School as a place of orientation and as a place of prevention of disorientation

Haci-Halil Uslucan

Haci-Halil Uslucan

School as a place of orientation and as a place of prevention of disorientation

The following short expert report is essentially devoted to two central questions:

1. Why is school the genuine place of orientation in the world?
2. What is the role of prevention in this respect?

I. School as a place of orientation in the world

Why is school the genuine place of orientation in the world in the lives of young people? If we just consider how much time a child spends in school up to the end of the tenth grade - with about 37 school weeks and a weekly number of hours of about 30 - it is at least 11,000 hours in ten years; up to the final school leaving examination it sums up to almost 15,000 hours. In this respect, we can speak of school as the first „major and lasting coercive institution" in a child's life. And at the same time, it is also the place where he or she is not only taught, instructed, etc., but also encounters children of other linguistic, cultural and religious backgrounds. In this respect, it is also a prominent place where life in a world characterised by plurality is directly practised. At the same time, this transition - in the primary phase - from the parental home to school as a central space of experience and interpretation is initially a critical life event for all children. The different demands that now affect the child must be perceived, understood and mastered; at the same time, a „liveable" synthesis with the child's own expectations and desires must be created. In this context, migrant children are a particularly vulnerable group. For them, this transition may be even more serious if they have not previously attended a day care centre and are confronted with different cultural and religious backgrounds for the first time at school. Then they feel the differences and inconsistencies between the values of their own family and religious context and the values of the host society conveyed by the school much

more strongly. However, parental educational tasks are also much more demanding (and difficult to cope with) for immigrants than for native parents; on the one hand, they have to maintain continuity with their (own) history and tradition, but on the other hand, they also have to offer their children skills, knowledge and orientation for a society that is often not entirely transparent to themselves. In particular, immigrants from countries with a high cultural distance to Germany (such as Turkey, Syria, Arab countries, etc.) are faced at the beginning of migration with the task of processing a rather high degree of uncertainty and ambiguity and having to form new cognitive schemata appropriate to the current living environment (Hänze & Lantermann, 1999). Accordingly, this brief expert report will address this group in a separate section.

Regardless of the demographic or culturally different composition of classes, the question of orientation and disorientation is also becoming increasingly important, especially in adolescence: One of the tasks in the development specific to adolescence is to build a personal identity and to prepare to some extent for adult life (Fend, 1994; Fuhrer & Laser, 1997). In line with the individualisation thesis, the developmental psychologist James Marcia has been able to show in his work since the 1990s (1993) that the proportion of young people with a diffuse identity has risen from 20% in the past to 40%. This means that for some time now, a growing number of young people have no longer been able to commit themselves to stable, binding and obligatory – and in this sense identity forming – relationships, orientations and values, and that the question of reliable orientation has become more urgent than ever.

Functions of school:

As we all know, school as an institution not only has a selective, allocative and qualifying function, but also always a socialising and legitimising function; i.e. an effect on the recognition of the legitimacy of the existing social order among the pupils (Fend, 1981).

But are these functions always fulfilled or sufficiently fulfilled? Here we can certainly ask some critical questions:

1. The qualifying function is limited by the fact that educational processes are long-term investments, but the demands of the economic system change rather quickly.

2. Allocation and selection function: In practice, job allocations often take place via gender- and other specific pathways; examinations sometimes have only a legitimising and only limited objectively differentiating character.

3. Integration and legitimation function: Educational success tends to familiarise people with middle-class values, and too little attention is being paid about the pluralisation of life-styles; especially the ethno-cultural-linguistic heterogeneity of current school classes.

As far as the cognitive orientation function of school is concerned, i.e. knowledge in and knowledge about the world, it can be stated that its primary task is to impart contemporary cultural tools, without the mastery of which the acquisition of cultural products seems almost impossible. The education researcher Baumert (2002) has outlined these as follows:

1. Mastery of the common language
2. Mathematical modelling ability
3. Foreign language skills
4. IT competence

Last but not least, the teaching of a more psychological skill, namely the self-regulation of the acquisition of knowledge (cf. Baumert, 2002).

How can schools provide this orientation by means of (good) teaching?

One of the outstanding findings in educational research in this context is the work of the Australian researcher John Hattie: With regard to the concept of good teaching, Hattie (2008; 2015) encourages teachers to use the maxim „visible teaching and visible learning", i.e. „visible teaching and learning" and „recognisable teaching and learning". In other words, the teacher himself becomes the learner and the teaching is determined by, for example, feedback and actively passionate engagement. One of his core findings is that prior knowledge and basic cognitive skills are particularly crucial for predicting learning success, but that these are linked to other factors such as socio-economic status and student-related personality traits (motivation and self-concept).

He identified teaching and learning strategies and classroom climate as particularly effective factors. Hattie's study is so central because it refers to 815 meta-analyses, which in turn are based on 50,000 studies. And out of these 815, a large proportion (365 meta-analyses) relate to the field of teaching. In this respect, especially for cognitive orientation in the world, teacher action or the teacher's instructional design is essential (cf. Hattie & Yates, 2015).

Other studies also show that a positive school climate has a supportive and protective effect, especially if there is a good relationship with the teacher, whom the students perceive as interested in them and challenging them (Wild, Hofer & Pekrun, 2006). Above all, a school climate in which the cultural-religious diversity of the pupils is seen as an enrichment and not as a hindrance can contribute to resilience, because thus the individual pupil is given a feeling of importance, significance and recognition (Speck-Hamdan, 1999).

As far as social learning is concerned, which is covered by subjects close to this topic, such as German, political world studies, social studies, religious education, etc., its goals in the current ethno-cultural, religious heterogeneous school landscape could be described as follows: To perceive and acknowledge other religious traditions and their equal rights, but above all to recognise plurality in the other (such as within other religions etc.). This form of „education for (religious) tolerance" is important for the prevention of prejudice and the avoidance of stereotypes. And this seems to be important not only for inter-religious dialogue, but also for everyday social life. For example, apart from theological or religious questions, Islamic religious education in schools has the potential to reduce prejudices, and of course especially prejudices against Muslims, which is important not only for Muslims but also for the local population, too. After all, greater proximity and familiarity can mean that pupils/students do not become susceptible to generalising statements because they know different people from this circle (of Muslims).

Thus, in prevention research, it has also been recognised that not only behavioural prevention is important, but also relational prevention, i.e. in detail, the shaping of someone's socio-cultural environment, their social relationships with others (Marckmann, 2010).

School, it can be briefly summarised, plays a central role in personality development as well as in social and ethical-moral orien-

tation in the world. For this reason, we will try to provide brief answers to the following questions:

a. How can school promote the equal participation of all, but especially the integration of pupils with a history of immigration or migration and flight, and contribute to the recognition of lived diversity as normality?
b. How can schools keep the risks low for all children and act to prevent violence (both the prevention of physical violence, but also the prevention of verbal violence, for example by implementing programmes such as „Non-Violent Communication (NVC)", etc.)? At the same time, we can ask: How can it strengthen individual resilience of children and thus do justice to the idea of prevention of (conceivable) disorders/deficits?
c. How can schools promote or increase moral sensitivity and democratic competences of pupils?

a) Equal participation: Orientation for all

For more than ten years, educational policy has rightly called for the institution of school to recognise linguistic-cultural, ethnic and national plurality in education as a normality and to abandon the orientation towards a homogeneous student body in which heterogeneity functions as a deviation (cf. Krüger-Potratz, 2006). In view of the current demographic situation, where more than every third child in schools has a migration background, this demand is more than overdue.

Since 2015, the new version of the Orientation Framework for Sustainable Development in the Context of Education adopted by the Standing Conference of the Ministers of Education and Cultural Affairs of the Federal States (KMK) also stipulates a change of perspective and empathy as central competences for pupils/students in order to see themselves as „global citizens" (Standing Conference of the Ministers of Education and Cultural Affairs of the Federal States, 2016, p. 10).

How can this be achieved, initially in organisational terms? As an example, Claudia Schanz (2006) compiled the findings and steps in a model school in Hannover that tried to implement intercultural education in school development. She was able to identify the following processes:

- First, it takes individuals or a group to convince the teachers of the opportunities of a new departure in the school.
- It is important to involve an external consultant who accompanies the process in the long term.
- The development of a culture of dialogue and conflict within the staff is essential in order to reach an agreement on what constitutes a „good intercultural school".
- The implementation of intercultural education in the individual lesson contents is the next step.
- This process must be continuously supported by internal and external training.
- The school tries to systematically involve parents, especially parents with a migrant background.
- Opening the school internally (teaching content, other teaching methods, etc.) as well as opening it externally (dialogue with the community) complement or complete this process.

How can vulnerable groups in particular, such as migrant children, be better included and better supported in this opening? One of the possibilities is to explicitly address the strengths of the pupils, namely through self-affirming interventions, as documented in the study of the Expert Council of German Foundations for Integration and Migration (SVR), which bears the programmatic title: Vielfalt im Klassenzimmer [Diversity in the Classroom] (SVR, 2017).

But first a step back: What were the background assumptions and research findings of this study? Previous findings made it clear that teachers who had a low acceptance of cultural diversity in the classroom also had higher stress levels, which can subsequently lead to the risk of lower support, especially for students with a migration background (cf. Hachfeld et al., 2015). If teachers expect different performance from diverse immigrant groups in the classroom (i.e. assume that some are better performers and others are poorer performers), they unintentionally create so-called „self-fulfilling prophecies" because they then tend to allocate their attention and learning support selectively. For example, they call on these pupils less often or make their interaction with this pupil much shorter. The result is that certain groups, especially those from whom less performance is expected, are disadvantaged.

Conversely, it has also been shown that when students perceive that they belong to a negatively stereotyped group, they actually obtained bad results in test situations (Steele & Aronson, 1995; Owens & Massey, 2011). This is often described by the term „stereotype threat". Furthermore, a drop in school motivation was also observed (Sherman et al., 2013). In this respect, it is important to raise awareness of stereotype threat mechanisms in school and to discuss them in class, for example (Johns et al., 2005).

However, the positive message of the SVR study is: Already by means of small psychological interventions, sustainable improvements in learning motivation and school performance of disadvantaged pupils can be achieved and the „stereotype threat", the threat to identity by stereotypes, can be counteracted. These small „wise" interventions (cf. Walton, 2014) lead to a change in psychological attitudes that has an immense impact in interaction: One of these „wise" interventions are based on the self-affirmation theory (orig. Steele, 1988). This intervention was used, for example, in the SVR study of 2017 under the heading „Wider die Stereotypisierung. Bessere Schulleistung durch Selbstbestätigung" [Against stereotyping. Better school performance through self-affirmation] and the following became clear using the example of pupils of Turkish and Arab origin: When they dealt with things that were important to themselves, better school performance in a mathematics test was still noticeable both immediately after the intervention, but also relatively sustainably, about eight weeks later. Explicitly, the strengths and resources of the students were called up and awakened in this intervention. The fact that pupils are „vaccinated" with a positive conviction proves to be psychologically effective: They are made aware that they too can do something particularly well as well as gain some control over their own performance. These positive experiences, such as better school performance, but also praise from their teachers and parents can contribute to confirming and also stabilising their conviction that they can do something well (SVR, 2017).

In addition to these „wise" interventions, it is important to involve migrant youths more strongly in positions of responsibility in school contexts - regardless of their possibly lower linguistic competences. It is expected that they then identify more strongly with the task, which strengthens their inner ties to the school, but also that they thereby gain experiences of usefulness and self-efficacy (Uslucan, 2011a).

For pedagogical contexts in particular, it is important to consider the following: In view of the fact that young people with a migration background suffer from a higher number or more intensive risks, as is clear in many studies (cf. Uslucan, 2008, 2012), then even a completely „normal", inconspicuous way of life by them would initially have to appear as requiring explanation. Therefore, not only the particularly positive cases should be highlighted, but also the efforts „towards normality" of the „inconspicuous" should be honoured and recognised. After all, successful integration often happens „inconspicuously".

b) Violence prevention and resilience:

If one considers the functions of violence in the lives of young people, one cannot avoid the points of asserting interests, seeking recognition and experiencing self-efficacy. If schools fail to fulfil these basic needs and desires without violence, young people resort to violence (cf. Mayer, 2014). Especially when competition leads to the marginalisation of the lower achievers, who then lose the joy of learning, become victims of bullying and violence by others as a result, this frustration can also lead to aggression against oneself, but also to depressive moods and withdrawal.

Forms of violence prevention in school:

First of all, schools can generally have a violence-preventing effect by giving people the opportunity to participate, for example by encouraging participation in school committees, facilitating this, rewarding participants, etc. In addition to participation, opportunities for identification with the school are also important. In addition to participation, opportunities for identification with one's own school, class, etc. must be strengthened, for example through recognisable signs of belonging, be it in the form of a school emblem, recurring ritualised events in the school (sports tournaments, performances, musical events, etc.) (cf. also Mayer, 2010). It is known from research on violence and vandalism that, for example, destruction of school property is less frequent when students have positive relationships with their school, for example, when they are given more opportunities to shape their immediate environment (be it the classroom or the living space in an institution): Environments are less likely to be aggressively damaged if people have designed or helped to design them themselves, because they are more likely to develop a „commitment", i.e.

a sense of obligation (Klockhaus & Michel, 1988). In the light of this idea, it is then also important to immediately repair already existing damage in buildings and facilities, because pre-damaged environments offer even more incentives for vandalistic acts.

Finally yet importantly, violence-triggering aspects, which from the students' point of view are caused by unfair or non-transparent grading, should of course also be avoided. Teachers should make their reasons for the assessment of performances as transparent as possible, giving students the opportunity to influence it (example: Teachers giving short feedback after each lesson, be it in symbols +, - or 0, be it verbally). In this way, they can motivate students in the long run or justify it more transparently in case of unfavourable grading.

In particular, it is advisable for pupils with a migration background or with a recent refugee background, who tend to perform poorly at school, to take up the findings of educational psychology on reference norm orientation and not only measure their performance against a social reference norm - usually the German peer group in the class. For then they feel that despite their efforts they often do not achieve the required performance and are more inclined to resign. It is much more conducive to take their individual developmental steps and improvements into account and then to acknowledge them (Rheinberg, 2006). In this way, school is no longer perceived by them only as a place of experiences of failure, which they sometimes meet with violence out of a double speechlessness (low knowledge of German, low transparency of performance feedback).

Non-Violent Communication (NVC) according to Marshall Rosenberg (2013) is an exemplary and also well-evaluated project on how a better access to oneself and thereby also to relevant social partners can be acquired in school. The central components of NVC are: Observations, feelings, needs and requests. The background to the transfer of NVC to school is the principle that school is not exclusively about teaching learning content (qualification function of school), but also about teaching universal social values (integration function of school), i.e. values that are valid regardless of ethnicity, culture, religion/worldview, tradition, gender, economic/social background, etc. The main focus of the project is on the development of the social skills of the pupils. etc. The objective is

to work on inner attitudes, behaviour and thought patterns, focusing in particular on negative feelings and thoughts that hinder understanding and cooperation with others in everyday school life. Non-violent communication, for its part, is based on authenticity and respect towards oneself and others and aims to promote an empathetic attitude, especially among pupils. In relation to the context of school, this form of communication promotes self-confidence as well as trust in others and cultivates social needs for community and belonging. This is particularly relevant for schools that are strongly characterised by cultural and social diversity. It is conceivable to use projects like NVC with young people who are often involved in conflicts due to so-called „violations of honour", personal insults, etc.. This is because, among other things, NVC is also about recognising one's own tension in a concrete situation, the anger that arises, the trigger as well as the negative thoughts that follow and reinforce the anger, to judge in a more targeted way and finally to change these thoughts. If one wants to classify it psychologically, NVC follows a socio-psychological-ecological paradigm, which always explains or understands human action in the context of its environment and therefore includes the relevant environment of the students (family, school or teachers). The competences that form the personality and precede subject learning (especially social competences) are promoted more strongly. These include the promotion of attentiveness in dealing with each other as well as a more conscious use of language: The aim is, on the one hand, to avoid verbal injuries, but also to express oneself authentically. At the same time, the pupils' emotional language repertoire is expanded (How can I express my need without hurting the other person? Marco Jose gave a nice example of this: Instead of „Why don't you make it clear to him that...an empathic question back would be: „Do you feel sad because you wish you had more appreciation from him?"; Jose, 2016, p. 120). It is well documented that promoting mindfulness in dealing with oneself and others also indirectly increases the ability to concentrate (cf. Jose, 2016).

For the question of violence prevention, proven experiences and findings from social psychological attitude research can also be used: For example, it can make sense to have young people at school who have been noticed for violent acts actively promote non-violent coexistence (through lectures, homework, etc.), knowing full well that they may adhere to strongly chauvinistic or violence-accepting or -glorifying beliefs. As a result, these young

people are forced into a dissonance situation that is cognitively uncomfortable and tense, because they become aware of their hypocrisy when publicly reciting this content. In order to maintain self-esteem, as similar experimental findings in health behaviour show, adolescents are then more willing to actually implement the hypocritical behaviour later on (cf. Aronson et al., 2008).

Another effective measure (nonetheless unspecific to incidents of violence) is the social reduction of stereotypical portrayals of and discrimination against immigrants, and currently explicitly against Muslims. In everyday life, we often witness a devastating cycle of reporting and perception, which, for example, has a formative effect on the everyday practice of educators and teachers: A supposedly „factual" reporting, which, however, is based on anecdotal, selective individual observations (without a more precise description of their basis of observation, the situation, the sample composition, their initial hypotheses, etc.), which is then blown up by the mass media and leads practitioners to exactly the same form of perception of their clientele that this unreflected reporting generates (cf. Uslucan, 2011b). Not seeing through this latent racism can hardly be blamed on those working in the field: Even without the assumption of discriminatory attitudinal patterns, it has long been demonstrated in memory psychology that people are much more likely to remember and then recognise information that conforms to their presuppositions/hypotheses (cf. Tversky & Kahnemann, 1973). This finding, in turn, has been known in the school context since the early 1970s as the „Pygmalion Effect", i.e. the „shaping and construction" of the good/bad pupil on basis of teachers' expectations (Rosenthal & Jacobson, 1971).

Against this background, public communication and media coverage that not only highlights or registers differences, but also highlights the positive facets of (religious) minorities and presents them in a frame of reference that includes the majority as well as the minority, is a significant form of stereotype avoidance (cf. Sassenberg et al., 2007).

c) Strengthening democratic competences:

School is the exemplary place where democratic competences can be acquired, exercised, moderated and refined. Here, the insights and demands of John Dewey (1916) show that they have not lost

their relevance, even after more than 100 years: Dewey's basic intention was to involve pupils directly in the process of producing democratic values and structures and thus to constantly renew democracy „from below", as it were. In his sense, democracy cannot be reduced merely to political democracy, to a form of government, to a procedure of decision-making, etc., as is often observed in autocratically governed countries. Democracy through education and democracy in education (i.e. the active participation of the students in shaping the school, the classroom, the house rules, etc.) can be emphasised as core maxims. In this respect, it represents a form of living together in which common experiences are made and common values are shared. These considerations have been very actively developed and continued in educational research in recent decades by Wolfgang Edelstein (Edelstein et al., 2009).

Democracy education is also directly linked to moral development, which is a central theme of subjects such as German, political world studies, but also like religious education and practical philosophy, which will be discussed in some detail.

School can be the genuine place to start with central questions of morality, one of which could also be, for example: Why be moral at all? For the discussion of this question, it is a good idea to go through the whole spectrum of response behaviour in class, from complete amoralism and the rejection of morality to literal compliance with moral instructions.

An essential cognitive goal (for moral orientation in the world) should be that universal human goods such as friendship, love, recognition are inconceivable without a minimal form of reciprocity, consideration and compliance with rules: Just to be individually happy, a minimum of morality is necessary. So in order to be the person we want to be and to contour our identities, the minimal recognition and inclusion of the other person is always inescapable, no matter how much we reject the other. This creates the need to be responsive to the other person.

In the promotion of moral competences, moral judgement should be worked out by the individual himself; it cannot be taught directly, but at best indirectly. And for this, experiences in the social space and active mental processing of moral experiences and phenomena (weighing up arguments and checking facts oneself) are indispensable. Therefore, didactically, a proximity to experience is

indispensable when teaching moral aspects. While hypothetical conflicts/dilemmas (such as the famous "Heinz dilemma" in moral studies, where students are asked whether Heinz, the husband, is allowed to break into a pharmacy and commit theft - after unsuccessful attempts to round up the necessary money - if the medicine is needed to save his sick wife) can be discussed more easily, they are conducted without engagement. And vice versa: Conflicts in which the students themselves are involved, thereby also taking a certain personal risk, are more likely to stick and are usually still reworked in the memory (cf. Uslucan, 2014).

Especially when individual motives and reasons are given little consideration or are completely neglected and pupils simply have to adopt certain attitudes, such as honesty, these attitudes prove to be quite unstable, as psychological moral research has shown since its beginnings: For example, quite early in moral research it was found that attempts to teach children honesty as a value in a Sunday school, virtually as a sermon, had little effect and that these children cheated in later test situations just as much as other children without instruction or without a moral sermon (Hartshorne & May, 1928). Among other reasons, indoctrinative moral promotion is not advisable and timely because, on the one hand, it excludes the child's self-determination and, on the other hand, it places no trust in the child's rationality or his or her abilities to apply cognition and reason.

Another intervention (in school) for the promotion of moral orientation could be to discuss in the appropriate subject (German, social studies, religious education, etc.) the so-called naturalistic fallacy in moral psychology, namely the false conclusion from the factual situation (as it is) to the wanted situation (as it should be), which has now acquired a new explosiveness and urgency due to the culturally different composition of classes: Because there are certain values in society (such as competitive pressure, etc.), should pupils necessarily adopt them in order to survive in this society? Why should they not acquire other attitudes (such as cooperation)?

The central insight here should be: Values are not legitimate just because they are valid in a culture. It is therefore important to work out with pupils the difference between validity and legitimacy. This critical reflection on tradition and culture contains both morality-promoting and violence-preventing elements, e.g. in

dialogues in which students refer to their own culture/tradition in morally controversial positions. With regard to the difference between social validity and worthiness of validity, the common realisation would be: Not every tradition is worth keeping, as history sufficiently shows (such as violence in education, unequal treatment of men and women, unequal treatment of boys and girls, the caste system in India, slavery, etc.). This form of dialogue or critical reflection is particularly useful when teachers have basic knowledge of the cultural or religious backgrounds of their pupils, so that they do not fall prey to naïve assumptions on the part of the pupils.

Furthermore, with regard to teaching, an essential strategy for promoting morality is the induction of moral-cognitive conflicts, i.e. the staging of moral conflict situations and the discussion of the legal and moral positions involved in the respective conflict. The background to this approach is the Piagetian hypothesis that cognitive conflicts create an imbalance (both logical and emotional) and push towards a more stable equilibrium at a higher level (through reflective reorganisation). In this respect, such mental „disturbances" are fruitful developmental factors (Piaget, 1976). This discussion promotes moral judgement in children, which has long been a major finding in moral psychology (Blatt & Kohlberg, 1975).

As indicated above, the discussion of moral conflicts should revolve around „real-life" conflicts, so that young people also have the opportunity to identify with the events and the people involved and to show moral commitment out of concern. The problems under discussion should therefore potentially also be their own (for example, discrimination against social/ethnic/religious minorities, women, etc.).

Moral education, moral guidance can only succeed if the moral actions of the individual (both teachers and students etc.) are supported and stimulated. In this sense, it also presupposes (and at the same time creates) a morale-promoting school environment. For example, in schools where this kind of morality promotion is actively pursued (the so-called „just-community" approach according to Lawrence Kohlberg, 1996), this means that a participatory democracy is created in which every member of the school community has a voice, the teacher is - formally speaking - an equal among equals and her voice counts only by the force of the

rationality of her argument, but not by the force of her official authority. The idea of this „just community" implies creating a community in school that works out for itself the norms to which it obligatorily submits and acts as a model for the whole of society. Democracy in and democracy through the school, as already formulated by John Dewey, marks the objective of an education for a moral personality.

II. What role does prevention play in the school?

When dealing with prevention, it is first necessary to free oneself from an economically truncated view according to which prevention always saves money or prevention is cheaper than cure. This is not always true, as Suhrcke has already shown very well in 2010: The actual criterion of prevention is not cost savings, but cost effectiveness; i.e. what is the ratio of the resources used to the actual outcome? With regard to school, the question would be how many resources does school have to use to suppress which behaviour or which event? For example, it is known from health research that not every prevention suppresses (potential or future) suffering; possibly, it would not occur in the first place in this group of people and thus a „treatment" with the preventive measure would have been unnecessary (cf. Suhrcke, 2010). With regard to violence prevention at school, it can be said that the effects of measures that are supposed to counteract the development of an undesirable personality trait such as aggression or antisocial personality are difficult to prove, because it is not the normal case that such traits always develop. The vast majority of young people grow up without antisocial tendencies, regardless of prevention measures. In this respect, it is only logical that prevention measures that, for example, promote specific competencies, must also prove that these developments are not natural changes, but can be specifically attributed to increases in competencies due to intervention. Last but not least, it should also be recognisable that the behaviours learned in the programme allow for a transfer or are actually transferred. To be concrete: This means that they are used in everyday life, for example, if a pupil showed a reduction in violence during the programme, this can also be found later in his/her everyday life and was not only limited to the specific training situation (at school).

In order to assess the potential effectiveness of interventions, it is therefore necessary to specify the target group precisely and in advance. In this respect, universal approaches (i.e. those that, for example, randomly focus on all pupils, adolescents, all children or all migrant youth, etc.) are less effective than selective approaches targeting those groups that have a high probability of developing the undesired behaviour. As an example, the study by Beelmann and Lösel (2006) can be cited here, which was able to determine an effect strength of only d = 0.08 for an unselected group (universal prevention) with social training programmes, but already showed mean effect strengths around d = .52 for indicated prevention programmes. Against this background, the authors state that the average effectiveness of the measures is often rather small to medium effects, so that no great expectations should be placed on prevention programmes.

The results of evidence of effectiveness - whether positive or negative - should be documented in such a way that they answer the question of why something worked or why something else did not work here in this constellation, and what undesirable effects occur. Eventually - in the light of these findings - action that is more effective can be taken in the future and new programmes do not always have to be launched.

Nevertheless: As mentioned above, prevention should not only be understood as saving costs (e.g. in the health sector as saving the costs of follow-up treatments etc.), but with prevention the individual's own responsibility should be strengthened at the same time; autonomy should be supported. Ultimately, a good prevention strategy is not only oriented towards effectively combating the occurrence of „evil" or avoiding its emergence, but rather towards organising learning processes on how individuals and institutions can avoid „evil" or learn to deal with „evil", which also applies to schools.

When does prevention work?

In a famous meta-analysis, Tobler (1997) investigated the effectiveness of prevention projects, in this case drug prevention, and divided the projects investigated into two categories (knowledge-providing, classical educational programmes vs. interactive, involving programmes) and convincingly showed that the effec-

tiveness of interactive programmes was significantly higher than of programmes providing knowledge. Other similar studies have also found that, for example, prejudices and stereotypes are not changed simply by confronting people with more objective facts, but rather when people have the opportunity to discover the facts themselves. This principle, the strong involvement of the student body and independent discovery, is also promising in respect to school-based prevention measures. Only externally imposed instructions, even though they are conveyed through external rewards (e.g. whoever participates in the programme gets advantages at school), tend to have negative effects on intrinsic motivation (on action based on convictions), if they are used as a specific form of control; i.e. if, for example, rewards/gratifications are withdrawn again on a case-by-case basis (e.g. if the pupil no longer participates in the programme/measure). The reason for this is that the self-determination or the experience of autonomy of the person is then restricted. As a result, the individual's willingness to carry out this activity solely for the sake of its intrinsic quality (for example, that non-violent communication is also personally satisfying) often decreases. Only individuals who identify strongly with the task can develop resistance to this subversion of their beliefs.

In general, programmes, interventions as well as preventive measures that are committed to youth development or the psychological empowerment of young people should be guided by the so-called „five c": "competence, confidence, connection, character and caring" (Lerner et al., 2005). These also indirectly inhibit violence and suppress antisocial behaviour. Against this background, competences should be strengthened, confidence should be created, social connections and networks should be established, young people's character should be strengthened and they should be given a feeling of caring. This caring should result in a kind of establishment of „caring relationships", both that young people are cared for and that young people care for others, such as younger pupils, the school garden, etc.

Early interventions seem to be more successful when they are linked to the family or to family values and the realisation of these values in everyday routines, i.e. when they also take certain cultural factors into account. In the case of migrant families, this means that intervention measures/training programmes

must be able to connect to their everyday beliefs if they are to bring about real changes in the children and families concerned (cf. Guralnick, 2008).

Ambivalences, tensions and possibilities of prevention measures in schools:

It is obvious that prevention measures should primarily start where the risks arise. However, if we look at a specific group, such as young people with a migrant background, it becomes clear that risky life constellations are of a more diverse nature among them and that school can only exert limited influence on them. For example: These can be social risks, such as social inacceptance and discrimination, which increase the stress level and vulnerability, but can also be associated with family and biographical risks (lower educational capital and poorer career prospects).

On the one hand, prevention research proves that universal approaches (e.g. those that indiscriminately target all young people or all pupils etc.) are usually less effective than selective approaches, which often target those groups that have a high probability of developing the undesired behaviour. On the other hand, in the school context, a „treatment" only with a certain (ethnic/religious) group would lead to a further stigmatisation of this group, for example, if targeted or selective prevention work or campaigns (anti-radicalisation projects) were launched only addressing Muslims, which could subsequently inhibit cooperation. This is because they suggest right from the start that these people are in need of special „treatment" and follow a logic of suspicion (cf. Schau, Jakob & Milbrandt, 2020). The „de-radicalisation expert" Michael Kiefer therefore gets to the point when he writes: "If young people are explicitly addressed as Muslims and thus as potential problem carriers, it is not uncommon to observe attitudes of refusal. Due to this fact, many projects often do not reach their target group or only to a limited extent" (Kiefer, 2014, p. 128).

This tension between selective and non-discriminatory measures cannot be completely resolved: On the one hand, there is convincing evidence that intervention programmes are more likely to succeed if they are implemented in such a way that risky (or at-risk) and non-risky young people, i.e. a ‚mix' of ‚antisocial' and ‚pro-social' young people are together in one group, i.e. not just a

‚treatment' of ‚at-risk', as was evident in a study by Dishion, McCord and Poulin (1999): It was found that in certain constellations, interventions even increased violence, especially among „high-risk youths", meaning young people with a high risk potential. The authors attributed this effect to negative boosters deriving from peers: In this study, the peer influence was about nine times stronger than, for example, the influence exerted by adults/ trainers/teachers and mentors. Therefore, it can be concluded that intervention measures in which only young people with a history of violence and family history (e.g. in juvenile prison, etc.) are included are psychologically counter-productive because they hardly give the affected persons the opportunity to learn pro-social behaviour, but rather encourage the consolidation of previous behaviour characterised by violence. This „mixture" can be usefully implemented in schools, for example. At the same time, this underlines why „treatments" in ethnically or religiously (only Muslims) homogeneous groups are rather questionable: In these constellations, it is more likely that solidarisation effects (as „foreigners", as „Muslims", as „Turks" or generally as a stigmatised group) will occur and strong reactance/rejection against trainers, mentors and the changes associated with the measure will develop.

In addition, it is generally necessary to point out a premature, false, reflexive religionisation of the phenomenon of violence; and not only with regard to the school. This is both a task of the school, but at the same time also a task of Muslim representatives/ organisation as well as a task of a sensitive, non-discriminating public and media professionals. In school contexts, in lessons, it should be insisted, for example, that when young Muslims think they have to react aggressively because their religion, their tradition, their culture is being violated, that not only the preservation of cultural or religious traditions is a high good, a high value, but also openness to new ways of life and cultures and religions; and at the same time that these cultures and religions are not something static, but are always changing and have also changed. Islamic religious education in schools can also make an enormously valuable contribution to this.

It is a truism to point out that there is no such thing as „the migrant family, etc." because the heterogeneity both within immigrants and within a single immigrant group, such as the population of Turkish origin, is greater than in many cases in the „native"

population. In many cases, ascriptions by others and self-ascriptions do not coincide; for example, when young people with a migrant background are perceived by Germans as Turks, but they themselves see themselves as Kurds from an internal perspective. It is also important to pay more attention to the methodological problem of mixing ethnic affiliation and social class: Often, class affiliation (e.g. lower class) and ethnicity overlap; phenomena that could possibly only be understood against the background of different social affiliations are unreflectively ethnicised or culturalised in school contexts. In the context of reflexive migration research, it is therefore necessary to be sensitive to the fact that a school focus that is predominantly oriented towards deficits in the lives of immigrants and media reporting (family violence, youth violence, patriarchal relationships, forced marriages, educational failures, etc.) increases the danger of further stigmatisation and discrimination of these groups (Uslucan, 2020).

Therefore, for social pedagogical, but also for preventive as well as interventive/therapeutic work, it has proven useful to take a closer look here and, following the intersectionality analysis (Leiprecht & Lutz, 2006), to take into account the subjectively always unique starting point of action. In concrete terms, this means in action to examine the simultaneous influence of gender, ethnicity, class, nationality, sexual orientation etc. in order not to expose oneself to false homogenisation. Therefore, interpretations (and interventions based on this interpretation) that derive all of a person's actions only from their social class, gender, culture, religion, etc. seem too short-sighted. For the recent popularity in the media of justifying everyday actions of the other, or the „foreigner", with reference to his/her culture is not only an extremely conservative argument, because it denies the very fact of the processuality, the coming into being and the changeability of culture, but it also assumes that people always act in conformity with culture in their attitudes and actions, thus denying the subject his/her resistance to cultural designs. The implication of this „culturalising" idea is that individuals are puppets of their culture and cannot act differently than their cultural imprint allows (for criticism to this puppet model, see Leiprecht, 2004). It is thus misunderstood that, for example, people call themselves „Turks" or „Muslims" and feel that they belong to this ethnic or religious community without, for example, observing the specific religious commandments in everyday life. In everyday contexts, an individual's actions are not only

carried out from the perspective of his or her culture or religion, as is often assumed of Muslims in the debates of recent years. If this were the case, the person would then have to legitimise all his or her actions culturally/religiously; for example, his or her financial transactions, his or her fashion and musical tastes, his or her sporting, culinary preferences, etc. This would mean that the individual's actions would have to be legitimised culturally/religiously. In this respect, it is a self-deception to be able to account for all areas of life from only one perspective, which Amartya Sen has very nicely described as an „illusion of singular identity" (2007, p. 79). No aspect of our identity (neither religious nor, for example, cultural) can be considered the sole or primary category of our belonging: As human beings, we always have plural identities, even if not all aspects of identity were a free choice. But focusing on only one, such as ethnic, cultural or religious identity, both in school and non-school contexts, disregards an essential insight of human socialisation and living conditions and marks a gross insensitivity.

III. Literature:

Aronson, E., Wilson, T. D. & Akert, R. M. (2008). Sozialpsychologie. Pearson, München.

Baumert, J. (2002). Deutschland im internationalen Bildungsvergleich. In N. Kilius, J. Kluge & L. Reisch (Hrsg.), Die Zukunft der Bildung (S. 100–150). Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.

Beelmann, A. & Lösel, F (2006). Wirksamkeit von Interventionen zur Prävention von Aggression, Gewalt, Delinquenz und Kriminalität. Eine kritische Wirksamkeitsbilanz. Zeitschrift für Politische Psychologie, 14, 313-330.

Blatt, M. & Kohlberg, L. (1975). The effects of classroom moral discussion upon children`s level of moral judgement. Journal of moral education, 4, 129-161.

Dewey, J. (1916/1985): Democracy and Education. In: The Middle Works 1899- 1924, Vol 9, Carbondale and Edwardsville (Southern Illinois University Press).

Dishion, T. J., McCord, J. & Poulin, F. (1999). When interventions harm: Peer groups and problem behavior. American Psychologist, 54, 755-764.

Edelstein, W., Frank, S. & Sliwka, A. (2009). Praxisbuch Demokratiepädagogik. Sechs Bausteine für Unterrichtsgestaltung und Schulalltag. Weinheim: Beltz

Fend, H. (1981). Leistungsvergleich zwischen Gesamtschule und Schulen des traditionellen Schulsystems. Wissenschaftliche Bestandsaufnahme der Arbeit der Niedersächsischen Gesamtschulen. Eine Information des Niedersächsischen Kultusministers.

Fend, H. (1994). Die Entdeckung des Selbst und die Verarbeitung der Pubertät. Entwicklungspsychologie der Adoleszenz in der Moderne, Bd. III. Bern: Huber.

Fuhrer, U. & Laser, S. (1997). Wie Jugendliche sich über ihre soziale und materielle Umwelt definieren: Eine Analyse von Selbst-Fotografien. Zeitschrift für Entwicklungspsychologie und Pädagogische Psychologie, 29, 183-196.

Guralnick, M. J. (2008). International perspectives on early intervention: A search for common ground. Journal of Early Intervention, 30 (2), 90-101.

Hachfeld, A., Hahn, A., Schroeder, S., Anders, Y., & Kunter, M. (2015). Should teachers be colorblind? How multicultural and egalitarian beliefs differentially relate to aspects of teachers' professional competence for teaching in diverse classrooms. Teaching and Teacher Education, 48, 44-55.

Hänze, M. & Lantermann, E.-D. (1999). Familiäre, soziale und materielle Ressourcen bei Aussiedlern. In R. K. Silbereisen, E.-D. Lantermann & E. Schmitt-Rodermund (Hrsg.), Aussiedler in Deutschland: Akkulturation von Persönlichkeit und Verhalten (S. 143-161.). Opladen: Leske + Budrich.

Hartshorne, H. & May, M. A. (1928). Studies in the Nature of Character. Vol. 1, Studies in deceit. New York: MacMillan.

Hattie, J. (2008). Visible Learning: A Synthesis of Over 800 Meta-Analyses Relating to Achievement.

Hattie, J. & Yates, G. C. R. (2015). Lernen sichtbar machen. Schneider Verlag Hohengehren.

Johns, M., Inzlicht, M., & Schmader, T. (2008). Stereotype threat and executive resource depletion: examining the influence of emotion regulation. Journal of Experimental Psychology: General, 137(4), 691-705.

Jose, M. (2016). Positive Psychologie und Achtsamkeit im Schul-
    alltag. Wiesbaden: Springer.

Kiefer, M. (2014). Dialog als Methode der Radikalisierungsprä-
    vention. In W. El-Gayar, & K. Strunk (Hrsg.), Integration ver-
    sus Salafismus. Integrationsfindung muslimischer Jugend-
    licher in Deutschland. Analysen – Methoden der Prävention
    – Praxisbeispiele (S. 125-138). Schwalbach: Wochenschau
    Verlag.

Klockhaus, R, Trapp-Michel, A. (1988). Vandalistisches Verhalten
    Jugendlicher. Göttingen: Hogrefe.

Kohlberg, L. (1996). Die Psychologie der Moralentwicklung.
    Frankfurt: Suhrkamp.

Krüger-Potratz, M. (2006). Migration als Herausforderung für
    Bildungspolitik. In R. Leiprecht & A. Kerber (Hrsg.), Schule
    in der Einwanderungsgesellschaft (S. 456-82). Schwalbach/
    Ts.: Wochenschau Verlag.

Kultusministerkonferenz der Länder (2016). Orientierungsrahmen
    für den Lernbereich Globale Entwicklung im Rahmen einer
    Bildung für nachhaltige Entwicklung. 2. aktualisierte und
    erweiterte Auflage. Berlin.

Leiprecht, R. & Lutz, H. (2006). Intersektionalität im Klassenzim-
    mer: Ethnizität, Klasse und Geschlecht. In R. Leiprecht & A.
    Kerber (Hrsg.), Schule in der Einwanderungsgesellschaft (S.
    218-234). Schwalbach/Ts.: Wochenschau Verlag.

Leiprecht, R. (2004). Kultur - Was ist das eigentlich? Arbeits-
    papiere des Interdisziplinären Zentrums für Bildung und
    Kommunikation in Migrationsprozessen (IBKM). Nr. 7.

Lerner, R. M., Almerigi, J. B., Theokas, Ch. & Lerner, J. (2005).
    Positive Youth Development. A View of the Issues. Journal
    of Early Adolescence, 25, 10-16.

Marcia, J. E. (1983). Some directions for the investigation of ego
    development in early adolescence. The Journal of Early
    Adolescence, 3 (3), 215–223.

Marckmann G. (2010). Prävention aus ethischer Perspektive. In
    Bundeszentrale für gesundheitliche Aufklärung (BZgA)
    (Hg.), Prävention im Fokus unterschiedlicher Perspektiven
    (S. 53-68). Köln: BZgA.

Mayer, G. (2014). Was brauchen Kinder, damit sie nicht Gewalt
    brauchen. Zu den Bedingungen der Entstehung von Ge-
    walt. In E. Marks & W. Steffen (Hg.), Mehr Prävention-weni-
    ger Opfer. Ausgewählte Beiträge des 18. Deutschen Präven-
    tionstages 2013 (S. 209-227). Godesberg: Forum Verlag.

Owens, J. & Massey, D. S. (2011). Stereotype threat and college academic performance: A latent variables approach. Social Science Research 40 (1), 150–166.

Piaget, J. (1976). Die Äquilibration der kognitiven Strukturen. Stuttgart: Klett.

Rheinberg, F. (2006). Motivation. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.

Rosenberg, M. (2013). Gewaltfreie Kommunikation. Eine Sprache des Lebens. Junfermann Verlag, Paderborn.

Rosenthal, R. & Jacobson, L. (1971). Pygmalion im Unterricht. Weinheim: Beltz.

Sachverständigenrat deutscher Stiftungen für Integration und Migration (SVR)(2017). Vielfalt im Klassenzimmer. Wie Lehrkräfte gute Leistung fördern können. Berlin.

Sassenberg, K., Fehr, J., Hansen, N., Matschke, C., & Woltin, K.-A. (2007). Eine sozialpsychologische Analyse zur Reduzierung von sozialer Diskriminierung von Menschen mit Migrationshintergrund. Zeitschrift für Sozialpsychologie, 38, 239-249.

Schanz, C. (2005). Visionen brauchen Wege - Die interkulturelle Öffnung der Schule. In R. Leiprecht & A. Kerber (Hg.), Schule in der Einwanderungsgesellschaft (S. 110-125). Schwalbach im Taunus: Wochenschau-Verlag.

Schau, K., Jakob, M. & Milbradt, B. (2020). (Präventive) Arbeit mit heterogenen Zielgruppen. In S. Hößl, L. Jamal & F. Schellenberg (Hg.): Politische Bildung im Kontext von Islam und Islamismus (S. 224-245). Bonn: Bundeszentrale für politische Bildung.

Sen, A. (2007). Die Identitätsfalle. Warum es keinen Krieg der Kulturen gibt. Beck: München.

Sherman, D. K. (2013). Self-affirmation: Understanding the effects. Social and Personality Psychology Compass, 7(11), 834-845.

Speck-Hamdan, A. (1999). Risiko und Resilienz im Leben von Kindern aus ausländischen Familien. In G. Opp, M. Fingerle & A. Freytag (Hrsg.), Was Kinder stärkt - Erziehung zwischen Risiko und Resilienz (S. 221-228). München: Reinhardt.

Steele, C. M. (1988). The psychology of self-affirmation: Sustaining the integrity of the self. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), Advances in experimental social psychology (pp. 261 – 302). New York: Academic Press.

Steele, C. M., & Aronson, J.M. (1995). Stereotype threat and the intellectual test performance of African-Americans. Journal

of Personality and Social Psychology. Vol. 69, 797-811.

Suhrcke, M. (2010). Prävention aus ökonomischer Perspektive. In Bundeszentrale für gesundheitliche Aufklärung (BZgA) (Hg.), Prävention im Fokus unterschiedlicher Perspektiven (S. 38-52). Köln: BZgA.

Tobler, N. (1997). Meta analysis of adolescent drug prevention programs: results of the 1993 meta analysis. In Bukoski, W. (ed.), Meta-analysis of Drug Abuse Prevention Programs. NIDA, Bethesda, MD, pp. 5–68.

Tversky, A. & Kahneman, D. (1973). Availability: A heuristic for judging frequency and probability. Cognitive Psychology, 42, 207-232.

Uslucan, H.- H. (2008). Gewaltbelastungen von Jugendlichen mit Migrationshintergrund In H. Scheithauer, T. Hayer & K. Niebank (Hrsg.), Problemverhalten und Gewalt im Jugendalter (S. 289-301). Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.

Uslucan, H.- H. (2011a).: Resilienzpotenziale bei Jugendlichen mit Migrationshintergrund. In M. Zander (Hg.), Handbuch Resilienzförderung. Wiesbaden: VS-Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften, S. 555-574.

Uslucan, H.- H. (2011b). Vorurteile, Stereotype und Diskriminierungen als Integrationsbarrieren. Friedrich-Ebert Stiftung WISO Diskurs (Hg.), Integrationspolitik in Nordrhein-Westfalen, 13-22.

Uslucan, H.-H. (2012). Kriminogene Entwicklungsrisiken von Jugendlichen mit Zuwanderungsgeschichte und Möglichkeiten der Prävention und Intervention. Forensische Psychiatrie, Psychologie, Kriminologie, 6 (2), 102-110.

Uslucan, H.-H. (2014). Jung, amoralisch und konfus? Fragen der Moral und Identität junger Heranwachsender mit und ohne Zuwanderungsgeschichte. In W. El-Gayar & K. Strunk (Hrsg.), Integration versus Salafismus. Identitätsfindung muslimischer Jugendlicher in Deutschland (S. 11-19). Schwalbach/Ts.: Wochenschau Verlag.

Uslucan, H.-H. (2020). Gewaltfördernde oder friedfertige Religion? Religiosität und Jugendgewalt. In Halbhuber-Gassner, L. & Kappenberg, B. (Hrg.), Wege aus der Radikalisierung. Eine Herausforderung auch für die Straffälligenhilfe (S. 25-40). Lambertus Verlag: Freiburg im Breisgau.

Walton, G. M. (2014). The new science of wise psychological interventions. Current Directions in Psychological Science, 23 (1), 73-82.

Wild, E., Hofer, M. & Pekrun, R. (2006). Psychologie des Lerners. In A. Krapp & B. Weidenmann (Hrsg.), Pädagogische Psychologie (S. 203-267). Beltz: Weinheim.

Content

II. Lectures and Documents from the 14th Annual International Forum