

PROJECT NUMBER: 580362-EPP-1-2016-1-IT-EPPKA3-IPI-SOC-IN

ACCORD KA3 – Multilateral Project

KEY ACTION 3: INITIATIVES FOR POLICY INNOVATION – SOCIAL INCLUSION THROUGH
EDUCATION, TRAINING AND YOUTH

Attain Cultural integration through Conflict Resolution skill Development

Erasmus + 2016

D5.1 Report on interethnic conflicts in educational contexts

Project start date: 31/12/2016
months

Duration: 36

Work Package: WP5 – Quality Assurance

Leading Partner: University of Antwerp (UANT)

"The European Commission support for the production of this publication does not constitute an endorsement of the contents which reflects the views only of the authors, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein."

Nature	Name	Role	Partner	Date
DRAFT	Michiel Lippens, Lore Van Praag, Christiane Timmerman	P WPL	UANT	13.07.2017
FINAL	Davide Marocco	CO	UNINA	16.07.2017

Content

Introduction	4
The ACCORD project	4
About this document	5
1. State of the art: ethnic inequality and ethnic discrimination in European educational systems	6
1.1. Migration in Europe	6
1.2. Integration and education	8
1.3. Ethnic inequality in European educational systems	9
1.3.1. Individual- and family related factors	11
1.3.2. School- and educational system related factors	13
1.3. Interethnic conflicts and ethnic discrimination in the educational context	16
1.3.1. Situating and defining the concepts	16
1.3.2. Prevalence	19
1.3.3. Consequences	20
1.3.4. Interethnic conflicts in the classroom: problem statement	20
2. Methodology	22
2.1. School ethnography	23
2.1.1. Research scope	23
2.1.2. Selection research units and gaining access to the field	23
2.1.3. The field work	25
2.1.4. Data analysis	26
2.2. National focus group discussions	27
2.2.1. Research scope	27
2.2.2. Organization, target group and structure	27
2.2.3. Data analysis	28
3. Results and discussion	30

3.1. Ethnographic Research: types of interethnic conflicts.....	30
3.1.1. Typology of ethnic discrimination in a classroom setting	30
3.1.2. The ACCORD Interethnic conflict scenarios.....	39
3.2. National focus group discussions: perceptions about interethnic conflicts	42
3.2.1. Perceptions about the ACCORD interethnic conflict scenarios.....	42
3.2.2. Self-made interethnic conflict scenarios	46
4. Conclusion.....	49
References	52
Annexes.....	66
Annex 1: information sheet for participants in ethnographic research.....	66
Annex 2: informed consent teachers and pupils in ethnographic research	68
Annex 3: informed consent parents of pupils in ethnographic research.....	69
Annex 4: information sheet on socio-economic and ethnic/racial background of pupils in ethnographic research.....	71
Annex 5: example field notes ethnographic research.....	74
Annex 6: tips organizing a focus group discussion	77
Annex 7: example workshop/focus group report	79

Introduction

Over the last decades, Europe is undergoing massive demographic and cultural changes featured by diverse migration flows. Most European societies have become immigrant receiving countries, and the proportion of young people with different ethnic backgrounds increases. In this context, education plays a central role to prevent and combat social exclusion and overall discrimination, as well as to foster mutual understanding and respect societal values (European Commission, 2015; Stevens & Dworkin, 2014).

The ACCORD project

The ACCORD project (Erasmus Plus EU Programme, “Social Education through Education, Training and Youth”) aims to prepare teachers to take an active stand against all forms of ethnic discrimination and racism, to deal with ethnic diversity and handle conflicts that might emerge. Through a free, open online training course built on game-based learning (GBL) and scenario-based learning methodologies, secondary school teachers from all over Europe will develop their competences in terms of intercultural literacy, inclusive education and conflict management. Consequently, teachers will be able to acquaint their pupils with the necessary competences for living in a ‘superdiverse’ society, as well as creating a safe, caring and constructive community (Wilkerson, 2013).

The main objectives of ACCORD can be described as follows:

- to exploit, upscale and disseminate the results of already existing digital tools and psycho-pedagogical practices, in order to produce and test an easily accessible and flexible e-learning platform and training system that could facilitate the enhancement of conflict resolution skills development at a low cost;
- to overcome both geographical and resource obstacles that often hinder the access to professional training and assessment schemes in intercultural communication and conflict resolution by using digital practices, especially within the education sector;
- to promote and evaluate the acceptance of Serious Games and GBL approaches in teacher education, in order to derive observations and best practices from comparative analysis in various EU Countries;
- to adapt, upscale, and generalize through the implementation and analysis of extensive testing the positive results obtained by the project *ENACT: Enhancing Negotiation skills through on-line Assessment of Competencies and interactive mobile Training* (A project funded by EACEA under the Lifelong Learning Programme - Key Activity 3) in integration with *EMMA, the European Multiple MOOC Aggregator* (a project funded by the European Union's Competitiveness and Innovation Framework Programme).

The ACCORD project is applied by seven core partners in five European Union countries, i.e., Italy (University of Naples Federico II and Fondazione Mondo Digitale), Spain (University of Barcelona), Austria (University of Vienna), Germany (University of Erlangen-Nuremberg) and Belgium (University of Antwerp).

This report is designed to provide more in-depth knowledge about the different types of interethnic conflicts that occur in a school context and to contextualize the developed tools. In doing so, we aim to define the impact of the migration-integration nexus on the educational systems within Europe, and more specifically, frame the occurrences of interethnic conflicts in broader ethnic educational inequalities. The analyses of the interethnic conflicts in a classroom and school context will be used as a starting point to construct the interethnic conflict scenarios in the ACCORD E-tool, and also help to contextualize these scenarios for future users. To meet this goal, field work was conducted in secondary schools in Flanders (northern part of Belgium). Through this field work, we were able to identify already some different types of interethnic conflicts that occur in everyday educational practices, and use the input coming from these ethnographic fieldwork to design the scenarios used in the tool. Furthermore, national focus group discussions were organized in all European countries involved in the ACCORD project. The aim of these national focus group discussions was to gather the perspectives, meanings and reactions of teachers and other school personnel related to the constructed ACCORD interethnic conflict scenarios in a classroom context, and possibly adjust these scenarios to make them fit in all European countries.

About this document

The present deliverable reports the findings of the fieldwork and the focus groups, executed by the University of Antwerp. The report starts off with section 1, which offers a brief description about the migration flows in the European Union, a discussion of the concept of 'integration', the role of education within integration processes and the current observed ethnic inequalities in European educational systems. Subsequently, the possible role of ethnic discrimination (and interethnic conflicts) in sustaining or strengthening ethnic inequalities within European educational systems will be discussed and situated within the literature. Section 2 describes the research setting, and data collection methods employed (i.e., ethnographic field work and focus groups) during the field work, followed by section 3 in which the results of the ethnographic field work and the national focus group discussions are presented. Finally, section 4 sums up the main conclusions.

1. State of the art: ethnic inequality and ethnic discrimination in European educational systems

1.1. Migration in Europe

During the last decades, Europe has become a multicultural patchwork with millions of new immigrants (Zick, Pettigrew & Wagner, 2008). As a result of, past and current, migration flows, European member states are becoming more and more ethnically diverse (Van den Eede, Wets & Levrau, 2008). Even though his report will focus on 'ethnic discrimination' situated in teacher-pupils interactions, it is crucial to shed some light on the migrations flows within the European Union. Understanding interethnic conflicts in the educational systems of a host society, requires a fuller appreciation of some key characteristics about migration flows in Europe. Consequently, this could also result in a better understanding of 'immigrant populations' and the conflicts they encounter in the immigrant societies (Alba & Foner, 2015). Both immigrant populations encounter their own sensitivities and receive distinct reactions from the majority groups in the immigration countries (Eriksen, 2015). Before setting out the prevailing research, two crucial remarks about these migration flows in Europe need to be made. In a first part, we will briefly set out the different sizes and ethnic compositions of the different European nation states, with a clear emphasis on the ACCORD project countries (i.e., Austria, Belgium, Germany, Italy and Spain). The second part will discuss the reasoning behind the labeling of the current migration flows and immigrant population within Europe as 'superdiverse' (Vertovec, 2007).

Since 1990, all European countries, apart from Lithuania, Poland, Romania, and Iceland, have experienced more immigration than emigration (Migrant Integration Policy Index, 2015; Penninx, 2006; Zick, Pettigrew & Wagner, 2008). This led to a rise of ethnic, religious, and racial diversity in most European societies (Alba & Foner, 2015). Despite the rise of overall immigration in Europe, it is important to be fully aware that migration and settlement patterns of immigrants are unevenly divided over the European member states, both in time and space. This uneven distribution is also found in the ACCORD project countries, even though all five countries are characterized by a migration of mainly low-educated immigrants (Migrant Integration Policy Index, 2015). Yet Austria, Belgium and Germany should be labeled as (relatively) 'long-standing destination countries', while Italy and Spain should be labeled as 'new destination countries', in an European context (OECD, 2016). The main difference is that long-standing destination countries know a longer history of migration dating back to the inflow of 'guest workers' after the Second World War, while the new destination countries transformed from emigration to immigration countries approximately 25 years ago (Azzolini, Schnell, & Palmer, 2012; Migrant Policy Index, 2015; Penninx, 2006; OECD, 2016). Before the 90s, Spain and Italy were sending countries of the guest workers to Northern European Countries, like Austria, Belgium, and Germany (Azzolini, Schnell, & Palmer, 2012). These

historical differences are visibly reflected in the size and composition of the immigrant pupil population in the five countries. Austria, Belgium, and Germany, on the one hand, have many second- and third- generation immigrant pupils, and relatively fewer numbers of newly arrived immigrants (OECD, 2016). On the other hand, the immigrant pupil population in Italy and Spain mainly consists of first generation pupils, while the number of second generation pupils is still quite small in size (Azzolini, Schnell, & Palmer, 2012; Bernardi, Garrido, & Miyar, 2011; OECD, 2016).

While past migration flows in Europe were characterized by a large inflow of people from a small number of origin countries (e.g., Turkey), current migration flows exist of smaller immigrant groups from a large number of origin countries (Engbersen, 2018). This mainly due to the 'refugee crisis' and the accession of ten East-European countries to EU membership in the past 15 years (Alba & Foner, 2015). These migrations flows have changed drastically throughout time, as well as the variations between and within immigrant groups (Eriksen, 2015). These changes led academics to label the current migration flows and immigrant population within Europe as 'superdiverse' (Vertovec, 2007; Engbersen, 2018). This 'superdiversity' explicitly recognizes that the current European immigrant population has a large diversity of profiles, social backgrounds, human capital and goals/aspirations (e.g., variations in duration of stay and socio-economic profiles) (Vertovec, 2007; Engbersen, 2018). The notion of 'superdiversity' succeeds in breaking the commonly used dichotomous lens between 'the non-immigrant population' on the hand, and the 'immigrant population' on the other hand. Simply put, the immigrant populations cannot be regarded as a homogenous group in terms of region of origin, socio-economic status, educational attainment and migration motivation. The current immigrant population consists of, for example, expatriates working for multinational companies and international organizations, refugees and asylum seekers from African and Asian countries, and students from all over the world. In urban areas, classrooms containing pupils with ten to fifteen different nationalities are nowadays more often the norm than the exception (Crul, 2016). However, within each of the European member states, the increasing migration flows have also been paralleled by expressions of hostility towards migrant groups that started to settle in the European host societies (Bovenkerk, Miles & Verbunt, 1990; Zick, Pettigrew & Wagner, 2008). These expressions of hostility comprise, among other things, ethnic stereotyping, prejudices, individual and structural ethnic discrimination towards ethnic minority group members, resulting in many structural disadvantages as well as interethnic conflicts in a wide array of contexts. The overarching question of the whole ACCORD project is exactly looking for ways to deal with, and prevent ethnic stereotyping, prejudicing and discriminatory practices in an educational context as a way to enhance integration processes of immigrants in all their respective host societies.

1.2. Integration and education

The integration of immigrants in institutions in the host society became a hot topic in politics and public debates within Europe and its member states since the 1990s (Eriksen, 2015). Despite the widespread use of the concept ‘integration’, it remains unclear what this concept of ‘integration’ actually means. In Europe, it is a frequently used but rather vague notion that could encompass a huge amount of meanings (Favell, 2003; Gosh, 2004). Based on policy documents and scientific research, we can conclude there is no straight forward definition or shared interpretation of this concept (Gosh, 2004). In Europe, there is no overall clear consensus on what migrants are ought to do to integrate and to be seen as ‘integrated’ in their host societies (Gosh, 2004; Verkuyten, 2010).

In general, the meaning of ‘integration’ can be seen as a mode of ‘acculturation’ (Berry, 2001). Acculturation “*comprehends those phenomena which result when groups of individuals having different cultures come into continuous first-hand contact with subsequent changes in the original culture patterns of either or both groups (Redfield, Linton & Herskovits, 1936, p. 149)*”. The concept of ‘acculturation’ is introduced in academic research as a neutral term, as it implies that when different cultural groups meet cultural changes might occur in all cultural groups. However in many public discourses, this concept of ‘integration’ is interpreted in terms of ‘assimilation’, which means the (voluntary or forced) disappearance of ethnic differences in a national state, all adapting to the culture and associated practices of the host society (Berry, 1990; Peach, 2005). However, many more interpretations exist, often not coinciding with each other, varying across and within ethnic/migrant groups, and depending on the context (Van Praag, Stevens & Van Houtte, 2015). In the context of interethnic conflicts, it is important to recognize that, due to its widespread use (Favell, 2003), the notion of integration reveals a lot of complexity and its interpreted in a myriad of ways (Verkuyten, 2010). These distinct interpretations of various actors, gives rise to many distinct demands, expectations and consequently, misunderstanding and conflict (e.g. in the school context, Van Praag, Stevens & Van Houtte, 2015). The concept as such is not only interesting for this report as it results in contrasting expectations and conflicts, but also because there is a common understanding that education is the key to realize a successful ‘integration’ of immigrant groups in receiving societies, regardless of the migrant generation.

Before we explore the role of education within the integration processes, three final interconnected remarks on the meaning of the ‘integration’ concept should be made. Firstly, it is important to be wary about the culturalisation of the current integration debate (Entzinger & Biezeveld, 2003; Engbersen, 2018). The integration of an ethnic minority group in a host society constitutes not only cultural integration, but also deals with socio-economic, attitude, political and legal dimensions. Integration needs to be understood as a multidimensional concept (Van den Eede, Wets & Levrau, 2008). Taking into account the culturalisation of the current integration debate is important, as it emphasizes the observation that the integration of ethnic minority groups is not only about ‘making cultural differences’ work, but also about,

for example, making socio-economic and religious differences work (Crenshaw, 1989). Secondly, we want to emphasize the observation that not all immigrant groups can be perceived as the same when it comes to integration processes (Penninx, 2006). Some groups are perceived differently by the majority and other ethnic minority groups due to the perceived cultural distances, religious affiliation, or lower level of human capital. These (perceived) differences could challenge and impact the integration processes and entail the risk of ethnic segregation. This is especially true in the educational context, since the human capital of some migrants is more aligned with the expectations of national educational contexts (Crul, 2018). Thirdly, the researcher Gosh (2004) also states that integration means the absence of ethnic discrimination in any sort and form. The ACCORD project will especially focus on the prevention and combatting of ethnic discrimination, as it is an invaluable condition for a successful integration.

Despite the observation that the meaning of integration is not clearly defined by all distinct actors living in European nation states and the institutions they are part of, there is a widespread agreement within the European Union that education plays a crucial role in the integration processes. In 2004, the European Council agreed on eleven principles that should guide her nation states in their strategies to integrate people with an immigrant background in their respective host societies (Van den Eede, Wets & Levrau, 2008). These principles emphasized that European nation states, among other integration strategies, should guard the equal access of pupils with an immigrant background to public and private education as well as have continuous attention for the specific challenges of pupils with an immigrant background in the educational system of the host society. The importance of education is also widely recognized within international scientific research (e.g., Azzolini, 2011; Sayad, 2004; see overview: Stevens and Dworkin, 2014). Scholars Alba and Nee (2015), for example, conclude that education and educational opportunities drive all other indicators of social and cultural integration (e.g., work, housing, etc.). Similar reflections are to be found in the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) reports written by The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD): *“Education can help immigrants acquire skills and contribute to the host-country economy; it can also foster immigrants’ social and emotional well-being and sustain their motivation to join others in work and life in their new communities - and, by doing so, help them integrate more easily* (OECD, 2018).” Irrespective of the widespread consensus that educational systems are motors for integration and social upwards mobility (Schneider, Crul & Van Praag, 2014), research shows that education still remains one of the greatest weaknesses in integration policies of European countries (e.g., Breen, Luijkx, Müller & Pollak, 2009; Jacobs, 2013; Migrant Integration Policy Index, 2015).

1.3. Ethnic inequality in European educational systems

The migration flows towards Europe are profoundly changing the ethnic composition of (European) classrooms (OECD, 2018). PISA-results reveal that almost one in four 15-year-old

pupils in EU countries was either foreign-born or had at least one foreign-born parent (OECD, 2018). For example, in Spain, a country that has been labeled as a new destination country, the increase of first generation immigrant pupils is 2 percent higher than in most Western European countries and the share of second generation immigrant pupils is significantly lower than in most Western European countries (Migrant Integration Policy Index, 2015). The increase of pupils with an immigrant background poses new challenges for the national educational systems, which too frequently assume pupils to have a shared culture and similar background. These challenges are especially acute for immigrant pupils growing up in low families with a socio-economic status, in which parents often have limited educational achievements and work at low-skill jobs (Alba & Foner, 2015). Yet, European educational systems are currently falling short of being motors for integration and social upwards mobility for people with an immigrant background (e.g., Breen et al., 2009; Jacobs, 2013; Migrant Integration Policy Index, 2015; Stevens & Dworkin, 2015). International scientific research confirms that ethnic inequalities in educational systems persist over time and countries (Stevens & Dworkin, 2015). In this section, we will discuss the prevailing ethnic inequalities in European educational systems, and set out the existing factors that could contribute to these educational gaps between ethnic groups in European educational systems. Special attention will be given to the pupil-teacher relationship and the perception of unfair treatment by pupils in classroom practices, which takes a pivotal position within the ACCORD-project.

Within international research, ethnic inequalities in educational systems are mostly studied by exploring the 'educational gap' between pupils with an immigrant background on the one hand and non-migrant pupils on the other (Azzolini, 2011). The exploration of this educational gap has seen a growing research interest in Europe during the recent years (e.g., Azzolini, 2011; Heath & Brinbaum, 2014), and has a long standing tradition in North-America (e.g., Portes & MacLeod, 1996; Morgan 2005). The educational gap between ethnic groups is mostly researched by studying by looking at two schooling outcomes, namely educational achievement and educational attainment (Azzolini, 2011). Educational achievement alludes to learning outcomes (i.e., marks and standardized tests). Educational attainment refers to the progression of pupils in the educational system (i.e., qualification, rate of early school leavers, school choice, etc.). The international research field highlights that pupils with an immigrant background have a disadvantage compared to non-migrant pupils in educational achievement and attainment (Breen et al., 2009; Marks, 2005; Stevens & Dworkin, 2014). Ethnic inequalities within European educational systems are first and foremost reflected in the unequal educational outcomes of pupils with an immigrant background in comparison with non-migrant pupils. In all European countries, immigrant pupils, particularly first-generation immigrant pupils (i.e., foreign born pupils of foreign born parents), have a lower level of educational achievement than non-migrant children (Jacobs, 2013; OECD, 2016 & 2018). Across OECD-countries 51% first generation immigrant pupils failed to reach baseline academic proficiency in reading, mathematics and science, compared to 28% non-migrant pupils who fail to reach that level (OECD, 2018). The educational achievement level of second-

generation immigrant pupils is on average higher than first-generation immigrant pupils across all European countries (European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights, 2017). This troubling educational achievement gap between immigrant and non-migrant pupils is also observed in the ACCORD participating countries. In Belgium, for example, foreign-born pupils with low-educated mothers are two times as likely to be low-achievers in mathematics (51%) compared to non-migrant pupils with low-educated mothers (25%) (Jacobs, 2013). The situation in Germany is even more troubling, as 58% of first-generation and 37% of the second-generation immigrant pupils with low-educated mothers were low-achievers in mathematics, in comparison to 20% non-migrant pupils with low-educated mothers (Migrant Integration Policy Index, 2015). The educational achievement gap in Germany is one of the biggest internationally (OECD, 2018; Stevens & Dworkin, 2014). Similar trends are found in research that looks into the educational attainment gaps between pupils with an immigrant background and non-migrant pupils (Jacobs, 2013; OECD, 2018; Stevens & Dworkin, 2014). Pupils with an immigrant background are 6% more likely to have repeated a grade across European countries (OECD, 2018). Scientific research also highlights they are overrepresented in vocational study tracks, and have a higher risk to become early school leavers (Murdock, 1999; OECD, 2018). For example, in Italy, research shows that pupils with an immigrant background encounter higher risks of grade retention, delay, and early school leaving. Furthermore they are also disproportionally concentrated in vocational study tracks (Azzolini, 2011). In the following sections, we will briefly discuss the factors that could contribute to this educational gap, organized by level of analysis: individual- and family related factors and school- and educational system related factors.

1.3.1. Individual- and family related factors

There are several individual- and family related factors that could explain (part of) this educational gap. International scientific research connects the educational gap of pupils with an immigrant background to a 'double disadvantage' (Azzolini, 2011; Breen et al., 2009; Crul, 2016; Jacobs, 2013; Stevens & Dworkin, 2014). Research shows that pupils with an immigrant background are more likely than non-migrant pupils to live in families with a low socio-economic status, which can already account for a substantial part of their educational disadvantages. Additionally, research indicates that pupils with an immigrant background face disadvantages that are specifically linked to their migration background. International research relates this double disadvantage to a combination of individual and family- level factors (e.g., socio-economic background and language spoken at home), as well as classroom-, school- and educational system related factors (e.g., socio-economic/ethnic segregation and school climate/culture) (Hanushek & Wössman, 2011; Jacobs, Rea, Teney, Callier & Lothaire, 2009; Cobb-Clark, Sinning & Stillman, 2012).

Pupil's socio-economic background appears to be the most powerful factor in explaining the educational gap between ethnic groups, although its relevance differs significantly among specific receiving countries (e.g., Marks, 2005) and between national-origin groups (e.g.,

Heath & Brinbaum, 2014). The PISA results, for example, show that pupils with an immigrant background are on average more socio-economically disadvantaged compared to non-migrant pupils. This would explain approximately 20% of the educational gap (OECD, 2018).

With regard to factors that cause migration background to explain part of this educational gap, many factors are mentioned such as ethnic discrimination (e.g., D'hondt, 2016; Stevens, 2010-see next section more in-depth), language proficiency (Esser, 2006), and instrumental parental support at home (e.g., Casacchia, Natale, Paterno & Terzera, 2008; Eccles, 2005; Grolnick, 2009). These factors should also be seen within their immigration and educational context. For instance, although language acquisition is deemed to be an important factor to understand the curricula and participate in school life, researchers do agree that its positive effect is overestimated by national authorities (Meijnen, Rupp, & Veld, 2001). Furthermore, the importance of language proficiency to explain an educational gap between pupils with and without a migration background varies across migrant generations, with second generations generally showing a higher proficiency than first generation immigrants (Esser, 2006). In Spain and Germany, respectively 50% to 60% of the pupils with an immigrant background speak the language of instruction at home. Another factor refers to the importance of the role of the parents for pupil's educational success (e.g., Casacchia, Natale, Paterno & Terzera, 2008; Eccles, 2005; Grolnick, 2009). These studies show, for example, that pupils with an immigrant background receive less instrumental support from their parents compared to non-migrant pupils, which is crucial in the context of educational systems that emphasize individual study at home (e.g., Germany and Italy) (Grolnick, 2009). Furthermore, in order to fully understand and successfully navigate within educational systems, parental knowledge about the educational system of the host society and how to prepare for a future that fits best the pupil's abilities and aspirations is deemed to be crucial. The lack of knowledge of parents about the educational system of the host society has a negative impact on the educational attainment of their children (Azzolini, 2011; Breen et al., 2009; Marks, 2005).

Additionally, pupils' school-related feelings and attitudes could also explain partly why pupils with an immigrant background tend to perform lower in education than their majority counterparts. It is noteworthy to mention that the PISA-results show that pupils with an immigrant background in all countries, report on average a greater motivation to do well in school (OECD, 2018), which seems contradictory to their overall lower educational achievement. Research in the United States about this 'attitude-achievement paradox' (Mickelson, 1990) highlights that many pupils with an immigrant background underachieve compared with their non-migrant peers, even though they often show more positive school attitudes. In research this discrepancy is explained by distinguishing abstract attitudes (i.e., dominant ideas about schooling) from concrete attitudes (i.e., individual perceptions of reality and originate from the educational benefits people expect to obtain on the labor market). It is only the concrete attitudes, and not the abstract ones, that are able to influence educational achievement (Mickelson, 1990). Similar findings are also found in European research which highlights that pupils with an immigrant background might indeed have more optimistic

abstract attitudes about education than their non-migrant peers, however this is not translated in their concrete attitudes towards education, which depends mainly on the socio-economic background of the pupil (e.g., D'hondt, Van Praag, Stevens & Van Houtte, 2015; 2016; Van Praag, D'hondt, Stevens & Van Houtte, 2015).

Finally, perceptions of ethnic discrimination also matter for pupils' experiences in school and have an impact on their attitudes towards school, their sense of school belonging and their development of aspirations and educational decision making (e.g., D'hondt, 2016; Jacobs, 2013; Stevens 2009; 2010). Furthermore, scientific studies highlight that pupils with an immigrant background are more likely to be victimized because of their ethnicity and appearance (Qin, Way & Rana, 2008). The rates are especially higher among recently arrived pupils with an immigrant background, as they are very unfamiliar with the language and have weaker social networks (OECD, 2018). Pupils who are frequently bullied may start to feel insecure and have considerable difficulties finding their place at school (Rivara & Le Menestrel, 2016). Previous studies also indicate that pupils with an immigrant background are more likely to report perceived unfair treatment by teachers, the numbers are particularly high in Belgium and Germany (European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights, 2017; OECD, 2018).

1.3.2. School- and educational system related factors

Beyond factors situated at the individual- and family level, there also seem to be school- and system related factors that can partly explain the educational gap between pupils with and without an immigrant background (Alba & Foner, 2015; Jacobs, 2013). These factors can be divided into systemic features of the educational system on the one hand, and aspects related to school culture and climate on the other hand (Stevens & Dworkin, 2014).

At the system level, factors, such as the role parents should play in education, entry age of education, the organization of student grouping, measurement of achievement, grade retention practices, procedures of track allocation, organization of the curricula, etc., vary across national educational systems (e.g., Erikson & Jonsson, 1996; Kerckhoff, 2001; LeTendre, Hofer & Shimizu, 2003; Jacob & Tieben, 2009; Kelly & Price, 2011; Oakes & Guiton, 1995). These characteristics can all have a (combined) influence on the ways pupils with an immigrant background feel like they belong in education, find their ways throughout education and achieve in education.

Firstly, educational systems vary in the intensity and the type of role parents are expected to play during varying stages of students' school career (cf. supra). A second system factor is the date of school entry, which alludes to the observation that the level of educational achievement will be lower when the pupil with an immigrant background enters the educational system at an older age, or when he or she starts during the middle of the school year (Opdenakker & Hermans, 2006). A third system factor, namely the grouping of pupils into tracks, streams, and ability groups, could also contribute to the creation and the persistence of ethnic inequalities in education (Stevens & Dworkin, 2014). These tracking features of

educational systems may advantage some groups over the other, which may result in the persistence of ethnic inequalities throughout education (Hallinan, 1994; Crul, 2016; Van Praag et al., 2015; 2016). Educational systems characterized by early tracking mechanism can also cause difficulties for pupils with an immigrant background. In Germany and Austria, for example, schooling start at the age of six or even seven, and the division of pupils in study tracks starts around the age of 10. As a result a disproportionate number of pupils with an immigrant background are shunted on to the vocational path (Crul, 2016). In other words, early tracking in educational systems can act like a 'sorting machine' by differentiating the pupil population (Hao & Pong, 2008). These grouping practices in education have a high impact on pupils' future outcomes in education and on the labour market (e.g., Hallinan & Kubitschek, 1999; Hallinan, 1994). To conclude, tracking is consistent with the desires of parents who have relatively high levels of education, because their children tend to be placed in more highly valued tracks. While tracking tends to have negative consequences for pupils with less access to mainstream cultural and social capital, which is more often the case for pupils with an immigrant background and a low socio-economic background (Alba & Foner, 2015). Studies show that the described stratified system and its possible perverse consequences exist in the German and Flemish educational systems (e.g., Crul, 2016; Migrant Integration Policy Index, 2015; Van Praag, Van Houtte, Demanet & Stevens, 2013). The grouping of pupils into tracks, streams, and ability groups, contributes to the creation and the persistence of ethnic inequalities in education (Stevens & Dworkin, 2014). Fourthly, also the level of academic or socio-economic school segregation plays a significant role in the creation of the 'educational gap' (Jacobs, 2013). Studies observe that socio-economic school segregation, rather than ethnic school segregation, has detrimental effects on learning processes (OECD, 2016; Van der Silk, Driessen & De Bot, 2006), not necessarily due to the composition itself, but also due to the school staff composition, developed teaching practices, etc. (e.g., Agirdag, Van Houtte & Van Avermaet, 2011; Van Houtte, 2010). Research in primary education shows for example that higher proportions of pupils with a low socio-economic background and immigrant background in a school is associated with lower levels of math achievement for those groups (Agirdag, Van Houtte & Van Avermaet, 2010).

Another level that plays an important and more symbolic role in the ways educational systems could contribute to or complicate the integration of pupils with an immigrant background in education and society is through the educational practices, prevailing rules and school cultures within these systems, which may also impact pupils' sense of school belonging, and different aspects of their educational achievement and attainment. These influences could relate to the wearing of religious symbols (e.g., headscarves) (Korteweg & Yurdakul, 2014; Van Praag et al., 2016), linguistic policies (e.g., monolingual school cultures) (Strobbe, 2016; Van der Wildt, Van Houtte & Van Avermaet, 2013; Agirdag; 2009; Van Praag et al., 2015), and recognizing dietary practices (Fleischmann & Phalet, 2011). Over the last few years, one of the most debated topics is religion in school, which lead a lot of pupils with an immigrant background to question their religious identity (Zemni, 2016). However, religiosity does not

necessarily have to hinder students from achieving good grades in school (e.g., Agirdag, Hermans & Van Houtte, 2011; Timmerman, 1997; Van Praag et al., 2016). While there could be a huge potential for school, and by extension educational systems, to structurally embed diversity in their curriculum and school practices, this tendency could need more attention (Gorski, 2008). For example, when teaching history, more diversified approaches and perspectives could be taught, also considering non-Western perspectives and approaches towards a similar event or era (Ogbu & Simons, 1998).

In schools, the nature of the pupil-teacher relationships could also play a role in sustaining ethnic inequalities within education. Scientific research highlights that pupil-teacher relationship has a significant impact on the academic achievement, and the social and emotional well-being of disadvantaged pupils with an immigrant background (Battistich, Solomon, Watson & Schaps, 1997; OECD, 2016 & 2018). International research suggests, for example, that pupils with an immigrant background have more positive attitudes and higher academic motivation when they perceive a teacher as helping and caring, while the perception of unfair treatment by a teacher is related to negative learning outcomes (e.g., Pitzer & Skinner, 2016; Ricard and Pelletier, 2016). Studies also show that teachers have greater negative attitudes and lower expectations towards pupils with an immigrant background (e.g., Agirdag, Loobuyck & Van Houtte, 2012; Coronel & Gómez-Hurtado, 2015; Glock & Krolak-Schwerdt, 2013). One form of perceived unfair treatment in the pupil-teacher relationship is a central element of the ACCORD-project, namely unfair treatment related to ethnic background, which we will discuss in depth in the next section (i.e., ethnic discrimination). The aforementioned results emphasize that very specific and sometimes subtle dynamics in a classroom setting can have a significant negative impact on the learning outcomes of pupils with an immigrant background, and processes of broader ethnic inequality (Levräu & Timmerman, 2009).

To conclude, while the widespread idea that educational systems are motors for integration and socially upward mobility, ethnic inequalities in education persist through different interrelated factors, situated at distinct levels (Schneider, Crul & Van Praag, 2014). Within this complex array of factors that continue to contribute to the existence of educational gaps between pupils with immigrant background and those without, it is for many teachers often very complicated to fully understand the seeds of interethnic conflicts, and how to prevent and deal with such conflicts. Being more aware of all possible seeds for interethnic conflict and different types of interethnic conflicts, will better equip both teachers and teachers in training to cater the needs of pupils with an immigrant background and subsequently contribute to the creation of an inclusive school climate and better student-teacher relationships. In the next section we will set out more in-depth the ways interethnic conflicts can occur in schools and show the different types of ethnic discrimination in an educational context.

1.3. Interethnic conflicts and ethnic discrimination in the educational context

This section will provide deeper insights in the distinct types of interethnic conflicts and ethnic discrimination that occur within an educational context. Three topics surrounding the concepts of interethnic conflicts and ethnic discrimination will be elaborated on. First, the definitions of the concepts ‘ethnicity’, ‘ethnic prejudices’, ‘ethnic discrimination’ and ‘interethnic conflicts’ are discussed, and, subsequently, situated in the broader international research field as well as in current societal debates. Second, we discuss the prevalence of ethnic discrimination in European societies, and especially in the educational sector. Third, we will focus on the possible negative consequences of ethnic discrimination that could be experienced by diverse actors in schools.

1.3.1. Situating and defining the concepts

During the 60’s and 70’s of the previous century, there was a common believe on the European continent that racism was something from the past, referring to the cruelties of the holocaust (Bovenkerk, Miles & Verbunt, 1990). This believe was premature, as racism found new roots in Europe through widespread anti-immigrant sentiments (Bastos, Ibarrola-Amendarize, Sadinha, Westin & Will, 2006). There are remarkable similarities in the manifestation of hostility to certain immigrant groups in the various European members, for example cross-national movements to send immigrants back to their country of origin (Bovenkerk, Miles & Verbunt, 1990; Eriksen, 2015; Wieviorka, 1994). Yet, there are also some considerable differences between the European member states with respect to content, timing and the progress of various forms of anti-immigrant sentiments (Bovenkerk, Miles & Verbunt, 1990; European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights, 2017). In the United Kingdom, for example, its content seems to be dominated by a discourse on race as a biological entity, while in Belgium and Germany the anti-immigrant sentiments are dominated by conceptions of ‘unassimilability’ on the grounds of cultural or religious identity, which are based on opinions in regard to the incompatibility of ethnic minority identities with the values of the (Western) host society (Bovenkerk, Miles & Verbunt, 1990; Zick, Pettigrew and Wagner, 2008). One of the reasons why these anti-immigrant sentiments came to flourish is due to the migration flows as such as *“people become aware of their culture when they stand at its boundaries: when they encounter other cultures, or when they become aware of other ways of doing things, or merely of contradictions of their own culture (Cohen, 1985, p. 61)”*. Nowadays, anti-immigrant feelings are still very much intact among citizens of the European member states and its state apparatus (Eriksen 2015; European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights, 2017; Zick, Pettigrew & Wagner, 2008). The anti-immigrant feelings in the European Union are directed towards all different kinds of immigrants and ethnic communities (e.g., refugees and

the Jewish community), but Muslims in particular have been increasingly targeted by acts of ethnic discrimination during the last decade (European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights, 2017; Zemni, 2011). Similar trends in the context of anti-immigrant feelings are also found in the educational context (e.g., D'hondt, 2016; Vandezande, Fleischmann, Baysu, Swyngedouw, & Phalet, 2009).

In this report, we will focus on the concepts 'ethnic discrimination' and 'ethnic prejudices', as the main basis and framework to understand interethnic conflicts in the educational and the classroom context. 'Ethnicity' can be conceptualized as a category that includes race, religion, culture, nationality and language (Kivisto & Crull, 2012). An 'ethnic prejudice' can be conceptualized as a negative judgement beforehand of ethnic groups or individuals on the base of traits attributed to that group (Bastos et al., 2006). Having an ethnic prejudice does not imply that someone would act upon it, so no interaction occurs. For example, a person may have prejudices about the Muslim religious community, but this does not necessarily imply he or she would discriminate Muslims in everyday practices (Tatum, 2017). 'Ethnic discrimination' can be defined as the differential treatment on the basis of ethnicity that disadvantages a member of a specific ethnic group (Quillian, 1995). Ethnic discrimination is a relational concept, which implies that it always occurs in an interaction (Stevens, 2010). This interaction can occur between two or more individuals, but also between an individual and a policy for example (Schofield, 2010). It is exactly this relational dimension that separates ethnic discrimination from ethnic prejudices. Important to note is that the nature of ethnic discrimination differs over time and needs to be embedded into broader societal processes and its proper context (Clair & Denis, 2015; Eriksen, 2015; Tatum, 2017). In the current social and political climate of Europe, for example, ethnic discrimination seems to be increasingly organized along religious lines, rather than cultural ones (Foner, 2015; Zemni, 2011). Finally, ethnic discrimination also needs to be conceptually distinguished from the notion 'racism', which is a broader notion that includes ethnic/racial prejudices and discriminatory acts (Bastos et al., 2006; Clair & Denis, 2015; D'hondt, 2016).

Ethnic discrimination is a complex concept. To dissolve this complexity international research situates ethnic discrimination on different levels and looks into the different ways it might occur. Ethnic discrimination (in the educational context) can be situated at three levels: the micro, meso- and macro level (Jones, 1972; Bastos et al., 2006). The micro-level constitutes individual ethnic discrimination in an interpersonal context between pupils or between a pupil and a member of the school staff (e.g., ethnic name-calling in class). This results in *interpersonal ethnic discrimination*. At the meso level, institutional ethnic discrimination occurs when the school, (un)intentionally, tolerates, creates and/or implements policies that lead to disparities among ethnic groups (e.g., banning of headgear), or induce a school climate that tolerates processes of stigmatizing and ethnic discrimination, which then can be defined as *institutional ethnic discrimination*. The macro level refers to broader structural processes of social categorization, to differential power structures in society and to the basic norms and values upon which a society is built on, which can lead to

structural ethnic discrimination. All the levels of ethnic discrimination are intertwined (Zick, Pettigrew & Wagner, 2008). For example, ethnic humour on an interpersonal level is in a complex manner connected with trends on the macro level (Kuipers & van der Ent, 2016).

The sociological studies about racism and ethnic discrimination knew two distinct phases throughout time (Clair & Denis, 2015; Wieviorka, 1994). The first phase typically considered racism as a set of overt individual-level attitudes, while the second phase conceptualized racism not solely as something explicit. Research started to lay emphasis on implicit biases, and began to look into how subtle processes of racism are constructed and sustained on the different levels (e.g., Gaertner & Dovidio, 1986; Pettigrew, 1993). This still ongoing second phase saw the birth of various new and inspiring theories about racism and ethnic discrimination. The theories on new racism (or cultural racism), for example symbolic racism and aversive racism, observe that overt racism (i.e., active or explicit racism) has decreased over time, while covert racism (i.e., passive or subtle racism) is still very much intact or is even increasing (e.g., Gaertner & Dovidio, 1986; Henry & Sears, 2008; Tatum, 2017). Within European studies the most common distinction to be found is between 'direct' and 'indirect' ethnic discrimination. Direct ethnic discrimination refers to explicit ethnic slurs and is the most recognizable form of ethnic discrimination (e.g., calling a dark-skinned individual 'nigger'). Meanwhile, indirect discrimination occurs when an apparently neutral provision criterion or practice would put particular persons with an ethnic background in a disadvantaged position in comparison with other ethnic groups (European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights, 2017). This shift to researching more subtle forms of racism and ethnic discrimination is important, but two crucial remarks should be made. Firstly, the recognition of more subtle types of ethnic discrimination, should not mean undervaluing or underestimating the relevance and prevalence of overt types of ethnic discrimination (e.g., Stevens, 2010). Secondly, researchers focusing on new racism also overestimate differentialist racism and underestimate inegalitarian racism. The former type of racism sees the other ethnic group as fundamentally different, while the latter type sees the other ethnic group as inferior to the own ethnic group. Yet, in everyday social life it appears that the perception of someone or a group as ethnically different (than the own ethnic group) is frequently intertwined with feelings of superiority towards that ethnically defined person or group (Wieviorka, 1994). Nonetheless, the theories of new racism led to innovative conceptualizations of ethnic discrimination (Bastos et al., 2006; European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights, 2017; Wrench, 2015).

The most important lessons that need to be drawn out of this 'research shift' is the clear recognition that ethnic discrimination or doing 'a racist act' is not an exclusive trait of a 'racist' person or group, like, for example, Front National in France and the Ku Kux Klan in the United States (Wrench, 2015). Furthermore, ethnic discrimination is usually thought of as an intentional act, but studies highlight that also unintentional acts may be experienced as discriminatory by a victim, even though the perpetrator did not have the intention to do so (Bastos et al., 2006). Moreover, ethnic discrimination can be very implicit and subtle. For

instance, if a person labels a woman from Thailand as ‘exotic’, this can also be seen as a subtle form of ethnic discrimination (e.g., Sue et al., 2007). As a result ethnic discrimination is frequently not recognized, brushed away or neglected, which Wrench (2015) conveniently calls the ‘invisibility of ethnic discrimination’ (Wrench, 2015). Finally, research implies that every act or experience of ethnic discrimination can be interpreted in a multitude of different ways, according to the perspective from which one sees it (e.g., Eriksen, 2015; Nouwen & Clycq, 2016; Stevens, 2010). These findings indicate that experiences of ethnic discrimination are highly dependent on the context. This is for example also the case in the school context, where experiences are constantly negotiated by school actors. This shows, for example, that a potential racist act of a teacher can be interpreted in a myriad of ways by a pupil, depending on a complex interplay of intrapersonal, relational and situational factors (Stevens, 2010).

1.3.2. Prevalence

How many occurrences of ethnic discrimination do actually happen? Is it something that occurs regularly, especially in the educational context? Scientific research, but also popular media, show that immigrants are still particular targets of prejudices and discrimination within the European member states (Wagner, Christ & Heitmeyer, 2010; Zick, Pettigrew & Wagner, 2008). Yet, it is very complex to measure (occurrences of) ethnic discrimination as surveys only offer a snapshot, and the wide array of studies use different measures and target groups (D’hondt, 2016). Despite the complexity to capture ethnic discrimination in clear numbers, research overall does show that ethnic discrimination is still present in everyday practices, also within a school and classroom context (e.g., European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights, 2017; Stevens & Dworkin, 2014; Vandezande et al., 2009). The second European Union Minorities and Discrimination Survey (EU-MIDIS II) executed by the European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights (FRA), for example, indicates that a considerable proportion of people with an immigrant background in the European Union face high levels of discrimination because of their ethnic background. More than 35% of the respondents admit they experienced ethnic discrimination in one or more of the following areas: employment, housing market and education (European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights, 2017). Research on the prevalence of ethnic discrimination also highlights that not every ethnic group is targeted in the same way, and/or these ethnic groups perceive ethnic discrimination in a different manner (Tatum, 2017). Roma, North-African and Sub-Saharan African respondents generally report higher levels of ethnic discrimination than any other ethnic group (European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights, 2017). Most surveys also report that skin colour or physical appearance is perceived as the main discrimination ground for experiences of ethnic discrimination (European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights, 2017). Yet, these results should be interpreted with caution, as the difficulty to measure ethnic discrimination is related to the social nature of the phenomenon as such (Stevens, 2010). More comparative, longitudinal surveys on ethnic prejudice and discrimination are needed to gain more insight

on the prevalence of ethnic discrimination in the European nation member states (Zick, Pettigrew & Wagner, 2008).

1.3.3. Consequences

The intrapersonal, interpersonal and institutional consequences of experiences of (ethnic) discrimination in a school context are extensively documented in international research (e.g., Brown, 2005; D'hondt, 2016; Mellor, 2004). On an individual level, being a victim of ethnic discrimination is related with a myriad of physical, psychological and social consequences (Brown, 2005). Ethnic discrimination is related, for example, to more anxiety, a lower self-esteem and a higher affiliation with deviant peers (e.g., Brown, 2015; Mellor, 2004). Research also shows that perceived ethnic discrimination by pupils can have a negative impact on their aspirations and attitudes toward school, their sense of school belonging, study motivation and academic self-worth (D'hondt, 2016; Neblett, Philip, Cogburn & Sellers, 2006; Nouwen & Clycq, 2016). Ethnic discrimination can also result or contribute to processes leading to early school leaving (Murdock, 1999). Other long-term psychological consequences of ethnic discrimination can be the denial of ethnic identity, higher stress levels and the development of racial battle fatigue (D'hondt, 2016; Mellor, 2004). Furthermore, experiences of discrimination reduce people's trust in public institutions and might possibly undermine feelings of attachment to the host society (Tatum, 2017). Additionally, the consequences on an institutional level shows that ethnic discrimination can have a negative impact on, for example, the school environment and the overall wellbeing of the school staff (Schofield, 2010). Finally, research reports that members of the ethnic majority are afraid to talk about ethnic discrimination as they might offend people with different ethnic backgrounds, which results in a 'fear-induced-silence' and a potential limitation in the recognition of the privileged position they have as members of the ethnic majority (Tatum, 2017). Overall, the occurrence and fear of being discriminated against impedes integration processes (European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights, 2017).

In summary, the research on consequences of (perceived) ethnic discrimination highlights its potential devastating effects not only on the individual and interpersonal level, but also on the institutional level (e.g., Brown, 2015; Mellor, Merino, Saiz & Quilague, 2009; Schofield, 2010). The existence of ethnic discrimination in a society is a serious problem for those who are confronted by it, but it goes further than this, as it also implies a major cost to society because people's capacities and potentials get lost (Bastos et al., 2006).

1.3.4. Interethnic conflicts in the classroom: problem statement

Despite the frequent references made to ethnic discrimination, a lot of research fails to systematically study and categorize different levels and forms of ethnic discrimination within school settings and everyday educational practices. As a result, it is not very clear in which

different kind of forms ethnic discrimination can actually occur in everyday classroom practices. In other words, it is hardly known which types of interethnic conflicts occur in the classroom between a pupil and a teacher on the one hand, and between pupils themselves on the other. These observations lead us to the following research question: *'Which forms of ethnic discrimination can occur in everyday classroom practices within secondary education?'* As ethnic discrimination is a relational concept, this will lead us to observe different forms of ethnic discrimination between pupils and teachers, but also between pupils themselves. In each of these instances the teacher plays a crucial role. Furthermore, in this report, we will apply an interdisciplinary approach by combining perspectives from anthropology, sociology and social psychology as a way to frame the different occurrences of ethnic discrimination in the classroom. Finally, inspired by the different theories of new racism (e.g., Gaertner & Dovidio, 1986; Henry & Sears, 2008) (cf. supra), we want to move beyond narrow conceptualizations of racism and ethnic discrimination. This means we will not only include overt individual occurrences of ethnic discrimination (e.g., ethnic slurs), but also lay bare the more covert and subtle occurrences of ethnic discrimination between individuals in a classroom setting.

The overview of the prevailing international literature indicates that occurrences of ethnic discrimination are very diverse and complex (Clair & Denis, 2015). This complexity implies that it is impossible to offer a prescribed solution to prevent or deal with experiences of ethnic discrimination by pupils with an immigrant background in a school- and classroom context (Tatum, 2017). With this research we mainly want to inspire and support teachers and other school personnel in the framing of occurrences of ethnic discrimination, understanding each other and leading the way to discuss these type of misunderstandings, prejudices, feelings of unfair treatment. The research aspires to strengthen pupil-teacher relationships, improve the educational achievement of pupils with an immigrant background, and enhance the overall classroom and school culture.

2. Methodology

A qualitative research framework is deemed to be suitable to answer the central research question of this report, namely *‘Which forms of ethnic discrimination can occur in everyday classroom practices within secondary education?’*. Qualitative data collection methods offer the possibility to study and gain insight on the experiences of ethnic discrimination in a classroom, and more specifically on occurrences of ethnic discrimination between teachers, other school personnel as well as pupils (Denzin & Lincoln, 1994).

The research will combine different forms of qualitative data collection that render it possible to research experiences of ethnic discrimination in ‘real-life classroom settings’, as well as create a feedback loop (‘retrospective’) to validate the selected interethnic scenarios for the ACCORD training. The following table provides a summary of the executed data collection methods:

Methodology	Goal	Timeline
School ethnography	The aim is to gather data about interactions, power dynamics in the classroom, and also be able to notice, not only overt and explicit, but also more covert and subtle forms of interpersonal ethnic discrimination between teachers and pupils. This data is used to create a typology of interethnic conflicts to select and construct interethnic conflict scenarios for the ACCORD training (i.e., game based learning).	March-May 2017
National focus group discussions	The objective of the focus group discussions is to gather data about the meaning processes teachers and other school personnel relate to experiences of ethnic discrimination in the classroom. The second aim is to triangulate the results from the school ethnography, and validate them cross-nationally (i.e., the ACCORD project countries).	October-December 2017

Table 1: summary data collection methods.

2.1. School ethnography

2.1.1. Research scope

To study the different forms of ethnic discrimination in a classroom context, we decided to conduct ethnographic observations in two Flemish schools (i.e., a school ethnography). A school ethnography allows the researcher to spend a considerable time in the research setting (i.e., schools and classrooms), and makes it possible to participate in the daily routines of a school setting (De Waele, 1992; Van Praag & Stevens, 2016). The school ethnography enabled the researcher to observe experiences of ethnic discrimination, between pupils and teachers and between the pupils themselves, in everyday educational practices (Ball, 1990). By executing a school ethnography, we tried to describe and demonstrate the complexity of interethnic conflicts in a classroom, as well as show the different ways they might actually occur. The school ethnography allowed the researcher to not only report explicit forms of interpersonal ethnic discrimination, but also the more subtle and implicit forms (Bastos et al., 2006).

In summary, the period of participation and observation in the schools allowed the researcher to observe events or behaviors related to interethnic conflicts that might not be mentioned in interviews, to observe events in schools/classrooms and behaviors by school actors that became routinized, and finally to gather data on a sensitive and sometimes unspoken topic in the educational context (Kawulich, 2005). In the context of this project, the emphasis was on ethnographic class observations, but also some informal interviews were performed with teachers and other school personnel to enrich the data collection process. The 'school ethnographies' lasted for a period of five weeks, and were conducted by one researcher.

2.1.2. Selection research units and gaining access to the field

After an extensive literature study ethnographic research was executed in two secondary schools in the 'superdiverse' city of Antwerp ('Hendricks High' and 'St. Jozef')¹. Two schools were chosen based on three theoretical criteria (Patton, 2001): city setting (1), ethnic composition of the school (2) and the offered tracks (3). The two latter criteria were deemed important as interethnic conflicts would significantly differ based on the ethnic composition of the school (and classes) and the tracks where they take place (Stevens, 2010; Van Praag et al., 2015). The focus on two schools allowed the researcher to compare two institutional settings, and their possible impact on the way interethnic conflicts occur in a classroom

¹ The name of the secondary schools that participated in the school ethnographies are anonymized.

setting. In each school one class group unit was chosen. The class group unit in Hendricks High was an academic track, while the class group unit in St. Jozef was a vocational track. The chosen school year was the third year of secondary education. Pupils were aged between 13-14 years old. This age and school year also marks a crucial phase in adolescents' development. Psychological research shows that youngsters aged around 14 years are emotionally more sensitive and vulnerable to exclusionary processes (e.g., more prone to feelings of shame), which makes this age group an important one to study the impact of ethnic discrimination (Thomaes, Olthof, Bushman, & Nezelek, 2011).

The researcher planned to spend two and a half weeks in each secondary school and each classroom unit (i.e., five weeks in total). The principal of each secondary school was contacted by the researcher to ask for permission to execute the school ethnography. After the approval was granted by the principals the researcher was allowed to execute his fieldwork in each secondary school. At the start of each research period the teachers and pupils of the classroom unit at hand were informed about the content of the project and the process of data collection. This included a presentation of the research topic by the researcher, as well as an information sheet with more detailed information (cf. annex 1). The presentations about the project took place at both schools, but one crucial adaptation was made in the slides after the first school ethnography was carried out. In the first school, the researcher shared all the information about the project (i.e., topic of investigation), while in the second school the researcher refrained in telling the participants that it was specifically about 'interethnic' conflicts. He told the participants of the second school that the project was about all kinds of conflicts in a classroom setting. This adaptation was decided upon, because the researcher observed during the first school ethnography that teachers became very aware about how they talk about interethnic conflicts and discrimination and how they tackle diverse topics related to ethnicity (e.g., during one course a teacher looked at the researcher and instantly she invited all the pupils in the classroom to share their stories about ethnic discrimination). To avoid a possible bias in the results, the researcher decided to frame the project differently in the second school, however, no substantive and crucial information was left out (Mortelmans, 2013). During the introductory presentations in both schools teachers and pupils were also told that the researcher would follow their class group for some weeks and would make notes during the courses, more specifically field notes. These field notes remain confidential and will not be shared with anyone. Students and teachers were asked to do what they would normally do, without paying attention to the researcher.

The introductory presentations of the researcher during the entry in the school provided teachers and pupils with the space to become familiar with the idea that someone had chosen their school as a research topic. After each introduction and presentation the teachers, as well as the pupils themselves were asked for their informed consent (cf. annex 2) (Fontana & Frey, 1994; Davies, 2008). As all pupils in the third year of secondary education were younger than 18 years, parents were informed and were given the possibility to refrain their children from

participation in the research (cf. annex 3). In addition, all students had the possibility to withdraw during the research, or not participate in an interview, irrespective of the approval of their parents. All pupils gave their permission to execute the research, so did most teachers. There was one teacher in Hendricks High who did not give approval to execute the research, as the teacher would feel uncomfortable with an extra individual being present during classes.

2.1.3. The field work

The school ethnography was conducted in the period March and May 2017. All class group units were observed for two weeks and a half. This period of time seemed sufficient as theoretical saturation was starting to surface during the latter stages of the time period. The first signs of theoretical saturation became apparent in increasingly repetitive field notes, and experiences of field fatigue by the researcher (e.g. taking less notes or paying less attention) (Blommaert & Jie, 2010).

Before the start of the school ethnography the researcher immersed himself in the subject of ethnic discrimination (e.g., theories of modern racism and more covert/implicit forms of ethnic discrimination) as well as taking time to understand the field of education, and more specifically the schools where the ethnography would take place (e.g., schools documents on ethnic diversity) (Blommaert & Jie, 2010). Furthermore, before the start of each school ethnography, the researcher asked the principal to already provide the names of the pupils as well as an accompanying picture, which supported the researcher in getting to know his research subjects and facilitating the process of taking field notes.

During the fieldwork, the researcher took different research roles when following the classroom units in their everyday routines. Depending on the actual setting and demands of the respondents within this setting, the researcher role, as described by Gold (1958), varied to some extent from 'participant as observer' (e.g., playing football with some of the pupils) to 'participant as observer' (e.g., sitting in the back of the classroom and observe the teacher-pupil interactions). However, the researcher was present in the classroom, during breaks, or during school activities, trying to be as discrete as possible, without evaluating or influencing teachers and pupils in their ways of behaving, speaking and acting. So the overall research role could be best categorized as 'observer as participant'. Over time and due to the switching in research roles, the awareness and the possible distrust of teachers and pupils alike started to diminish (Denzin & Lincoln, 1994), which enhanced the quality of the data collection process (Blommaert & Jie, 2010).

When the researcher was present at the school sites, he laid an emphasis on making field notes, also the informal interviews with teachers and other school personnel were integrated in the field notes. An illustration of the field notes is added at the end of the report (cf. annex 5). In each classroom, field notes were made about pupil-teacher and peer interactions and friendships, interethnic friendships and communication, teaching practices, discrimination,

etc. Field notes were made, visibly, during courses, but not during breaks or during conversations (e.g., in the teachers' lounge), and full notes were written immediately after exiting the field (Berg, 2004). In each field of study, the researcher made first detailed, descriptive observations, writing down carefully what happened exactly in the classroom and how pupils and teachers interacted and reacted towards each other. These field notes were more descriptive in nature and tried to grasp the (automatic) routines in the classroom and ways of structuring the classroom. Over the course of the school ethnography, more analytic notes were written that compared distinct happenings and lead to a preliminary analysis of occurrences of ethnic discrimination in the classroom. Furthermore, attention has been given to the subjective reflections of the researcher, including notes about specific situations, experiences or personal feelings that could be interesting when analyzing the notes (Berg, 2004). Immediately after school was finished, the researcher wrote down his notes on his computer, adding some additional reflexive notes or remembering things he could not write down during the day (e.g., informal conversations with teachers). At the end of the ethnographic period, the researcher took the time to explicitly thank everybody (e.g., thanking the pupils with a small gift) and informed teachers and pupils about the future course of the project. The pupils were also asked by the researcher to fill in an information sheet on their socio-economic and ethnic/racial backgrounds, which could be useful for future research activities (cf. annex 4).

The researcher encountered some difficulties during his fieldwork. Especially pupil-teacher conflicts or tensions, the maintenance of the confidential position of the researcher (Fontana & Frey, 2004) and the confrontation with everyday racism, appeared to be difficult to deal with for the researcher. Especially the latter confrontations with experiences of racism, which is coincidentally also at the heart of this project, were tough for the researcher to endure. The researcher found it difficult to take a position when racist dialogues occurred, and he was invited to share his opinion. The researcher tried to make sure he stayed open to all different kind of opinions regarding such topics, this also included distancing himself from conveying a certain opinion on the matter. This was shown, for example, during a conversation that took place in the teachers' lounge in St. Jozef. The researcher was sitting on a table, and overheard some teachers talking about pupils and using very explicit ethnic slurs. During the conversation one of the teachers invited the researcher to sit with them. The researcher did join the group of teachers, and calmly nodded when they asked his opinion, but refrained in stating a verbal opinion. By doing this, the researcher wanted to avoid that the teachers would openly start to distrust him. In summary, to assure the confidential position of the researcher and anonymity of the respondents, it was important to stay out of interethnic conflicts, and also to take sufficient time as a researcher to emotionally process the periods of fieldwork.

2.1.4. Data analysis

To study the different forms of ethnic discrimination in a classroom setting, and to analyze the school ethnography data an *'adaptive theory approach'* was employed (Layder, 1998). The adaptive theory approach rests on the twin employment of, and the subsequent interaction between, existing theoretical materials and the empirical data that will emerge out of this research. Thus, throughout the empirical fieldwork, and the subsequent analysis, the core concept of *'interethnic conflicts'* was continuously refined and adapted, which resulted in a typology of different forms of ethnic discrimination in the classroom between teachers and pupils, and between pupils themselves (Layder, 1998). This type of data analysis renders it possible to let the theories and empirical data interact from the get-go, which is also one of the core attributes when executing ethnographic research (Blommaert & Jie, 2010). The process of data analysis mainly rested upon imposing ordering patterns and regularities onto the constructed field notes (Eriksen, 2015). The data-analysis was facilitated by the electronic software NVivo, to support the systematic analyses of the gathered data.

2.2. National focus group discussions

2.2.1. Research scope

After ethnographic fieldwork was carried out, national focus group discussions were planned in all project countries. The aim was to gain insights from teachers and other school personnel on the selected scenarios of interethnic conflicts/ethnic discrimination, which will be used during the ACCORD training. As the ethnographic research was only executed in a Flemish school context, it was deemed necessary to collect meaning processes, thoughts and opinions of teachers and other school personnel from the other project countries about the selected interethnic conflicts: In which way are the selected conflict scenarios recognizable for teachers and other school personnel in other national educational contexts? Which meaning processes do teachers and other school personnel relate to these selected classroom conflicts? Etc.

Choosing focus group discussions as the data collection method to gather this data seemed appropriate for two reasons. Firstly, a focus group is suitable to answer the aforementioned research questions because it provides participants with the space to share topics they label as important related to ethnic discrimination in a school- and classroom context, and also why they think so (Merton, Fiske & Kendall, 1990). Furthermore, the data collection method makes it possible to gain insight on impressions of teachers and other school personnel, as well as on different thought- and meaning processes related to ethnic discrimination between pupils and teachers (Stewart & Shamdasani, 1991). Secondly, focus group discussions allow researchers to collect a considerable amount of information in a short time span and contrast the views of participants with each other (Mortelmans, 2013).

2.2.2. Organization, target group and structure

The focus groups discussions were organized across all the project countries of the ACCORD project. Each partner was responsible for organizing and hosting their own national focus group discussions, presenting the addressed topics, facilitating activities and discussions, as well as collecting and reporting results, according to a common, structured topic list and procedure. The main organizer of these focus group discussions was one of the other project partners, namely University of Barcelona (UB). To support the other project partners we created an information sheet which provided some tips on how to organize a focus group discussion (cf. annex 6).

The organized focus group discussions included in-service teachers of secondary education. Participants were carefully recruited, so to gather a heterogeneous group of teachers from different levels and disciplines. As shown in the following table, a total of 69 participants participated in the focus group discussions .

Partner and country	Number of participants
Unina, Italy	21
FMD, Italy	8
UV, Austria	11
UA, Belgium	12
UB, Spain	12
FAU, Germany	5
Total	69

Table 2: The amount of focus group participants for each partner institution.

We collected data of school personnel by presenting five carefully selected interethnic conflict scenarios. The focus group discussions tried to collect their perspectives regarding (a) the identification of the conflict at stake, (b) the way they would manage the conflict, and (c) the adaptation of the conflict to their specific national educational contexts (e.g., can you see this conflict happening in your own classroom?). Afterwards, teachers and other school personnel were also given the opportunity to create their own interethnic conflict scenarios, representative of their own local educational context. A total of 19 interethnic conflict scenarios, constructed by the participants, were created (cf. annex 7).

2.2.3. Data analysis

For the data analysis of the focus group discussions data we applied a thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006). The results were organised, and will also be presented, in three parts:

- Discussion about the substantive elements of the selected ACCORD interethnic conflict scenarios. This included for instance the meaning they attach to the scenarios and the labelling of these scenarios as ‘interethnic conflicts’.

- Discussion about three themes that inductively raised out of the collected data. These discussion themes are related to the concept of ethnicity, the role/responsibility of education, teachers and other school personnel during occurrences of ethnic discrimination and finally the target group of the ACCORD project.
- Discussion about the created interethnic conflict scenarios by teachers and other school personnel.

3. Results and discussion

3.1. Ethnographic Research: types of interethnic conflicts

In this section, the results of the school ethnography are presented. Different types of ethnic discrimination that occurred in classroom settings during the school ethnography will be put forward. The results of the school ethnography show that occurrences of ethnic discrimination in a classroom are very complex, and occur in different types and forms. In the context of this report it was not our intention to make casual claims, or make assumptions about the severity of one type of ethnic discrimination over the other. With outlining different types of ethnic discrimination in a classroom, we first and foremost wanted to show its complexity and show a myriad of ways it can actually occur, without offering an exhaustive list. It will become clear throughout this section that the different types of ethnic discrimination in a classroom are not context-bound as such, although their content, their prevalence, the way they might surface or the way they might be dealt with may differ significantly from one (national) school- and classroom context to another.

Each type of ethnic discrimination will be presented with illustrations from the field work², and will also be theoretically discussed (cf. part 3.1.1). While the typology is able to distinguish different types of ethnic discrimination from a theoretical point of view, in practice these lines are not as easy to draw. The types can overlap, merge or occur at the same time in a classroom setting. All the interethnic conflicts occur in a classroom setting, and reflect pupil(s)-teacher/pupil(s)-pupil(s) interactions (i.e., interpersonal level of ethnic discrimination). In the second part of this section we will elaborate on how the five interethnic conflict scenarios for the ACCORD E-tool were chosen, and how they are related to the constructed typology of ethnic discrimination in a classroom setting (cf. part 3.1.2).

3.1.1. Typology of ethnic discrimination in a classroom setting

The data analysis of the field notes and the (informal) interviews with teachers resulted in the following (not exhaustive) typology of ethnic discrimination in a classroom setting:

Typology of ethnic discrimination
(1) Overt and explicit types of ethnic discrimination
(2) Ethnic micro-insults
(3) Ethnic micro-invalidations

² All extracts from the field notes are modified to respect the scientific ethical principles of anonymity and confidentiality

(4) Ethnic humour
(5) Ethnic discrimination related to distinct visions on integration/ethnic identities
(6) Ignoring occurrences of ethnic discrimination
(7) Ethnic discrimination related to whiteness and ethnocentrism
(8) Implicit bias and Pygmalion effect
(9) Reverse racism

Table 3: *typology of ethnic discrimination in a classroom setting*

Each type of ethnic discrimination (1 to 9) will be elaborated on in the following paragraphs.

A first type of ethnic discrimination that occurred in a classroom setting, but also in the wider school environment, can be labeled as ‘overt, explicit, active and intentional’ interpersonal discrimination (Tatum, 2017; Wrench, 2015). Wrench (2015) calls this a direct form of discrimination, and more specifically ‘racist discrimination’. People who execute this type of ethnic discrimination, act consciously and are willing to exclude an individual on the base of negative group-based characteristics. Overt interpersonal types of ethnic discrimination happened in all type of interactions, although they were more present within the group of pupils, and also within the group of teachers. Typical forms of overt interpersonal ethnic discrimination are ethnic slurs (e.g., ‘*Smelly Turk*’, ‘*Persons with a Moroccan background always have bad parents*’). A part of these ethnic slurs could be disguised or were labeled as ‘ethnic humour’ (cf. infra). However, this was not necessarily the case, as illustrated in the following fragment of a conversation in the teachers’ lounge of St. Jozef:

“[Teachers having a conversation among each other] *Isabella is from Ghana I think, she will probably already get pregnant on her 16th like most girls in that culture. Why should we even bother teaching these kids?*”

Hence, this fragment shows that particular events are easily seen as cultural traits, suggesting that school actors think that a distinct treatment would be more suited for members of this group.

Two important remarks need to be made about this type of ethnic discrimination. First of all, while international research signifies a shift from overt interpersonal to covert interpersonal ethnic discrimination (e.g., Tatum, 2017; Clair & Denis, 2015), the results of the school ethnography show that these occurrences are not as seldom as sometimes stated in the literature (Stevens, 2010). They still deserve our attention. Secondly, scientific literature highlights that teachers and pupils usually define ethnic discrimination in terms of overt interpersonal types of ethnic discrimination, (e.g., Bonilla-Silva, 2003; Wrench, 2015). By doing this, there is a risk that not only some types of interpersonal ethnic discrimination are ignored (e.g., unintentional and/or subtle types of ethnic discrimination), but also institutional and structural discrimination are ignored or insufficiently recognized within educational contexts. In the remainder of this result section it will become evident that ethnic discrimination is more

than the limited conceptualization of the social phenomenon as solely explicit, interpersonal and intentional.

The next types of ethnic discrimination, namely ethnic micro-insults and ethnic micro-invalidations are more subtle/covert types of ethnic discrimination. An *ethnic micro-insult* is a subtle insensitive, demeaning and/or rude remark about a person's his or her ethnic minority identity (e.g., 'You are Asian, I am sure you are good in mathematics'). Finally, an *ethnic micro-invalidation* is a remark that excludes, negates or nullifies a person's ethnic minority status (e.g., not recognizing an experience of ethnic discrimination when expressed as such by a member of an ethnic minority). Both of them are related to the theoretical framework of 'racial/ethnic micro-aggressions (e.g., Solorzano, Ceja & Yosso, 2000; Sue et al., 2007) and occur through similar mechanisms. A racial/ethnic micro-aggression can be defined as "*brief and commonplace daily verbal, behavioral and environmental indignities, whether intentional or unintentional, that communicate hostile, derogatory, or negative racial/ethnic slights and insults to the target group or person (Sue et al., 2007, p. 273).*" Most studies mainly focus on three forms of micro-aggressions: micro-assaults, micro-insults and micro-invalidations (e.g., Minikel- Lacoque, 2013; Nadal, Issa, Griffin, Hamit, & Lyons, 2010; Sue et al., 2007). The third type of micro-aggression, a *micro-assault*, is an explicit (verbal or nonverbal) derogatory remark (e.g., 'all Muslims are terrorists'), that can be labeled as an overt, intentional micro-aggression (cf. type 1), while a micro-insult and a micro-invalidation are rather covert, elusive and often unconsciously acted out (Minikel-Lacoque, 2013).

The following fragments of the school ethnography are illustrations of ethnic micro-insults and micro-invalidations in everyday educational practices:

Form of ethnic micro-aggression	Illustrations school ethnography
Ethnic micro-insult	<p>(1) <i>"Teacher T. asks Thomas [a boy who was born in Syria] if his father is really a doctor [Fragment field notes St. Jozef]."</i></p> <p>(2) <i>"Teacher P. tells Teacher T. that Pieter is really a nice looking boy for being an Asian [Fragment field notes St. Jozef]."</i></p>
Ethnic micro-invalidation	<p>(3) <i>At some point of the conversation a teacher compliments Alicia: "I'm very impressed by how fluent you speak Dutch [Researcher remark: Alicia was born and raised in the Dutch speaking part of Belgium] [Fragment field notes Hendricks High]."</i></p> <p>(4) <i>During class, the subject of ethnic discrimination comes up. Teacher S. invites everyone to share their experiences. Jasmine</i></p>

	<p><i>shares the story of how people in the grocery store always look weird at her mother because of the fact that she wears a headscarf. Teacher S. states that people may not look weird at her because of what she wears but because of the way she acts. Not everything that looks like a racist reaction at first sight is racist per se. Jasmine reacts with anger to this response of teacher S [Fragment field notes Hendricks High]."</i></p>
--	--

Table 4: illustrations of ethnic micro-insults and micro-invalidations that occurred during the school ethnographies

In illustration (3) the teacher conveys the message that Asian people are not as desirable as other ethnic/racial groups, while in illustration (4) the teacher conveys the message to the pupil that she is a foreigner in the country she was born. These more subtle types of ethnic discrimination occurred during all types of interactions in a school context, among pupils/teachers themselves but also during pupil-teacher interactions. Some researchers argued that micro-aggressions are the new face of (ethnic) discrimination as they are more subtle, and less recognized in the public discourse (e.g., Bonilla-Silva, 2003; Solorzano, Ceja & Yosso, 2000; Wrench, 2015). As Suarez-Orozco et al. (2015, p. 152) state it poignantly, ethnic micro-aggressions are *"like water dripping on a sandstone, they can be thought of as small acts of racism, consciously or unconsciously perpetrated, welling up from the assumptions about racial [ethnic] matters most of us absorb from the cultural heritage in which we come of age in"*.

In summary, ethnic micro-insults and micro-invalidations are seemingly small, often unintentional and unconsciously committed by individuals. Additionally, they are perceived as not being a big deal, which makes it difficult and frustrating to share for a member of an ethnic minority group (Sue et al., 2007). How pupils/teachers might react in some of these aforementioned illustrations is being left open, they might stay silent, feel unrecognized, blame themselves or they might look for ways to resist the micro-aggressions, which might eventually result in a verbally offensive interaction (like in illustration (5)) (Mellor, 2004). The concepts of ethnic micro-insults and micro-invalidations also demonstrate that the best intentions of an individual does not necessarily prevent ethnic discrimination from happening, and although seemingly small they can possibly sustain and strengthen 'othering' processes between different ethnic groups (i.e., 'us' versus 'them') (e.g., Sue et al., 2007; Van der Heijde, Kampman & Bruin, 2016) and convey huge consequences.

The fourth type of ethnic discrimination we distinguish are occurrences of ethnic humour between pupils themselves or between teachers and pupils, which happen quite regularly in a school context (Van Praag, Stevens & Van Houtte, 2017). Occurrences of ethnic humour during the school ethnography ranged from being seemingly very innocent (e.g., friendly

banter between pupils themselves) to explicit racial slurs (e.g., teachers in the teachers' lounge joking about the dick size of dark-skinned pupils). Following extract is an example of ethnic humour that occurred between a pupil and a teacher in Hendricks High: "*Mathias [Dark-skinned boy] is singing a pop song in the classroom in broken English. The teacher is amused and starts singing along. She imitates the broken English and imitates a monkey while jumping around him.*" The latter fragment can be perceived as offensive, but research shows that humour in general is always prone to a clash of different interpretations (e.g., one person might find a joke funny while another person might feel offended) (Kuipers & van der Ent, 2016). The ambivalent character of ethnic humour is also reflected in scientific research: some researchers believe that ethnic humour rarely has an effect or meaning (e.g., Davies, 2012), others believe ethnic humour reflects and sustain (in subtle ways) structural ethnic inequalities (e.g., Billing, 2001; Weaver, 2011), while others believe you cannot generalize as it depends on the context and the intention of the joke at hand (e.g., Lockyer & Pickering, 2005; Oring, 2003). Scientific research did prove that ethnic humour gives insight on the (unequal) ethnic relationships in a society, but humour evolves slower than changes within a society (Kuipers & van der Ent, 2016). This means they do not trigger ethnic inequalities, but depending on different factors they can sustain ethnic inequalities. So is ethnic humour always perceived as a form of ethnic discrimination? No. Can it be? Yes. The ethnic joke showed in above fragment of Hendricks High can function as an explicit or subtle form of ethnic discrimination, depending on situational, relational and intrapersonal factors (Stevens, 2008). This means that one pupil could interpret an ethnic joke as innocent, while another could perceive it as a form of ethnic discrimination. The labeling of an ethnic joke as a type of ethnic discrimination should therefore always be evaluated on its own, and is highly dependent on its context, intent, timing and content (Stevens, 2008). It can also be used by a pupil or by a teacher as a way to justify an act of ethnic discrimination: 'it was just a joke' (Lockyer & Pickering, 2005). As the philosopher Watzlawick (1967) argues: 'you cannot not communicate'. In this sense a teacher should try to be wary when ethnic humour takes place in his or her class.

The fifth type of ethnic discrimination is related to distinct visions an individual might hold about integration and/or the construction of ethnic identities. Teachers during the school ethnographies sometimes had a hard time trying to grasp some of the underlying processes in relation to an ethnic identity. Some teachers were prone to minimize its importance or its relevancy during certain events. It occurred, for example, during arguments that pupils would start to shout in their defense '*we are discriminated again*' or '*you [teacher] treat us like slaves, just like in the past*'. These kind of phrases might be insignificant, but at the same time they can also be of crucial importance. During these type of conflicts it could indeed be true that pupils with an immigrant background use his or her ethnic identity in an instrumental manner to stir up the discussion or to get something out of the discussion. Yet, there are also other ways to look at it. The fact that a pupil brings this up during an argument could also mean something. A possible meaning could be framed by relating it to a theoretical

perspective, called '(ethnic) majority vs. minority readings of history' (Delgado & Stefancic, 2001). This perspective implies that a member of an ethnic majority group uses a different lens than a member of an ethnic minority group to frame ethnic inequality and occurrences of ethnic discrimination in a society. This theoretical approach is based on research executed in the context of the slavery past in the United States and shows how different readings of a certain historical event still has an impact on the way we think and act in the present. The research compares two readings of the slavery phenomenon in the United States, one based on how 'whites' would recall the event and one how 'blacks' would recall the event. While 'whites' perceive slavery as something from the past initiated by bad people, 'blacks' recall that it still left its footprints in the United States society (e.g., racial inequality in education).

The described discrepancy between readings of one or more historical events can be (partly) explained by the notion of modern/symbolic racism (Sears & Henry, 2008). Modern or symbolic racism argues that while overt direct forms of ethnic discrimination have declined, implicit and more subtle forms of ethnic discrimination are still very much intact. Due to the fact that explicit forms of ethnic discrimination are less prevalent, 'whites' no longer believe that racial/ethnic prejudice and discrimination really exist, while 'blacks' recognize and frame some events as ethnic discrimination, while 'whites' would not. This results in them not feeling part of an ethnic majority and/or a national identity. Although this research was executed in the United States, it also applies for ethnic minority groups in the member states of the European Union. In Flanders (Northern part of Belgium). For example, a pupil with a Moroccan background recalls that he was always pushed into playing the role of the 'bad guy' in primary education, because his skin had a darker tone than his peers. He continues by sharing that these experiences are still confusing him today, as he always labeled himself as a Belgian and has no real connection with the Moroccan community. Yet, others made him feel that the opposite is true (Carpentier, 28.10.2017). Either way, the presented research and the aforementioned examples can help us explain why readings of history are so different. Subsequently, they show that growing up as a member of an ethnic minority does have an impact, and by consequence influences the way you look at the current society. Whether or not teachers understand these difference frames and perspectives, they cannot be overlooked in classroom situations. And when a teacher reacts to these type of events (e.g., we are slaves, just like in the past) in a crude way, this might yet again be perceived as a type of ethnic discrimination by a pupil with an immigrant background.

The sixth type of ethnic discrimination is a peculiar one as it is the teachers' act of ignoring expressions of ethnic discrimination in a school context. During the school ethnography this happened on numerous occasions. In Hendricks High, for example, the pupils were watching a movie. At some point a conflict started between a few pupils, at some point the word 'nigger' was used a few times and the pupil to who it was targeted to became furious. The teacher in the classroom chose to ignore the ethnic slur, and the conflict altogether. Afterwards, the researcher asked the teacher about the conflict. The teacher shared that he didn't intervene cause he perceived it as innocent banter between several pupils. Overall, when teachers chose

to ignore an act of ethnic discrimination they mostly did it to move on with their lesson, or they would ignore it at first but would isolate the pupils afterwards to discuss the event.

At first glance these occurrences of ignoring experiences of ethnic discrimination among pupils may seem innocent, and justified from a pragmatic point of view (Ladson-Billings, 1995). Yet, when this happens regularly, there is a risk of what Apple (1993) labeled 'death in the classroom'. This death implies that teachers stop trying to reach and invest in each pupil, and stop looking for ways to innovate their pedagogies to address the complexities of social inequalities (Ladson-Billings, 1995). Furthermore, during the school ethnography the ignoring of experiences of ethnic discrimination by teachers was sometimes related to colourblindness (Decuir & Dixson, 2004). Colourblindness refers to the believe that we live in a post-racial/post-ethnic society, which is a society where 'ethnicity' or 'race' has no impact on the life opportunities, and the overall achievements of an individual (Bonilla-Silva, 2003). Someone who firmly beholds this perspective will ignore ethnicity in any conflict that occurs (e.g., it has something to do with his or her personality or it is just them being kids). As a consequence ignoring a conflict by applying a colourblind perspective risks preserving a status-quo, and thus existing ethnic inequalities (Bonilla-Silva, 2003). It fails to take into consideration the persistence and permanence of ethnic discrimination, and the construction of pupils with an immigrant background as 'others' (Decuir & Dixson, 2004).

In summary, if we read the ignoring of experiences of ethnic discrimination in the context of theories about colourblindness and neutrality, we can consequently label this act as a type of ethnic discrimination.

The seventh conflict is related to the concept of whiteness (e.g., Frye, 1983; McIntosh, 2003) and ethnocentrism (e.g., Gillborn, 1990). Whiteness on the one hand can be defined as the set of characteristics and experiences that are attached to the 'white' race (Sue, 2004). In the European context scholars don't talk about whiteness, but refer to national contexts as a signifier of the same processes (e.g., 'Dutchness', 'Flemishness', etc.) (Wekker, 2016). Theories about whiteness and other variants emphasize the observation that members of an ethnic majority are not seen as an ethnic group on their own, as they perceive themselves as 'normal' (Wekker, 2016). It is a state of unconsciousness: it is often invisible to members of the ethnic majority group, which leads to cultural norms and practices being unnamed and unquestioned (Frankenberg, 1993). Ethnocentrism on the other hand is neutral concept, and can be defined as the tendency to evaluate other ethnic groups from the standpoint of one's own ethnic group and experiences (Gillborn, 1990). However, some circumstances of ethnocentrism acted out by members of an ethnic majority group will lead to ethnic discrimination, as ethnic minority members are further away from the norms and values stipulated by the 'powerful' ethnic majority. When relating ethnocentrism to the ethnic majority it is almost impossible to distinguish it from acts of institutional and structural discrimination (Gillborn, 1990; Quaynor & Litner, 2015). Both whiteness and ethnocentrism have in common that they are mostly

invisible to the eye of ethnic majority members, but both these invisible beliefs, values, and assumptions can have severe consequences for ethnic minority members (Sue, 2004).

An example of ethnic discrimination related to whiteness and ethnocentrism that occurred during the school ethnography was related to the dominance of the Dutch language: “*After Sandra [pupil with an immigrant background] gave a speech, the teacher remarks that she did quite well, but warns her that she needs to work on her language because her accent is too thick. The teacher shares with the researcher afterwards that she is afraid that people might hear that she has ‘an ethnic background’, which might in the long run ruin her chances on the labour market [Hendricks High]*”. The teacher’s remark can be related with the observation that language, especially in Flanders, is seen as the most valuable asset of integration processes (Blommaert & Van Avermaert, 2008). Subsequently, the remark conveys the message that “*despite the prestige of foreign language learning, some languages have a lower status (Dixson & Rousseau, 2006, p. 34)*”. However, the teacher makes the remark out of concern, as research indeed shows that having a foreign accent influences opportunities on the Flemish labour market (e.g., Baert, Cockx, Gheyle, & Vandamme, 2013). Despite the best intentions the actions of the teacher can be framed as ethnic discrimination, because rather than questioning the (invisible) norms and values, and questioning or attacking institutional ethnic discrimination on the labour market, she is conveying the message that pupils with an immigrant background need to be just like ethnic majority members to succeed in the host society.

An eight type of ethnic discrimination that occurred during the school ethnography can be labeled as implicit bias, which is in many ways connected with the Pygmalion effect, which is a type of self-fulfilling prophecy where the negative expectations of teachers will negatively impact the learning outcomes of the pupils (Rosenthal & Jacobson, 1968). An ‘implicit bias’ can be defined as an unconsciously triggered belief in the inferiority of, or negative attitude toward, an ethnic group. Furthermore, these implicit biases can impact expectations and action (Clair & Denis, 2015). The negative consequences of implicit biases in the educational context is within research called ‘the Pygmalion effect’ (Rosenthal & Jacobson, 1968). Empirical research on the Pygmalion effect show that expectations of teachers about the learning outcomes of certain pupils can influence the behavior of the teacher, even as much that teachers might play a big role in the final learning outcomes of the pupils (Stevens, 2008). This is also true for implicit biases of teachers about pupils with an immigrant background (e.g., Jungbluth, 2003). Of course, not every teacher conforms to these expectations, and also not every pupil conforms to the expectations of the teacher, it might even motivate them to do better in school (Levrau & Timmerman, 2009). Nevertheless, these unconscious negative beliefs, feelings and resulting expectations about ethnic groups may not appear on a survey but are generally revealed in everyday interpersonal interactions at school (Clair & Denis, 2015). Implicit biases are connected to acts of ethnic micro-insults and micro-invalidations, but more so they lead to spontaneous and mostly nonverbal behaviors and emotions that

could affect interpersonal interactions (Lane, Banaji, Nosek, & Greenwald, 2007). As a consequence, it is also difficult to observe these types of ethnic discrimination in everyday classroom settings. Yet, it is clear that some teachers during the school ethnography had lower expectations on the learning outcomes of pupils with relatively low levels of Dutch proficiency.

The ninth and last type of ethnic discrimination that arose out of the school ethnography is related to the concept of 'reverse racism', and how teachers react to occurrences of reverse racism as well as use it as a justification for their own behaviour. Reverse racism is commonly used to refer to various expressions of hostility of ethnic minority group members towards ethnic majority group members (Denis, 2004; Gallagher, 2015). Two events that occurred in a classroom context during the school ethnography can be used to illustrate reverse racism. A first one took place in Hendricks High. During a discussion about ethnic discrimination, a teacher points out that racism is something that works both way. She told her pupils that she sometimes also feels discriminated against when pupils (with an immigrant background) speak their mother tongue, which she cannot understand. A second event took place in St. Jozef. In this event, the teacher was confronted with an anti-LGBTQ stance by some of her pupils with an immigrant background. The latter event is a reflection of how teachers can be confronted with pupils who hold a different interpretation of certain Western values. In both events teachers (and a lot of people) would rightfully argue that members of an ethnic minority group also discriminate members of an ethnic majority groups (Desmond & Emirbayer, 2009). As a teacher in Hendricks High puts it: *"I don't get it, they always say we are racist, but at the same time they are discriminating us"*.

However, during aforementioned events, some teachers miss out on some significant aspects related to 'reverse racism'. Firstly, a distinction should be made between ethnic discrimination acted out by a member of an ethnic minority group on the one hand and ethnic discrimination by a member of an ethnic majority group on the other. Making this distinction is not implying that the one is worse than the other, but we should consider the clear differences in (societal) power relations on the one hand, and the cumulation of experiences of ethnic discrimination by ethnic minority group members on the other hand (Desmond & Emirbayer, 2009). The first aspect implies that both types of ethnic discrimination are not equal, as ethnic minority groups do have a socially and culturally disadvantaged position in the host society on the institutional and structural level (e.g., Bonilla-Silva, 2003; Gallagher, 2015; Quaynor & Lintner, 2015). Secondly, members of the ethnic minority group are confronted with experiences of ethnic discrimination on a daily basis, also outside of the school setting (e.g., Desmond & Emirbayer, 2009; Stevens, 2010). Claims of reverse racism/ethnic discrimination therefore tend to ignore both disparities (Clair & Denis, 2015). By using these forms of reverse racism as a way to justify or even approve your own actions of ethnic discrimination worsens the situation, and fortifies the consequences of other experiences of ethnic discrimination.

3.1.2. The ACCORD Interethnic conflict scenarios

After constructing a (non-exhaustive) typology of types of ethnic discrimination that can possibly occur in a classroom we had to decide which types could possibly be incorporated in the ACCORD E-tool. Five scenarios needed to be created.

The selection was based on two dimensions, a technical and a substantive one. The technical dimension refers to the technical feasibility, accessibility and/or transparency of a type of ethnic discrimination to be incorporated in an E-tool. Is it technically possible to incorporate this conflict? The substantive dimension refers to the relevance, variation and clarity of a type of ethnic discrimination to be incorporated in an E-tool. Does the conflict has enough content and relevancy to be incorporated? The final decision was made in consultation with the different partners of the project.

In the following part, the scenarios will be presented while pinpointing its specific relation with the typology of the different types of ethnic discrimination. At the end, we will briefly describe why some types of ethnic discrimination were not chosen. All the scenarios are inspired by the findings of the school ethnography, but were adapted to safeguard anonymity and confidentiality, and to transform these scenarios from a specific Flemish context to other European national contexts. All scenarios occur in a classroom context, and are occurrences of ethnic discrimination between a pupil-teacher or between pupils themselves where the teacher needs to react to.

The first scenario is related to the type of ethnic discrimination that is related with distinct visions on integration/ethnic identities, and the way institutional/structural ethnic inequalities can come to the foreground in a daily conversation (e.g., Delgado & Stefancic, 2001; Sears & Henry, 2008).

Scenario 1

A boy of Ethiopian descent caught the attention of the teacher during class because he was making too much noise. Despite several warnings of the teacher, the student and the teacher get caught up in a verbal conflict. At some point during the conflict the boy screams to the teacher that 'history still lingers on' and 'white people still treat people of colour as slaves'.

The second scenario is related to ethnic humour (e.g., Kuipers & van der Ent, 2016; Stevens, 2008; Van Praag, Stevens & Van Houtte, 2017).

Scenario 2

During an ICT-Class, a boy of Italian descent forwards an e-mail with a picture enclosed to his classmates. Suddenly, the whole class starts laughing. The picture shows a selfie of two

monkeys wearing sunglasses and has a text which says: “this is a picture of us during our holidays in Brazil.” He shouts: ‘Sam’s holidays picture [boy of African descent].’

The third scenario is related to the theoretical framework of micro-aggressions, and more specifically micro-insults and micro-invalidations (e.g., Minikel- Lacoque, 2013; Sue et al., 2007).

Scenario 3

The subject of the course today is the exploration of religions. The teacher kindly asks a Muslim pupil to teach the class everything what there is to tell about the religion of Islam. The teacher always enjoys it when her own pupils can learn her something new. The pupil refuses to accomplish the request of the teacher.

The fourth scenario is related to several analyzed types of ethnic discrimination and its aforementioned discussions, namely ethnic micro-invalidation, distinct visions about integration/ethnic identities and aspects of whiteness and/or the (invisible) privileged position of ethnic majority members (e.g., Sue et al., 2007; Quaynor & Lintner, 2015).

Scenario 4

During class, the subject of ethnic discrimination comes up. The teacher invites everyone to share their experiences. One girl shares the story of how people in the grocery store always look weird at her mother because of the fact that she wears a headscarf. One of the pupil of the class states that people may not look weird at her because of what she wears but because of the way she acts. Not everything that looks like a racist reaction at first sight is racist per se. The Muslim girl becomes furious and responds that this is not true.

The fifth and last scenario is related to reverse racism and ethnic discrimination between ethnic minority group members themselves, and also the way teachers react to this occurrence, as well as how they might use it as a form of justification for their own behaviour (e.g., Denis, 2004; Gallagher, 2015).

Scenario 5

The class watched a movie that tackled the theme of sexuality. One of the topics during the movie was about homosexuality. After the movie a discussion in class takes place. A Muslim boy of Turkish descent feels disgusted and shouts that two boys kissing should not be allowed and is completely unethical. An Orthodox Christian boy of Greek descent reacts and say that ‘the Turkish is a backward culture and the Islam is not a religion of modern times.’

None of the chosen scenarios are directly related to explicit and overt forms of ethnic discrimination, ignoring ethnic discrimination and implicit ethnic biases. The first, overt direct ethnic discrimination, is indirectly incorporated in some scenarios. For example, the last scenario could also be labeled as an overt type of ethnic discrimination. We decided against incorporating a scenario that only consists out of an explicit type of ethnic discrimination, as they are publicly recognized, scrutinized and rejected. Rather, it seems more viable to include types of ethnic discrimination that are more difficult to decipher in everyday educational practices. Yet, the theoretical content about these overt types was incorporated in the ACCORD Massive Open Online Course. We also decided against incorporating an occurrence of ignoring ethnic discrimination, because it was difficult to incorporate this in a scenario form, as well some problems arose in the context of technical feasibility. Lastly, the type of ethnic discrimination related to implicit bias and its possible consequences was technically too complex to incorporate. However, theoretical content about implicit ethnic bias's and the Pygmalion effect was included in the ACCORD Massive Open Online Course.

3.2. National focus group discussions: perceptions about interethnic conflicts

3.2.1. Perceptions about the ACCORD interethnic conflict scenarios

The focus group discussions provided the participants – all active in educational sectors – the opportunity to react on the created ACCORD interethnic conflict scenarios. The overall reactions by the participants on each scenario will be briefly discussed to demonstrate the differences across countries, the difficulties with regard to these scenarios and the interpretations of these interethnic conflicts and the perceptions thereof.³ To facilitate reading, we repeated the abovementioned interethnic conflict scenarios above every discussion.

Scenario 1

A boy of Ethiopian descent caught the attention of the teacher during class because he was making too much noise. Despite several warnings of the teacher, the student and the teacher get caught up in a verbal conflict. At some point during the conflict the boy screams to the teacher that ‘history still lingers on’ and ‘white people still treat people of colour as slaves’.

The first scenario elicited a lot of discussion among participants, mainly about the labeling of the conflict as ‘interethnic’. The focus group discussion in Austria proved to be an interesting case, as two different stances got confronted with each other:

“I think it is not an intercultural conflict. Maybe a white boy is making noise and the teacher says that he has to be quiet – it’s the same. So, I think the scenario is not a problem of interculturality (participant focus group discussion Austria).”

“It seems the conflict is because he does not belong to the majority culture. Because of that, we can also say that the conflict is not caused by the teacher’s behavior in the classroom, but because of the psychology of children and how they perceive the situation. So it is an intercultural problem (participant focus group discussion Austria).”

While the first participant did not label the conflict as interethnic, the second did by referring to the observation that the conflict may lay in the perception of the pupil. These debates demonstrate vividly that the interpretation of interethnic conflicts is not always so

³ Due to time constraints, not all national partners were able to discuss all the interethnic conflict scenarios with their participants.

straightforward, and often cannot be solved without taking into account each other stances. The illustrated discussion shows the tension between the focus on classroom management and practices on the one hand, and the individualized cultural interpretations of children on the other. Furthermore, it was also suggested by participants that the ethnic background of the pupil in the scenario could be changed depending on the ethnic composition of the European member states. This actually suggests that the particular minority group and the different relationships between particular ethnic groups shape interethnic conflicts and individual interpretations hereof, as well as the importance of the context for the definition and interpretation of interethnic conflicts.

Scenario 2

During an ICT-Class, a boy of Italian descent forwards an e-mail with a picture enclosed to his classmates. Suddenly, the whole class starts laughing. The picture shows a selfie of two monkeys wearing sunglasses and has a text which says: “this is a picture of us during our holidays in Brazil.” He shouts: ‘Sam’s holidays picture [boy of African descent].’

The second scenario about ethnic humour was less discussed among the participants in all national contexts. The reactions of teachers and other school personnel can be distinguished as follows: some participants laughed with the scenario and felt this occurrence should be treated as ‘humour’, others thought this could potentially be labeled as ethnic discrimination, and a third group defined every occurrence of ethnic humour as ethnic discrimination (e.g., Kuipers & van der Ent, 2016). Participants agreed that ethnic humour is a common practice in a classroom, and thought it was an interesting perspective to incorporate in the ACCORD training.

Scenario 3

The subject of the course today is the exploration of religions. The teacher kindly asks a Muslim pupil to teach the class everything what there is to tell about the religion of Islam. The teacher always enjoys it when her own pupils can learn her something new. The pupil refuses to accomplish the request of the teacher.

The third scenario was in general perceived as an interethnic conflict by most participants. Some labelled this scenario rather as a tension, than as a conflict. Interestingly, in one focus group discussion, some participants argued that this may be a interethnic conflict, but “*not in the terms described in the scenario because students are always happy to share their own customs, traditions, religions (participants focus group discussion Italy).*” We can label the reaction in this focus group discussion as a type of ethnic discrimination on its own, for example as (positive) ethnic stereotyping (Clair & Denis, 2015), because the participants imply that pupils with an immigrant background are always happy to share their ‘own’ customs,

traditions and/or religions (Van der Heijde, Kampman, & Bruin, 2016). However, it is not because a pupil is a member of an ethnic minority group/community, he or she has a salient ethnic identity and/or wants to share these aspects with other people (Fenton, 2010).

Scenario 4

During class, the subject of ethnic discrimination comes up. The teacher invites everyone to share their experiences. One girl shares the story of how people in the grocery store always look weird at her mother because of the fact that she wears a headscarf. One of the pupil of the class states that people may not look weird at her because of what she wears but because of the way she acts. Not everything that looks like a racist reaction at first sight is racist per se. The Muslim girl becomes furious and responds that this is not true.

The fourth scenario was only introduced during one focus group discussion in Italy, due to time constraints. The following extract reflects a part of the discussion about the fourth scenario:

“Probably the girl understands that her mother is not integrated at all and suffers for that because she desires a mother similar to her Italian friends’ ones (focus group discussion Italy).”

Most participants in this focus group discussion interpreted the scenario in such a way that the pupil with an immigrant background must have felt bad that her mother is not ‘integrated’ in the Italian society, almost arguing that the girl in question needs to be saved from her religion (and also assuming she wants this). While this could be true, the goal of including this scenario was mainly to convey the message that ethnic discrimination can have different meanings, and can also be perceived in different ways (Eriksen, 2015).

Scenario 5

The class watched a movie that tackled the theme of sexuality. One of the topics during the movie was about homosexuality. After the movie a discussion in class takes place. A Muslim boy of Turkish descent feels disgusted and shouts that two boys kissing shouldn’t be allowed and is completely unethical. An Orthodox Christian boy of Greek descent reacts and say that ‘the Turkish is a backward culture and the Islam is not a religion of modern times.’

The fifth and last scenario was discussed in most focus group discussions. Participants seemed to be pleased that this scenario was included, as it occurs quite often in their respective educational contexts. The scenario highlights occurrences of reverse racism and ethnic discrimination between ethnic minority group members. Interestingly, while there was always some type of discussion during the other scenarios about the labelling of the conflict as ‘interethnic’, in this scenario, this type of discussion was absent. This finding is in line with

critical studies that looks deeper into the reactions and perceptions of ethnic majority people in the context of ethnic discrimination (e.g., Decuir & Dixon, 2004; Quaynor & Litner, 2015). More specifically, ethnic majority tend to conceptualize ethnic discrimination as a neutral concept, stripping it back from all its power dynamics and its devastating impact in historical processes. By doing this, they risk neglecting that ethnic discrimination can happen in a lot of different ways, and also occurs on different levels (Denis, 2004; Gallagher, 2015). In other words, literature suggests that the participants do not debate about the labeling of the conflict as ‘interethnic’ because it is a very overt and explicit type of discrimination.

To conclude, in some interethnic conflict scenarios, there was a lot of debate about the labeling of the conflict as ‘interethnic’. This is especially true for scenario one, three and four. The discussions show that some participants uphold a clear definition of what ethnic discrimination is. Upholding a clear definition of ethnic discrimination risks neglecting the fact that ethnic discrimination might also occur unintentionally, and might still be perceived as such by the victim. This risk is illustrated in the focus group discussion of Austria about scenario one. While some participants did not make any connection with ethnic discrimination in the scenario, others did so by using the perspective of the pupil as a starting point. In the Massive Open Online Course, it is emphasized regularly that ethnic discrimination cannot solely be captured by upholding ‘objective’ definitions, as it is a social phenomenon (e.g., Eriksen, 2015; Stevens, 2008; 2010). We believe these discussions are an important strength and feature of the ACCORD training, as one conflict might be perceived as ethnic discrimination by one person, while another person does not relate the conflict to ethnicity at all (Eriksen, 2015; Stevens, 2008; 2010). When teachers would use the E-tool developed for the ACCORD project in team, these discussions should be stimulated rather than avoided. The discussion about the labeling of the conflicts as ‘interethnic’ was less present in the scenarios about ethnic humour and reverse racism, mainly because both scenarios appeared to be very recognizable for all participants, and also both scenarios reflect more overt and explicit occurrences of ethnic discrimination in the classroom.

The national focus group discussions also led to some results that were not directly related to the ACCORD conflict scenarios, but were nonetheless relevant in the context of this project. Following results are briefly touched upon: the concept of ethnicity, ethnic discrimination as a residual matter of the educational context and the specific target group of the ACCORD conflict scenarios.

Firstly, in all focus group discussions there were debates among the participants about the meaning of ‘ethnicity’. In the context of this report we opted for an open definition in regard to ‘ethnicity’, which implies that ethnicity can refer to racial, cultural, national, religious and language boundaries (Kivisto & Crul, 2012). By doing this, we wanted to avoid, for example, that people would perceive a cultural conflict as ethnic discrimination, but would not perceive a religious conflict as such (Clycq, 2015). During the focus group discussions, ethnicity was mainly narrowed down to culture, which is indeed is one of the most common interpretations

of ethnicity within Europe (Fenton, 2010). In everyday educational practices, these conceptual debates are important. However, when somebody is discriminated in a classroom context on the base of race, culture, nationality, language or religion it does not matter as much if this is called ‘ethnic’, ‘racial’ or ‘religious’ discrimination, as it needs to be recognized as an act of discrimination either way (Clair & Denis, 2015; Foner, 2012).

Secondly, many participants mentioned that dealing with or prevent ethnic discrimination was not a core task of the educational sector, but rather a residual matter. This is reflected in statements like ‘*we can’t deal with this during mathematics*’. Nevertheless, the majority of school staff personnel, researchers and policy makers emphasize the role education plays in tackling social inequality matters (e.g., Gorski, 2008; Ladson-Billings, 1995; Crul, Schneider & Van Praag, 2014).

Thirdly, some participants underlined that the offered ACCORD interethnic conflict scenarios are more suitable in the context of 2nd or 3rd generation immigrant pupils, as the interethnic conflicts with for example newly arrived pupils with an immigrant background can differ significantly (e.g., due to language issues and local immigrant discourses).

3.2.2. Self-made interethnic conflict scenarios

During the national focus groups, the participants were asked to make their own interethnic conflicts scenarios in a class- or school context. A total of 19 self-made scenarios were collected. All the self-made scenarios will be discussed separately in regard to two dimensions, namely people involved during interactions (1), and the type of ethnic discrimination at heart of the scenario (2).

The core interactions or relationships in the self-made interethnic conflict scenarios were mainly centered around two kinds: acts of ethnic discrimination by pupils directed to teachers and acts of ethnic discrimination among pupils themselves. Only two scenarios highlighted an act of ethnic discrimination by a teacher directed to a pupil or pupils, and there were no scenarios that emphasized possible acts of ethnic discrimination among teachers themselves. Three self-made scenarios also brought in new interactions, namely acts of ethnic discrimination by parents directed to teachers (or the school as a whole). Finally, one scenario had an undefined core interaction as the event in the scenario was related to many school actors, and was rather situated on the institutional level. The results are summarized in the following table:

Central interaction interethnic conflict	Amount of interethnic conflict scenarios (N)
Teacher(s) → Pupil(s)	2
Pupil(s) → Teacher(s)	5
Pupil(s) ↔ Pupil(s)	8
Teacher(s) ↔ Teacher(s)	0
Parent(s) → Teacher(s)	3

Table 5: central interactions in the self-made interethnic conflict scenarios in the context of ethnic discrimination

The results of this exercise suggest that the participants lay a stronger emphasis, in comparison with the ACCORD interethnic conflict scenarios, on ethnic discrimination acted out by pupils themselves. However, we do believe that these type of interactions are also present in the constructed conflict scenarios (cf. supra). Subsequently, it is also not surprising that the participants introduced the role of parents in the interethnic conflict scenarios, as the role of the parents within educational systems is becoming increasingly important (Opdenakker & Hermans, 2006). Additionally, by including parents in the educational project, incidences of interethnic conflicts are placed within its wider context (thus bring society in the school). Yet, within the ACCORD E-tool, the teacher-pupil relationship and the classroom setting are the focal point, which does not enable us to incorporate the role of the parents in a direct manner.

Secondly, the scenarios differed with regards to the different types of ethnic discrimination included in the self-made scenario. Some scenarios were able to incorporate different types of ethnic discrimination into one event, which resulted in an overlap of some types. The explicit and overt types of ethnic discrimination are central in most self-made scenarios. Following fragment of a self-made scenario illustrates these overt and explicit types of ethnic discrimination:

“In the school cafeteria, a new instructor has come to work. Her name is Fatima and she practices the Muslim religion. The students do not always pay attention to her indications given and she frequently hears comments such as: “I will take off my hat when you take off that disgusting veil” (focus group discussion Spain).

The type of ethnic discrimination that could be found second-most in the self-made scenarios were those that made a connection with reverse racism and/or ethnic discrimination between ethnic minority group members. Following self-made scenario is an example of this:

“Scenario handshake: after graduation we as the examiners/jury hand over the certificates and congratulate with handshakes. A woman, wearing a ‘chadon’ [veil], doesn’t shake hands with male examiners but only with female ones (focus group discussion Austria)”.

A significant amount of the self-made scenarios signaled issues where, according to them, ethnic minority group members were not willing to accept Western norms and values. The illustration stated above is an example of this. Ethnic micro-insults and micro-invalidations were present in three self-made scenarios. Both ethnic humour and ethnic discrimination related to distinct visions of integration occurred two times, and one participant wrote a

scenario related to institutional and structural ethnic discrimination. Types of ethnic discrimination related to ignoring, whiteness and implicit bias were not present in the self-made scenarios. The results are summarized in the following table:

Type of ethnic discrimination	Amount of interethnic conflict scenarios (N)
Explicit and overt	13
Ethnic micro-insult	1
Ethnic micro-invalidating	2
Ethnic humour	2
Related to distinct visions of integration/ethnic identities	2
Ignoring	0
Whiteness and ethnocentrism	0
Implicit bias and Pygmalion effect	0
Reverse racism	7
Institutional and structural	1

Table 6: types of ethnic discrimination that were central in the self-made scenarios

The overrepresentation of overt and explicit types of ethnic discrimination in the participants' self-made scenarios might be a reflection of the narrow conceptualization of ethnic discrimination and racism in the public sphere (e.g., Bonilla-Silva, 2003; Wrench, 2015). Additionally, it also reflects and confirms research findings which highlight that explicit and overt types of ethnic discrimination are still perceived by teachers as the most important signifier of interpersonal ethnic discrimination (e.g., Stevens, 2010). The second-most reported type of ethnic discrimination was reverse racism and related (reactions to) ethnic discrimination between different ethnic minority group members. Most of these scenarios reflected the difficulty of teachers and other school personnel in coping with cultural differences, and the reluctance of ethnic minority group members to accept certain Western values (e.g., gender equality). Due to the importance of this subject for teachers and other school personnel, we decided to incorporate it in a creative manner within the fifth ACCORD conflict scenario (i.e., scenario related to perceptions about homosexuality).

4. Conclusion

The ACCORD-project aims to prepare secondary school teachers and by extension other school personnel, to constructively prevent and deal with interethnic conflicts that may arise in classroom interactions. Subsequently, this project aims to support school actors to create positive learning environments, and to address ethnic diversity in a classroom- and school context. To do so, the project aims to develop, implement and validate an open online learning platform, providing pedagogical resources and activities based on game-based and scenario-based learning.

The first section of this report provided a brief description of migration dynamics and history in the European Union. Subsequently, this report elaborated on the meaning of integration processes of immigrant children in education and also situated the role of education in the different integration debates and describing different ethnic inequalities that exist in European educational systems. One lesson that can be drawn out of this state of art, is that no country is a one-sided success when it comes to the employment of education as a motor of social upward mobility in the integration process, as no single educational system ensures that pupils with an immigrant background will achieve parity with pupils who are members of the ethnic majority population (Alba & Foner, 1015). A myriad of structural, institutional, family and individual related factors still play a significant role. One factor that plays a role in sustaining and/or strengthening different ethnic inequalities in the educational context was elaborated on, namely interethnic conflicts and ethnic discrimination in the classroom context. The goal of this report was to gain valuable insights in the different ways ethnic discrimination might actually occur during pupil(s)-teacher(s) interactions within a classroom setting. To achieve this goal school ethnographies and national focus groups were executed.

The results of the school ethnographies, and the associated theoretical discussions, lay bare that experiences of ethnic discrimination occur in a myriad of ways in classroom and school contexts. A typology of nine different types of ethnic discrimination was constructed, which highlighted that experiences of ethnic discrimination how small, subtle and insignificant they may sometimes seem, might also be very complex and by extension can be linked with different aspects of institutional and structural ethnic discrimination. The typology was used to create five interethnic conflict scenarios, which will be incorporated in the ACCORD E-tool. The complexity of everyday occurrences of ethnic discrimination also means that no straight forward answers or actions can be formulated on how to prevent or how to solve them (Stevens, 2008). We do hope that the created typology, and the resulted five interethnic conflict scenarios can inspire and support teachers and other school personnel in preventing and tackling occurrences of ethnic discrimination in their respective classrooms and schools.

As Garibay (2014) states, examining and dealing with ethnic discrimination in everyday educational practices should be an important component of professional development. It can encourage and provide skills for teachers and other school personnel in order to create a more positive and optimal learning environment. During the focus group discussions, we invited school personnel to reflect on the five interethnic conflict scenarios, and to create their own interethnic conflict scenarios. The five interethnic conflict scenarios sparked a lot of discussion between the participants, which were mainly centred around the labelling of the conflict as 'ethnic', and whether these 'interethnic' conflicts would be applicable in their own national educational context. The discussions, especially around the labelling of the conflict as 'interethnic', can be seen as a confirmation of the theoretical backbone that was built around the scenarios, which will be incorporated together with the scenarios in the ACCORD-Massive Open Online Course (ACCORD MOOC). Finally, most participants acknowledged that many of these interethnic conflict scenarios happen regularly in their own national educational context.

Both the executed school ethnographies and the national focus group discussions highlight the complexity of ethnic discrimination in a classroom setting and confirm the difficulties teachers and other school personnel have in framing these occurrence in their daily professional lives. Although the complexity prevents a straight forward answer, we do want to finish off this report with some general guidelines that can support teachers, school personnel and also schools in dealing with occurrences of ethnic discrimination. Firstly, we advise to take time to critically reflect upon ones' own assumptions and prejudices, both individually as in group and, and also try to change it once in a while (Gorski, 2006). Secondly, during reflection moments and team meetings, it is important to distinguish between the difference between intention and impact of ethnic discrimination when discussing interethnic conflicts (Suarez-Orozco et al., 2015). The typology illustrates that interethnic conflicts can still occur, despite the best intentions of teachers and pupils alike. Thirdly, do not be afraid to talk about ethnicity and ethnic discrimination, and also to create a safe environment in which feelings of being discriminated against can be more easily discussed. Further on, research shows that a lot of members of the ethnic majority group have little experience in discussing matters of ethnic discrimination, partly because they are afraid of asking naïve questions or making offensive remarks (Tatum, 2017). This 'fear induced silence' in combination with the harsh label of being called 'a racist' make it very challenging for teachers and other school personnel to tackle the subject in their respective classrooms and schools. A recommendation would be to support teachers and other school actors in trying to gain more knowledge and experience surrounding ethnic discrimination, as well as realize that ethnic discrimination is a common occurrence in everyday life.



Co-funded by the
Erasmus+ Programme
of the European Union



1.1. References

- Alba, R., & Foner, N. (2015). *Strangers No More? Immigration and the Challenges of Integration in North America and Western Europe*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Apple, M. (1993). *Official knowledge*. New York: Routledge.
- Agirdag, O. (2009). All Languages Welcomed Here. *Educational Leadership*, 66(7), 20-25.
- Agirdag, O., Hermans, M., & Van Houtte, M. (2011). Het verband tussen islamitische religie, religiositeit en onderwijsprestaties. *Pedagogische Studietoën*, 88(5), 465-473.
- Agirdag, O., Loobuyck, P., & Van Houtte, M. (2012). 'Determinants of attitudes toward muslim students among flemish teachers: a research note'. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 51(2), 368-376.
- Agirdag, O., Van Houtte, M., & Van Avermaet, P. (2011). Why does the ethnic and socio-economic composition of schools influence math achievement? The role of sense of futility and futility culture. *European Sociological Review*, 28(3), 366-378.
- Azzolini, D. (2011). A new form of educational inequality? What we know and what we still do not know about the immigrant-native gap in Italian schools. *Italian Journal of Sociology of Education*, 1, 197-222.
- Azzolini, D., Schnell, P., & Palmer, J. (2012). Educational Achievement Gaps between Immigrant and Native Students in Two "New Immigration Countries": Italy and Spain in comparison. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 643(1), 46-77. doi: 10.1177/0002716212441590
- Ball, S. J. (1990). Self-doubt and soft data: social and technical trajectories in ethnographic fieldwork. *International Journal of Qualitative Research in Education*, 3(2), 157-171. doi: 10.1080/0951839900030204
- Battistich, V, Solomon, D., Watson, M., & Schaps, E. (1997). Caring School Communities. *Educational Psychologist*, 32(3), 137-151. doi: 10.1207/s15326985ep3203_1
- Bastos, J., Ibarrola Armendariz, A., Sardinha, J., Westin, C., & Will, G. (2006). Identity, representation, interethnic relations and discrimination. In R. Penninx, M. Berger & K. Kraal (Eds.), *The dynamics of international migration and settlement in Europe : a State of the Art* (pp. 201-232). Amsterdam: Amsterdam University press.

- Bernardi, F., Garrido, L., & Miyar, M. (2011). The recent fast upsurge of immigrants in Spain and their employment patterns and occupational attainment. *International Migration*, 49(1), 148-187.
- Billig, M. (2001) Humor and hatred: The racist jokes of the Ku Klux Klan. *Discourse and Society*, 12(3): 267-289.
- Blommaert, J., & Van Avermaet, P. (2008). *Taal, onderwijs en de samenleving: de kloof tussen beleid en realiteit*. Berchem: EPO.
- Blommaert, J., & Dong, J. (2010). *Ethnographic Fieldwork: A Beginner's Guide*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Bonilla-Silva, E. (2003). *Racism without racists*. Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield
- Bovenkerk, F., Miles, R., & Verbunt, G. (1990). Racism, migration and the state in Western Europe: a case for comparative analysis. *International Sociology*, 5(4), 334-358.
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77-101. doi: 10.1191/1478088706qp063oa
- Breen, R., Luijckx, R., Müller, W., & Pollak, R. (2009). Persistent inequality in educational attainment: evidence from eight European countries. *American Journal of Sociology*, 114(1), 1475-1521.
- Brown, C.S. (2015). *The educational, psychological and social impact of discrimination on the immigrant child*. Washington, DC: Migration Policy Institute.
- Carpentier, N. (27.10.2017). Jij bent de eerste zoals ik. *De Standaard*, retrieved from Archief van De Standaard Online: http://m.standaard.be/cnt/dmf20171026_03154749
- Casacchia, O., Natale, L., Paterno, A., Terzera, L. (2008). *Studiare Insieme, Crescere Insieme? Un'indagine Sulle Seconde Generazioni in Dieci Regioni Italiane*. Milano: Franco Angeli.
- Clair, M., & Denis, J. S. (2015). Sociology of Racism. In J. D. Wright (Ed.), *International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences* (2nd Edition) (pp. 857–863). Oxford: Elsevier.
- Clycq, N. (2015). From people like us to the fundamentally other in an era of antiracism: the instrumental use of religion to exclude the other while avoiding stigma. *Current Sociology*, 65(6), 717-734.
- Cobb-Clark, D., Sinning, M. & Stillman, S. (2012). "Migrant Youth's Educational Achievement: The Role of Institutions". *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 64(3), 18-45.
- Cohen, A. P. (1985). *The Symbolic Construction of Community*. London: Routledge.

- Coronel, J. M. & Gómez-Hurtado, I. (2015). 'Nothing to do with me! Teachers' perceptions on cultural diversity in Spanish secondary schools. *Teachers and Teaching*, 21(4), 400-420.
- Crenshaw, K. (1989). "Demarginalizing the Intersection of Race and Sex: A Black Feminist Critique of Antidiscrimination Doctrine, Feminist Theory and Antiracist Politics. *University of Chicago Legal Forum*, 1989(8), 139-167.
- Crul, M. (2016). Early education is key to helping migrant children thrive. The Guardian [18.09.2016, Archive of The Guardian: <https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2016/sep/18/early-education-key-migrant-children-thrive-integration>]
- Crul, M. (2018). Culture, Identity, Belonging, and School Success. *New Directions for Child and Adolescent Development*, 160, 109-114.
- Davies, C.A. (2008). *Reflexive ethnography. A guide to researching selves and others* (2nd edition). London: Routledge.
- Davies, C. A. (2012). *Jokes and Targets*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- DeCuir, J. T., & Dixson, A. D. (2004). "So When It Comes Out, They Aren't That Surprised That It Is There": Using Critical Race Theory as a Tool of Analysis of Race and Racism in Education. *Educational Researcher*, 33(5), 26-31.
- Delgado, R., & Stefancic, J. (2001). *Critical race theory: an introduction*. New York: NYU Press.
- Denis, R. M. (2004). Racism. In A. Kuper (Ed.), *The Social Science Encyclopedia, Volume 2* (3rd edition). London; New York: Routledge.
- De Waele, J. P. (1992). *Systematische participerende observaties*. Brussel: VUB Press
- Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2005). *Handbook of Qualitative Research*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Desmond, M., & Emirbayer, M. (2009). What is racial domination? *Du Bois Review*, 6(2), 335-355. doi:10.1017/S1742058X09990166
- D'hondt, F. (2016). Ethnic discrimination and educational inequality [Doctoral Thesis]. Gent: Universiteit Gent.
- D'hondt, F., Van Praag, L., Stevens, P. A. J., & Van Houtte, M. (2015). Do attitudes toward school influence the underachievement of Turkish and Moroccan minority students in Flanders? The attitude-achievement paradox revisited. *Comparative Education Review*, 59(2), 332-354.
- D'hondt, F., Van Praag, L., Stevens, P. A. J., & Van Houtte, M. (2016). The Attitude-Achievement Paradox in Belgium: An Examination of Abstract and Concrete School

Attitudes of Ethnic Minority Students. *Acta Sociologica*, 59(3), 215-231, doi: 10.1177/0001699316636944

Dixson, A. D., & Rousseau, C. K. (2006). *Critical race theory in education: all god's children got a song*. New York: Routledge.

Eccles, J. S. (2005). Influences of parents' education on their children's educational attainments: the role of parent and child perceptions. *London Review of Education*, 3(3), 191-204.

Engbersen, G. (2018). *Lecture IMISCOE PhD Winter School Migration & Urban Change: Super-Diversity and Social Cohesion* [PowerPoint Slides]. [16.01.2018, IMISCOE Website: <https://www.imiscoe.org/news/network-news/migration-and-urban-change-15-19-january-2018>]

Entzinger, H., & Biezeveld, R. (2003). *Benchmarking in immigrant integration: a report written for the European Commission*. Rotterdam, European Research Centre on Migration and Ethnic Relations (ERCOMER).

Eriksen, T. H. (2015). *Small Places, Large Issues: an introduction to social and cultural anthropology (4th ed.)*. London: Pluto Press.

Erikson, R., & Jonsson, J. O. (1996). *Can Education Be Equalized? The Swedish Case in Comparative Perspective*. Boulder: Westview Press.

Esser, H. (2006). Migration, Language and Integration. *AKI Research Review - WZB Berlin*, 4.

European Commission. (2015). *Declaration on Promoting Citizenship and the Common Values of Freedom, Tolerance and Non-discrimination through Education*. Informal Meeting of European Union Education Ministers, Paris, 17 March 2015. Brussels: European Union.

European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights. (2017). *Second European Union Minorities and Discrimination Survey: Main Results*. Retrieved from: <http://fra.europa.eu/en/publication/2017/eumidis-ii-main-results>

Favell, A. (2003). Integration and nations: the nation-state and research on immigrants in Western Europe. *Comparative Social Research*, 22, 13-42.

Feng, Y., Lou, C. M. D., Gao, E., Tu, X., Cheng, Y., Emerson, M. R., & Zabin, L. S. (2012). Adolescents' and young adults' perception of homosexuality and related factors in three Asian cities. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 50(3), 256-260.

Fenton, S. (2010). *Ethnicity: Key Concepts (2nd Edition)*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

- Fleischmann, F. & Phalet, K. (2011). Integration and religiosity among the Turkish second generation in Europe: A comparative analysis across four capital cities, *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 35(2), 320-341.
- Foner, N. (2015). Is Islam in Western Europe like race in the United States? *Sociological Forum*, 30(4), 885-899.
- Fontana, A. & Frey, J.H. (1994). Interviewing: The Art of Science. In: N.K. Denzin & Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.) *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (pp. 361-376). Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications.
- Frankenberg, R. (1993). *White Women, Race Matters: The Social Construction of Whiteness*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Frye, M. (1983). "On Being White." *The Politics of Reality: Essays in Feminist Theory*. Freedom, CA: Crossing.
- Gaertner, S. L., & Dovidio, J. F. (1986). The aversive form of racism. In J. F. Dovidio & S. L. Gaertner (Eds.), *Prejudice, discrimination, and racism* (pp. 61-89). San Diego, CA, US: Academic Press.
- Gallagher, C. A. (2015). Color-blind egalitarianism as the new racial norm. In K. Murji & J. Solomos (Eds.), *Theories of Race and Ethnicity: Contemporary Debates and Perspectives* (pp. 40-56). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Garibay, J. C. (2014). Diversity in the classroom. Retrieved from University of California—Los Angeles, Office of Faculty & Diversity Development website: <https://faculty.diversity.ucla.edu/publications/diversity-in-the-classroom> [Google Scholar](#)
- Gillborn, D. (1990). *'Race', Ethnicity & Education: teaching and learning in multi-ethnic schools*. London: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Glock, S., & Krolak-Schwerdt, S. (2013). Does nationality matter? The impact of stereotypical expectations on student teachers' judgments. *Social Psychology of Education*, 16(1), 111-127.
- Gold, R. L. (1969). Roles in Sociological Field Observations. In G. J. McCall & J. L. Simmons (Eds.), *Issues in Participant Observation: A Text & Reader* (pp. 217-223). Boston: Addison-Wesley.
- Gorski, P. (2006). Complicity with conservatism: the de-politicizing of multicultural and intercultural education. *Intercultural Education*, 17(2), 163-173.

- Gorski, P. (2008). Good intentions aren't enough: a deconolizing intercultural education. *Intercultural Education*, 19(6), 515-525.
- Gosh, B. (2004). The challenge of integration: a global perspective. In R. Süßmuth & W. Weidenfeld (Eds.), *Managing Integration: the European Union's responsibilities towards immigrants*. Brussels: European Union.
- Grolnick, W. (2009). The role of parents in facilitating autonomous self-regulation for education. *Theory and Research in Education*, 7(2), 164-173.
- Hallinan, M. T. (1994). Tracking-from theory to practice, *Sociology of Education*, 67(2), 79-84.
- Hallinan, M. T. & Kubitschek, W. N. (1999). Curriculum differentiation and high school achievement. *Social Psychology of Education*, 3(1-2), 41-62.
- Hanushek, E., & Wüßman, L. (2011). *The Economics of International Differences in Educational Achievement: Handbook of Economics of Education* (3rd Edition). New York: Elsevier.
- Hao, L., & Pong, S. (2008). The Role of School in the Upward Mobility of Disadvantaged Immigrants' Children. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 620(1), 62-89.
- Heath, A., & Brinbaum, Y. (2014). *Unequal Attainments. Ethnic Educational Inequalities in Ten Western Countries*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hernstein, R., & Murray, C. (1994). *The Bell Curve. Intelligence and Class Structure in American Life*. New York: The Free Press.
- Jacobs, D. (2013). The Educational Integration of Migrants. What is the Role of Sending Society Actors and is there a Transnational Educational Field? INTERACT RR 2013/03, Robert Schuman Centre for Advanced Studies, San Domenico di Fiesole (FI): European University Institute, 2013.
- Jacob, M. & Tieben, N. (2009). Social selectivity of track mobility in secondary schools. A comparison of intra-secondary transitions in Germany and the Netherlands. *European Societies*, 11(5), 747-773.
- Jacobs, D., Rea, A., Teney, C., Callier, L., & Lothaire, S. (2009). *De sociale lift blijft steken. De prestaties van allochtone leerlingen in de Vlaamse Gemeenschap en de Franse Gemeenschap*. Brussel: Koning Boudewijnstichting.

Jones, J. M. (1972). *Prejudice and racism*: Addison-Wesley Reading, MA.

Jungbluth, P. (2003). De ongelijke basisschool: etniciteit, sociaal milieu, sekse, verborgen differentiatie, segregatie, onderwijskansen en schooleffectiviteit. Nijmegen: ITS.

Kawulich, B. B. (2005). Participant observation as a data collection method. Forum: *Qualitative Social Research*, 6(2). Retrieved from: <http://www.qualitative-research.net/fqs/fqs-eng.html>

Kelly, S. & Price, H. (2011). The correlates of tracking policy: Opportunity hoarding, status competition, or a technical-functional explanation? *American Educational Research Journal*, 48(3), 560-585.

Kerckhoff, A.C. (2001). Education and social stratification processes in comparative perspective, *Sociology of Education*, 74 (Special Issue), 3-18.

Kivisto, P., & Croll, P. R. (2012). *Race and ethnicity: the basics*. New York: Routledge.

Korteweg, A. C., & Yurdakul, G. (2014). *Religion, Culture and the Politicization of Honour-Related Violence A Critical Analysis of Media and Policy Debates in Western Europe and North America*. Gender and Development Programme Paper Number 12 October 2010, United Nations Research Institute for Social Development. \$

Kuipers, G., & van der Ent, B. (2016). Etnische humor en etnische relaties in Nederland. *Sociologie*, 12(2), 169-200.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1995). Toward a theory of culturally relevant pedagogy. *Educational Research*, 32(3), 465-491.

Lane, K.A., Banaji, M.R., Nosek, B.A., Greenwald, A.G., 2007. Understanding and using the implicit association test IV: what we know (so far). In B. Wittenbrink & N. S. Schwarz (Eds.), *Implicit Measures of Attitudes: Procedures and Controversies* (pp. 59-102). New York: Guilford.

Layder, D. (1998). *Sociological Practice: Linking Theory and Social Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE publications.

LeTendre, G.K., Hofer, B.K., & Shimizu, H. (2003). What is tracking? Cultural expectations in the United States, Germany, and Japan. *American Educational Research Journal*, 40, 43-89.

- Levrau, F., & Timmerman, C. (2009). Het janusgezicht van het onderwijs. Een literatuurstudie over het onderwijs in een interculturele samenleving. *Steunpunt Gelijkekansenbeleid – Consortium Universiteit Antwerpen en Universiteit Hasselt*. Beveren: Drukkerij Wilda.
- Lockyer, S., & Pickering, M. (2005). The ethics and aesthetics of humour and comedy. In S. Lockyer & M. Pickering (Eds.), *Beyond a Joke: The Limits of Humour* (pp. 1-24). London: Palgrave.
- Marks, G. N. (2005). Accounting for immigrant differences in reading and mathematics in twenty countries. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 28(1), 925-946.
- McIntosh, P. (2003). White privilege: Unpacking the invisible knapsack. In S. Plous (Ed.), *Understanding prejudice and discrimination* (pp. 191-196). New York, NY, US: McGraw-Hill.
- Merton, R. K., Fiske, M., & Kendall, P. L. (1990). *The Focused Interview*. New York: Free Press.
- Meijnen, W., Rupp, J., & Veld, T. (2001). Van Achterstand naar succes. In W. Meijnen, J. Rupp & T. Veld (Eds.), *Suscesvolle Allochtone Leerlingen* (pp. 1-16). Leuven: Garant.
- Migrant Integration Policy Index (2015). Retrieved from: <http://www.mipex.eu/key-findings>
- Mellor, D. (2004). Responses to racism: A taxonomy of coping styles used by aboriginal Australians. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 74(1), 56-71.
- Mellor, D., Merino, E., Saiz, J. L., & Quilaqueo, D. (2009). Emotional reactions, coping and long-term consequences of perceived discrimination among the Mapuche people of Chile. *Community and Applied Social Psychology*, 19(6), 473-491.
- Mickelson, R. A. (1990). The attitude–achievement paradox among Black adolescents. *Sociology of Education*, 63, 44-61.
- Minikel-Lacocque, M. (2013). Racism, college, and the power of words: Microaggressions reconsidered. *American Educational Research Journal*, 50(3), 432-465. doi: 10.3102/0002831212468048
- Morgan, S. L. (2005). *On the Edge of Commitment. Educational Attainment and Race in the United States*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Mortelmans, D. (2013). *Handboek Kwalitatieve Onderzoeksmethoden* (4de druk). Leuven: ACCO.

- Murdock, T. B. (1999). The social context of risk: Status and motivational predictors of alienation in middle school. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 91*(1), 62-75.
- Nadal, K. L., Issa, M. A., Griffin, K. E., Hamit, S., & Lyons, O. B. (2010). Religious microaggressions in the United States: Mental health implications for religious minority groups. In D. W. Sue (Ed.), *Microaggressions and marginality: Manifestations, dynamics, and impacts* (pp. 287-312). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Neblett Jr., E. W., Philip, C. L., Cogburn, C. D., & Sellers, R. M. (2006). African American adolescents' discrimination experiences and academic achievement: racial socialization as a cultural compensatory and protective factor. *Journal of Black Psychology, 32*(2), 199-218.
- Nouwen, W. and N. Clycq (2016). The Role of Teacher-Student relations in Stereotype Threat effects in Flemish Secondary Education. *Urban Education, 1-30*.
- Oakes, J. & Guiton, G. (1995). Matchmaking: The decisions of high school tracking decisions. *American Educational Research Journal, 32*(1), 3-33.
- OECD (2016). *PISA 2015 results (Volume 1): excellence and equity in education, PISA*. Paris: OECD Publishing.
- OECD (2018). *The resilience of students with an immigrant background: factors that shape well-being*. Paris: OECD Publishing.
- Ogbu, J. U. & Simons, H. D. (1998). Voluntary and involuntary minorities: A cultural-ecological theory of school performance with some implications for education. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly, 29*(2), 155-188.
- Opdenakker, M. C. & Hermans, D. (2006). Allochtonen in en doorheen het onderwijs: cijfers, oorzaken en verklaringen. In Sierens, S., Van Houtte, M., Loobuyck, P., Delrue, K. and Pelleriaux, K. (Eds.), *Onderwijs onderweg in de immigratiesamenleving* (pp. 33-66). Gent: Academia Press.
- Oring, E. (2003). *Engaging Humor*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Patton, MQ. (2001). *Qualitative Research and Evaluation Methods* (2nd Edition). Thousand oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

- Peach, C. (2005). The ghetto and the ethnic enclave. In D. P. Varady (Ed.), *Desegregating the City: Ghettos, Enclaves and Inequalities* (pp. 31-48). Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Penninx, R. (2006). Introduction. In R. Penninx, M. Berger & K. Kraal (Eds.), *The Dynamics of International Migration and Settlement in Europe: A State of Art* (pp. 7-18). Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.
- Pitzer, J., & Skinner, E. (2016). Predictors of change in students motivational resilience over the school year: the role of teacher support, self-appraisals, and emotional reactivity. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 41(1), 15-29. doi: 10.1177/0165025416642051
- Portes, A. & MacLeod, D. (1996). Educational progress of children of immigrants: The roles of class, ethnicity, and school context. *Sociology of Education*, 69(4), 255-275.
- Qin, D. B., Way, N., & Rana, M. (2008). The 'model minority' and their discontent: Examining peer discrimination and harassment of Chinese American immigrant youth. *New Directions for Child and Adolescent Development*, 2008(121), 27-42.
- Quaynor, L., & Lintner, T. (2015). Chapter 3: critical race theory in education. In S. Totten & J. Pedersen (ed.), *Educating about Social Issues in the 20th and 21st centuries* (pp. 32-50). Charlotte: Information age publishing.
- Quillian, L. (1995). Prejudice as a response to perceived group threat: Population composition and anti-immigrant and racial prejudice in Europe. *American Sociological Review*, 60(4), 586-611.
- Redfield, R., Linton, R., & Herskovits, M. (1936). *Memorandum on the study of acculturation*. *American Psychologist*, 38(1), 149-152.
- Ricard, N. C., & Pelletier, L. G. (2016). Dropping out of high school: The role of parent and teacher self-determination support, reciprocal friendships and academic motivation. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 44(1), 32-40.
- Rivara, F., & Le Menestrel, S. (2016). *Preventing Bullying Through Science, Policy, and Practice*. Washington: National Academies Press.
- Rosenthal, R., & Jacobson, L. (1968). *Pygmalion in the classroom*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

- Sayad, A. (2004). *The Suffering of the Immigrant*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Schneider, J., Crul, M., & Van Praag, L. (2014). Upward mobility and questions of belonging in migrant families. *New Diversities*, 16(1), 1-6.
- Schofield, J. W. (2010). Chapter 11: the colorblind perspective in school: causes and consequences. As in J. A. Banks & C. A. M. Banks (Ed.), *Multicultural Education: issues and perspectives* (pp. 259-283). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Sears, D. O., & Henry, P. J. (2008). The Origins of Symbolic Racism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 58(2), 259-275.
- Solórzano, D., Ceja, M., & Yosso, T. (2000). Critical race theory, racial microaggressions, and campus racial climate: The experiences of African American college students. *Journal of Negro Education*, 69(1), 60-73.
- Stevens, P. A. J. (2008). Pupils' perspectives on racism and differential treatment by teachers: on stragglers, the ill and being deviant. *British Educational Research Journal*, 35(3), 1-18.
- Stevens, P. A. J. (2010). Racisme van leerkrachten in de klas: een exploratief onderzoek naar de betekenis en perceptie van racisme bij leerkrachten door hun autochtone en allochtone leerlingen. *Tijdschrift voor Sociologie*, 31(3-4), 330-353.
- Stevens, P. A. J., & Dworkin, A. G. (2014). *The Palgrave handbook of race and ethnic inequalities in education*. London: Palgrave.
- Suarez-Orozco, C., Casanova, S., Martin, M., Katsiaficas, D., Cuellar, V., Smith, N. A., & Dias, S. I. (2015). Toxic Rain in Class: Classroom Interpersonal Microaggressions. *Educational Researcher*, 44(3), 151-160.
- Stewart, D. W., & Shamdasani, P. N. (1991). *Focus groups: theory and practice*. Newbury Park: Sage.
- Strobbe, L. (2016). Taalbeleid of talenbeleid? De plaats van meertaligheid op school. In L. Van Praag, S. Sierens, O. Agirdag, P. Lambert, S. Slembrouck, P. Van Avermaet, J. Van Braak, P. Van de Craen, K. Van Gorp & M. Van Houtte, *Haal meer uit meertaligheid. Omgaan met talige diversiteit in het basisonderwijs* (pp. 117-130). Acco: Leuven/Den Haag.
- Sue, D. (2007). Whiteness and Ethnocentric Monoculturalism: Making the "Invisible" Visible. *American Psychologist*, 59(8), 761-769.

- Sue, D. W., Capodilupo, C. M., Torino, G. C., Bucceri, J. M., Holder, A. M. B., Nadal, K. L. & Esquilin, M. (2007). Racial microaggressions in everyday life: implications for clinical practice. *American Psychologist*, 62(4), 271-286.
- Tatum, B. D. (2017). *Why are all the black kids sitting together in the cafeteria?* New York: Basic Books.
- Timmerman, C. (1997). Turkse jonge vrouwen in België, islam en nationalisme: onderwijs maakt het verschil. *Migrantenstudies*, 13(3), 167-187.
- Thomaes, S., Olthof, T., Bushman, B. J., & Nezlek, J. (2011). Turning shame inside-out: 'humiliated fury' in young adolescents. *Emotion*, 11(4), 786-793.
- Van den Eede, S., Wets, J., & Levrau, F. (2009). De Vlaamse Integratiekaart Deel II: Exploratieve Literatuurstudie van het Concept Integratie. *Steunpunt Gelijkekansenbeleid – Consortium Universiteit Antwerpen en Universiteit Hasselt*. Beveren: Drukkerij Wilda.
- Van der Heijde, H, Kampman, L, & Bruin, K. (2016). *Culturele diversiteit in de klas*. Bussum: Uitgeverij Coutinho.
- Van der Slik, F. W. P., Driessen, G. W. J. M., & De Bot, K. L. J. (2006). "Ethnic And Socioeconomic Class Composition And Language Proficiency: A Longitudinal Multilevel Examination in Dutch Elementary Schools". *European Sociological Review*, 22 (3), 293-308.
- Van Der Wildt, A., Van Houtte, M. & Van Avermaet, P. (2013). *Language ideologies in schools: a conceptual model integrating two fields of research*, Paper presented at 'Urban multilingualism and education' in Ghent (Belgium), 7-8th of March 2013.
- Vandezande, V., Fleischmann, F., Baysu, G., Swyngedouw, M., & Phalet, K. (2009). Ongelijke kansen en ervaren discriminatie in de Turkse en Marokkaanse tweede generatie. *Onderzoeksverslag CeSO/ISPO, 2009(11)*. Leuven: KULeuven.
- Van Houtte, M., & Stevens, P. A. J. (2009). School ethnic composition and students' integration outside and inside schools in Belgium. *Sociology of Education*, 82(3), 217-239
- Van Houtte, M. (2010). So where's the teacher in school effects research? The impact of teachers' beliefs, culture, and behavior on equity and excellence in education. In K. Van den Branden, P. Van Avermaet & M. Van Houtte (Eds.), *Equity and Excellence in Education: Towards Maximal Learning Opportunities for all Students* (pp. 87-107). London: Routledge.
- Van Houtte, M, Demanet, J., & Stevens, P.A.J. (2013). Curriculum tracking and teacher evaluations of individual students: selection, adjustment or labeling? *Social Psychology of Education*, 16(3), 329-352.

- Van Praag, L., Stevens, P., & Van Houtte, M. (2014). Belgium. In P. A. J. Stevens & G. A. Dworkin (Eds.), *The Palgrave Handbook of Race and Ethnic Inequalities in Education* (pp. 106-138), London: Palgrave.
- Van Praag, L., Stevens, P. A. J., & Van Houtte, M. (2015). 'No More Turkish Music!' The Acculturation Strategies of Teachers and Ethnic Minority Students in Flemish Schools. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 42(8), 1353-1370 doi:10.1080/1369183X.2015.1103171
- Van Praag, L., Boone, S., Stevens, P. A. J., & Van Houtte, M. (2015). How tracking structures attitudes towards ethnic out-groups and interethnic interactions in the classroom: an ethnographic study in Belgium. *Social Psychology of Education*, 18(1), 165-184.
- Van Praag, L., D'hondt, F., Stevens, P. A. J., & Van Houtte, M. (2015). Is the sky really the limit? Exploring the attitude-achievement paradox in the Belgian context. *Sociology of Race and Ethnicity*, 1(2), 225-238.
- Van Praag, L., Agirdag, O., Stevens, P. A. J., & Van Houtte, M. (2016). The perceived role of Islamic religiosity in minorities educational success in Belgium. A cure or a curse? *Social Compass*, 63(4), 529-546.
- Van Praag, L., & Stevens, P. A. J. (2016). Kwalitatieve onderzoeksmethoden in onderwijssociologie. In Mieke Van Houtte, Bram Eidhof & Marc Vermeulen (Eds.), *Sociologen over onderwijs. Inzichten, praktijken en kritieken* (pp. 115-130). Antwerpen/Apeldoorn: Garant
- Van Praag, L., Stevens, P. A. J., & Van Houtte, M. (2017). How humor makes or breaks student-teacher relationships: a classroom ethnography in Belgium. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 66, 393-401. doi:10.1016/J.TATE.2017.05.008
- Verkuyten, M. (2010). *Identiteit en diversiteit: de tegenstellingen voorbij*. Amsterdam: Pallas Publications.
- Vertovec, S. (2007). Super-diversity and its implications. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 30(6), 1024-1054. doi: 10.1080/01419870701599465
- Wagner, U., Christ, O., & Heitmeyer, W. (2010). Anti-immigration Bias. In J. F. Dovidio, M. Hewstone, P. Glick & V. M. Esser (Eds.), *The Sage Handbook of Prejudice, Stereotyping and Discrimination* (pp. 361-376). London: Sage.
- Watzlawick, P. (1967). *Pragmatics of Human Communication*. New York: Norton.

- Weaver, S. (2010) Liquid racism and the Danish Prophet Muhammad cartoons. *Current Sociology*, 58(5): 675-692.
- Wekker, G. (2016). *White innocence: paradoxes of colonialism and race*. London: Duke University Press.
- Wieviorka, M. (1994). Racism in Europe: Unity and Diversity. In A. Rattansi & S. Westwood (Eds.), *Racism, Modernity and Identity: On the Western Front* (pp. 199-232). Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Wilkerson, K. L. (2013). *Promoting Social Skills in the Inclusive Classroom*. London: Guilford
- Wrench, J. (2015). Raising awareness of the problem of discrimination against migrants and minorities in employment. Retrieved from <http://www.globalmigrationpolicy.org/articles/Events/WrenchGenevaAug2015.pdf>
- Zemni, S. (2011). The shaping of Islam and Islamophobia in Belgium. *Race & Class*, 53(1), 28-44.
- Zemni, S. (2016). Doceren over (politieke) Islam in tijden van IS en Syrië-strijders. *Sociologos*, 37(1), 63-66.
- Zick, A., Pettigrew, T. F., & Wagner, U. (2008). Ethnic Prejudice and Discrimination in Europe. *Journal of Social Issues*, 64(2), 233-251. doi: 10.1111/j.1540-4560.2008.00559.x

3.1. Annexes

Annex 1: information sheet for participants in ethnographic research

The following document was used to inform participants in the ethnographic research about the content, goals and research activities of the ACCORD-project. The document was originally prepared in Dutch, but was translated in English in the context of this report.

Information sheet: Attain Cultural integration through Conflict Resolution skill Development (ACCORD)

We would like to invite teachers and pupils to participate in a research. By providing you this information sheet we would like you to offer more clarification about the research project.

Who are we? Researchers of the University of Antwerp

This research project is executed by Michiel Lippens of the University of Antwerp and is supervised by Prof. dr. Christiane Timmerman and dr. Lore Van Praag.

For more information go to the provided link and read 'ACCORD-project':

<https://www.uantwerpen.be/nl/onderzoeksgroep/centrum-migratie-intercul-studies/projecten-en-publica/projecten/>

What do we do? A research to support a positive class climate

The ACCORD-project tries to support teachers in trying to prevent, and to deal with different kinds of conflicts in the classroom and in the school. To support this process an electronic tool is being developed. To realize this Belgium is working together with other European Universities, like the University of Barcelona. The research is founded by the European Commission.

Why do we do this research? To gain more insight on everyday educational practices

Through classroom observations we want to gain insight on different classroom practices. By doing this we will be capable to make the electronic tool suitable for use, as it needs to reflect daily educational practices in a school setting.

What will be asked? The research would like to spend a period together with pupils and teachers

The researcher would like to spend a period together with the pupils and teachers at school (e.g., be present during different courses). This period will last approximately two weeks. The presence of the researcher should have no influence on the daily classroom practices, and by extension the execution of the courses.

Important: all the data will be processed anonymously. No one will be able to detect where the data comes from.

The identity of the teachers and the pupils will be protected, and the data will be processed in full



confidentiality. The data that will be gathered, will be stored in a database where only the researcher has access to. The results will only be used for scientific purposes.

Don't hesitate to contact us!

In case you would like to receive more information or if you have more questions about the research project, you can always contact the main researcher via following contact details:

Michiel Lippens: E-Mail to michiel.lippens@uantwerpen.be or call 03/ 265 59 52

We would like to thank you for taking the time to go through this information sheet and we hope we can count on your agreement to participate in this research.

Annex 2: informed consent teachers and pupils in ethnographic research

The following version of the informed consent was used to receive permission of the school, teachers and pupils to execute the ethnographic research activities. The document was originally prepared in Dutch, but was translated in English in the context of this report.

Informed consent pupils and teachers

Title research: The ACCORD-Project

Main researcher: Michiel Lippens (University of Antwerpen – Centre for Migration and Intercultural Studies, CeMIS)

Supervisors: dr. Lore Van Praag and Prof. dr. Christiane Timmerman

To be completed by the participant

I declare to be informed in a clear manner about the nature, methods and goals of the research (see added information sheet). I know that the data and results will be processed with respect to the principles of anonymity and confidentiality, and will be only publicized as such to third persons. The data will be only used for scientific purposes. All my questions were answered.

I declare to be a voluntary participant in the research. I reserve the right to stop participating in the research at any point in time.

Name participant:.....

Date:.....

Signature participant:

To be completed by the main researcher:

I have given an oral and written statement about the research. I will answer the remaining questions about the research to the best of my possibilities. The participant will experience no adverse effects if he or she decides to leave the research prematurely.

Name Researcher:

Date:

Signature researcher:

Annex 3: informed consent parents of pupils in ethnographic research

The following version of the informed consent was used to give the parents of the pupils the opportunity to disclaim the ethnographic research activities. The document was originally prepared in Dutch, but was translated in English in the context of this report.

Informed consent parents

Title research project: ACCORD

Dear parent(s),

My name is Michiel Lippens and I am the main researcher in the ACCORD-project (also see added information sheet for a more detailed explanation). The main goal of the research project is to provide tools for teachers (in training) to create a more positive classroom climate (e.g., support them in dealing and preventing different kinds of conflicts). To gather data for the research project I would like to do classroom observations for a period of two weeks in the classroom of your son and/or daughter. My tasks will mainly consist of sitting behind the pupils in the classroom and writing some notes. During the classroom observations I will be completely neutral, and not disorder the classroom practice. The classroom and the courses will not be disturbed or stop because of my presence. In the context of the research project it's essential that all the events within the school just can go on as they usually do.

As you can read in the added information sheet, all the data will be processed respecting the principles of anonymity and confidentiality. So no names will be used, also not of the schools. The data will only be used for scientific purposes.

Participating in the research is also completely voluntary, that's why we also want to inform the parents about the research. I do hope you will allow your son and/or daughter to participate in the research. If you would NOT like your child to be participating in the research, please fill in the provided information strip. If you don't have any issue with your child participating in the research, then the approval of the school and your child is sufficient.

If you still have any questions or remarks left, you can contact the main researcher via following contact details: michiel.lippens@uantwerpen.be or 03/265.59.52.

Yours sincerely,



Michiel Lippens

I, the signing person,, parent of
....., do not allow participation in the context of the ACCORD-
project led by Michiel Lippens of The University of Antwerp.

Date:.....

Signature parent:

Annex 4: information sheet on socio-economic and ethnic/racial background of pupils in ethnographic research

The following document was used to gather information on the social-economic and ethnic/racial background of the pupils that participated in the ethnographic research. The document was originally prepared in Dutch, but was translated in English in the context of this report.

Background information participants in observation classrooms

Name:.....

Name track and study year:.....

Sex: girl/boy

Date of birth:...../...../.....

Please provide the nationality of the persons in the following table:

Persons	Nationality
Yourself	
Your mother	
Your father	
Your grandmother (the mother of your mother)	
Your grandfather (the father of your mother)	
Your grandmother (de mother of your father)	
Your grandfather (the father of your father)	

Please provide the country of birth of the persons in the following table:

Persons	Country of birth
Yourself	
Your mother	

Your father	
Your grandmother (the mother of your mother)	
Your grandfather (the father of your mother)	
Your grandmother (de mother of your father)	
Your grandfather (the father of your father)	

What is your religion?

- Catholic
- Protestant
- Muslim
- Jewish
- Non-religious
- Other:.....

If you would give yourself a grade from 0 to 10 in the context of your 'religious experience', going from 'not-religious' (0) to 'very religious'(10), how much would you grade yourself?

Non-religious 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 religious

Your father

What is his educational level?.....

What is or was his (current) professional occupation?.....

Your mother

What is her educational level?.....

What is or was her (current) professional occupation?.....

Is there something you want to share with or tell to the researcher?

.....

.....

.....

.....

Closing



If you would like to receive an invitation for the participation in future focus group discussions in the context of the ACCORD-project you may write your e-mail address on the following dashed line:

.....

Thank you very much for participating in the ACCORD-project!

Annex 5: example field notes ethnographic research

The following document is an example of the field notes made by the researcher during the ethnographic research. The example encompasses field notes made during the course of one class group. Adaptations to the extract were made to respect the ethical principles of anonymity and confidentiality.⁴ The document was originally prepared in Dutch, but was translated in English in the context of this report.

Monday 02/05

Observation classroom 1

Where? T2.26

Wie? 3A-3B (all girls)

Course? Course X, teacher *Patrick Fleming*

Pupils? See separate document

When? 9u15

General classroom climate

They start the course with a test. Elisa is absent today. Also Christina is not present today. After the test the course starts again. Patrick Fleming is in comparison with teaching 3A-3B more quiet and less cynical. He is letting the pupils hear an audio fragment about French fries. The girls are sitting on their ascribed spots. They always need to sit on the same desk. The girls do not seem to be segregated by ethnicity.

Concrete observations

During the class about French fries the topic of migration comes up [...]. He says that a lot of people are negative about migration, and they call them refugees. He asks the pupils if they had experiences of ethnic discrimination when growing up. [**memo researcher**: seems like he is asking them about experiences of ethnic micro-aggressions]. A lot of fingers went up in the classroom.

Avril shares her story

Avril shares that once upon a time there was an old lady at the school gate that didn't want to let her pass, and the woman was screaming to her that she needs to go back to her country. The teacher asked how Avril reacted. Natalie, another pupil, jumped into the conversation and said you just need to laugh with it, because there is nothing more you can do. Natalie just thought it was a very funny story.

⁴ The research underlines the ethical principles of **anonymity** and **confidentiality**. Only the researcher is able to identify the responses of individual subjects, as all efforts are made to prevent anyone else to link individual research subjects with certain responses. To preserve this cause adaptations in the extract of field notes were made.

Natalie shares her story

After Natalia busted into the conversation she shared her own story. She shared that people regularly laugh with her mother because of her headscarf. Patrick Fleming reacted by saying that this has more to do with the fact that her mother is a little bit of a special case [...]. The only people who discriminate are bad people according to the teacher, people who don't like refugees [**memo researcher**: outliers].

Felicia shares her story

Now Felicia shares her story. She shares that at some point somebody was angry with her in the shop. They said she was a 'nigger', and that she needs to go away. Felicia shared that she did nothing and tried to ignore it. Patrick Fleming thought this was indeed the best reaction. The best thing you can do is just run away and ignore it, cause you are just better than them. [**memo researcher**: not trying to fight it, and ignore it is according to the teacher the best method to deal with experiences of ethnic discrimination].

Patricia shares her story

The fourth person who shares her story is Patricia. She recalls all the times she was in the shopping street, and people were looking at her because of the way she dresses. She admits she gets angry a lot of times because of this and thinks that people should not stare at her like that. Patrick Fleming reacted to this situation by saying that she may be interpreting these situations in a wrong way, maybe people are not looking at her because of the way she dresses, but maybe because she can be crazy sometimes. While laughing he said that it might have something to do with something completely different. The pupil tried to resist this remark, but the teacher finished off this class group moment of sharing experiences by telling them they need to finish the curriculum for today.

[**memo researcher**: according to the teacher not attacking it and running away are the best solutions. The researcher thinks that may have something to do with the fact that people in the school don't always point out (ethnic) differences. Every pupil is the same. When a conflict is explicit you run away, because these are bad people. They are outliers of our society. When pupils share something that they care about, because they feel like it attacks their ethnicity, the teacher doesn't give counterweight when it is something more explicit. When the experiences are more implicit or less clear then the teacher says it might be a flawed interpretation. It seems like racism for the teacher is rather seldom, and something only racist people do. Racist people are not real Flemish people. The more subtle ethnic discrimination is and less straight forward, the teacher seems to imply that it is not really racism or ethnic discrimination].

Attitude towards researcher

Patrick Fleming seems to be less disturbed by the researcher. He always tries to get in a dialogue with the researcher, before and after the lesson. While they were making their test he passed by the researcher and asked him what he was writing. The researcher tried to laugh



with it, and said it's a little bit of a secret and they will get a report of the research when everything is done. He thanked him again for participating in the research [**memo researcher:** maybe this was not the best strategy, the researcher should reflect on this and learn]. The researcher also shared if he wants, he can also participate in a focus group discussion at the end of the project, so he can get an idea of what will happen with all the data. He shared that he might be interested to participate in the focus group discussion.

Annex 6: tips organizing a focus group discussion

Tips focus group discussion (University of Antwerp)

We made this document for ACCORD-members who do not have a lot of experience with the organization of focus group discussions. In what follows, you can read some general issues that have to be considered when doing these focus group discussions and we also provide some useful tips. We divided our remarks in **four parts**: preparing the focus group, introduction and management of the focus group, ending the focus group and some other remarks.

A. Preparing the focus group

- Organize the focus group in an adequate location (e.g. think about accessibility, timing, silence etc.).
- We would advise to use a round table setting, to stimulate face-to-face contact. The researcher should have a good overview of the whole discussion and be able to make eye contact.
- Be aware of practical organization (provide food/drinks, recording material, etc.).
- Kindly ask the participants to set out name tags/let the participants introduce themselves to each other.
- Before starting the focus group, an informal meeting can already take place (e.g. let the participants talk to each other while providing them with drinks).
- Reflect on the number of participants you gathered. Usually the amount of participants in focus groups vary between 6 and 10 persons. The specific amount can have an impact on the way the group discussion goes/the way you run the group discussion. For example, smaller groups run a higher risk of creating longer periods of silence or a person may dominate the discussion. In groups with a bigger amount of participants some might feel like they are ignored or they have to wait too long to speak up.
- In two words: be prepared (e.g., think about good follow-up questions).

B. Introduction and management of the focus group

(1) Introduction

- Start the discussion by laying out some basic rules of communication (e.g., everyone can state their opinion, respect each other, there are no wrong answers etc.).
- Let them know how long the discussion will be and provide them with information regarding a break/breaks.
- Point out that the focus group is anonymous and voluntarily (e.g., tell them that they can always leave if they want to).
- Let them know you will audio-record the discussion.

- Give some general information about the research (be careful to not bias the discussions: e.g.: state you are interested in the classroom dynamics and interethnic contact; NOT state that you are interested in teacher racism and prejudices).

(2) Management

- The data you will collect will consist of the answers given during the discussion that takes place between the participants (and the researchers). To elicit discussion keep questions open and be aware that your answer may steer some answers.
- It is important to let the participants clarify their answer: what do you mean with this? Can you specify your answer? Etc.
- Give every participant enough time to state their opinion.
- Watch out for persons that dominate the discussion too much (e.g., clear away by relocating the discussion to another person).
- Avoid yes/no questions. (e.g., NOT: Do you prefer to live in a city; YES: Where do you like to live?)
- Use small summaries to finish off one part of the discussion (e.g., a scenario). Also invite them to give feedback on your summary.
- Silence periods are not always bad, give the participants enough time to think and answer.
- Pay attention to quiet/shy participants. Avoid asking them direct questions. Use indirect questions (e.g., I am interested in everyone's opinion) or ask a direct question when you start a new topic.

C. Ending the focus group

- End the discussion with a general statement or summary concerning the subject. Explicitly ask them for feedback and also ask them if they have any questions left.
- Thank them for their participation (e.g., thank you for coming, I hope you all enjoyed the discussion, etc.).
- You can always ask them informally afterwards if they liked it, if they would change something, etc.
- Ask for contact details.

D. Other remarks

- We would advise to do the focus group discussion with **two researchers**. One of them will be the **moderator**, while the other one could be the **observer**. The observer can support the discussion, and he or she will also be able to notice non-verbal gestures. To have two perspectives is also better to discuss the results afterwards.
- The **moderator** has several roles. He functions as...
(1) *Interviewer*: ask questions by using different techniques (e.g., active listening, summarizing, ask the participants to specify certain answers,...).

- (2) *Facilitator*: facilitate the discussion (do not steer!)
- (3) *Therapist*: read and interpret the participants (e.g., notice when someone is absent).
- (4) *Guardian of time* (together with the other researcher).
- *Other tips for the moderator*: act relaxed, don't judge and listen very carefully (active listening). Keep focus during discussion and make sure every subject received the necessary attention. Make sure you made it possible for everyone to participate and show respect for every opinion.

Annex 7: example workshop/focus group report

1. WORKSHOP ORGANIZATION	
Country	Belgium (Flanders)
Organizing partner	University of Antwerp (CeMIS - Centre for Migration and Intercultural Studies)
Date	11/09/2017 (Scenario's only) and 12/12/2017
Settings: address, room and equipment	<p>Workshop/focus group 1 (= EVENT 1)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grote Kauwenberg 14, 2000 Antwerpen • D.014 (University Antwerp) • Hand-outs, A4 paper, Beamer,... <p>Workshop/focus group 2 (= EVENT 2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lange Nieuwstraat 55, 2000 Antwerpen • Social Room at CeMIS (University Antwerp) • Hand-outs, flipchart, A4 paper,...
Duration	1h and 30 minutes each
Number of participants	<p>EVENT 1: 5 participants</p> <p>EVENT 2: 7 participants</p> <p><u>13 Participants</u> in total</p>
Description of participants: positions, institutions, etc.	<p>EVENT 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers secondary education (5) – mainly schools with a high concentration of children with a migrant background <p>EVENT 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers secondary education (5) – mainly schools with a high concentration of children with a migrant background and also a school with a focus on refugee youngsters (reception classes) • Principal and policy coordinator (1) • Student counsellor (2)
Facilitators: name and position	<p>Michiel Lippens lead both events (Junior Researcher).</p> <p>dr. Lore Van Praag was present during both events, providing support (e.g. taking pictures, taking notes, making extra comments, etc.) (Post-Doctoral researcher).</p> <p>Prof. dr. Christiane Timmerman was present at the first event (Coordinator CeMIS).</p>
Agenda: different stages of the event	<p>EVENT 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduction event (e.g., everybody introduced themselves) • Phase 1: Presentation content ACCORD • Phase 2: scenario's interethnic conflicts (focus discussion)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Phase 3: Summary and closing (e.g., disseminating contact information and thank you e-mails) <p>EVENT 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Introduction event (e.g., everybody introduced themselves) Phase 1: Presentation content ACCORD Phase 2: Scenarios interethnic conflicts (focus discussion) Phase 3: Competence framework teachers and other school actors (focus discussion) Phase 4: Summary and closing (e.g., disseminating contact information and thank you e-mails).
<p>2. INTERCULTURAL CONFLICT SCENARIOS (STAGE C)</p>	
<p>Scenario 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Title of the scenario Participants' perspectives on the intercultural conflict Way participants would feel, as teachers, in the situation Way participants would feel, as pupils in the situation Solutions proposed to solve the conflict Does the scenario reflect participants' specific educational contexts? 	<p>Title scenario: majority vs. minority cultures (Event 1 and 2)</p> <p><i>Labeling Interethnic conflict</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some participants would not label this as an interethnic conflict as they feel that the pupil 'abuses/misuses' the ethnic different to fight with the teacher. Another participant added that she would also not label this as an interethnic conflict as it is a sign of deeper underlying problems (e.g., a drama or a hostile family environment). <p><i>Feelings and impressions</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> One participant shared that this was quite common in her school and she labeled it as 'a group phenomenon' in her context. She doesn't really understand it why they do this, because when you look at the individual persons who act like that, they get helped by 'whites' in their daily lives. Some participants believed the reaction comes out of fear/anger because he/she is afraid of being perceived as different (Researcher remark: racial lines). <p><i>How to act as a teacher</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some reactions grew out of interest: 'what did I do to make you feel this way?'

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Another participant argued that she would not confront the pupil in the classroom, but take the pupil apart during the break to talk about it. • Another participant would use the opportunity to organize a class (in this case she was wondered why some of these pupils are so actively against racism, while they act racist all the time themselves and confirm stereotypes). • Reaction depends on the subject of the class (e.g., one participant said he wouldn't be able to do these type of collective classes as a reaction cause his subject isn't aligned with the subject at hand). • Reaction depends on context (situational). • Some of them would not let the situation escalate and would have 'prevented' the comment from happening in the first place. <p><i>Other comments</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some teachers argued that the quote of the pupil should be modified to '<i>you are a racist</i>'. Something that it is more common among pupil-teacher relationships here in Flanders (<-> supra). • In both events, we received the remark that discrimination between ethnic minorities happens more (or at least also happens) compared to between ethnic minority and majority members [Researcher remark: we already incorporated this in the scenarios somehow, but it's a very interesting observation. The theoretical framework of differences between discrimination majority vs. minority and discrimination between ethnic minorities should be incorporated in the MOOC as I do believe there are some crucial remarks to be made around these teacher perceptions. This is also reflected in a remark during event 1, where participants didn't understand why they couldn't use the word 'nigger' when the 'blacks' can use it themselves. They don't think it's fair.]
<p>Scenario 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Title of the scenario 	<p>Title scenario: gender and sexuality</p> <p><i>Labeling Interethnic conflict</i></p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participants' perspectives on the intercultural conflict • Way participants would feel, as teachers, in the situation • Way participants would feel, as pupils, in the situation • Solutions proposed to solve the conflict • Does the scenario reflect participants' specific educational contexts? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One of the participants wouldn't label this as interethnic, but rather interreligious. • Another participant remarked that being Moroccan (for example) is very often intertwined with religious lines [Researcher remark: this is a discussion about the meaning of 'ethnicity' and is in line with international literature pointing to the fact that within Europe religion is becoming the new line of dividing (ethnic) groups (we vs. them) rather than culture (e.g, Wekker and Clycq), see also Foner (2012) where he comments on similarities/differences between race in the US and religion in the EU]. <p><i>Feelings and impressions</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The participants felt like these issues were most of the time due to their parental environment. <p><i>How to act as a teacher</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some teachers chose to avoid these types of discussions. Why discuss it? It only sparks intensive discussion that will become counterproductive. This is the opposite reaction of some other participants and their schools, as they chose to reflect on this with the whole team and look for a solution on the class level. Another reaction was that they chose to ignore the specific topic of homosexuality in separate classes, but they try to incorporate in school theme days with other subjects (e.g., gender theme day). • Another controversial topic is naked bodies in biology classes. Some pupils chose to cover the images (for themselves or for the parents). A participant reacted to this and added that their school decides to only show these type of image class, so that the parents would not see them. Another reaction was discussing it in class but really show them 'our' side. • A participant mentioned that too frequently schools act like they don't have time for this topic as they have to complete their curriculum. Yet she felt like we should promote these type of discussion as this is something that plays a big part
---	---

	<p>in the lifeworld of youngsters aged around 15-16 (e.g., building their (sexual) identity).</p> <p><i>Other comments</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> An interesting divide was remark was made by one teacher: the difference of interethnic conflicts in reception classes (e.g., newcomers) and the mainstream education (e.g., newcomers but also 2nd and 3rd generation ‘migrants’). They are confronted with interethnic conflicts in different ways (e.g., in reception classes there are pupils who just sit down in the park and start peeing). Although there are similarities, the type of conflicts can differ.
<p>Scenario 3 & 4</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Title of the scenario Participants’ perspectives on the intercultural conflict Way participants would feel, as teachers, in the situation Way participants would feel, as pupils, in the situation Solutions proposed to solve the conflict Does the scenario reflect participants’ specific educational contexts? 	<p>In event 2 we were only able to discuss two scenario’s. During event 1 we shortly discussed the scenarios ‘stereotyping and ethnic humour’ and ‘racism is exceptional’. Sadly due to time constrains we weren’t able to discuss it in an extensive matter.</p> <p><i>Labeling Interethnic conflict</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As far as ethnic humour goes the teachers thought it should be allowed to a certain extent. It depends on the context and the relationship you have with the respective class and pupils. Therefore they wouldn’t label it as an interethnic conflict in every situation. <p><i>Feelings and impressions</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The teachers said the ethnic humour scenario is very common in their context. Participants also admitted that pupils and teachers alike sometimes (mis)use ethnic humour as a way to mask their behaviour. In the ‘racism is exceptional’ scenario two participants said they would be afraid to start the conversation as it would run the risk to get out of hand quite easily. They would prefer to just give their lessons. Most participants of the first event said they would avoid sensitive topics all together (e.g., sexuality, antisemitism,...). <p><i>How to act as a teacher</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Two participants laughed with the ethnic humour scenario and said that they would not react to it.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In the 'racism is exceptional' scenario teachers said they would hardly ever ask about ethnic discrimination experiences in a full group, they would keep it for a private conversation with the pupil. Also age plays a role here, they would try to do with the whole group when the pupils were aged 16-18 years old.
3. ACCORD COMPETENCE FRAMEWORK (STAGE E)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Competences required to manage the intercultural conflict at stake in the created scenarios Participants' perspectives on the relevance of the framework elements (i.e. competences, knowledge, skills and attitude) 	<p>Event 1 & 2</p> <p>Due to time constraints we weren't able to go through the whole competence framework. We decided to let the teachers reflect themselves about competences, knowledge,... they think they need to handle interethnic conflicts. The provided list is the result of these discussions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Empathy and being flexible. Self-reflection (e.g., one teacher mentioned she is 'ethnically blind' therefore she doesn't believe ethnicity is there. She remarked that it may be difficult sometimes for her to deal with these type of conflicts because of that attitude. Another person remarked that being confronted with ethnic minorities on a daily basis makes it sometimes impossible to see those ethnic differences). They mentioned that, although there's a difference between 'white schools' and concentration schools (= dominated by members of ethnic minorities), all teachers should be prepared to deal with this type of diversity. Make a team of teachers/others who work around these subjects (e.g., a place where teachers can share their experiences and most importantly a place where they are not afraid to share missteps and mistakes). A space of trust which creates an open climate. Also important for teachers in training. Knowledge about different cultures (e.g., Muslims don't want to admit lies because of their 'honour' or when pupils do not look in your eyes it might not be a sign of disrespect).

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Moderating and counselling competences (e.g., a teacher shouldn't only be a dominant actor who shares the facts). • The relational dimension between teacher and pupils was stressed multiple times. • Importance of the prevailing classroom culture.
4. RESULTS OF THE EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE (STAGE F)	
<p>Summary of participants' perspectives towards:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The ACCORD training methodology • Training contents and resources needed to learn how to manage intercultural conflicts in school context • Expectations in participating in the project and training 	<p>EVENT 1 & 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All participants agreed on the fact that the ACCORD methodology would be useful for their context. Another thing they appreciated was that the methodology invites them to go into the discussion around the subject and it invites them to be open about their insecurities regarding interethnic conflicts with pupils. In summary they saw it as an important reflection tool. • Some of them mentioned that there are already some trainings that can help them, but most of them aren't fit or useful for a school context. • The E-learning context is valued, mainly because it makes the material easily accessible. Also the fact that it could make real-life experiences really visual by the use of e-characters was appreciated. • They recognize the use of role-playing games, talking about experiences (like in the focus group/workshops), learning from experts (and other teachers alike), and internships (for teacher in training more specifically) as good methodologies to support them in the subject matter. • Some of the participants really appreciated the tool because it gave real-life experiences to reflect on. Its practicality was valued by multiple participants. The importance of context when the scenario's will be incorporated was stressed. • Their expectations of ACCORD are centered around key words like 'reflection tool', 'knowledge about cultures and different intercultural tensions' and 'good practices'.
<p>Participants' satisfaction with the event (mean values)</p>	<p>EVENT 1: no standardized evaluation EVENT 2 (one digit after decimal point, on 5)</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Duration • Location • Infrastructure • Overall organization • Relevance of the topics • Contents • Presentation given • Provided materials • Opportunities to interact with participants • Overall assessment of the workshop 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Duration: 3,5 • Location: 4 • Infrastructure: 3,4 • Overall organization: 4,4 • Relevance of the topics: 4,3 • Content: 4,1 • Presentation: 3,5 • Materials: 3,7 • Interaction with other participants: 4,1 • Overall assessment: 3,9
<p>Conclusions and general comments</p>	<p>Overall, we as researchers were satisfied with the course of both events. We did feel like the program was too ambitious for the time we offered them (e.g., we wanted to discuss more scenarios during the second workshop/focus group).</p> <p>We were also surprised by the difference in assessment of the scenarios in between our two groups. During the first event, most participants interpreted the scenario's not in the same way as the researchers, in the sense that they did not necessarily felt the teacher had to change, rather they perceived the scenario's as an insult/threat of their dominant culture and they were interested in a way to even react in a more severe way to restrict them. We should note here that at the first event, we presented slightly adapted versions of the scenario's as this was the test case, and in these scenario's one possible reaction of a teacher was included in each scenario. We felt that the teachers expressed ethnic (religious/racial) discrimination in a very explicit way. During the second event, teachers expressed more subtle forms of interpersonal and institutional ethnic discrimination and seemed to undermine the importance of interethnic conflicts, by believing these issues were more related to power dynamics in the classroom or referring to a particular situation or context. The second group seemed to be able to reflect more on their own position in these discussions (e.g., a colour-blind/ethnically blind perspective). As every perspective has its merits and</p>

	<p>flaws it makes you realize how complex these issues are. There's not one good solution to these type of conflicts and it seems like the last group was more aware of this observation and willing to negotiate about what they could do to handle these kinds of conflicts. Therefore they stressed the importance of transparency, openness to discuss, team work,...</p> <p>To explain these differences, we should definitely stress the role of the different levels in a school and their impact on the concrete teacher practices.</p>
--	---

Self-made scenarios by participants

EVENT 1

- The participants agreed that there should be a scenario based on gender, sexuality and/or religion. [**Researcher remark:** We already added a new scenario based on this information].
- We didn't explicitly asked for their own scenario's during the rest of this focus group.

EVENT 2

(-) Scenario description

(°) *Researcher remarks*

- 'Pupils of African origin laugh with physical assaults most of the time ["Tonight the belt"]. Most of the time they are very tough about it, but at the same time it's one of the reasons why they are so afraid of getting notes [because the parents would slap them]. They also use social media to showcase the violence'
 - *'Tonight the belt' is a saying about parents who use physical ways to discipline their child*
 - *Central themes scenario: social media, physical assault and the way they interpret and use it for different goals. Different meanings of violence.*
- A boy from Iraq focuses on the Afghan people, who were all standing there together. This boy shouts "Fuck all Afghans", and all Afghan fight with the Afghan boy standing next to the boy from Iraq. This is an interethnic conflict which works polarizing as the boy that gets beat up is also from Afghan descent yet he gets punished for being affiliated with the boy from Iraq.
 - *Central theme scenario: ethnic discrimination between minorities*
- When the teacher says the students should not say something, the students say 'we do this at home'.
 - *Central theme scenario: role of the parents*

- The conflicts between Muslims and 'black' (Sub-Saharan) Africa, the students always pick on the only 'black' one, 'is this how YOU do this'.
 - *Central theme scenario: someone of origin X is seen as a specialist and grabs the focus of the class.*
 - *Already incorporated in the scenarios.*

- "Being possessed" by a jinn, which makes it difficult to control behavior because it makes it difficult to deal with and react with, as a school. You can discuss a lot of things but this issue you can't discuss.
 - *Central theme scenario: topics of controversy and how to deal with them without losing the connection or the understanding of the pupils at hand.*