

Intercultural empathy among Norwegian students: an inclusive citizenship perspective

Trond Solhaug (1), Audrey Osler (2, 3)

1 Norwegian University of Science and Technology (NTNU), Trondheim, Norway

2 University College of South East Norway

3. University of Leeds, UK

Accepted version of article in
International Journal of Inclusive Education.

This article has been accepted for publication and undergone full peer review but has not been through the copyediting, typesetting, pagination and proofreading process, which may lead to differences between this version and the Version of Record.

Please cite this article as doi: [10.1080/13603116.2017.1357768](https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2017.1357768)

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved.

**Intercultural empathy among Norwegian students: an inclusive citizenship
perspective**

Trond Solhaug

Teacher Education Programme

Norwegian University of Science and Technology

Faculty of Social Sciences and Technology Management, Institute for teacher education.

Norwegian University of Science and Technology (NTNU), Trondheim, Norway

trond.solhaug@ntnu.no

Audrey Osler

University College of South East Norway and University of Leeds, UK

A.H.Osler@leeds.ac.uk

;

To cite this article: Trond Solhaug & Audrey Osler (2017): Intercultural empathy among
Norwegian students: an inclusive citizenship perspective,

International Journal of Inclusive Education,

DOI: 10.1080/13603116.2017.1357768

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2017.1357768>

Abstract

In recent decades, Norwegian schools have experienced increased cultural diversification among students. Growing heterogeneity in origin and culture may enhance the risk of student marginalization, segregation and exclusion. In response to these challenges, this paper examines students' intercultural empathy and, particularly, how schools can develop their intergroup empathy to support social inclusion. Theoretically, we applied an inclusive citizenship perspective. The study draws primarily on quantitative data gathered from paper questionnaires collected from 1006 students in two upper-secondary schools and three lower-secondary schools. We explored the antecedents of intercultural empathy among the students using regression analyses. First, we found that there are substantial differences between the scores of boys and girls on intercultural empathy. Second, we found that information on culture and diversity was a predictor of certain aspects of intercultural empathy. Third, a variety of school variables were applied to explore possible ways to support student intercultural empathy, which showed moderate associations with intercultural empathy. Fourth, variables measuring students' perceptions of human rights implementation in school were also moderately associated with aspects of intercultural empathy. The results and their implications for teaching are discussed.

Keywords: Intercultural empathy, inclusive citizenship, gender, deliberation, controversial issues.

Intercultural empathy among Norwegian students: an inclusive citizenship perspective

Introduction and context

The focus of this article is intercultural empathy among selected Norwegian students. The important contexts for the study are globalization, regional conflicts and the free movement of people within the Schengen Agreement area, which have increased diversity in Norway and its schools. Minorities currently comprise approximately 15% of the total population, with a comparatively high yearly increase of about 1% (SSB 2012, 2015). Recently, in response to these numbers, the Scandinavian countries have introduced new border controls and reduced their levels of immigration. Far-right political parties in Norway and Europe have expressed concerns about immigration and security threats, unemployment and ethnic, religious and cultural conflicts (Gutwirth and Burgess 2011; for Norway, see also SSB 2011 and “Welfare and Migration” NOU 2011). A mock election surveyⁱ of students aged 14 to 20 (random sample N = 4631) revealed that a majority of boys perceive immigration primarily as a threat, while girls are more positive (NSD 2013). However, three out of four students recognise immigrants’ contributions to business and professional life, nine out of ten think migrants should have the same professional career options as Norwegians and seven out of ten think that immigrants contribute positively to the economy (SSB 2015).

Despite Norway’s long history of immigration (Brochmann and Kjeldstadli 2008), concerns regarding increased diversity have been voiced by the Ministry of Children and Equality (2012/13), which discussed ‘a comprehensive integration policy diversity and community’ in its Report 6 to the *Storting* (the Norwegian parliament). A follow-up programme directed primarily at teachers sought to promote inclusive education in a broad sense (*Utdanningsdirektoratet* [Norwegian Directorate of Education and Training]). This reflects the longstanding inclusion of the concept of comprehensive and inclusive education for all within Norwegian school policy (Nilsen 2010). It also serves as the motivation for the current study

of intercultural empathy. Although the empirical focus of this article is increased diversity caused by immigration, we conceptualize diversity and inclusive education as encompassing all students, regardless of culture, class, disability, gender, sexuality or geographic location (Arnesen, Mietola, and Lahelma 2007; Le Roux 2001). Schools are likely the most important public institutions in which youth can engage with others despite differences, and Norwegian schools are obligated to offer equal opportunities for student participation (Opplæringslova 1998) and to adapt teaching and learning to individual needs. Based on the above context, the aim of our research is as follows:

To explore the antecedents of aspects of intercultural empathy among Norwegian school students.

We answer this question by performing regression analyses with intercultural empathy as a dependent variable and provision of protection and adapted teaching rights human rights, protection, participation in school, perceptions of adapted teaching, gender and students' wellbeing in school, knowledge of diversity, cultural capital at home, motivation in school, efforts in school work as independent variables.

Previous research

Rasoal, Jungert, Hau, and Andersson (2011) empirically investigated whether empathy and ethnocultural empathy were the same or different. Using different scales, they found that the two share considerable overlap. Intercultural empathy increases perceived concern about the welfare of other people, spark attitude changes towards groups experiencing oppression (Wang et al. 2003) and challenge distinctions between the 'citizen and the other' (Hall 2012; Zembylas 2012). In contrast, a lack of empathy has been linked to intergroup aggression and social dominance (Wang et al. 2003). While Zhu (2011) regards intercultural empathy as a foundation of communication and understanding of 'the other', Hofmann (2000) links

empathy to pro-social behaviour. A school culture of ‘multiculturalism’ may prevent violence and facilitate community engagement and respect for diversity (Chang and Le 2010; Le and Johansen 2011). Tangen (2009) found that empathetic teachers may promote wellbeing and support motivation among students. Further research on teachers’ understanding of cultural differences and cross-cultural sensitivity was conducted by Mahon (2006) and Mahon and Cushner (2014), and research on new item-scales was done by Mallinckrodt et al. (2014), who published their work after the present study was developed. In Finland, key research has been done by Dervin, Paatela-Nieminen, Kuoppala, and Riitaoja (2012) and Dervin and Hahl (2014), focusing specifically on intercultural competences in teacher education. In addition, a number of Norwegian publications address dialogue, inclusion within teaching and learning without explicitly touching upon empathy (Børhaug 2015; Eriksen and Sajjad 2015; Skrefsrud 2012; Westrheim and Tolo 2014). Research and scholarship designed to support teachers and students in addressing diversity, social change, inclusion and social justice have been most comprehensively conducted by Banks and colleagues (2010), who explore multiculturalism in education. By building on this body of research, our study shows that intercultural empathy facilitates intergroup relations and may promote a feeling of inclusiveness among students. We found no similar studies in Norway and consider our study to be an original scientific contribution.

Theory

Inclusive citizenship

As pointed out in the introduction, inclusiveness is a very important goal in Norwegian schools and a main reason for applying the theory of inclusive citizenship to the analysis of predictors of intercultural empathy (Isin and Nielsen 2008; Isin and Turner 2002; Osler and Starkey 2005). In particular, we apply the feminist theories of citizenship practices, which emphasise justice, recognition, self-determination and solidarity (Fraser 2003; Kabeer 2005;

Lister 2008). 'Justice' is understood as fairness in treating people and students equally. To understand and resolve dilemmas of justice, it is necessary to build our knowledge of rights and empathy with students' situations. 'Recognition' acknowledges the intrinsic worth of all human beings, including their differences. Recognition may be institutionalized, but it still requires an interpersonal response, something our study seeks to address through intercultural empathy. 'Self-determination' can be understood as a person's ability to exercise some control over his/her own life. Self-determination is vital for inclusive citizenship and support for self-determination from the human environment requires some degree of empathy. Finally, 'solidarity' can be seen as both a societal goal and one of particular importance in education (Kabeer 2005, 3-7). Acts of solidarity always build on some understanding, knowledge and positive feeling of the other. Linking these four aspects, Lister (2008, 50) writes of 'the capacity to identify with others and to act in unity with them in making claims'. The ability to participate or organize some form of collective action and join forces in claim making is vital in order to be politically effective. Collective action also requires some interpersonal empathy in the process. Lister (2008) also stresses the importance of 'participatory parity', or the ability of members of a society to interact with one another as peers. This latter concept is of particular interest to intercultural empathy because it reflects the capacity (or willingness) to empathize and identify with others in a spirit of solidarity. Finally, Lister (2008, 51) suggests that the politics of difference require an 'ethos of pluralization'; in other words, to avoid exclusive identities and politics, one must recognize others' rights to be different and promote reflective solidarity as a 'universalism of difference'. To summarize, we argue that inclusiveness in education is also a question of practice and relations in school, and that a certain ability to understand and sympathize with other students is vital and will be elaborated on next.

Dependent variable: intercultural empathy

In our theoretical outline, we decompose ‘intercultural empathy’ before arriving at an understanding of the concept. The term ‘intercultural’ implies that there are multiple groups with different cultures in a society. Culture is a contested concept and may be understood as ‘distinct, relatively homogenous and stable’, or ‘neither clearly bound, tightly integrated nor unchanging’ (Hylland-Eriksen 2009, 10; see also Jagoda 2012). Like Hylland-Eriksen (2009) and Jagoda (2012, 300), we regard culture as ‘a social construct vaguely referring to a vastly complex set of phenomena’ (Hylland-Eriksen 2009, 10). Following these scholars, we see intercultural relations as subjective encounters between humans in which perceptions of culture as similar or different are defined and constructed by the individuals.

The term ‘empathia’ stems from the Greek language and refers to understanding others by entering their world (Zhu 2011). In recent literature, empathy has been described as ‘the immediate experience of the emotions of another person’ or ‘the intellectual understanding of another’s experience’ (Duan and Hill 1996, 261; see also, DeTurk 2001;). A cognitive aspect of intercultural empathy is the ability to take on the role(s) or perspective(s) of another person (Gladstein 1983). In many situations, it is important to respond with similar emotions (emotional empathy), as this shows an ability to understand ‘another person’s inner experiences’ (Duan and Hill 1996, 262). Building on this, we consider empathy as having both cognitive and emotional traits and as being present in most encounters between individuals. As pointed out in the previous section, experiencing a certain level of empathy is important for wellbeing and feelings of inclusion (e.g., in school). Therefore, in the present study, we argue that a certain amount of empathy is needed in all human encounters. As the society pluralizes, perceived cultural differences are present in ever more encounters, which generates new experiences and calls for understanding and sorting out similarities and differences. Intercultural empathy is a reservoir of cognitive understanding and emotional involvement, which are particularly important where individuals perceive significant cultural

differences. Furthermore, intercultural empathy may be learned through experience. This implies that schools might actively support the development of empathy.

Empirically, intercultural empathy is multi-dimensional (Nicovich, Boller, and Cornwall 2005). The emotional and cognitive aspects of empathy are built using dimensions proposed by Wang et al. (2003), who identified four empirical aspects: feelings and expression of empathy (FEE), and empathetic awareness (EA), acceptance of cultural difference (AD) and empathetic perspective-taking (PT) (These abbreviations are used later in text and tables). These four dimensions reflect the multi-dimensionality of the concept. Feelings and expression of empathy are measured with six items (D1, D4, D5, D6, D7 and D8), which reflects one's willingness to act upon perceived discrimination and injustice. The numbers refer to items and measurement data in the Appendix. A sample item D1 is: 'I often speak against anyone who tells jokes that could be perceived as discriminatory'. Empathetic awareness reflects subjective indifferences to perceived unequal treatment (D2 and D3). A sample item is: 'It does not bother me if people make statements that might seem racist toward some groups'. Attitudes towards difference are measured by D11 and D12, which express negative attitudes towards inviting students to take an active stand. A sample item is: 'I have little knowledge of people whose background is very different from mine'. Finally, with regard to intercultural perspective-taking, we used two items (D9 and D10), which aim to measure an individual's ability to take another's perspective. A sample item D9 is: 'I find it hard to imagine what it is like to be someone who is very different from me'. (see Appendix for item text, factor loadings and Chronbach's α ; explained variance for factors in all scales available at: <http://www.ntnu.edu/employees/trond.solhaug>).

Independent variables

We include individual variables, school context variables and social background variables in order to explore their possible contributions to the four aspects of intercultural empathy. Our

overall motivation for this is to reveal which variables are the significant contributors to intercultural empathy and inclusive citizenship practices.

Individual variables

First, as pointed out in the previous section, possessing a certain cognitive experience and knowledge of diversity is vital to feel and express empathy in diverse interpersonal relations. In our first variable, we apply a scale where students assess their cognitive understanding of selected elements of prejudice and diversity (Munroe and Pearson 2006). The scale builds on Banks' (2010) transformative model of multicultural education, which comprises five inter-related elements: knowledge construction, content integration, prejudice reduction, equity pedagogy and an empowering school culture. Banks (2010) contends that when teachers draw on content from a range of cultures and students have an understanding of how knowledge is constructed, they will feel empowered to contribute to an inclusive and empathetic school culture. Following this, we expect knowledge of diversity to be favourably associated with intercultural empathy. To accomplish this, we use a three-item scale (F2, F3 and F4). A sample item F2 is: 'I know that there are big differences in how people practise their religion'. (Hypothesis, H1, see table of hypotheses at the end of theory section).

Second, we continue to explore students' personal motivations concerning schooling. We understand motivation as a continuum from external motivation to identification and intrinsic motivation. Intrinsic motivation reflects an inner drive for learning (Ryan and Deci 2003). We assume that students who are highly motivated will have a broad-based drive to learn from both compulsory school activities and the social aspects of schooling. Among these social aspects are increased diversity. Often, perceived cultural difference might trigger curiosity, but it may also trigger uncertainty/anxiety and perceptions of cultural differences, which need to be overcome. We assume that highly motivated students possess some energy that is not only directed at schooling, but may also support the student's willingness to learn from others

and overcome interpersonal differences (H2). To measure this factor, we use a two-item scale (I1 and I2). A sample item I2 is: 'I like working with most school subjects'.

Third, we explore how a student's willingness to invest 'effort' in schooling might contribute to intercultural empathy. Effort can be gauged by the time spent on a task and the level of exhaustion upon task completion (Malmberg, Walls, Martin, Little, and Lim 2013). The personal characteristic of doing one's best and investing a level of exhaustion might also be valuable in intercultural relations where questions arise and there is a need to learn, understand and reflect upon relational experiences to reach cross-cultural understanding. We believe that students who give their best (highest) effort most of the time tend to develop learning habits may also result in greater understanding and more open attitudes towards school diversity and support intercultural empathy (H3). We use a three-item scale (J1, J2 and J3). A sample item J2 is: 'I am quite sloppy with my schoolwork'.

Fourth, an individual characteristic we consider is the students' estimations of their own academic achievements in terms of grades. In the present study, we see grades as an overall indicator of perceived success in schooling. We argue that the level of personal satisfaction with the outcome of schooling may transfer to the more social aspects and general wellbeing in school. We assume that grade levels are positively related to intercultural empathy (H4).

Fifth, we include gender (Q1) as a key variable in our study. (the item has only two values girl, boy) Since previous research indicates that women tend to be more empathetic than men, we also expect them to be more empathetic towards humans from diverse cultures. Very briefly, we offer two theoretical rationales in support for this assumption. First, as primary socialisation agents of gender roles, mothers have a profound influence on their daughters (Rittenour, Colaner, and Odenweller 2014). Much learning of gender roles and attitudes are transmitted through children mimicking their parents (Bandura 1997), but behaviours are

sanctioned with communication strategies (Blakemore and Hill 2008; Marks, Lam, and McHale 2009). The transfer of empathetic attitudes from mothers to daughters during childhood socialization is perfectly possible. The second rationale may be summarized in feminist theory. The material and social conditions of our upbringing profoundly influence how we perceive the world, which historically has been somewhat different for men and women (Hartsock 1983). The historical situation of women's oppression and liberation may imply that they also perceive the diverse social world differently than men and empathise more with particularly minority and oppressed groups (Hartsock 1983, Hekman 1997) (hypothesis, H5).

School context

What motivates inclusion of these variables is the school's role in promoting more understanding and empathy in diverse societies. We believe that schools and teachers are models (Bandura 1997) in terms of respect for diversity, human rights (HR), student's wellbeing in school and the teacher's ability to adapt teaching to students' diverse needs.

As for HR in schools, we believe that the students (H6) should perceive the provision of students' rights as effective. Second, rights to protection from prejudice and bullying are important (H7), and finally, participation rights must be emphasised (H8). All these follow the examples of Declaration on Human Rights Education and Training (DHRET) (UN 2011) and the Rights of the Child (UN 1989; see also McPherson and Abell 2012 and McPherson 2015). The empirical scales are: first, perceived effectiveness of adapting teaching to students' needs (provision adaptation, A2 and A3) and the second, focusing the perceived implementation of students' rights to curriculum adaptations or exemptions (provision exemption, A4 and A5). Sample items are A2 'All teaching takes into account that students can be very different and have very diverse backgrounds', and A5: 'Instruction is structured so that I can request in advance not to participate in teaching activities that are against my religious convictions'. The

third scale addresses the protection of rights from various forms of prejudice and discrimination; it includes four items (B2, B3, B4 and B5). A sample item B3 is: ‘When an incident could lead to a student being expelled, the case is always examined thoroughly’. The fourth scale measures the effectiveness of participation rights (C1, C2, C3, C4 and C6). A sample item C3 is: ‘At this school students are shown as much respect as adults’. We argue that students’ perceptions of the effectiveness of individual educational rights in school are important contextual signs of respect and an effort to provide a true ‘inclusive education’ for all students. Therefore, we expect that these variables are positively associated with aspects of intercultural empathy.

Wellbeing in school is our next context variable. We build on previous work on school-related wellbeing, which has been defined as ‘how students subjectively evaluate and emotionally experience their school lives’ (Tian, Tian, and Huebner 2015, 106). We argue that a student’s feeling of wellbeing is very important to schooling. By presenting favourable attitudes to all diverse students in schools, teachers and leaders are important significant others and role models, which may promote intercultural empathy. To measure wellbeing, we build on D’Acci’s (2011) model to develop our indicators (O1, O2 and O3). A sample O3 is: ‘Mostly I feel well treated by the teachers at school’. We assume that a subjective feeling of wellbeing is associated with favourable attitudes towards diversity in school (H9).

Furthermore, we believe that increasing diversity requires teachers to exert effort to support a greater variety of students in their learning. ‘Adapted teaching’ is especially emphasized in the Norwegian context (Kunnskapsdepartementet [Ministry of knowledge] 2006–2007) and is characterised by variations in exercises, content, work methods, teaching aids, intensity and organisation (Bjørnsrud and Engh 2012; Kunnskapsdepartementet 2003, 76). We included a scale of four items (N1, N2, N3 and N4). A sample item N3 is: ‘The teachers work hard to help us to understand the subjects’. We assume that students’ perceptions of teacher support

for learning and their recognition of adapted teaching are favourably associated with intercultural empathy (H10).

As the last contextual variable, we included indicators of school diversity. This is based on the ‘contact hypothesis’, which proposes that personal contact between social groups tends to make them less hostile toward one another (Pettigrew, 1998). Personal contact in schools, therefore, has the potential to ‘produce’ more harmony and mutual understanding in society. However, as emphasized by Allport (1954, 262–3), the nature of the contact is essential. Contact is most powerful when occurring under facilitating conditions like status equality, the pursuit of common goals or cooperation.

We included two items of school diversity. The first (R1) indicates the number of mother tongues spoken in a given school, while the second (R2) indicates the percentage of bilingual pupils. In line with the contact hypothesis, we assume that ethnic cultural diversity offers students opportunities to learn and develop greater intercultural understanding and empathy (Rasoal, Jungert, Hau and Andersson 2011) (H11).

Student social background and environment

To measure students’ social backgrounds (Q2), we ask what languages students speak at home, which is a proxy for other forms of diversity. We assume that students from diverse families are more empathetic to cultural diversity (H12).

We also include an indicator of students’ cultural capital (Q3), which is the ‘number of books at home’. In line with Bourdieu (1986), we define cultural capital as embodied dispositions of the mind, as objectified in cultural goods or institutionalized as educational qualifications. We assume that cultural capital may foster knowledge and insight, which might lead to greater intercultural empathy (H13).

Furthermore, we include a variable measuring of parents' education (Q4). With this variable, we seek to explore how education (as a part of cultural capital) might influence intercultural empathy (H14).

In our selection of schools and pupils, we included students from six different class levels (8 to 13). Here, we wish to explore whether intercultural empathy varies according to student age (Q5) (H15). Table 1 presents a summary of the hypotheses.

Table 1. A summary of hypothesis.

Hypothesis nr	Individual variables	Hypothesis
	Individual variables	
H1	Information	To be well informed contributes to intercultural empathy.
H2	Motivation	To be highly motivated at school contributes to intercultural empathy.
H3	Effort	To always make a good effort contributes to intercultural empathy.
H4	Grades	To have good grades contributes to intercultural empathy.
H5	Gender	Females have higher intercultural empathy.
	School context variables	
H6	HR provision adaptation	Provision of human rights in school contributes to intercultural empathy.
	HR provision exemption	
H7	HR protection	To protect all students in school contributes to intercultural empathy.
H8	HR participation	To engage and participate in school contributes to intercultural empathy.
H9	Adapted teaching	Adapted teaching to all students' needs and support for all students contributes to intercultural empathy.
	Teacher support	
H10	Wellbeing in school	Providing wellbeing to all students contributes to intercultural empathy.
H11	Number of different mother tongues	Diverse school populations contribute to intercultural empathy.
	Background variables	
H12	Languages at home	Students from diverse family backgrounds have more intercultural empathy.
H13	Cultural capital/books home	Coming from families with high cultural capital contributes to higher intercultural empathy.
H14	Parental education	Students who have parents with higher education are more interculturally empathetic.
H15	Class level	Intercultural empathy develops positively with age.

Methodology

The study is based on a quantitative methodology supplemented by additional interviews with school leaders and teachers.

Sampling

Research pressure in schools severely limited our options; however, we have attempted to select schools and students experiencing a variety of cultural diversity. Specifically, we selected schools from two different geographical regions that vary according to cultural diversity. The design assumes that increased diversity in schools offers opportunities for the learning and development of inter-relational attitudes across diverse populations.

We selected students from three general classes on each of our three levels of study. In addition, in one of the schools, we included students from an international baccalaureate programme (1U). The sample sizes and diversities are displayed in the table below.

Table 2. Sample and diversity across five schools. U = upper secondary school. L = lower secondary school.

School	N1U	N2U	N3L	N4L	N5L
Number of different languages spoken	27	36	28	11	4
Proportion of bilingual students (%)	10	17	14	12	2
N = 1006	270	237	218	188	93

Research assistants made appointments with teachers, attended classes, informed and sought the consent of students, distributed the questionnaires and collected the responses. The response rate varied from 85% to 94% and included between 77% and 85% of the student population, which we consider to be high. On average, 9% of students were not present in their classes when the data collection took place. The questionnaires and files were processed at Norwegian University of Science and Technology (NTNU).

Analytical procedures

The data were processed using IBM SPSS. All distributions were checked for skewness and kurtosis, which were well below 1.0 (the threshold is 2.0). Missing data of 1% to 3% were replaced in the sample and assigned the mean value.

Our scales were developed from theory and international studies. We used a semi-confirmatory item analysis (principal axis factoring) with a non-rotation option. Factor loadings, Chronbachs α and R^2 were used as measures for the factors' explained variance and are reported in the Appendix (Ringdal 2013). Considerations of concept validity and statistical validity were the basis for decisions on items in sum scores, which were the basis for the empirical analysis.

Analytically, we started with correlations between explanatory variables and aspects of intercultural empathy. In order to achieve the scientific goal of a simple model explaining the maximum amount of variance (Kline 2005), the variables with significant bivariate correlations are presented in the first multiple regression model. The second and final regression models include only the significant variables from the first regression model. This procedure was followed for all four aspects of our dependent variable.

Results

According to theory, our dependent variable is measured with four separate aspects. Table 3 illustrates the correlations among these aspects. Since our sample is large ($N = 948$), we avoid displaying insignificant results.

Table 3. Bivariate correlations between aspects of cultural empathy N = 948.

	Feelings and expressions of empathy (FEE)	Acceptance of differences (AD)	Empathetic awareness (EA)	Perspective-taking I (D9r) PT
Acceptance of differences (D11, D12)	.40**			
Empathetic awareness (D2, D3)	.16**	.28**		
Perspective-taking I (D9r)	.00	-.29**	-.12**	
Perspective-taking II (D10)	.09**	.025	-.13**	.04

The inter-correlations between aspects of intercultural empathy are (surprisingly) fairly moderate except for the correlation between feelings and expressions of empathy and acceptance of differences. In particular, the single items D9 and D10 have strikingly low correlations with other aspects of empathy, showing that the theoretical concept is rather wide. In our presentation of the results, we first display the bivariate correlations between four aspects of the dependent variable and all independent variables (Table 4). Then, we display the regression results and give our comments.

Table 4. Bivariate correlations between aspects of intercultural empathy and explanatory variables. Only significant correlations are displayed. Numbers are in Pearson's r. N = 948.

Hypotheses	Variables/Intercultural aspects	Feelings and expressions of empathy (FEE); D1, D4, D5, D6, D7, D8	Empathetic awareness -(D2,D3-EA)	Acceptance of differences (AD; D11, D12)	Perspective-taking I (D9 reversed) PT1	Perspective-taking II (D10)
	Individual variables					
H1	Information	.26**	.20**	.19**		
H2	Motivation	.24**	.09**	.10**		.12**
H3	Effort	.11**				
H4	Grades	.16**	.17**	.13**		
H5	Gender	-.41**	-.33**	-.09**		
	School context					
H6	HR Provision adaptation	.12**			.08*	
	HR Provision exemption	.08**	.063*			
H7	HR Protection	.20**				
H8	HR Participation	.21**		.08*		
H9	Well-being in school	.20**		.10**		-.11**
H10	Adapted teaching	.10**		.07*		-.07*
	Teacher support					-.11**
H11	Number of different mother tongues.	.10**	.13**	.10**		
	Background variables					
H12	Languages at home		-.12**		.13**	.46**
H13	Cultural capital/books home	.12**	.19**			-.18**
H14	Parental education		.12**	.08*		-.17**
H15	Class level	.18**	.13**	.19**	.13**	

* sig. at the 5% level, ** sig. at the 1% level.

Table 5. Multiple regression of significant correlates with four aspects of intercultural empathy. First and second regressions are provided. Variables entered in the first regression are significant correlates (see table 2). Variables entered in the second regression are significant variables from the first regression. Only significant variables are displayed. Numbers are regression coefficients β and R^2 . N = 948.

Hypotheses	Variables/Intercultural aspects	Feelings and expressions of empathy (FEE) Reg1	Feelings and expressions of empathy (FEE) Reg2	Empathetic awareness (D2, D3-Reverse scale EA) Reg1	Empathetic awareness (D2, D3-EA) Reg2	Acceptance of differences (D11, D12-AD) Reg1	Acceptance of differences (D11, D12-AD) Reg2	Perspective-taking I (D9r) PT 1 Reg1	Perspective-taking II (D10) PT 2 Reg1
	Individual variables								
H1	Information	.17**	.20**	.12**	.17**	.11**	.13**		
H2	Motivation	.13**	.14**						.15**
H5	Gender	-.41**	-.41**	-.33**	-.31**	-.07**	-.07**		
	School context								
H6	HR Provision adaptation							.08*	
H7	HR Protection	.15**	.10**						
H8	HR Participation	.14**	.14**						
	Background variables								
H12	Language home			.07**	.10**			.13**	.43**
H14	Parental education								-.13**
H15	Class level (age)					-.14	-.14	.13**	
	Explained variance R²	31%	28%	19%	15%	6%	6%	4%	25%

* sig. at the 5% level, ** sig. at the 1% level.

Note that all regression results are predictions (unique effects) from independent variables on aspects of intercultural empathy while controlling for all other independent variables in each regression (Ringdal 2013). Our outline of the results starts with the hypotheses, continues with aspects of intercultural variables and ends with three groups of variables.

We start with all our hypotheses. First, being informed about cultural diversity (H1) has a medium correlation with FEE, EA and AD both in correlations and regressions. The hypothesis is moderately supported. Being motivated in school also contributes to intercultural empathy and H2 is also supported, but very moderately in two aspects of intercultural empathy (FEE and PT2). Gender (H5) exhibits strong β for FEE ($r = .41$) and EA ($r = .33$). These results are quite noteworthy and H5 is supported. Note that effort (H3) and grades (H4) have very moderate, but significant, correlations with FEE, and grades also have correlations for EA and AD but have no significant unique effect in the regressions.

Out of the four aspects of human rights in school (provision adaptation, provision exemption (H6), protection (H7) and participation (H8), only protection and participation display low/medium contributions to FEE, while provision of rights has only a weak contribution to PT1 (below 10). The hypotheses H7 and H8 are moderately supported for two aspects of intercultural empathy while H6, provision adaptation, has weak support for perspective taking (PT1).

The variables of adapted teaching (H10) and well-being (H9) have low to medium correlations with FEE and, to some extent, EA and AD, but none of them are significant in the regressions. This implies that, while school contextual factors may be important, other variables may be of greater significance to students' intercultural empathy. Teacher support (H10) has a surprisingly small contribution to intercultural empathy, except for a moderate correlation with D10 (recognising diverse perspectives).

With regard to students' socio-economic backgrounds, cultural capital, languages spoken at home and parental education, all have significant, but modest, correlations with aspects of intercultural empathy. Among the variables that indicate diversity, only R1 (number of

different mother tongues spoken in schools) (H11) lend some moderate support to the much-researched contact hypothesis as correlations, but are not significant in the regressions.

The language spoken at home (H12) has a significant but moderate contribution to EA, AD and PT1, but a strong contribution to PT2. Parental education (H14) contributes only moderately to perspective taking (PT2). The hypothesis is moderately supported. Cultural capital (H13) and parental education (H14) have some moderate correlations with aspects of intercultural empathy but have no unique effects in the regressions. The hypotheses are not supported.

A special variable, age/class level (H15), also has significant contributions to AD and PT. This indicates that intercultural empathy increases with age; however, this is most likely due to increased experiences, knowledge and reflective practices with increasing maturity. The hypothesis is supported.

We continue by summarizing the contributions to the four aspects of intercultural empathy. Beginning with 'feelings of empathy and expression' (FEE), all variables except teacher support, language spoken at home and parental education contribute in bivariate correlations. In the second regression, only information, motivation, gender, protection and participation contribute significantly. Explained variance is 28% in the second regression, which is satisfactory. As for empathetic awareness (EA), most contributions are moderate/medium except for gender. Nine other variables (information, motivation, grades, provision exemption, number of mother tongues spoken in schools, language spoken at home, cultural capital, parental education and class level) correlate bivariate. Only three variables are significant in the regressions: information, gender and language spoken at home. The explained variance is 15%, which is moderate. Also, for acceptance of difference, ten variables (information, motivation, grades, gender, participation, wellbeing in school, adapted

teaching, number of mother tongues, parental education and class level) correlate moderately. Only three variables contribute in the regressions: information, gender and class level. The explained variance is 6%, which is low. For perspective-taking, two items (D9 and D10) exhibit very low inter-correlations ($r = .22$), meaning that they can be analysed as two single items: one more general (D9-PT1) and one more specific, related to religion and language (D10-PT2). As for PT1, three variables display moderate correlations with provision adaptation, language at home, and class level. The same variables display moderate contributions in the regressions. The explained variance is only 4%. For PT2 motivation, language spoken at home and parental education are significant. The explained variance is 25%, much due to the contribution $\beta = .43$ for the variable 'language spoken at home'. Adapted teaching, teacher support and wellbeing in school are negatively correlated with recognition of diverse perspectives. Our interpretation of this is that challenging experiences take energy, attention and possibly interest, which is needed in order to empathise with cultural differences and generally, with others' experiences.

Looking briefly at the three groups of variables, 'individual', 'school context' and 'background variables', there are some differences. First, the individual variables, information, motivation and particularly, gender tend to display stronger contributions to intercultural empathy than all others. Among the school context, variables, particularly the HR-variables 'protection and participation', are the significant contributions. We would also like to point out here that variables like wellbeing in school and teacher support are not significant in regressions, but they may not be ignored in the practice of schooling for their contribution to intercultural empathy.

With respect to family background variables, they contribute moderately except in the case of perspective-taking (PT), in which personal experiences from home or school seem to play an

important role. Experiencing diversity in school proves insignificant in the regression analysis; therefore, the contact hypothesis is only very moderately supported.

Overall, the individual variables seem to be more important in explaining the four aspects of intercultural empathy. Of the empirical findings, two variables stand out as contributors to intercultural empathy. The first is gender difference, which is stronger than expected. Second, students' knowledge of cultural differences seems to predict empathy in three out of the four aspects.

Discussion

What particularly motivates this study is the question of inclusive practice among citizens in increasingly pluralist societies. Intercultural empathy is in this study seen as vital to the practice of inclusive citizenship and school is a particularly important arena for intercultural contact and the practice and learning of inclusiveness. Therefore, we start with discussing the results in relation to schools as an arena for intercultural contact and stimulation of intercultural empathy.

In addition to the listed school context variables (provision of rights, protection, participation, wellbeing and teacher support), schools certainly provide knowledge about diversity and stimulate student motivation and effort. In highly diverse schools, the learning of diverse cultures takes place every moment informally, but may also be stimulated in various ways in classroom discussions, cultural arrangements and planned exposure of identities and diverse ways of teaching. Our results for class level clearly indicate that such positive development of intercultural empathy may take place. We therefore emphasise that knowledge/information and planned development provide a variety of options that schools have for stimulating intercultural empathy and inclusive citizenship.

The human rights variables provide moderate statistical contributions. However, the provision of rights, their communication and effective practice are vital legal frameworks for the openness and willingness of schools to listen and include diverse students. Particularly, protection rights (from bullying and racism) and participation rights are school-based institutional frameworks that support schooling and inclusive citizenship, including work for justice, recognition of others, solidarity and self-determination; thus, despite moderate statistical effects, they should be underestimated. To be more concrete, exposure of difference may lead to disagreement and sometimes conflict. We argue that this is unavoidable in any school (not just diverse ones) and that differences in views is food for discussion. Schools therefore need to see such disagreements as learning opportunities and a practice toward a universality of difference (Banks, 2008).

The teacher contextual variables (i.e., teacher support, wellbeing and adapted teaching) contribute rather modestly to intercultural empathy. Such contextual variables often have low unique contributions in statistical regression analyses. Despite this, we argue that the moderate β -regression coefficients for the potential contribution of the contextual variables presented in this study may not tell the whole story. Further explanations may consider how collective school activities, teachers' performances, and students' practices act and perform as models and role models in the practice of inclusive citizenship. In Albert Bandura's (1997, 86–101) comprehensive research on self-efficacy, he points to the importance of models for helping students acquire capabilities, adopt attitudes and prepare themselves for certain actions or behaviours. Through teacher modelling behaviours and attitudes favourable to diversity, schools can foster a vision of inclusive citizenship that may have powerful implications for promoting acceptance and respect. We therefore argue that teachers' and students' empathetic institutional practices may model awareness and practices of inclusive

citizenship that other students can adopt. We also argue that the effects of schooling are dependent on how *clear and consistent* the practice of teachers and school leadership is.

Our findings concerning gender differences support the picture revealed in a number of studies that women seem to exhibit more empathy than men (Albiero and Matricardi 2013; Barrett et al. 2000; Brody 1997; Neumann, Boyle, and Chan 2013). The current findings also mirror the differences in attitudes towards diversity and openness to immigrants in the school election survey described in the introduction. We have offered both theory of socialization as well as standpoint theory embedded in Marxist historical materialist and structuralist thinking and in the historical suppression of women. Feminist theory argues that there are fundamental differences in perceptions and thinking between men and women, particularly in the fields of oppression, marginalization and inequality (Hartsock 1986). Vulnerable groups, regardless of sex, gender, class, ethnicity, colour or origin, may have recognisable experiences stemming from their social positions, oppression mechanisms and feelings of being different from the dominating group or the majority. Such groups' shared experiences of similar patterns of historical oppression allow group members to recognize and empathise with other groups' positions. The differences in intercultural empathy may have consequences for girls' and boys' abilities to identify with and recognise diverse students, enable solidarity, interact as peers and practice inclusive citizenship across differences and the question is whether we may speak of a gendered citizenship practice (Lister, 2012). In other words, do gender differences imply that girls are more likely to practice inclusive citizenship than boys? We have no empirical support for this; however, we can offer relevant arguments.

First, all encounters among humans begin with perceptions grounded in life experiences of others where they commonly seek to define others in all relevant aspects (Goffman 2011). Therefore, individuals are influenced by their unique points of view, regardless of the groups they are a part of. Perceiving similarities and being open to interesting or different

perspectives are often triggers for positive feelings, which lead to feelings of togetherness.

Consequently, if females are more likely than males to perceive themselves as having repressive experiences similar to those of various minorities, we argue that females will also be more able/likely to express recognition of and show solidarity towards minorities.

Furthermore, females may be more likely to make friends across perceived race and ethnic boundaries and to practice more inclusive citizenship.

Second, we argue that intercultural competence leads people to judge differences more favourably. Even if the first encounter between individuals of great differences (racial or ethnic) is perceived to be negative, we contend that individuals who identify recognitions and similarities across their own perspectives might be more patient and more likely to develop positive relationships and to practice inclusive citizenship in the long term.

Third, as pointed out by Lister (2012, 372), citizenship has a long historical tradition of being gendered 'in the sense that women and men have stood in a different relationship to it, to the disadvantage of women'. The historical gender differences are apparent in civil and political participation as well as social rights. Having pointed this out, it seems reasonable to assume that such a gendered historical tradition is also visible in the practice of inclusive citizenship.

A counter argument is that much inclusive practice builds not on deep knowledge, concern or feelings of empathy for 'the other' but, rather, on common personal interest in particular issues and practice. Both boys and girls make friends and practice inclusiveness for a variety of reasons, and differences in intercultural competence may not be an obstacle.

One should not underestimate the importance of intercultural competence for real and inclusive citizenship, particularly in the current global and European climate. Differences in intercultural competences may have consequences for our ability to identify with, recognise

and enable solidarity across differences. However, as we have pointed out, there are many reasons for engaging in inclusive practises.

A brief and final suggestion for school practice in support for inclusive citizenship among diverse students is to promote open dialogue and discussions in a deliberative (democratic) manner (Habermas, 1995). Building on deliberative democratic practice Thomas Englund suggest an ethical framework for deliberation in classes; students present diverse views, students should tolerate listen and respect others, students should explore collective will in groups, students should be critical of traditional views, and be able to perform deliberation without the teacher being present (Englund, 2006). Such a framework is necessary in order to engage with difference and controversies in class (Hess, 2009).

Conclusions

The following conclusions may be drawn from this study:

- Students' information and understanding of cultural diversity is an important predictor of intercultural empathy, thus creating opportunities for schools to support inclusive citizenship.
- The institutionalisation of human rights, particularly participation, moderately but significantly predicts intercultural empathy.
- School contextual variables like teacher practice exhibit positive bivariate correlations but show moderate or no controlled effects in multiple regressions, but may still be vital to a consistent school modelling effective inclusive citizenship.
- Experiencing diversity in school has low predictive value and proves insignificant across multiple regressions. This finding is somewhat surprising; however, further research is needed to explore the effect of diversity.

- Girls score higher on empathy scales, particularly with respect to intercultural feelings and expression of empathy and empathetic awareness. This may reflect their different approach to inclusive citizenship
- Students' social backgrounds have fairly low predictive value on aspects of intercultural empathy.

Important implications from this study point to further research on gender differences and citizenship practices in diverse cultural environments. In school, teachers should raise issues that invite students to reflect on and discuss diversity in order to address potential controversies and concerns affecting inclusive citizenship in practice.

Study limitations

First, though our sample is large and representative of the included schools, it may not be generalizable to the country level. Strictly speaking, therefore, our conclusions are limited to the present sample. Second, our dependent variable is measured with four aspects and 12 items. However, some of the measured aspects are weak in terms of concept validity. There is also some variety in the factor loadings, including, particularly, the aspect perspective, which correlates only weakly with the other aspects of intercultural empathy. Third, there are some weaknesses in the measurement of the independent variables. Fourth, the gender differences in emotions and empathy open a contested field to which we draw attention (e.g., Barrett, Robin, Pietromonaco, and Eyssell 1998; Brody 1997). Fifth, when interpreting gender differences, certain contextual, situational and ethnic differences must still be taken into account (Albiero and Matricardi 2013; Barrett, Lane, Sechrest, and Schwartz 2000; Brody 1997).

Reference List

Appendix.

- <https://www.cristin.no/as/WebObjects/cristin.woa/wa/fres?sort=arandpnr=23352andaction=sok>
- Albiero, P., and G. Matricardi. 2013. "Empathy Towards People of Different Race and Ethnicity: Further Empirical Evidence for the Scale of Ethnocultural Empathy." *International Journal of Intercultural Relations* 37 (5): 648–655. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2013.05.003>.
- Allport, Gordon W. 1954. *The Nature of Prejudice*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Arnesen, A. L., R. Mietola, and E. Lahelma. 2007. "Language of Inclusion and Diversity: Policy Discourses and Social Practices in Finnish and Norwegian Schools." *International Journal of Inclusive Education* 11 (1): 97–110. doi:[10.1080/13603110600601034](https://doi.org/10.1080/13603110600601034).
- Bandura, A. 1997. *Self-Efficacy the Exercise of Control*. New York: W.H. Freeman and Company.
- Banks, J. A., and C. A. M. Banks, eds. 2010. *Multicultural Education: Issues and Perspectives*. 7th ed. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Banks, James A. 2008. "Diversity and Citizenship Education in Global Times." in *The Sage Handbook of Education for Citizenship and Democracy*, edited by James Arthur, Ian Davis, and Carole Hahn, 57–70. London: Sage.
- Barrett, L. F., L. Robin, and P. R. Pietromonaco. 1998. "Are Women the 'More Emotional' Sex? Evidence from Emotional Experiences in Social Context." *Cognition and Emotion* 12 (4): 555–578. doi:[10.1080/026999398379565](https://doi.org/10.1080/026999398379565).
- Barrett, L. F., R. D. Lane, L. Sechrest, and G. E. Schwartz. 2000. "Sex Differences in Emotional Awareness." *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 26 (9): 1027–1035. doi:[10.1177/01461672002611001](https://doi.org/10.1177/01461672002611001).
- Bjørnsrud, H., and R. Engh. 2012. "Teamwork to Enhance Adapted Teaching and Formative Assessment." *Policy Futures in Education* 10 (4): 402–410. doi:[10.2304/pfie.2012.10.4.402](https://doi.org/10.2304/pfie.2012.10.4.402).
- Blakemore, Judith, and Craig Hill. 2008. "The Child Gender Socialization Scale: A Measure to Compare Traditional and Feminist Parents." *A Journal of Research* 58 (3):192–207. doi: [10.1007/s11199-007-9333-y](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-007-9333-y).
- Bourdieu, P. 1986. "The Forms of Capital." in *Education Culture Economy Society*, edited by A. H. Halsey, H. Lauder, P. Brown, and A. S. Wells, 241–258. London: Oxford University Press.
- Brochmann, G., and K. Kjeldstadli. 2008. *A History of Immigration*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- Brody, L. R. 1997. "Gender and Emotion: Beyond Stereotypes." *Journal of Social Issues* 53 (2): 369–393. doi:[10.1111/j.1540-4560.1997.tb02448.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4560.1997.tb02448.x).
- Børhaug, F. 2015. *Når Periferien Udfordrer Sentrum: Interkulturell Oppbygging som Inkluderer Minoritetsungdommer i Skolen* [When Periphery Challenges the Centre]. Oslo, Norway: Universitetsforlaget.
- Chang, J., and T. N. Le. 2010. "Multiculturalism as a Dimension of School Climate: The Impact on the Academic Achievement of Asian American and Hispanic Youth." *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology* 16 (4): 485–492. doi:[10.1037/a0020654](https://doi.org/10.1037/a0020654).
- D'Acci, L. 2011. "Measuring Well-Being and Progress." *Social Indicators Research* 104 (1): 47–65. doi:[10.2307/41476540](https://doi.org/10.2307/41476540).

- Dahl, Ø., P. Dybvig, and D. Keeping. 2013. *Møter Mellom Mennesker: Innføring i Interkulturell Kommunikasjon* [Human Encounters: Introduction to Intercultural Communication]. Oslo: Gyldendal Akademisk.
- Dervin, F., and K. Hahl. 2014. "Developing a Portfolio of Intercultural Competences in Teacher Education: The Case of a Finnish International Programme." *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research* 59 (1): 95–109. doi:10.1080/00313831.2014.904413.
- Dervin, F., M. Paatela-Nieminen, K. Kuoppala, and A.-L. Riitaoja. 2012. "Multicultural Education in Finland: Renewed Intercultural Competences to the Rescue?" *International Journal of Multicultural Education* 14 (3): 1–13.
- DeTurk, S. 2001. "Intercultural Empathy: Myth, Competency, or Possibility for Alliance Building?" *Communication Education* 50 (4): 374–384. doi:10.1080/03634520109379262.
- Duan, C., and C. E. Hill. 1996. "The Current State of Empathy Research." *Journal of Counseling Psychology* 43 (3): 261–274.
- Engen, T. O. 2010. "Literacy Instruction and Integration: The Case of Norway." *Intercultural Education* 21 (2): 169–181. doi:10.1080/14675981003696305.
- Englund, Tomas. 2006. "Deliberative communication: a pragmatist proposal." *Journal of Curriculum Studies* 38 (5):503-520
- Eriksen, T. H., and T. A. Sajjad. 2015. *Kulturforskjeller i praksis: perspektiver på det flerkulturelle Norge*. [Cultural Differences in Practice]. Oslo: Gyldendal akademisk.
- Fraser, N. 2003. "Social Justice in the Age of Identity Politics: Redistribution, Recognition and Participation." in *Redistribution of Recognition? A Political-Philosophical Exchange*, edited by N. Fraser and A. Honneth, 1–109. London: Verso.
- Gladstein, G. A. 1983. "Understanding Empathy: Integrating Counseling, Developmental, and Social Psychology Perspectives." *Journal of Counseling Psychology* 30 (3): 467–482.
- Goffman, Erving. 2011. *Stigma: den avvikandes roll och identitet* [Stigma notes on the management of spoiled identity]. 3. uppl. ed.,. Stockholm: Norstedt.
- Gutwirth, S., and J. P. Burgess. 2011. *A Threat against Europe? Security, Migration and Integration*. Brussels: VUBPRESS.
- Habermas, Jurgen. 1995. "Three Normative Models of Democracy." *Constellation* 1 (1):1-10.
- Hartsock, N. C. M. 1983. "The Feminist Standpoint: Developing the Ground for a Specifically Feminist Historical Materialism." in *Discovering Reality: Feminist Perspectives on Epistemology, Metaphysics, Methodology, and Philosophy of Science*, edited by S. Harding and M. B. Hintikka, 283–310. Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands.
- Hekman, S. 1997. "Truth and Method: Feminist Standpoint Theory Revisited." *Signs* 22 (2): 341–365.
- Hess, Diana E. 2009. *Controversy in Classroom. The Democratic Power of Discussion*. London: Routledge.
- Hofmann, M. L. 2000. *Empathy and Moral Development*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- International Organization for Migration (IOM). 2015. *Irregular Migrant, Refugee Arrivals in Europe Top One Million in 2015*. <http://www.iom.int/news/irregular-migrant-refugee-arrivals-europe-top-one-million-2015-iom>.

- Hylland-Eriksen, T. 2009. "What is Cultural Complexity?" in *Jesus beyond Nationalism. Constructing the Historical Jesus in a Period of Cultural Complexity*, edited by H. Moxnes, W. Blanton, and J. Crossley, 9–24. London: E=UiNOX.
- Isin, E., F., and G. M. Nielsen. 2008. *Acts of Citizenship*. London: Zed Books.
- Isin, E. F., and B. S. Turner. 2002. "Citizenship Studies: An Introduction." in *Handbook of Citizenship Studies*, edited by E. F. Isin and B. S. Turner, 1–10. London: Sage.
- Jagoda, G. 2012. "Critical Reflections on Some Recent Definitions of 'Culture'." *Culture and Psychology* 18 (3): 289–303.
- Kabeer, N. 2005. "Introduction." in *Inclusive Citizenship*, edited by N. Kabeer. 1–27. London: Zed Books.
- Kline, R. B. 2005. *Principles and Practice of Structural Equation Modeling*. London: Guildford Press.
- Kunnskapsdepartementet. 2003. *St. meld 30: Kultur for Læring* [Culture for Learning]. Oslo: Ministry of Knowledge.
- Kunnskapsdepartementet. 2006–2007. *St.meld. 16 ...Og Ingen Stod Igjen Tidlig Innsats for Livslang Læring* [...No Child Left Behind]. Oslo: Ministry of Knowledge.
- Le Roux, J. 2001. "Effective Schooling is Being Culturally Responsive." *Intercultural Education* 12 (1): 41–50. doi:10.1080/14675980120033957.
- Le, T.N. and S. Johansen. 2011. "The Relationship Between School Multiculturalism and Interpersonal Violence: An Exploratory Study." *Journal of School Health* 81 (11): 688–695. doi:10.1111/j.1746-1561.2011.00645.x.
- Lister, R. 2008. "Inclusive citizenship." in *Citizenship Between Past and Future*, edited by E. F. Isin, P. Nyers, and B. S. Turner, 48–60. London: Routledge.
- Lister, R. 2012. "Citizenship and Gender." in *The Wiley-Blackwell Companion to Political Sociology*, edited by Edwin Amanta, Kate Nash, and Alan Scott, 372–382. London, New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- McPherson, J.L.P. and N. Abell. 2012. "Human Rights Engagement and Exposure: New Scales to Challenge Social Work Education." *Research on Social Work Practice* 22 (6): 704–713.
- McPherson, J. L. P. 2015. "One Million Bones: Measuring the Effect of Human Rights Participation in the Social Work Classroom." *Journal of Social Work Education* 51 (1): 47–57. doi:10.1080/10437797.2015.977130.
- Mahon, J. 2006. "Under the Visible Cloak? Teacher Understanding of Cultural Difference." *Intercultural Education* 17 (4): 391–405.
- Mahon, J. A., and K. Cushner. 2014. "Revising and Updating the Inventory of Cross-Cultural Sensitivity." *Intercultural Education* 25 (6): 484–496. doi:10.1080/14675986.2014.990232.
- Mallinckrodt, B., J. R. Miles, T. Bhaskar, N. Chery, G. Choi, and M. R. Sung. 2014. "Developing a Comprehensive Scale to Assess College Multicultural Programming." *Journal of Counseling Psychology* 61 (1): 133–145. doi:10.1037/a0035214.
- Malmberg, L. E., T. A. Walls, A. J. Martin, T. D. Little, and W. H. T. Lim. 2013. "Primary School Students' Learning Experiences of, and Self-Beliefs about Competence, Effort, and Difficulty: Random Effects Models." *Learning and Individual Differences* 28: 54–65. doi:10.1016/j.lindif.2013.09.007.

- Ministry of Children and Equality. 2012/13. *A Comprehensive Integration Policy Diversity and Community*. Oslo: Ministry of Children and Equality.
- Marks, Jaime, Chun Lam, and Susan McHale. 2009. "Family Patterns of Gender Role Attitudes." *A Journal of Research* 61 (3): 221–234. doi: 10.1007/s11199-009-9619-3.
- Munroe, A., and C. Pearson. 2006. "The Munroe Multicultural Attitude Scale Questionnaire—A New Instrument for Multicultural Studies." *Educational and Psychological Measurement* 66 (5): 819–834. doi:10.1177/0013164405285542.
- Neumann, D. L., G. J. Boyle, and R. C. K. Chan. 2013. "Empathy Towards Individuals of the Same and Different Ethnicity when Depicted in Negative and Positive Contexts." *Personality and Individual Differences* 55 (1): 8–13. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2013.01.022.
- Nicovich, S. G., G. W. Boller, and T. B. Cornwell. 2005. "Experienced Presence within Computer-Mediated Communications: Initial Explorations on the Effects of Gender with Respect to Empathy and Immersion." *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication* 10 (2): 00–00. doi:10.1111/j.1083-6101.2005.tb00243.x.
- Nilsen, S. 2010. "Moving Towards an Educational Policy for Inclusion? Main Reform Stages in the Development of the Norwegian Unitary School System." *International Journal of Inclusive Education* 14 (5): 479–497. doi:10.1080/13603110802632217.
- NOU. 2011. *Velferd og Migrasjon—Den Norske Modellens Framtid* [Welfare and Migration. The Future of the Norwegian Model]. Oslo: Norwegian Government.
- NSD. 2013. *Skolevalgundersøkelsen* [School Election Survey]. <http://www.nsd.uib.no/skoleveven/skolevalg/datasett.cfm>.
- Opplæringslova. 1998. *Lov om Grunnskolen og den Vidaregåande Opplæringa* (*Opplæringslova*) [Law on Education]. Kunnskapsdepartementet. <https://lovdata.no/dokument/NL/lov/1998-07-17-61?q=oppl%C3%A6ringslova>
- Osler, A., and H. Starkey. 2005. *Changing Citizenship: Democracy and Inclusion in Education*. Maidenhead, UK: Open University Press.
- Pettigrew, Thomas F. 1998. "Intergroup Contact Theory." *Annual Review of Psychology* 49 (1): 65–85. doi: 10.1146/annurev.psych.49.1.65.
- Rasoal, C., T. Jungert, S. Hau, and G. Andersson. 2011. "Ethnocultural versus Basic Empathy: Same or Different?" *Psychology* 2 (9): 925–930. doi:236/psych.2011.29139.
- Ringdal, K. 2013. *Enhhet og Mangfold* [Unity and plurality]. Bergen: Fagbokforlaget.
- Rittenour, Christine E., Colleen Warner Colaner, and Kelly Geier Odenweller. 2014. "Mothers' Identities and Gender Socialization of Daughters." *Southern Communication Journal* 79 (3): 215–234. doi: 10.1080/1041794X.2014.895408.
- Ryan, R. M., and E. L. Deci. 2003. "On Assimilating Identities to the Self: A Self-Determination Theory Perspective on Internalization and Integrity Within Cultures." in *Handbook of Self and Identity*, edited by I. M. R. Leary and J. P. Tangney, 253–275. New York: Guilford Press.
- Skrefsrud, T.-A. 2012. "Å Være Lærer i Interkulturell Kontekst: Om Dialogens Betydning for Lærerkompetansen" [To be a Teacher in an Intercultural Context]. PhD diss., Norwegian University of Science and Technology (NTNU), Trondheim, Norway. <http://urn.kb.se/resolve?urn=urn:nbn:no:ntnu:diva-16381http://hdl.handle.net/11250/242897>.
- SSB. 2011. *Holdninger til Innvandrere og Innvandring* [Attitudes towards Immigrants and Immigration]. Oslo: Statistics Norway.
- SSB. 2012. *Samfunnsspeilet 3* [Mirror of Society]. Oslo: Statistics Norway.
- SSB. 2014. *Holdning til Innvandrere og Innvandring* [Attitudes towards Immigrants and Immigration]. Oslo: Statistics Norway.

- SSB. 2015. *Holdning til Innvandrere og Innvandring* [Attitudes towards Immigrants and Immigration]. Oslo: Statistics Norway.
- Statistics Norway. <http://ssb.no/sok?sok=holdning+til+innvandring>.
- Tangen, R. 2009. "Conceptualising Quality of School Life from Pupils' Perspectives: A Four-Dimensional Model." *International Journal of Inclusive Education* 13 (8): 829–844. doi:10.1080/13603110802155649.
- Tian, L., Q. Tian, and E. S. Huebner. 2015. "School-Related Social Support and Adolescents' School-Related Subjective Well-Being: The Mediating Role of Basic Psychological Needs Satisfaction at School." *Social Indicators Research* 28 (1): 105–129. doi:10.1007/s11205-015-1021-7.
- United Nations. 1989. *United Nations Convention of the Rights of Child*. <https://www.unicef.org/crc/>.
- United Nations. 2011. *United Nations Declaration on Human Rights Education and Training (Res. 66/137)*. <http://daccess-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N11/467/04/PDF/N1146704.pdf?OpenElement>.
- Wang, Y. W., M. M. Davidson, O. F. Yakushko, H. B. Savoy, J. A. Tan, and J. K. Bleier. 2003. "The Scale of Ethnocultural Empathy: Development, Validation, and Reliability." *Journal of Counseling Psychology* 50 (2): 221–234. doi:10.1037/0022-0167.50.2.221.
- Westrheim, K., and A. Tolo. 2014. *Kompetanse for Mangfold: Om Skolens Utfordringer i Det Flerkulturelle Norge* [Competence for Diversity]. Bergen: Fagbokforlaget.
- Zembylas, M. 2012. "The Politics of Fear and Empathy: Emotional Ambivalence in 'Host' Children and Youth Discourses about Migrants in Cyprus." *Intercultural Education* 23 (3): 195–208. doi:10.1080/14675986.2012.701426.
- Zhu, H. 2011. "From Intercultural Awareness to Intercultural Empathy." *English Language Teaching* 4 (1): 116–119.

ⁱ A survey of voting and political attitudes among secondary students in Norway before every parliamentary and local election.