

## On Second Look

### Shifting from a Perception at First Sight to a Different Point of View

**Abstract.** Social structures of inequality including discrimination, devaluation and racism are not only constantly reproduced by processes of social boundary making in daily life, they are also part of educational systems and teaching practices. We suggest to regard concepts of transculturality as a means to shed light on these social dynamics and to question any kind of simplistic black-and-white constructions of ‘cultural groups’, particularly if they are interwoven into the questions of who legitimately belongs and who does not. Teachers are challenged to deal with these dynamics on a daily basis. Many aspects of them have been socially established, cannot be changed easily and probably need to be humbly acknowledged. However, at the same time, teachers do have a certain scope of action in this regard. We offer a simple tool and invite to shift from a perspective ‘at first sight’ to what we call a second look, basically moving from first, judgmental and fear-driven reactions to a more trustful perspective which allows for a more appropriate and also a more professional response.

**Keywords.** Equal opportunities, social belonging, teacher education, transculturality, professionalisation

#### Auf den zweiten Blick

Von einer Wahrnehmung auf den ersten Blick zu erweiterten Perspektiven

**Zusammenfassung.** Im Zuge sozialer Grenzziehungsprozesse werden oft diskriminierende, abwertende oder auch kulturalisierende Argumente eingebracht oder reproduziert, um zu definieren, wer in welcher Weise dazugehören kann, nicht nur in den gesellschaftlichen Diskursen im Allgemeinen, sondern

auch im Rahmen von Bildungssystemen und im alltäglichen pädagogischen Handeln im Besonderen. Wir schlagen vor, Konzepte der Transkulturalität zu nutzen, um zuschreibende und bewertende Schwarz-Weiß-Konstruktionen von ‚kulturellen Gruppen‘ zu hinterfragen, insbesondere wenn sie mit der Frage verwoben sind, wer legitimerweise Zugehörigkeit und Teilhabe beanspruchen kann und wer nicht. Lehrkräfte sind herausgefordert, diesen sozialen Dynamiken professionell zu begegnen und ihnen auch entgegenzuwirken. Obwohl es sich dabei oftmals um historisch gewachsene Strukturen handelt, die nicht leicht verändert werden können, haben Lehrkräfte doch einen gewissen Handlungsspielraum. Wir regen an, die pädagogischen Handlungsmöglichkeiten zu erweitern und Situationen nach einem ‚ersten Blick‘ erneut mit einem ‚zweiten Blick‘ zu betrachten. Während die Wahrnehmung ‚auf den ersten Blick‘ oft von einem Gefühl der Angst und Abwehr geprägt ist, lädt der ‚zweite Blick‘ dazu ein, die Situation aus einer Perspektive eines grundsätzlichen Vertrauens neu zu sehen und auf diese Weise angemesseneres und auch professionelleres Handeln zu ermöglichen.

**Schlüsselwörter.** Chancengerechtigkeit, soziale Zugehörigkeiten, Lehrerinnen- und Lehrerbildung, Transkulturalität, Professionalisierung

## 1 Introduction

Never have we met a single teacher who deliberately wanted his or her students to feel excluded, devalued or hindered in their educational success. And yet: Research shows that some students are not given equal educational opportunities, do not feel safe in their social belonging and make bitter experiences of discrimination and racism in their educational careers (cf. OECD 2018, p. 24–39). While the causes are multidimensional and complex, there is also evidence that teachers may indeed be involved in the (re-)production of social inequalities and precarised belongings, which in turn means that teachers do have some influence and a certain scope of action in this regard (cf. Hattie, Zierer 2019; Weitkämper 2019).

This scope of action can be focused around two main objectives which are both grounded in the fundamental conviction that all students are bearers of equal rights (cf. Honneth 1995, p. 107–121; Helsper, Lingkost 2002, p. 133–134; Mantel 2022): *Firstly*, there is the objective to enable equal educational opportunities. Ideally, these opportunities are provided for all learners irrespective of differences such as those of national, ethnic, religious or socioeconomic origin, while

at the same time taking the different learning conditions and resources of the students into account. This of course is not an easy task, as the teachers' striving to address learners with their individual conditions and circumstances while attempting to orient themselves in all the complexity (cf. Mantel et al. 2019, p. 16–35) easily leads to teachers ascribing common stereotypes or assumed learning deficits related to social and/or migration-related origin. This again can have the consequence of (re-)producing inequalities by being biased in assessments and by causing expectancy effects and stereotype threat (cf. Rosenthal, Jacobsen 1968) among students (see overview e. g. in Weitkämper 2019).

*Secondly*, there is the objective of contributing to social cohesion and enabling equal rights for social belonging of all students. In the case of Switzerland, for instance, the curriculum for compulsory education in public schools highlights values such as promoting “mutual respect [...] particularly regarding cultures, religions and ways of living”, learning for “social justice”, “democracy” and a “pluralistic society” and “taking a stand against all kinds of discrimination” (D-EDK 2016, p. 20–21). This second main objective has its emphasis in the area of social learning and is also highly demanding, as it challenges teachers not only in finding their own way of how to live and express these values, but also in facilitating and supporting the respective learning processes among all of their students. The need for this kind of learning can hardly be overestimated as there are countless reports and studies about precarised social belongings as well as experiences of subtle devaluation, exclusion and violence among school children (cf. e. g. Korperschoek et al. 2020).

Given that the task is demanding and the need to meet these demands is high, the question arises of how teachers can be supported and professionalised for their teaching in schools of diverse societies. As many of these challenges have to do with common underlying social mechanisms that are often hidden, unrecognised and at the same time subtly effective, we suggest to pay attention to these basic driving forces in a first step and then experiment with some tools to find pedagogical orientation and to go beyond limiting perceptions at first sight and move to a ‘second look’.

## 2 The Concept of Transculturality as an Invitation to Move Beyond

Many of the above-mentioned challenges are closely entangled in social mechanisms that define who legitimately belongs to what group and who holds what position along power hierarchies, while economic benefit as well as power, pres-

tige and identity from belonging to a certain group may be motives for the social dynamics and “struggles over who legitimately should occupy which seat in the theatre of society” (Wimmer 2013, p. 5, referring to Weber 1921–1922, Bourdieu 1983 and Barth 1969). According to Wimmer (2013), such processes of boundary making can be observed all across different societies in the world. While they can be found on the macro-level and on the level of institutions, they also structure lives by processes on the micro-level in daily interactions among individuals.

These processes on the individual level have been described by Neckel (2000, p. 23–30) as social distinctions that are being made in order to gain or defend social advantages. These distinctions however only have the desired effect if they are linked to a comparative difference in value. Typically, the self-image of what is constructed as the ‘own group’ is idealised, while the value of the constructed ‘other’ is downplayed (see also Elias, Scotson 1965). Anhut and Heitmeyer (2000, p. 32–34) stress the fact that these mechanisms particularly come into play when individuals try to compensate for their own feeling of insecurity.

As a means to devalue or stigmatise others, it is particularly effective to choose those aspects that cannot be changed or taken away (cf. Anhut, Heitmeyer 2000, p. 32–34) such as those of gender, national, ethnic or socioeconomic origin, also in their intertwining (cf. Crenshaw 1991). The argumentations that are needed to create and reproduce boundaries are often readily available and have been established over centuries by continuously referring to (implicit) dichotomies such as superior versus inferior, modern versus traditional or developed versus underdeveloped. The way these black and white images are often being drawn and reproduced in politically motivated discourses seems so obviously inappropriate, undercomplex, one-sided and violently denigrating that it can be difficult to understand what makes them so persistently attractive except for the above-mentioned reasons. Huntington’s book *Clash of Civilizations* (1996) may be a good example for the amount of resonance these polarised constructions are able to create.

Interestingly, his book has been translated into German as ‘fight between cultures’ (*Kampf der Kulturen*) which seems symptomatic in the context of discourses that are often operating with the argument of ‘culture’. In these discourses ‘cultural difference’ is often claimed to be the cause for friction and conflict with those who are constructed and demarcated as ‘migrants’ or ‘foreigners’ (cf. Dahinden 2014). Consequently, their ‘cultural assimilation’ is argued to be the prerequisite for successful social approximation and integration. Within this kind of logic, ‘cultural assimilation’ appears as a quasi-natural process, while the underlying mechanisms of boundary making often remain invisible (cf. Mecheril 2003,

p. 120). However, ‘cultures’ and ‘cultural difference’ are in fact often being constructed – one might even say, they are secretly being kidnapped – for the very purpose of defining who is allowed to belong and who is not. From this point of view, the groups of ‘us’ and ‘them’ are not naturally given, but constructed by and emerging from the process of distinction and boundary making. Accordingly, ‘cultural difference’ in this case is not something that is being objectively observed, but something that is powerfully claimed and ascribed by culturalising, stereotyping or stigmatising those who are unwanted and either positioned beyond group boundaries or situated in a kind of grey zone that turns the question of belonging into a chronically precarious state and into a subject of constant struggle, justification and defence (cf. Mantel 2017, p. 54–55).

These processes do not necessarily have to be loud and violent, they can also be very subtle and implicit. Those being addressed by them may have little influence on them, as the influence largely depends on the relative power position of the respective group or person (cf. Wimmer 2013, p. 93–95). If they try to influence the processes from this defensive state of justification, they can hardly avoid referring to the very categorisations they are trying to challenge, so that by referring to them, these categorisations often end up being reinforced rather than questioned or weakened (cf. Dümmler 2015, p. 398–400; Mecheril 2003, p. 51).

In sum, what is being discussed as ‘culture’ and ‘cultural difference’ is easily being entangled into the question of who should be regarded as superior and who as inferior, which also powerfully defines who can legitimately claim what position in society. Consequently, ‘culture’ is often simplistically constructed as being characteristic for a certain ethnic or national ‘group’.

In contrast, concepts of transculturality have been brought into the debate for the last two decades as an attempt to overcome these kinds of simplistic, reductionistic, essentialist, static and container-like notions of ‘culture’. From our point of view, concepts of transculturality can be an invitation to question these notions and can function as an eye-opener in order not to fall prey to those polarised and polarising ascriptions within boundary making processes.

Welsch (1999) was one of the first to bring forward a concept of transculturality by making a clear point that notions of separate cultural groups with clear boundaries were highly inappropriate concepts, since there was often more cultural commonality between and within groups than is being argued in discourses and ways of thinking about ‘culture’. He states that the concept of transculturality is “not one of isolation and conflict, but one of entanglement, intermixing and

commonness” and suggests that it does not promote “separation, but exchange and interaction” (ibid., p. 205). One might also question the use of the term ‘cultures’ in the plural form altogether and replace it with the singular, acknowledging that ‘culture’ with all its different coloration and its dynamic heterogeneity is something that is commonly shared (cf. e. g. Maran 2019).

Similarly, Abu-Er-Rub et al. (2019) discuss how transcultural approaches can be made beneficial. They propose to practice a ‘transcultural turn’ and to critically pay attention when binary oppositions are supposed and when practices of boundary making come into play. They stress that cultural practice needs to be investigated with a processual and multi-sited view in which different perspectives are considered, including the question of who is involved and who is excluded.

Concepts of transculturality therefore offer a wide range of angles from which cultural practice can be looked at, and they may serve as helpful frameworks and reminders not to be deceived by a common rhetoric with a simplistic and powerful way of dividing the social world into ‘us’ and ‘them’.

### **3 Moving Beyond First Judgements**

In the role and responsibility of a teacher and being faced with the aforementioned challenges, the question arises of how a ‘transcultural lens’ can be made fruitful for educators and how the dynamics of boundary making can be dealt with in a professional way. Unfortunately, being entangled in these processes is often unavoidable and trying to step out of spontaneous reactions based on prejudice, bias or subtle devaluation can seem overly ambitious and simply unrealistic. We are in this together, in all these established social structures, with our habitual thinking patterns, our particular habitus, backgrounds and life stories, including all our insecurities and fears as well as our desire to be heard, seen, respected and recognised. Presumably, this is just a matter of being human. And yet: We almost always have a second chance, especially when we leave that place of perception at first sight and give room for a ‘second look’. Such a second look is not a small matter: Research has repeatedly shown that the teaching practice can change considerably depending on the underlying beliefs and points of view that a teacher chooses and learns to act from (cf. Leutwyler et al. 2014; Leutwyler, Mantel 2015).

In the following, we would like to provide inspiration on how to move from a perception at first sight to what we call a second look. These suggestions are based

on our own teaching practice, our experience in accompanying pre-service and in-service teachers, our own research as well as drawing from experienced teachers' and scholars' wisdom. By perception 'at first sight' we are referring to the reactions that happen quickly and intuitively. While these reactions can sometimes be very adequate, we are going to focus on those that are limiting to ourselves and others as they are influenced by all the social structures and boundary makings outlined above. They often entail reproductions of stereotypical ideas and social inequalities and at the same time often remain hidden to us, at least if we do not pay attention.

If a 'second look' is to be found, firstly, the spontaneous, emotional and sometimes unsatisfying reactions that often happen 'at first sight' need to be acknowledged. The more we become sensitive to these issues and aware of all our biases and entangledness in powerplays and subtle devaluing practices, the more we rely on our self-compassion. Only after having acknowledged what happened, including emotions like fear, anger or shame that might have been involved, do we find enough inner room for further steps.

A teacher once told us that her students' parents, who had migrated from Turkey to Switzerland constantly ignored her invitations for a meeting. She was convinced that they did not come because education did not mean anything to them, as they had not really been educated themselves in their country of origin. Besides, if they did not put energy into learning German, they were themselves to blame for not receiving all the necessary school information. When she overheard herself formulate this explanation, she realised that she had just reconstructed a common stereotype without really trying to understand what was going on. She had been tangled up in her reaction at first sight that had been flooded by her disappointment about them ignoring her invitation, her fear of not being respected as a teacher and her uncertainty of not knowing how to communicate with them effectively.

In order to move beyond her first interpretation, this teacher firstly needed to come to a halt with it. For this, acknowledging her disappointment and underlying fear and uncertainty was important. Coming to a halt with a first interpretation and judgment has been pointed out by Dewey (1910) to be highly significant for any kind of reflection. He states that "reflective thinking, in short, means judgement suspended during further inquiry". Dewey also acknowledges that this kind of suspense is "likely to be somewhat painful" as it "involves willingness to endure a condition of mental unrest and disturbance". At the same time, he stresses how significant it is to have this willingness to defer judgment and suspend conclusion: "The most important factor in the training of good mental

habits consists in acquiring the attitude of suspended conclusion [...]. To maintain the state of doubt and to carry on systematic and protracted inquiry – these are the essentials of thinking.” (ibid., p. 13).

Suspending first and spontaneous judgment and maintaining “a state of doubt” – as Dewey calls it – is therefore highly significant and particularly so in a field of action that is so prone and vulnerable to being overlaid and overridden by inherited ideas that we may have about ourselves and one another. The way we are influenced for this kind of perceiving ‘at first sight’ seems to a large extent to be fear-driven. Accordingly, it is most crucial to truly acknowledge this fear, consciously suspend spontaneous judgments and then move to a place of trust. Moving from fear to trust is the core of what is meant by moving from a perception ‘at first sight’ to a ‘second look’. “Where am I looking from? From a place of fear or from a place of trust?” is the inviting question to take this courageous step and risk another point of view (see also table 1).

#### **4 Shifting Perspective and Making Room for a Second Look**

When working with student teachers, the proposed shift of perception usually raises two questions: The first question is whether choosing a perspective from ‘trust’ leads to a naïve acceptance of any kind of behaviour, even if it is problematic or harmful, which is a very significant question that absolutely needs to be dealt with and cannot be satisfied by any kind of easy answer. In our view, deciding not to be so fear-driven, but rather to find that trustful place in oneself, does not mean to naïvely approve of everything. Rather, it is a perspective that is less fogged and clouded by stressful thoughts, inherited thinking habits and reactive patterns, but instead allows for a more realistic, clear and differentiated perspective that can lead to a much more appropriate response.

The second question is how to shift. Interestingly, this is a question that student teachers usually do not expect anyone else to answer for them, rather, they often enjoy sharing and exchanging their own personal strategies they have discovered for themselves. And they all have such strategies, for instance:

- Relax.
- Breathe and feel my feet right down to my toes.
- Talk to a trusted friend or colleague and ask for constructive input, a different way of looking at the situation or to show me my blind spots.
- Pause and make room for a second look.
- Sleep it over.

Table 1: “Where are you looking from?” (inspired by Dethmer, Chapman, Warner Klemp 2014).

At first sight	On second look
<b>Statements</b>	
<p>That’s right, that’s wrong.                      That’s not normal!                      If it’s not done in a certain way, it’s disrespectful/rude.                      They should ...                      These people are living backwards.                      They can’t understand.                      I know how these people function.                      Are you Swiss or are you Turkish/Chinese/xy?</p>	<p>What can I learn from this?                      At first I thought...and now I see...                      Things are sometimes not as they seem.                      I’m cautious about judging, there is so much I don’t know.                      In what ways does the irritation have to do with myself?                      Will you tell me about your point of view?                      I’d like to understand that better.                      How could we solve this together?                      Ambivalence is part of life.                      There are many ways of being.</p>
<b>Behaviours</b>	
<p>Reproducing stereotypes                      Seeing the familiar as the ‘normal’                      Quick, spontaneous judgement                      Standing by the judgement                      Taking irritations personally                      Seeing others per se as in need of help                      Avoiding conflict                      Wanting to be right</p>	<p>Genuine interest, enabling resonance for individuality                      True listening, considering other perspectives                      Sensitive to questions of belonging and (subtle) degradations                      Recognising and questioning stereotypes                      Knowledge of one’s own limited knowledge                      Finding creative solutions                      Getting acquainted with one’s own notions of ‘normal’, social belonging and power dynamics                      Being as respectful to oneself as to others                      Holding ambivalence</p>
<b>Beliefs</b>	
<p>There is ‘us’ on the one side and ‘the others’ on the other side.                      The ‘us’ group represents the ‘normal’.                      ‘The others’ deviate from the ‘normal’.</p>	<p>Everyone belongs.                      Diversity is the norm (and: rules are necessary to live together).</p>
<b>Point of View</b>	
<p>From a state of defence and fear</p>	<p>From trust</p>

- Feel my feelings. Be frustrated. Be in contact with my anger. Do sports.
- Ask myself: If I took out the fear, what would this look like? And what would I do?
- Ask myself: What would my more mature self do?
- Remind myself of what I know about stereotypes, prejudice and social boundary making.

Whether we choose to look from a place of fear or from a place of trust often makes an astonishingly huge difference (cf. Mantel et al. 2019). In the above-mentioned case of the teacher being disappointed about the parents not coming to meetings, she found out that her suggested time slots were very difficult for these parents to organise, as they both worked in the evenings and feared to jeopardise their jobs if they asked their bosses for a change of schedule. Having realised this obstacle, the teacher offered different time slots and the parents were able to accept her invitation.

Not long ago, we pursued a project in which we gathered a mixed group of teachers and researchers and discussed irritating moments around migration-related diversity in daily school life. One of the teachers recalled a situation in which three of her fifth-grade-students talked in Portuguese during the lesson. At first sight, there was a spontaneous disagreement within the group about talking in foreign languages in the classroom. It was argued that talking in Portuguese, while everyone else was not able to understand, was unfriendly, impolite and disrespectful, creating separate groups, being used as secret language to talk badly about others, and hindering the students in acquiring the school language of German. Besides, it felt awkward as a teacher, not being able to understand their conversation and not being able to fully control the situation. And additionally: Some teachers were used to having a rule that only the German language was allowed on the school premises as they had experienced this rule during their own primary schooling. We took a break, did not push the conversation any further, but gave room to acknowledge the reality as it was.

However, after a while, some new perspectives appeared. One of the teachers talked about her experience of using the different language competences in her class for language reflection. Counting numbers in different languages and discovering all the interesting similarities provided insight into how languages were related to each other. Another teacher said that she sometimes invited parents with other languages into her lessons to teach the class phrases and short songs. She also stressed that the students' language resources were often underestimated and a great source for learning and reflection. But what if students used their foreign language competences to secretly talk about private issues during

lessons or for gossiping? – After a while, we agreed that it was an important learning objective for students to be able to distinguish between situations in which speaking other languages is welcome and appropriate and situations in which it is socially inappropriate, as it excludes others. We also agreed that developing this kind of sensitivity should be an integral part of social learning processes and – for instance – be discussed with the whole class. Finally, one of the teachers emphasised that she actually enjoyed and loved it when the different language resources in her class became increasingly audible and visible, as she had always hoped to create a class atmosphere that allowed and encouraged everyone to feel comfortable, to be proud of their languages and not to feel ashamed of them, particularly those who spoke languages which were not necessarily positively connoted in the societal discourses. From her point of view, feeling comfortable with and enjoying the richness of different languages was a great way of broadening the students’ horizons while practicing the different language resources was highly significant for their identity development as well as for their personal growth.

## 5 Pathways to Professionalisation

Shifting perspective and making room for a second look can be seen as genuine processes of teacher professionalisation, as it entails what Helsper (2018) has described as a *de-centering* of one’s orientations and a *relativising* of one’s perspectives while being interested – and even *seeking* – to be challenged and to discover new horizons of perceiving, thinking and gaining knowledge (ibid., p. 128–132). The following six “commitments for true encounters” are a collection of aspects that have appeared to be particularly relevant for professionalisation in the realm of dealing with diversity and social inequalities. Hopefully, they can serve as interesting impulses for each teacher’s own way of creating pedagogical orientation and of finding out what supports them in their professionalisation and in their way of shifting to a ‘second look’:

*Sincere interest* is the first crucial step for a real encounter, particularly if there is an awkward feeling of irritation, strangeness or not-knowing. With sincere interest, this feeling can turn into a fascinated curiosity about the unfamiliar.

*Cheerful equanimity* is a real source of relief when prejudices and unsatisfying reactions are being uncovered. Feelings of paralysing guilt and shame are not helpful over the long run while being kind to oneself can help being kind to others.

*Openness to others* is a doorway to a colourful landscape of human diversity. This attitude includes a willingness to be okay with not-knowing and not-labelling and it releases the burden of wanting to control it all. Instead, it can hold ambivalence, does not rely on judgmental polarisations, but enjoys making attempts to understand the other from within their own perspective.

*Openness to self-awareness* can be sobering and enlightening at the same time, as it continuously allows for evernew insights into one's own ways of constructing 'normality' and one's position in society. "When I try to be successful in education and vocational career, I can be quite certain that my socioeconomic and national origin do not work against me" is a sentence that not everyone can agree with. "At the place where I'm at home, I'm never being asked where I come from" does not occur to everyone. To many teachers it does, as many teachers have not necessarily made a lot of experiences of racial or ethnic discrimination themselves. It is good to be reminded sometimes and to consider the different social positions among students and their parents (see also McIntosh 1989).

*Self-regulation* is probably more important than we might think. When we are stressed, it is difficult to calm fear and to acknowledge the so often experienced inner anxiety of not being good enough. Recognising others needs to go hand in hand with recognising ourselves. Acknowledging the reality of others does not mean losing ourselves. Both can equally be valued and appreciated.

*Expansion of knowledge* is a constant adventure into new ways of understanding the world, the way we live together and the different living conditions and privileges we have. It can be a crucial prerequisite to try and be appropriate in our response and to become increasingly sensitive to diversity.

## 6 Concluding Remarks

Shifting one's perspective and moving from a place of fear to a place of trust can support teachers in finding orientation within the social dynamics of transculturality and in seeing through the processes of social boundary making with all their devaluing, excluding, discriminatory and racist effects that are often reproduced unconsciously and unintentionally. However, this invitation to deliberately choose a trustful point of view shall not imply that individual teachers are made responsible to change social structures of inequality that have been established over centuries. It is not our attempt to increase teachers' stress level, but – quite to the contrary – invite them to enjoy the fascination of getting to know and accompanying their diverse students on their unique journeys. Moving beyond a

Table 2: “The six commitments for true encounters” (inspired by Dethmer, Chapman, Warner Klemp 2014).

<p><b>1. Sincere interest</b></p> <p>I’m looking for <b>real encounters</b> and I’m genuinely interested in people who irritate me or who seem strange or unfamiliar to me.</p> <p><i>(Versus: I already know enough about different people.)</i></p>	<p><b>2. Cheerful equanimity</b></p> <p>I’m aware of the fact that I have prejudices and when I uncover them, I’m <b>kind to myself</b> or I laugh a bit at myself.</p> <p><i>(Versus: I assume that I have no prejudices and when I happen to uncover some, I feel deeply ashamed.)</i></p>	<p><b>3. Openness to others</b></p> <p>I practice an <b>open-minded attitude</b> by deferring judgements about others as much as possible. I strive to understand the perspective of the other person and I’m aware that there is a lot I don’t know. In particular, I humbly acknowledge experiences of discrimination, especially if I do not know them from my own personal experience.</p> <p><i>(Versus: I’m quick to judge situations and people and I assume that my judgements are right.)</i></p>
<p><b>4. Openness to self-awareness</b></p> <p>I’m open-minded towards myself and I’m interested in my own influences and the inherited notions of ‘normal’. I make sure to consider these influences in a neutral and fair manner and not hastily judge them.</p> <p><i>(Versus: I’m totally normal. There are lots of not normal people in this world. That’s all I need to know about this topic.)</i></p>	<p><b>5. Self-regulation</b></p> <p>I make sure to find inner balance on an ongoing basis. The more I can myself source self-acceptance, the less I have a need to compare myself with others. If people don’t behave in the way I’d expect them to, I don’t take it personally. Sometimes I can simply accept things just the way they are.</p> <p><i>(Versus: If I’m not feeling good, it’s the fault of others. I can neither accept nor influence that.)</i></p>	<p><b>6. Expansion of knowledge</b></p> <p>I’m aware that there is a lot I don’t know. Again and again, I access new horizons to learn more about the living conditions of others and to discover my own ‘blind spots’.</p> <p><i>(Versus: I know enough about the life circumstances of others. I can judge concrete situations from my own life experience.)</i></p>

first sight and letting go of first judgments can be a relief and a door-opener for new ways of meeting each other. The Persian poet Rumi is told to have said: “Out beyond ideas of wrongdoing and rightdoing there is a field. I’ll meet you there.”

## Bibliography

- Abu-Er-Rub, Laila; Brosius, Christiane; Meurer, Sebastian; Panagiotopoulos, Diamantis and Richter, Susan (2019). Introduction. Engaging Transculturality. In: L. Abu-Er-Rub; C. Brosius; S. Meurer; D. Panagiotopoulos and S. Richter (eds.): Engaging Transculturality. Concepts, Key Terms, Case Studies. Abingdon: Routledge, p. xxiii–xliv
- Anhut, Reimund and Heitmeyer, Wilhelm (2000). Desintegration, Konflikt und Ethnisierung. Eine Problemanalyse und theoretische Rahmenkonzeption. In: W. Heitmeyer (ed.): Konflikt- und Gewaltforschung. Bedrohte Stadtgesellschaft. Weinheim/München: Juventa, p. 17–75
- Barth, Fredrik (1969). Introduction. In: F. Barth (ed.), Ethnic Groups and Boundaries. The Social Organization of Culture Difference. London: Allen & Unwin, p. 9–38
- Bourdieu, Pierre (1983). Ökonomisches Kapital, kulturelles Kapital, soziales Kapital. In: Reinhard Kreckel (ed.): Soziale Ungleichheiten. Göttingen: Otto Schwartz & Co., p. 183–198
- Crenshaw, Kimberle (1991). Mapping the Margins. Intersectionality, Identity Politics, and Violence against Women of Color. In: Stanford Law Review, 43:6, p. 1241–1299. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1229039>
- D-EDK (Deutschschweizer Erziehungsdirektorenkonferenz) (2016). Lehrplan 21. Gesamtausgabe. <https://www.lehrplan21.ch/> [09.12.2022]
- Dahinden, Janine (2014). “Kultur” als Form symbolischer Gewalt. Grenzziehungsprozesse im Kontext von Migration am Beispiel der Schweiz. In: B. Nieswand and H. Drotbohm (eds.): Kultur, Gesellschaft, Migration. Studien zur Migrations- und Integrationspolitik. Wiesbaden: Springer Fachmedien, p. 97–121
- Dethmer, Jim; Chapman, Diana and Warner Klemp, Kaley (2014). The 15 Commitments of Conscious Leadership. A New Paradigm for Sustainable Success. Conscious Leadership Group. La Vergne, Tennessee: Lightning Source Inc.
- Dewey, John (1910). How We Think. New York: Dover Publications
- Dümmler, Kerstin (2015). Symbolische Grenzen. Zur Reproduktion sozialer Ungleichheit durch ethnische und religiöse Zuschreibungen. Bielefeld: transcript
- Elias, Norbert and Scotson, John L. (1965). The Established and the Outsiders. London: Frank Cass & Co. Ltd

- Hattie, John and Zierer, Klaus (2019). *Visible Learning Insights*. London: Routledge
- Helsper, Werner (2018). *Lehrerhabitus. Lehrer zwischen Herkunft, Milieu und Profession*. In: A. Paseka; M. Keller-Schneider and A. Combe (eds.): *Ungewissheit als Herausforderung für pädagogisches Handeln*. Wiesbaden: Springer, p. 105–140
- Helsper, Werner and Lingkost, Angelika (2002). *Schülerpartizipation in den Antinomien von Autonomie und Zwang sowie Organisation und Interaktion. Exemplarische Rekonstruktionen im Horizont einer Theorie schulischer Anerkennung*. In: B. Hafenecker, P. Henkenborg and A. Scherr (eds.): *Pädagogik der Anerkennung. Grundlagen, Konzepte, Praxisfelder*. Schwalbach am Taunus: Wochenschau Verlag, p. 132–156
- Honneth, Axel (1995). *The Struggle for Recognition. The Moral Grammar of Social Conflicts*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press
- Huntington, Samuel P. (1996). *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of the World Order*. New York: Simon & Schuster
- Korpershoek, Hanke; Canrinus, Esther T.; Fokkens-Bruinsma, Marjon and de Boer, Hester (2020). *The Relationships between School Belonging and Students' Motivational, Social-Emotional, Behavioural, and Academic Outcomes in Secondary Education. A Meta-Analytic Review*. In: *Research Papers in Education*, 35:6, p. 641–680
- Leutwyler, Bruno and Mantel, Carola (2015). *Teachers' Beliefs and Intercultural Sensitivity*. In: G. Mészáros and F. Körtvélyesi (eds.): *Social Justice and Diversity in Teacher Education. Proceedings of the ATEE Winter Conference 2014*. Brussels: Association for Teacher Education in Europe, ATEE, p. 145–156
- Mantel, Carola (2017). *Lehrer\_in, Migration und Differenz. Fragen der Zugehörigkeit bei Grundschullehrer\_innen der zweiten Einwanderungsgeneration in der Schweiz*. Bielefeld: transcript
- Mantel, Carola (2022). *Teachers with So-Called Migration Background and the Question of Recognition. Experiences of Fragility and Hidden Pedagogical Potentials*. In: *European Educational Research Journal*, 21:2, p. 265–277. <https://doi.org/10.1177/14749041211008327>
- Mantel, Carola; Aepli, Marianne; Büzberger, Marcus; Dober, Heidi; Hubli, Janice; Krummenacher, Jolanda; Müller, Andrea und Puškarić, Julija (2019). *Auf den zweiten Blick. Eine Sammlung von Fällen aus dem Schulalltag zum Umgang mit migrationsbezogener Vielfalt*. Bern: hep
- Maran, Josef (2019). *Not 'Cultures', but Culture! The Need for a Transcultural Perspective in Archaeology*. In: L. Abu-Er-Rub, C. Brosius, S. Meurer, D. Panagiotopoulos, and S. Richter (eds.): *Engaging Transculturality. Concepts, Key Terms, Case Studies*. Abingdon: Routledge, p. 52–64

- McIntosh, Peggy (1989). White Privilege. Unpacking the Invisible Knapsack. Peace and Freedom Magazine, July/August, p. 10–12. <https://nationalseedproject.org/white-privilege-unpacking-the-invisible-knapsack> [09.12.2022]
- Mecheril, Paul (2003). Prekäre Verhältnisse. Über natio-ethno-kulturelle (Mehrfach-)Zugehörigkeit. Münster: Waxmann
- Neckel, Sighard (2000). Die Macht der Unterscheidung. Essays zur Kulturosoziologie der Modernen Gesellschaft. Frankfurt: campus
- OECD (2018). Equity in Education. Breaking Down Barriers to Social Mobility. Paris: OECD Publishing
- Rosenthal, Robert and Jacobsen, Lenore (1968). Pygmalion in the Classroom. Teacher Expectations and Student Intellectual Development. New York: Holt
- Weber, Max (1921–1922). Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck)
- Weitkämper, Florian (2019). Lehrkräfte und Soziale Ungleichheit. Eine Ethnographische Studie zum Un/Doing Authority in Grundschulen. Wiesbaden: Springer VS
- Welsch, Wolfgang (1999). Transculturality. The Puzzling Form of Cultures Today. In: M. Featherstone and S. Lash (eds.): Spaces of Culture. City, Nation, World. London: Sage, p. 194–213
- Wimmer, Andreas (2013). Ethnic Boundary Making. Oxford: Oxford University Press

## Authors

**Prof. Dr. Carola Mantel.** Head of the Institute for International Cooperation in Education (Institut für internationale Zusammenarbeit in Bildungsfragen, IZB) at the University of Teacher Education Zug. Research focuses: social inequalities and migration-related diversity, diversity among teachers, social boundary making  
[carola.mantel@phzg.ch](mailto:carola.mantel@phzg.ch)

**Tamina Kappeler.** MA. Research associate at the Institute for International Cooperation in Education at the University of Teacher Education Zug. Research focuses: social inequalities and migration-related diversity, educational development cooperation, representations of diversity in schools  
[tamina.kappeler@phzg.ch](mailto:tamina.kappeler@phzg.ch)

Correspondence Address:  
Prof. Dr. Carola Mantel  
Pädagogische Hochschule Zug  
Zugerbergstrasse 3  
CH-6300 Zug  
carola.mantel@phzg.ch