposed to act when they occur and to what extent shall I tolerate values in opposition to the curriculum?

My question to the students was if they could give one example of a situation when they got into conflict in classroom regarding some kind of discussion?

Josefine(10.55) started with one example of a discussion they had about religion and the question “why can you not consider your idol as your prophet or God?” She explained that the discussion was heated and a conflict occurred between atheistic and religious students and continued out in the corridor. There was for instance a response about the impossibility of comparing Jesus with Håkan Hellström\(^{16}\). Joakim(12.12) also remembered the occasion because he self had faith in AIK\(^{17}\). Mervat(12.16) did not agree that there was a real conflict among the students and Josefine(12.20) backed a little bit in here opinion and explained that there was no conflict in the sense that anyone risked being hurt but still there was a heated debate in an aggressive way.

I then asked them what they believed caused the conflict and Mervat answered that she believed that because “God and the prophet is something holy, and if anyone comes and says that AIK also is holy then you say no, it is two different things”\((13.00)\) Josefine notes that for her, as not religious, “it is difficult to familiarize in how it is to be following a religion”\((13.10)\) Mervat; “The ones that are religious have to defend themselves(...)I have grown up in a group oriented society and my parents has taught me to backup and defend my religion and country(...)It is just so about the same as someone talking rubbish about your friend and you have to defend it”\((15.10)\)

In group 1 they found it difficult to remember any case when they got into conflict. Klara believes that it sometimes happens but that it is “more on a everyday base, you always think differently, it is always something”\((07.00)\) Farida brought up an example of a conflict in the class when discussing a case with a woman that get offended and are called “nigger”\(^{18}\) on the bus. Do you have duties as a passenger to defend her? In this discussion it was possible to see differences among the students in the class according to Farida. She notes that some people do have the ability to feel empathy and others not. Emelie() also believed that it has to do with child rearing and depending what your family think is right. Klara agrees with Farida that the ability to imagine depend on child rearing. But also that a moral acting in this case depends on courage and “how you dare standing up for things” \(10.49)\)

Listening to the discussions it does not seem that open conflicts or heated debates about values are very common in the class. It happens sometimes but not very often. Group 2’s example of a conflict regarding holiness of religion seem to follow a common view in the

\(^{16}\) Swedish artist from Gothenburg

\(^{17}\) Swedish soccer team from Stockholm

\(^{18}\) My translation: “Svartskalle” in Swedish
Swedish society today where “non-western” cultures are described as putting more importance and respect into religion then “western” cultures do. This has been for instance demonstrated by the debate of the Muhammed caricatures that were published in Jyllandsposten. This kind of “current thinking” with prescribing values of “the East” and values of “the West” is something that Nussbaum clearly oppose as not rational and something that world citizenship education should work against.

During the interview I would also say that this picture somehow was supported by the fact that Mervat with muslim and Iranian background did emphasize respect and holiness of God and the prophet. Joakim and Josefine with a Swedish background both had difficulties in imagining what it would be like being deeply religious. It is however impossible to make any sound conclusions about non-western or western culture and its relation to religion on this case alone but can still give a picture of how it can be understood by students. (It is of course not the case that secularism uniquely Swedish nor that the Swedish secularism is homogeneous. Even if it is possible to se overall conclusions there are exist also a secularism in Iran!)

One notable thing is the discussion about the ability of imagination to be able to make moral decisions. This idea is put forward by Farida in a similar way as Martha Nussbaum is reasoning. The causes of imagination according to Klara depend on the child rearing which also is the same kind of thought as educating for narrative imagination which is put forward by Nussbaum.

*How am I as a teacher supposed to act when conflicting values occur? What are the students’ opinions about this?*

In group 1 Klara holds that if someone is expressing values that do not confirm well with the democratic society every person ought to tell that it is not okay. Farida means that “one always should say things in a humbly way and build it on facts, then people can listen” (16.50). Nahid agrees with Farida but Emelie holds that “you can mix. Depending what it is” (17.10) *I also ask them if there are examples when me as a teacher really have to speak up?* Farida mean that this is necessary when someone say something really offending or telling everyone are in a certain way*. “Maybe when it comes to humans one are more tuff”*(17.44) When discussing tolerance Farida believes that the teacher should ask questions as for example. Why do you believe so? Where does that opinion come from? “There usually an explanation, you do not believe things right by the way.”(18.33) The teacher should also demonstrate facts as explanation.

The student of group 1 all agree on that both students and teacher have to speak up if some moral behavior or value do conflict with a liberal democracy.

4.2.3 **Sense of belonging**

---

19 My translation: the Swedish proverb “Dra alla över en kam”
Should I as a teacher recognize and encourage different nationalities in the classroom or should Inot when educating for citizenship? Is recognition of cultural background important for moving towards a common citizenship or does recognition instead inhibit further steps for fellowship and mutual understanding? How should one as a teacher act regarding tolerance towards minority groups and student that demonstrates opinions that clearly differs from the curriculum of the school?

To the students with Swedish parents they all felt Swedish and the students with parents from other countries are all born in Sweden but felt somehow that they in different degree belonged to the other culture. To Mervat it felt obvious that she is from Iran. But at the same time Mervat tells that she actually don´t know. She does not feel belonging to any group or country. “I do not have the opinions of my parents and do not fit with Iranian people either and not Swedish people either” (02.12) But to both Farah and Nahid they felt that they were both Swedish and Iranian because they have other traditions and are raised in another way but still live in Sweden. Nahid experience different belongings depending on if she is in Iran or Sweden.

Regarding the question if nationality or loyalty to a group is important or desirable, Mervat believes that it is important to tell where you come from to be able to build a better relation. “Not because a desire of labeling another person it is instead to get to know the person better”. (08.20) “Some believes that you are a rassist because you ask if a person come from another country, but I don´t think so. When you don’t know anything about the person you try to find something common.” (08.55) Later on in the interview she said that if you don´t talk about it then it feels that it is something wrong. “Is no taboo (...) why should you not talk about it!”(24.58) “Maybe you are interested in my culture and why are you not supposed to be able to share?” (25.10) In Media for example it feels that you are not allowed to talk about being immigrant but “my goodness is it something wrong with that?”(25.20) Joakim replies that maybe you can find another word to be able to talk about it. Josefine agrees with Mervat “Some students do overreact but what the hell! You are creating yourself that it is negative, it is fucking neutral! (25.40) Mervat: “I believe that people are afraid of being labeled as racists...It feels that you (teachers) are very careful” (28.15) Farida in group thinks that your nationality doesn´t say exactly about who you are, it is more on the surface.”I do think more of it when someone else is bringing it up for discussion.” (06.35 grp 1) Klara believes that you see yourself as a group when you meet someone from your own country in another country. (04.30)

The picture that is painted by the students, is that origin and belonging to other nationalities is something that people is scare to talk about. This means students, as well as teachers and media. Mervat do for example think that the recognition of nationality is very important to develop relations and se commonalities. This perspective could be compared with Nussbaum, an Aristotelian opinion as well as the Stoics, namely that you should start with the local and then move on to other communities. But if you compare Mervats position with
Nussbaum’s in the case of identity they are not in the same opinion, since Nussbaum stresses that local groups should not be the primer loyalty. Farida in opposition to Mervat hold that nationality doesn’t say much about your personality and that she does not think about it very much.

All students seem to be unified in that belonging to different nationalities or being an immigrant is neutral even though people act as it is not neutral. Their solutions of how to deal with this are different. Mervat believes that the teacher has to speak up and talk more about origin and not be afraid of being labeling people but Josefine and Joakim seem to be more careful and that the teacher has to be judging from situation to situation to not be looked upon as a racist. Comparing this with Nussbaum she is very clear about that you should not be afraid of speak up your mind about more sensitive issues. But as I responded earlier she doesn’t take the pedagogical perspective into account enough on this issue. As a teacher one always have to take into account what the outcome of speaking up would be in terms of social inclusion and exclusion in classroom. This depend the situation. One can of course speak up one’s mind in different ways and especially if you have good relation to the students it is far more easier that you will not be misunderstood.

Discussing being a world citizen Emelie, Klara felt that we all live at the same planet, are all the same and that you feel some fellowship to the planet. Farida agrees that psychological are we the same even though traditions differ. To both Josefine and Mervat the concept of world citizenship is a little bit vague. Mervat; “You will not get a concrete answer you will still don’t know anything about the person.” (10.00) To Joakim world citizenship would anyhow mean that you have to ask about “where in the world? I come from Sweden. What culture are you then? And so forth...”(10.10).

No one of the students clearly rejects the idea of world citizenship, but several of them regard the concept as vague and saying nothing about the person. One should bear in mind that they not have discussed the concept before and according to Nussbaum it is necessary to educate for world citizenship to be able to overcome emotions to the local group. It is however clear that the students do agree with the basic idea that we have responsibilities and belong to all human beings of the world.

4.3 Summary of chapter
This chapter presents a student perspective to the ethical challenges of the multicultural classroom. The questions of universal values, conflicting values and sense of belonging are addressed by asking two groups of student, all belonging to multicultural classes, and then using the answer as a complementary perspective on Nussbaum’s theory of world citizenship. The intention with the interviews is to present a representation of the discussions and opinions that takes place in a multicultural classroom.

The results declare that the students do find some universal and common values across borders of nationality but the examples of values (might be described as principles) are more
concrete then the one presented by Martha Nussbaum. Proposals of universal values are for example, “not to steal”, “not to kill”, “not to hurt other people”, in comparison to Nussbaum’s universal values of “justice”, “rights” and “reason”. The student’s means that the values of democracy, freedom of religion, freedom of speech, discrimination and racism are values that need to be defended by the teacher, but also that someone in the class will oppose if the values are violated by someone.

The interviews also demonstrate that conflicts because of culture or conflicting values are not that common in the class. They give one example of conflicting views discussing the limits of freedom of speech contra freedom of religion that caused a heated debate between “atheistic” and “religious” students from different cultural background about what one can regard as religion and demonstrates what Nussbaum would call a “current thinking” of simplifications about East and West that should be rejected. The students all agree on that the teacher at some occasions need to speak out to the class if for example values of the democratic society are being violated or if someone is being offended. But some of the students also emphasize that both students and teachers should say things in a humble way at first, begin with asking questions and demonstrate facts as explanation.

The answers of the students present a complex picture on what culture or nationality the students identify themselves to as well as the significance of culture. In their discussions it is demonstrated that talking about sense of belonging, nationhood or immigrants is something that people seem afraid of and view as a taboo. This is obvious in both school and the society in general. They oppose that it has to be like this and means instead that nationhood is something “neutral” but they have different answers about how the teacher can act to avoid it. No one of the students reject the idea of world citizenship but several of the perceive the concept as vague and saying nothing about the person, even though they agree about that they all have responsibilities to all human beings of the world.
5. Conclusion and discussion

In the following I will sum up the conclusions of this thesis. I have chosen to start with the conclusions as a response to the questions of research that were presented in the introduction. I will then move on to conclude some advises, as guidance for the teacher in a multicultural classroom that logically follows out of the conclusions. Finally I will give a more open discussion out of my personal perspective of what I have learned and some reflections for the future of the multicultural classroom.

5.1 Conclusion

The first question of research to be answered in this thesis is: Can the theory of world citizenship, when structured and analyzed, give guidance for teaching citizenship in a multicultural classroom? I will answer the question by describing the pros and cons with the theory of world citizenship, starting with the pros.

Firstly it is possible to conclude that the theory of world citizenship do present several advantages as guide for teaching citizenship in a multicultural classroom. It is notable that the theory discusses relevant questions in relation to the ethical challenges of the multicultural classroom. Even though the context of the theory is presented out of an American and higher education perspective, the majority of the argumentation and proposals is well applicable in other liberal democracies as for example Sweden.

Nussbaum also presents a plausible argumentation on the necessity of an educational reform in a globalized and interconnected world. A liberal education of today, need to take into account that we live in a globalized world and as well propose a curriculum in line with the societal changes. To stay with a traditional curriculum based on the assumption to create citizens only familiar with the culture, traditions, language and goals of their own nation state is not really an option.

Out of a pedagogical perspective Nussbaum do present several educational proposals that have an instrumental strength in that they are highly applicable in the classroom. For example is her emphasis to train the capacities very concrete and useful in the context of a multicultural classroom. Succeeding in critical examination along with the students in a multicultural group will most likely lead to mutual understanding and strengthen the community of students as well as starting questions of uncertainty which is a good start for a learning process. Her concept of narrative imagination is well applicable in a multicultural classroom because you have students from other cultural background around, this will probably make it even easier to imagine the other. Another educational proposal of instrumental value is her categorization of understanding culture which can be a useful analytical tool for describing, understanding and interpret culture in a multicultural classroom. It also helps the teacher to categorize its own interpretation and to reflect upon the understanding and acting towards different cultures in classroom and teaching.
The presentation of the theory is made with various practical examples of how teaching of world citizenship can take different forms. It is also presented with a broad range of references to strands of liberalism in different parts of the world and through history. This richness of examples and references in her presentation makes the theory working very good as an inspiring tool for reflecting crucial questions of teaching citizenship in a multicultural classroom.

Continuing with the cons, it is possible to conclude that Nussbaum’s theory of world citizenship does also have several disadvantages and constrains. One constrain with the theory of world citizenship is that Nussbaum’s definitions of the fundamental and universal values of for example justice, rights, equality and reason are presented in a very general way and are not specified. Because of the possibility to interpret these values in such a many ways it makes it difficult to try the universality and relevance of the theory for teaching citizenship in a multicultural classroom. It might be the case that Nussbaum have chosen not to further develop the meaning of the terms because she feels it falls out of the framework of these publications. But still the definitions are important in this context to be able to make any judgment about the universality of the values. Without further specification, in reality, these values mean everything and nothing.

The thesis states that Nussbaum’s aspiration of the universality of the liberal values can be questioned. For example demonstrates Gertrud Himmelsfarb that the values that Nussbaum presents as to be found worldwide are predominately western and out of a western tradition. It is also important to make clear that even though it is possible to demonstrate the existense of the liberal ideas in various different traditions of the world (That Nussbaum does in a very pedagogical way), it is questionable as a moral argument for the moral worth of the values. The factual existence of an idea is not the same as giving the idea an essential moral value. For claiming world citizenship to be of essential moral worth it is therefore necessary to demonstrate a normative argument.

The analysis demonstrates that Nussbaum does not pay enough attention to the fact that values sometimes get into conflict, which is a weakness when applying it to the reality of the multicultural classroom where conflicting values is a reality. Even if the multicultural classroom not is to be looked as characterised by conflicts it is obvious that conflicts do occur. She tend to see the possibilities of common universal values but almost ignore the fact that values also get into conflict when cultures meet. Because of this her theory will be a weak guidance when confronted by conflicts.

The theory still leave questions unanswered about; on what values is the point when mutual understanding ends and the teacher should persist in defending the liberal values? The fact that the theory proclaim mutual understanding, learning about other cultures, critical examination of oneself at the one hand and proclaiming the universality of the classical liberal values and the necessity of defending them when threatened on the other hand seem contradictory. Nussbaum states clearly that the teacher cannot avoid taking the conflict
when the universal values are being violated, but because of the vague definitions of the universal values as well as her emphasizes on self-examination and mutual understanding it is very difficult to find any relevant guidance for the teacher.

The thesis states that the theory does not enough take into consider questions of identity and risks of social exclusion of minority groups when teaching world citizenship in multicultural classrooms. In a pedagogical situation it is necessary to take into consider reactions and the dynamic processes of the class. For the teacher one of the main factors of succeeding education is to maintain a positive dynamic process of the group. When social exclusion of individuals or minority groups develops, or relations between the students and the teacher break, the preconditions for succeeding education dramatically decrease. This factor is something that Nussbaum do not bring up for discussion when she states the necessity of defending liberal values and not to affirm the identity of minority groups. On the one hand she advocates the liberal values of tolerance; on the other hand she does not discuss the problems of how to handle the conflicts in the classroom.

Nussbaum’s demonstrates an ambiguity and contradiction in her theory regarding the question of sense of belonging. At one hand she rejects patriotism and to affirm the identity of minority groups in classroom but on the other hand she recognize that the education have to take its point of departure in the local settings of for example history, tradition and language. This thesis argues for that it is impossible to start in the local without somehow also affirm the identity of minority groups. Out of a pedagogical point of view it is necessary to use identity or the local setting for succeeding in educating citizenship. The thesis also demonstrates that distinct identities do not have to be seen as inconsistent poles as Nussbaum seem to mean. Instead much of recent pedagogical as well as philosophical research argues for the possibilities of multiple identities and citizenships.

Back to the first question of research; if the theory can give guidance for teaching citizenship in multicultural classroom, I can conclude that it for sure can. Even though the theory both contains pros and cons, it is a theory that to a great degree is applicable and possible to relate to the ethical challenges of the multicultural classroom and as a valuable guide for teachers.

**The second question of research:** *Is the theory of world citizenship a plausible theory confronted with the ethical challenges of a multicultural classroom?* Summarizing the pros and con in the previous section I find the theory of world citizenship plausible in the way that it presents reasonable arguments on the necessity of an educational reform in a globalized and interconnected world. A liberal education of today, need to take into account that we live in a globalized world and as well propose a curriculum in line with the societal changes. The theory is also plausible in the way that it makes educational proposals of instrumental worth to the ethical challenges in a multicultural classroom. Several of the educational proposals do respond to the ethical challenges as well as to the demand of a globalized society in a very useful way.
The theory is however not plausible in the way that the presentation of the universal values are vague and not specified, which makes the theory difficult to evaluate and use in the multicultural classroom regarding. The theory is not plausible because it does not pay enough attention to the fact that values sometimes get into conflict, which is a weakness when applying it to the reality of the multicultural classroom where conflicting values is a reality. The theory neither acknowledges the pedagogical importance of social inclusion when discussing conflicting values and sense of belonging. This is a factor of great importance if education for citizenship will succeed. Finally the theory is not plausible to the ethical challenges because it demonstrates an ambiguity and contradiction regarding guidelines on how to act as a teacher on the question of sense of belonging and recognition of identity.

The third question of research is formulated like this: In what way can a student perspective from a multicultural classroom try the relevance and present a complementary perspective to the theory of World citizenship education?

The results of the interviews states that the students perspective both demonstrates similarities and differences as a complement to the theory of world citizenship. Below I will briefly summarize the conclusion.

Firstly the students, recognize that some values or ethical principles seem to be universal and to be found across cultural borders, in a similar way as Nussbaum does. They do however present a different perspective on what universal values, because they propose more concrete or practical duties such as not lying, not to kill or not to hurt, in comparison to the values of justice, rights and equality promoted by Nussbaum.

Similar to the perspective of Nussbaum the students didn’t recognize conflicting values in classroom as very common. The example they discussed was a conflict about if your idol or football team can be regarded as a religion. The discussions of the students might be regarded as what Nussbaum would call “current thinking” of what is typical “western” or “eastern” values in terms of group oriented societies defending their culture.

In line with Nussbaum´s theory all students believed in the importance of the teacher to set limits if fundamental values of democracy are being violated. But according the students it is also important how the teacher does it and that the teacher acts in a humble way. The teacher should also begin with asking questions and state facts.

The students mean that the society and school seems to be afraid of talking about sense of belonging, nationhood or immigrants. They oppose it and find the concepts neutral. They differ on how the teacher should act to avoid this phenomenon. Some of them mean that the teacher need to speak clearly and not humble with anything at all, and this is in line with what Nussbaum seem to argue for in her texts. To speak out without taboos is the only way to avoid prejudices. Other students did however present a different opinion that the teacher
need to be more careful when talking about origin and make a judgment from situation to situation to not be misunderstood.

The students seem to agree upon that they all have responsibilities and belong to all human beings of the world, but what this mean in reality is not discussed further. Several of them find the concept of world citizenship vague and in reality saying nothing about a person. As one of the students put it regarding world citizenship, you will always continue asking, “...where in the world or what culture?”.  

5.2 A teacher’s advise to the multicultural classroom 

The main purpose of this thesis is to investigate if Nussbaum’s theory of world citizenship can contribute to the understanding of the ethical challenges of a multicultural classroom. In this section, this question is answered and some practical guidance to the teacher in a multicultural classroom is offered. The advises follows logically out of the conclusions of the thesis.

Universal values as an ethical challenge

There are good reasons to recognise and look for universal values across cultural and national borders in a multicultural classroom. This is something that is demonstrated both by ethical theory and by the student’s perspective. What the values are is more difficult to say and need to be explored together with the students. Even though Martha Nussbaum argues for the universality of the liberal values of justice, rights, equality and reason there are both philosophical and “empirical” reasons to question this assumption. As a teacher, one should however not deny the existence of conflicting values. When discussing universal values it is important to try being specific and giving examples of what ones mean. If not there is a risk of misinterpretations or that a consensus in reality means everything and nothing.

Nussbaum presents several educational proposals that can be useful for teaching world citizenship in a multicultural classroom. Her proposal of training the capacities of; critical examination, to see oneself as bound to all other human beings and that of narrative imagination are all stimulating virtues and values that are put forward also in the Swedish curriculum. Another useful pedagogical tool for teaching world citizenship is Nussbaum’s analytical concept of culture. Even though it might seem a bit theoretical in the beginning it offers good opportunities for further understanding of one’s own acting towards different cultures. This concept can also be a very valuable tool when discovering and analysing cultures of the world.

On the question about what values that has to be defended in the name of democracy or liberty, I am afraid I cannot give any specific answer. Nussbaum together with the students do all argue that the teacher needs to claim the fundamental values of liberalism and democracy when these are violated. The student’s give examples of when someone is offended or if someone being a racist and Nussbaum mentions the “fundamental liberal values”, but what specific values that needed to be defended and how this is done, has to be
decided by the teacher in each unique situation. The overall objective of the teaching should however always be to fulfil the aims of democracy stipulated by the curriculum. Even though there are occasions when the values cannot be proclaimed directly, the overarching goal need to be the liberal values of democracy. The ability to make a situation based moral judgement is also to be considered as the professionalism of the teacher that comes out of education, experience and reflection on teaching situations.

Conflicting values as an ethical challenge
When conflicting values do occur in classroom, how should one as a teacher act? Unfortunately Nussbaum displays quite small interest in the question and do not offer much of a discussion of how to act when the conflict suddenly is there. But she gives instead good advises in how to prepare the students to avoid conflicts. As a teacher this means that you should nourish the students to never see an opponent in a value - conflict as an “other” or an impossible alien and instead always try to look behind for example anger, hatred and honour. She means that it is rather the emotions that creates the conflicts that the values itself. Education cannot support or encourage hatred or anger towards individuals and cultural groups because of conflicting values. Mutual understanding and respect are very important sentiments that should be supported in classroom.

This thesis highlights what might be called “the pedagogical dilemma of conflicting values and social exclusion”. If one as a teacher tolerates values that are illiberal (in the name of the liberal democratic society) there is a risk that the fundamental liberal democratic values such as the equality of human beings, right to not be oppressed, freedom of speech etc. will be undermined. On the other hand, if one as a teacher does not recognize and “tolerate” different values and opinions of the student, which is an important part of their identity, there is a risk of social exclusion. It will then be even more difficult to include the students in the education to becoming good citizens and promote the liberal democratic values of the society. How should one as a teacher then act?

The answer of Nussbaum is to never use the “hands off” attitude and avoid the conflict but she does not discuss this dilemma out of the risk of social exclusion. The students have a similar perspective, that the teacher cannot avoid the conflict and need to defend the liberal and democratic values. The students do however emphasize the significance of the teacher of being humble, stick to fact and to adapt from situation to situation in the defend of the values. In this discussion I fully agree with the students. For the teacher, one of the main factors of succeeding education is to maintain a positive dynamic process of the group. When social exclusion of individuals or subgroups occurs or relations between the students and the teacher break, the preconditions for succeeding education dramatically decrease. As a teacher you have to take into account how your approach and argumentation are understood by the students and what kind of reactions that will follow.

20 For a further discussion on the meaning of tolerance se later on. As well Roth 1999, quotation by Karl Popper p. 63 Roth 1999
When one as a teacher meet students from different ethno-cultural backgrounds one always have to make a choice weather one should recognize and highlight the collective identity of the students or not.

In this thesis it is argued for the possibility of multiple identities and citizenship and the necessity of somehow affirm the local setting and identity of students to also achieve the goals of world citizenship. Nussbaum standpoint to put patriotism and cosmopolitanism as inconsistent poles is rejected because her argumentation appears to be contradictory. Nussbaum states that a cross-cultural studying should not be motivated on the ground of affirm identity to minority groups. She means that the affirmation of minority groups is divisive and subversive to the aims of the world community. But as I have argued both pedagogical and philosophical research demonstrates that multiple identity or citizenship does not have to be seen as two inconsistent poles. Instead multiple identities can be a way to achieve the goals of a common citizenship.

Out of a pedagogical view I argue that it is impossible to not somehow appeal to the identity of the students when teaching citizenship. To succeed a good learning processes the relation to the students is crucial and to achieve a human relation the student somehow need to be recognized by its identity. This does however not mean that the ethno-cultural identity is the only or most important identity to recognize. Instead this thesis demonstrates that the students have different opinions about the importance of ethno-cultural belonging and weather one as a teacher should affirm it or not. To some student´s nationality as an identity marker is really secondary and the teacher´s affirmation or prescribing of group belonging can be experienced as alien and even offensive. Whiles other recognize nationality as a fundamental identity marker and consider the teacher´s recognition of group identity as something very important. The conclusion must then be that as a teacher one need to recognize the identity of the student somehow to succeed citizenship education, weather it is because of ethno-cultural belonging, musical taste or hobbies, but the teacher also need to make a well considered judgment of how and to what degree this is done in each and every situation.

5.3 Discussion
So, after putting hard work into this thesis for a long period, am I better prepared for facing the challenges of the multicultural classroom? Yes is the answer! The ethical analysis has been a very effective tool for reflecting on the daily work of the teacher. In some aspects I have made several important conclusions about how to act as a teacher regarding the ethical challenges and when teaching citizenship. In other aspects I find myself with more questions than I did have from the beginning. One thing is however obvious, I feel much more confident when confronted with the ethical challenges of the multicultural classroom. I think the major reason for this is that all these questions have been present for me under such a long time and have made them less dramatic. Another reason is probably that I now
can see even more complexity of the questions and because of this feel more confident. During this work I do find that my own professionalism as a teacher has been developed. I think that this proof enough to conclude the importance and effectiveness using ethics as a tool for developing the daily work of the teacher.

Looking particularly to Nussbaum, she has been a really inspiring writer to use as a framework. Partly because her theory does present statements about cosmopolitanism that arouses feelings among many people but also because she is presenting her theory in a context of the daily work of teachers. She provide with useful devices for teaching citizenship and recognizes in a successful way the importance of applying ethical theory to education.

Looking particularly to the interviews of the students, I found them very helpful and of great interest for further understanding of the multicultural classroom. It is really a privilege to sit down and discuss this kind of questions and to hear their point of view. More discussions of this character with student would certainly develop a mutual understanding between students and teachers. If Nussbaum taught me the importance of bringing ethics to the daily practise, the interviews taught me about the importance to also bringing the daily practise to ethics. I believe that empirical ethics is an untapped resource and a great possibility for developing ethical theories about citizenship and multiculturalism.

What about the future? Out of my own perspective it will be interesting to see to what extent this thesis will have an impact on my daily work in the future. I have already noticed several aspects as mentioned above and hopefully these will remain. I am convinced that qualitative reflection of teaching is crucial for succeed in developing professionalism as a teacher. About the future of Swedish multicultural classrooms there are several great challenges ahead. One challenge is the growing support among young people to the rightwing and xenophobic political parties. We can also see several cases of young religious extremists using violence. There is an evident risk of polarisation in Swedish classrooms where the democratic and liberal values of the majority are challenged out different political and religious directions. In this situation the teacher does play a crucial role in defending the democratic and liberal values. Well-considered ethical decision and professionalism is then necessary and hopefully this work can bring some contribution to further discussions and to a development in the right direction.
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