



OPEN ACCESS

EDITED BY

Josefine Wagner,
University of Innsbruck, Austria

REVIEWED BY

Florian G. Hartmann,
Paris Lodron University Salzburg, Austria
Irma Eloff,
University of Pretoria, South Africa

*CORRESPONDENCE

Wiebke Waburg
✉ waburg@uni-koblenz.de

RECEIVED 02 November 2023

ACCEPTED 02 January 2024

PUBLISHED 17 January 2024

CITATION

Klöpfer L, Lebeda M and Waburg W (2024)
Welcome culture in German schools:
teachers' perspectives.
Front. Educ. 9:1332144.
doi: 10.3389/feduc.2024.1332144

COPYRIGHT

© 2024 Klöpfer, Lebeda and Waburg. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution License \(CC BY\)](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/). The use, distribution or reproduction in other forums is permitted, provided the original author(s) and the copyright owner(s) are credited and that the original publication in this journal is cited, in accordance with accepted academic practice. No use, distribution or reproduction is permitted which does not comply with these terms.

Welcome culture in German schools: teachers' perspectives

Lea Klöpfer, Maria Lebeda and Wiebke Waburg*

Educational Sciences, University of Koblenz, Koblenz, Germany

The secondary analysis focuses on teachers' perspectives on welcome culture (*Willkommenskultur*) in German schools for pupils who have fled from Ukraine. The following research question was pursued: What aspects of the welcome culture become apparent in statements of teachers? Data from five group discussions with individuals from primary and secondary schools and an educational institution in Rhineland-Palatinate were analyzed. Participants included teachers ($n = 12$), school principals ($n = 2$), and one director. The study indicates that refugees from Ukraine are treated differently from refugees originating from Syria or other countries; these differences can be recognized at both the individual and societal levels.

KEYWORDS

migration, school, teachers, refugees from Ukraine, welcome culture

Introduction

The article reports on an exploratory study in which group interviews with members of schools and educational institutions in Rhineland-Palatinate (RLP), one of Germany's 16 federal states, were subjected to secondary analysis. The analysis focuses on teachers' perspectives on welcome culture (*Willkommenskultur*) (Heckmann, 2012) in German schools for pupils who have fled from Ukraine. The so-called welcome culture was widely discussed in Germany in the context of the reception of refugees from Syria in 2015 (e.g., Dinkelaker et al., 2021). It is again evident in relation to the individuals fleeing Ukraine since February 2022. Our research explores the question: *What aspects of the so-called welcome culture become apparent in the statements of the teachers?* The central concern of the report is gaining insight into how welcome culture is negotiated at schools in RLP and the critical reflection of the results of the analysis.

Research into the welcome culture practiced in schools has as far as we know not taken place - and this despite the fact that the schooling of refugee children and young people takes place in some federal states in so-called welcome classes. Positive attitudes toward migration- and refugee-related heterogeneity (for which the welcoming culture normatively stands) can be assumed to be of great importance for integration processes in society as a whole (Filsecker and Abs, 2021). For the school setting, attitudes of teachers are accordingly to be taken into account. These are examined in the context of school-related immigration and acculturation research (see Hachfeld and Syring, 2020). One focus of the research has been on teachers' attitudes toward pupils who have fled Syria (Ekin and Yetkin, 2021). Ekin and Yetkin summarize the research findings available for Turkey as follows: Language problems, pupil and teacher adjustment problems, and inadequate training related to refugee education were reported by teachers. It was also found that respondents generally have positive attitudes toward Syrians and that teachers who teach Syrian children have better attitudes than teachers who do not teach Syrian children themselves (Ekin and Yetkin, 2021: 386). Moreover, to our knowledge, there is hardly any research on school situations (in Germany) in regard to the war in Ukraine. The

exploratory research project that we conducted addresses this desideratum and reports on welcoming practices from the perspective of teachers.

Background

Residence law in Germany

The Russian war of aggression against Ukraine has caused more than 21 million people to leave their homes (Statista, 2023). In addition to the many refugees within Ukraine, about 12 million have left Ukrainian territory. Since Russia's attack in February 2022, more than one million people have fled from Ukraine to Germany (Statista, 2023). In Germany, this EU-initiated protection status is anchored in §24 AufenthaltG.¹ It is granted without a procedure (but with an examination) upon registration with the Foreigners' Registration Office. In comparison of the residence regulations for people who fled from Ukraine with those for people from other nations, there are many differences, with refugees from all other nations being worse off. Unlike the large movement of refugees, especially from Syria in 2015/2016, people fleeing Ukraine did not have to go through an asylum procedure to extend their stay after the visa-free stay expired. In March 2022, the Council of the European Union declared the "existence of a mass influx of displaced persons" (EU, 2022, Art. 1²). This declaration aims to grant temporary protection status to displaced persons who lived in Ukraine or had their habitual residence or domicile in Ukraine regardless of their nationality (EU, 2022, Art. 2 (1), German Embassy 2022). The regulation also applied to family members, although a broader definition was applied to family than in asylum law (EU, 2022, Art. 2 (4), AufenthaltG). With immediate access to key rights and state benefits, people who fled Ukraine were able to participate in society to a greater extent than for refugees from other countries.

School participation for migrant and refugee pupils

In Germany, school attendance is compulsory for children from the age of six for a period of at least 9 years. While in some federal states school attendance is already compulsory during the asylum procedure, in other federal states it only becomes compulsory after the refugees have been assigned to a municipality by the state or after a certain period of time. Some federal states also grant children and adolescents the right to attend school while they are accommodated in an initial reception facility (Massumi et al., 2015: 37). In the case of Ukrainian pupils, the political will was to integrate them quickly into the German school system (SWK, 2022: 4) - a distinction according to residence status is not mentioned.

In Germany, there are five school organizational models, which can be grouped into three broad categories. In submerged models, all pupils

are taught together in a regular class. In (partially) integrative models, pupils partially participate in the instruction of the regular class and only language support is provided outside the regular class. In parallel models, pupils are taught in a specially designed class for a certain period of time or even until graduation (Massumi et al., 2015: 45).

In the context of labor migration in Germany in the 1960s, the law stipulated that foreign pupils should be taught together with German pupils, provided that their share in the class did not exceed 20% (Karakayali et al., 2017: 225). However, due to the high proportion of foreign pupils, there was (and still is) often a separation of foreign pupils into so-called *foreign*, *national* or *welcome classes* (Engel and Nohl, 2022: 288). In an evaluation of *welcome classes* in Berlin, the positive assessments from school administrators and teachers were primarily related to the teaching of German language skills and everyday knowledge for orientation in Germany (Neumann et al., 2020: 24 f). Less successful were the exchanges between the pupils of the *welcome classes* with the pupils of the regular classes as well as the integration of the pupils into society (Neumann et al., 2020: 24 f). The results are in line with the biggest pedagogical as well as social criticism of the *welcome classes* - the separation of the newly immigrated pupils (Engel and Nohl, 2022: 288 f). The separation does not only influence a child's perception, but also integration processes. Thus, the culture of the new country remains for the newly immigrated "without visualization, without the possibility to try it out interactively and to have it demonstrated in all its heterogeneity" (Engel and Nohl, 2022: 279³). Accordingly, culture cannot be lived, but is mediated by all actors and institutions involved - whereby mediation often leads to a homogenization of culture (Engel and Nohl, 2022: 279).

While origin or nationality used to be the decisive factor for assignment to regular classes for foreigners, in the mid-1990s the need for language support became the central criterion for separating foreign pupils and still applies today (Karakayali et al., 2017: 226). Within institutional construction processes, a German-language normality is constructed and a monolingual habitus (Gogolin, 1994) is established in German educational institutions (Karakayali et al., 2017: 227). It is assumed that German-speaking children growing up monolingually represent the normal case and everything else is understood as a deviation⁴ (Gogolin and Duarte, 2018).

Because of the criticism of parallel models and the difficulty of implementing submersive models due to the capacities of schools and teachers (partially) integrative models of school organization are the primary goal. For example, the Standing Scientific Commission of the Conference of the Ministers of Education and Cultural Affairs in the Federal Republic of Germany (SWK) recommends as "much as possible not to set up preparatory classes in elementary schools and the lower grades of secondary education" (SWK, 2022: 4⁵). The state of Rhineland-Palatinate also specifies that schooling should take place "either in internal differentiation in regular classes or in partial external differentiation" (RLP, 2023⁶). The Ministry of Education in

1 In Germany, the AufenthaltG (Residence Act) is a central law in the context of migration; it regulates the residence, employment and integration of foreigners in the federal territory.

2 Translated by the authors.

3 Translated by the authors.

4 The exception to this is languages that are not seen as a potential risk to pupils' learning success due to their use by large groups of speakers or their apparent economic advantages (Karakayali et al., 2017: 227).

5 Translated by the authors.

6 Translated by the authors.

RLP states four central points concerning the integration of Ukrainian children and young people in schools:

- admission to the existing regular classes
- intensive German language support
- joint participation in lessons in subjects with a rather “low language content” such as sports, music and art
- participation in Ukrainian learning opportunities (Ministerium für Bildung, 2022: 3 f).

Accordingly, the policy pursued is a partially integrative model, in which only language support is outsourced and integration into the regular class is conceived via subjects with a low language content. Participation in *Ukrainian online classes* is to be made possible by the schools. Statistics⁷ shows that many Ukrainian families comply with compulsory education or make use of the right to attend school. In 91% of families, at least one child of school age attends school. 70% of pupils are taught within a regular class or according to the partially integrative model, and 30% of pupils are taught exclusively in special classes for refugee children and youth. The state schools in Germany do not themselves offer classes that follow a Ukrainian curriculum (Mediendienst Integration, 2023). This may be one reason why in 23% of families, at least one child participates in online classes from Ukrainian schools on a supplementary basis. 3% of children and young people take part exclusively in Ukrainian online classes (IAB, 2022: 10).

Welcome culture

Welcome culture (*Willkommenskultur*) is a term that refers to the reception and integration of new immigrants and refugees into a new society. It can be seen as an important normative concept for Germany that also symbolizes a paradigm shift in immigration policy. Welcome culture according to Heckmann (2014) is a term that is predominantly used in Germany (or in German-speaking countries). However, welcome culture itself is a phenomenon that is also discussed internationally (Whiteman, 2005; Braun, 2017; Trauner and Turton, 2017; Funk, 2018).

For a long time, denial of the importance of immigration for German society dominated. The path from official denial to the acceptance of Germany as an immigration country and immigration society took decades (Bade, 2015). Although the idea is to convey a culture of welcome to new immigrants in general, the concept actually dates back to a time before the ‘refugee crisis in 2015’. When Germany was looking for specialists - in the sense of ‘guest workers’ - due to the shortage of skilled labor, the term had been established (Haman and Karakayali, 2016: 73). Nevertheless, welcome culture addresses the integration of new immigrants and not migrants who have been living in Germany for years or decades. The study adopts the definition of Heckmann (2012), where welcome culture refers to prejudice-free attitudes toward refugees at the individual level. On the societal level, it includes the existence of opening and welcoming practices toward new members of society. Heckmann (2014) coined the term welcome culture. The term refers to the principal attitude and practices of the

dominant culture toward new immigrants (Heckmann, 2014: 203). More precisely, it is a “positive, accepting attitude” (Heckmann, 2014: 203) that excludes discrimination. Heckmann locates a “useful vagueness” (Heckmann, 2012: 2⁸) in the concept of welcome culture, because this makes it possible to use the term productively depending on the context. The goal of welcome culture can be understood as breaking down barriers to integration and finding ways of inclusion (Heckmann, 2012: 2). To make the term more tangible, it can be differentiated on four levels.

The level of the individual is about encountering people who do not correspond to one’s own group, ethnicity, religion or appearance as openly as possible and without prejudiced attitudes and behavior (Heckmann, 2012: 3).

This level is expanded to include the second level of interpersonal relationships, as integration requires more than open attitudes. It is about establishing communication and entering into relationships (Heckmann, 2012: 3). The broadening aspect can be understood here as actively approaching and accepting each other without discriminating.

Welcome culture also plays an important role at the third level of organizations and institutions: because it is here that principles and regulations are established that directly affect migrants and refugees. Accordingly, it must first and foremost be possible to be accepted as a member of organizations and institutions (Heckmann, 2012: 3). At the same time, there is also an active component here, which places the responsibility for the inclusion of migrants and refugees in the hands of the dominant culture. Active practices, such as increasing the proportion of people with a migration background in organizations, are necessary to enable the development of representation of interests in the first place (Heckmann, 2012: 3).

Heckmann describes the fourth level as the level of society as a whole. This can be understood as being above the other three levels, as it is about the fundamental understanding of the entire population with regard to its self-image as a country of immigration (or not as a country of immigration) (Heckmann, 2012: 5).

Even though the term has now been divided into four levels, this should not lead to the idea that they exist and work independently of each other. It can be assumed that the levels are mutually dependent and influence each other. For example, institutions influence the attitudes of individuals and groups. Cultural narratives,⁹ in turn, shape and mould institutional possibilities.

Method

In context of the demand for the reusability of collected data in qualitative research (Medjedović and Witzel, 2010: 17) we decided for a *secondary analysis*. Quality, information content, and fits of data (Medjedović and Witzel, 2010: 59 f) of a primary survey of schools in the context of the newly arrived pupils from Ukraine were deemed suitable. In the summer of 2022, five group discussions with persons from primary and secondary schools and an educational institution in

⁷ THE statistics do not refer specifically to RLP, but to the whole of Germany.

⁸ Translated by the authors.

⁹ Cultural narratives, as a result of collective attitudes, make complicated realities tangible through meaningful representations. They compete with each other for interpretive sovereignty and yet can be closely intertwined.

Rhineland-Palatinate were conducted in this context. Twelve teachers, two school principals, and one director of the educational institution were interviewed. The focus of the interviews was on the needs analysis; there were no explicit questions about welcome culture. But in the interviews, there was a lot of information about the everyday practice in the schools regarding the newly immigrated pupils. Therefore, the perspective on welcome culture was conducted on the treatment of the newly immigrated pupils and the attitudes of the teachers.

The secondary analysis of the interviews was carried out with the content structuring qualitative content analysis (Kuckartz and Rädiker, 2022). Content analyses aim at describing features of communication in a systematic and intersubjectively comprehensible way. The aim is to summarize what is said about a certain topic: in the present case, this concerns statements about the four levels of welcome culture (Schreier, 2012: 3; Kuckartz, 2014: 39). Within the method of *consensual coding* (Kuckartz and Rädiker, 2022: 244¹⁰), the texts were coded independently by authors and an assistant and then the codings were compared and checked. The deductively created category system was derived directly from the research question (Kuckartz and Rädiker, 2022: 133) and is based on the four levels of welcome culture according to Heckmann (2012).

Results

In the following, an overview of the results found is given by citing exemplary sequences. The statement that dealing with pupils with a refugee background in 2022 is not a new and unknown challenge is assigned to the “*Level of society*.” A lot of experience has been gained in recent years, so that they felt well prepared. It was also mentioned that there was good and supportive management of the processes by the Ministry of Education. It is clear from the statements that an immigration-affirming social framework was perceived. This was also reflected symbolically, for example peace flags were hoisted in schools. According to the teachers, there were statements from Syrian pupils in connection with these symbolic measures, such as “But we did not have that”¹¹ (I2: 1322). With regard to the question about the self-image as a country of immigration in comparison between 2015 and 2022, one teacher wonders to what extent the great willingness to help in 2022 represents an attempt to make up for what was missed in 2015 (I2: 1339–1,402). This same teacher, moreover, reflects on other symbolic measures explicitly for Ukrainian children and how children from Afghanistan or Somalia feel about them. She says that it must be strange “when you come here and there is a sign at the gate saying welcome in Ukrainian, but not in Arabic, nor in Farsi” (I2: 1225–1,326).

In terms of *organizations and institutions*, a distinction must be made between the regulations and practices implemented by school-supporting institutions and individual schools. It was already mentioned that supporting structures were established by the ministry: e.g., a telephone hotline was set up to answer questions about the enrollment of pupils from Ukraine or the Ukrainian school

system. Translations were provided and work materials for Ukrainian children have been made available. In addition, an online portal was set up for potential (pedagogical) employees who speak Ukrainian and can be employed in schools. As one teacher said: “So well as with this crisis, so now (we have never been) so well adjusted. Yes, also with quite a lot of educational [...] quite great information” (I1: 432–434).

The interviewees report a variety of welcoming practices in the schools themselves: For example, weekly reception days were established, information and form collections were compiled, donation tables were set up. In some cases, welcoming ceremonies were held. There was an intensive search for new colleagues who spoke Ukrainian (or Russian), and Ukrainian-speaking teachers took on a variety of translation tasks. Intensive German courses were offered during school hours and in the holidays. The teachers also report that children took part in online classes offered by their Ukrainian home schools or the All-Ukrainian Online School¹²: “That’s also very exciting because the pupils are not cut off from the reality of what’s happening at home” (I2: 1168–1,169).

In some cases, there were exceptions for pupils from Ukraine: for example, mobile phone bans applied to them only to a limited extent, so that worried parents could reach their children. The regulations and practices described facilitate the arrival and development of the new school members. However, they sometimes lead to conflicts. For example, non-Ukrainian pupils apparently asked “Yes, why do we have mobile phone bans and they do not?” (I2: 1260).

At the *level of the individual*, it is evident that attitudes toward people from Ukraine are appreciative. They are seen as new members of the schools who should be supported. Their needs are mainly related to language barriers and the lack of knowledge about the rules and customs of German schools. The support offered is geared toward integration: “For me, it’s really about education and socialization [...], that you really pick up the parents” (I1: 318–319). Teachers also positively emphasize that with the Ukrainian children they “do not have to start at minus ten”¹³ (I2: 772–776), but can start teaching directly.

The perception of the pupils and parents from Ukraine is positive: one teacher, for example, says: “Even the people who are now starting their jobs without really getting to know the culture, that is a huge achievement.” (I1: 542–544). The attitude of the pupils toward their new classmates is described as follows: “really quite a lot are really helpful and [...] They are so curious about each other” (I2: 1349–1,350).¹⁴

The category *Level of interpersonal relationships* takes a look at the diverse personal commitment, e.g., with regard to the necessary support with language challenges. For example, there are many statements about people who give German lessons or courses on a voluntary basis. The support of teachers who can speak Ukrainian themselves is very important, as these teachers can interpret between the German and Ukrainian speakers in the school as well as help with filling out forms:

¹² <https://osvitoria.org/en/the-all-ukrainian-online-school/>

¹³ This means that the teacher can start the lesson with the necessary knowledge (in terms of content and school context) and does not have to explain how school works, and can build on existing comparable knowledge.

¹⁴ The aspect of helpful pupils is not further concretised by the teacher, but can also be located at the level of interpersonal relationships, when it is a matter of actively approaching each other (for example, in the sense of explaining school tasks).

¹⁰ Translated by the authors.

¹¹ All statements of the interview partners were translated from German into English by the authors.

“It was a great relief when they came here and someone spoke Ukrainian as their mother tongue, yes. There were also a lot of emotions involved, so tears came right away” (I1: 156–157). However, practice shows that literal translations (e.g., of forms) are often not sufficient: “the words do not have equivalents either, so you cannot translate them, that is, you have to translate concepts” (I2: 848–849).

In addition to assistance with communication, recommendations for everyday life - on sports facilities, public transport, medical care, etc. - are also given: “one girl came up to me and said: We have to go to the doctor with mom [...] Then I had written out Russian-speaking doctors here, for example” (I3: 218–220). Beyond that, respondents emphasize the great importance of building trustworthy relationships and security: “Yes, the first contact that takes place, they need someone who understands” (I2: 765–767).

Discussion

In the presentation of the results, it could be clearly shown that the teachers predominantly felt well prepared and networked with regard to the situation. They justified this primarily through the experience they had been able to gain in the 2015 situation. Symbolic measures (such as hoisting the peace flag) in combination with the confident statements about managing the situation show (at least for the current situation) that the teachers can be said to have a fundamentally positive (Heckmann, 2012) and welcoming attitude toward the new arrivals from Ukraine. The critical-reflective observations of individual teachers attempt to establish a connection between the situation in 2015 and the current situation. Thus, the consideration of the extent to which the current willingness to help the refugees from Ukraine represents an attempt to make up for the failures of 2015 can be viewed from different perspectives. On the one hand, different rules/laws generally apply to Ukrainian refugees, such as the possibility of visa-free entry and the subsequent granting of protection status. This in turn has a positive effect on the possibility of quickly participating in many areas of daily life in Germany. On the other hand, other reasons (such as new experience-based ways of dealing and attitudes) could also be suspected behind this willingness to help. The question is rightly raised as to why “Welcome” can suddenly be found in Ukrainian at school entrances, but not in other languages such as Farsi or Arabic.

Looking at the results from the perspective of the organizational and institutional level provided some interesting insights. In this context, the question of language and the possibilities or necessity to translate stands out. Language and the need to translate in the context of teaching were given a high importance. At the same time, children from Ukraine are also enabled to continue participating in mother-tongue lessons. The results show that (partially) integrative models have been established at the individual schools, which neither insist on strict monolingual German teaching (Gogolin, 1994) nor consistently place the pupils in separate welcome classes with intensive German lessons. This approach is also in line with the ideas of the Ministry of Education RLP. This flexibility and openness can definitely be seen as positive and as an active responsiveness to the needs of the Ukrainian families. In terms of the integration process, it is also positive that culture can be lived and experienced together through joint teaching, instead of only being taught in separate lessons and the idea of adapting to the dominant culture (see for overview: Engel and Nohl, 2022).

On an individual level, attitudes toward the Ukrainian children and their families were found to be generally positive. Teachers

positively emphasize how the newcomers master their entry into society and explicitly into professional life. Statements like “open the doors. Come to us” (I2: 1026–1028) clearly show that the teachers see themselves in this context as part of a welcoming integration society. As mentioned earlier in the text, further comparisons to other groups of refugees or to the situation in 2015 can be found especially at this level. The question that can and must be asked is how the different groups are valued. Statements such as, for example, that lessons with Ukrainian pupils do not have to start at minus 10, allow conclusions to be drawn about the perception of previous situations or other groups. This narrative implies that there is a lack of awareness of the value of education and a lack of willingness to build on students’ learning if Eurocentric notions of education are not met. Another reading of the two situations could also be linked to the extent to which more favorable conditions were simply created for the Ukrainian pupils by teachers - through the fundamentally open and positive attitude and the willingness to organize Ukrainian materials and lessons in Ukrainian - which make it easier to settle into everyday school life. In no case is the aim of this discussion to impute active group-related prejudices or discriminatory practices to the teachers interviewed, but it must be shown to what extent differences in the perceptions of the individual groups can be discerned. Heckmann also makes clear that it would not be realistic to assume that it is possible to create a society entirely without prejudice and discrimination through a welcoming culture (Heckmann, 2014: 205). However, pointing out these different perceptions is important insofar as it makes it easier to get to the bottom of the causes for the emergence of group-related prejudices and thus to identify concrete starting points for preventive measures or educational interventions.

The content analysis we conducted shows that, from the perspective of the teachers interviewed, a culture of welcome is cultivated. Accordingly, the current challenge is how to shape school life and the ‘post-migrant society’ (Foroutan, 2021). In their study, Zick and Krott (2021) suggest that it is no longer a question of negotiating who is allowed to come to Germany, but rather how to shape a common life in diversity. According to the authors, it is explicitly about developing comprehensible, inclusive concepts of belonging and equality, far removed from prejudices, obstacles and barriers that prevent and hinder equal coexistence (Zick and Krott, 2021: 28). The statements of the teachers interviewed show that a lot has happened since 2015 with regard to the integration of pupils with a refugee background: Teachers can build on the experience they have gained in the meantime. They see the school support measures for refugees from Ukraine as an opportunity to develop an inclusive school culture for all children. To achieve this goal, all stakeholders are called upon to look at social and school structures, attitudes and interactions. For teachers, on the one hand, the implementation of honest reflection practices and a transparent approach to power relations is strongly recommended. On the other hand, it is important to think further about the practices of a welcoming culture and to extend them to a post-arrival culture. A very important aspect of this is the involvement of refugees in this process.

Scope statement

The brief research report can be located in the field of migration studies. The study focuses on the role of teachers in the context of refugee students (especially in relation to Ukrainian students) and asks in particular about teachers’ perspectives on welcome culture. Data can

also be used to draw comparisons between the situation of refugees in 2015/2016 and the situation of Ukrainian refugees of 2022/2023. The results indicate that there is a difference in the role of socio-political concepts (in terms of welcome culture) between the two situations.

Data availability statement

The original contributions presented in the study are included in the article/supplementary material, further inquiries can be directed to the corresponding author.

Ethics statement

Ethical approval was not required for the study involving human participants in accordance with the local legislation and institutional requirements. The participants provided written informed consent for participation in the study and for the publication of any potentially identifiable images or data included in this article.

Author contributions

LK: Conceptualization, Data curation, Investigation, Methodology, Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing.

References

- Bade, Klaus J. (2015). Willkommen in der Einwanderungsgesellschaft? Politik unterrichten. Zeitschrift der Deutschen Vereinigung für Politische Bildung, Landesverband Niedersachsen, 1. Available at: http://kjbade.de/wp-content/uploads/2015/05/2015-06_willkommen-in-der-einwanderungsgesellschaft.pdf (Accessed May 08, 2023).
- Braun, K. (2017). Decolonial perspectives on charitable spaces of “welcome culture” in Germany. *Social Inclusion* 5, 38–48. doi: 10.17645/SI.V5I3.1025
- Dinkelaker, H., Huke, N., and Tietje, O. (2021). “Nach der ‘Willkommenskultur’” in *Geflüchtete zwischen umkämpfter Teilhabe und zivilgesellschaftlicher Solidarität* (Bielefeld: Transcript)
- Ekin, S., and Yetkin, R. (2021). Teachers’ attitudes to Syrian refugee students in Turkey. *Eurasian J. App. Linguistics* 7, 383–396. doi: 10.32601/ejal.911458
- Engel, J., and Nohl, A.-M. (2022). “Assimilation und Segregation. Zur erziehungswissenschaftlichen, gesellschaftlichen und biographischen Reflexion einer problematischen Beschulungsform” in *Reflexion und Reflexivität in Unterricht, Schule und Lehrer:innenbildung*. eds. C. Reintjes and I. Kunze (Bad Heilbrunn: Julius Klinkhardt), 277–294.
- EU. (2022). Durchführungsbeschluss (EU) 2022/382 des Rates vom 4. März 2022 zur Feststellung des Bestehens eines Massenzustroms von Vertriebenen aus der Ukraine im Sinne des Artikels 5 der Richtlinie 2001/55/EG und zur Einführung eines vorübergehenden Schutzes. Available at: <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/DE/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:32022D0382> (Accessed May 25, 2023).
- Filsecker, M., and Abs, H. J. (2021). “Attitudes towards refugees. A case study on the unfolding approach to scale construction”, in *International perspectives on school settings, education policy and digital strategies: a transatlantic discourse in education research*. Eds. A. Wilmers and S. Jörnitz (Opladen: Barbara Budrich), 120–136.
- Foroutan, N. (2021). Die postmigrantische Gesellschaft: Ein Versprechen der pluralen Demokratie. Bielefeld: Transcript.
- Funk, N. (2018). “A spectre in Germany: refugees, a ‘welcome culture’ and an ‘integration politics’” in *Refugee crisis: The Borders of human mobility*. eds. M. Duarte, K. Lippert-Rasmussen, S. Parekh and A. Viktikainen (London: Routledge), 44–54.
- Gogolin, I. (1994). *Der monolinguale Habitus der multilingualen Schule*. Münster: Waxmann.
- Gogolin, I., and Duarte, J. (2018). “Migration und sprachliche Bildung” in *Handbuch Interkulturelle Pädagogik*. eds. I. Gogolin, V. B. Georgi, M. Krüger-Potratz, D. Lengyel and U. Sandfuchs (Bad Heilbrunn: Julius Klinkhardt), 67–72.

ML: Conceptualization, Data curation, Investigation, Methodology, Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing. WW: Conceptualization, Investigation, Methodology, Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing.

Funding

The author(s) declare that no financial support was received for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Conflict of interest

The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

Publisher’s note

All claims expressed in this article are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of their affiliated organizations, or those of the publisher, the editors and the reviewers. Any product that may be evaluated in this article, or claim that may be made by its manufacturer, is not guaranteed or endorsed by the publisher.

Hachfeld, A., and Syring, M. (2020). Stichwort: Überzeugungen von Lehrkräften im Kontext migrationsbezogener Heterogenität. *Zeitschrift für Erziehungswissenschaft* 23, 659–684. doi: 10.1007/s11618-020-00957-7

Haman, U., and Karakayali, S. (2016). Practicing willkommenskultur: migration and solidarity in Germany. *Intersections. EEJSP* 2, 69–86. doi: 10.17356/ieejsp.v2i4.296

Heckmann, F. (2012). Willkommenskultur: Was ist das, und wie kann sie entstehen und entwickelt werden? (efms paper, 2012-7). Bamberg: europäisches forum für migrationsstudien (efms) Institut an der Universität Bamberg. <https://nbn-resolving.org/urn:nbn:de:0168-ssaoar-67033-8> (Accessed May 15, 2023).

Heckmann, F. (2014). *Integration von Migranten. Einwanderung und neue Nationenbildung*. Wiesbaden: Springer VS.

IAB. (2022). Geflüchtete aus der Ukraine in Deutschland: Flucht, Ankunft und Leben. IAB-FORSCHUNGSBERICHT 24/2022. Available at: <https://doku.iab.de/forschungsbericht/2022/fb2422.pdf> (Accessed January 01, 2023).

Karakayali, J., Zur Nieden, B., Kahveci, Ç., Groß, S., and Heller, M. (2017). Die Kontinuität der Separation. Vorbereitungsklassen für neu zugewanderte Kinder und Jugendliche im Kontext historischer Formen der separierten Beschulung. *Die deutsche Schule* 109, 223–235. doi: 10.25656/01_25881

Kuckartz, U. (2014). *Qualitative Inhaltsanalyse. Methoden, Praxis, Computerunterstützung*. Weinheim, Basel: Beltz Juventa.

Kuckartz, U., and Rädiker, S. (2022). *Qualitative Inhaltsanalyse. Methoden, praxis, Computerunterstützung*. Weinheim, Basel: Beltz Juventa.

Massumi, M., von Dewitz, N., Griefsbach, J., Terhart, H., Katarina, W., Hippmann, K., et al. (2015). Neu zugewanderte Kinder und Jugendliche im deutschen Schulsystem. Bestandsaufnahme und Empfehlungen. Köln: Mercator-Institut für Sprachförderung und Deutsch als Zweitsprache, Zentrum für LehrerInnenbildung der Universität zu Köln. Available at: https://www.mercator-institut-sprachfoerderung.de/fileadmin/Redaktion/PDF/Publikationen/MI_ZfL_Studie_Zugewanderte_im_deutschen_Schulsystem_final_screen.pdf (Accessed May 15, 2023).

Mediendienst Integration. (2023). Minderjährige Flüchtlinge aus der Ukraine. Available at: <https://mediendienst-integration.de/migration/flucht-asyl/ukrainische-fluechtlinge.html> (Accessed May 10, 2023).

Medjedović, I., and Witzel, A. (2010). *Wiederverwendung qualitativer Daten. Archivierung und Sekundärnutzung qualitativer Interviewtranskripte*. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.

Ministerium für Bildung. (2022). Informationen zur Beschulung ukrainischer Kinder und Jugendlicher, Available at: https://ukraine.rlp.de/fileadmin/ukraine/Kita_Schule/Schule/Informationen_zur_Beschulung_ukrainischer_Kinder_und_Jugendlicher.pdf (Accessed May 11, 2023).

Neumann, M., Haas, E.-C., Müller, F., and Maaz, K. (2020). WiKo-Studie. Evaluation der Willkommensklassen in Berlin. Abschlussbericht. DIPF | Leibniz-Institut für Bildungsforschung und Bildungsinformation. Available at: <https://www.dipf.de/de/forschung/pdf-forschung/steubis/wiko-studie-abschlussbericht> (Accessed May 16, 2023).

RLP. (2023). Sprachförderung/ Sprachbarrieren. Gibt es an den Schulen spezielle Förderangebote für ukrainische Kinder und Jugendliche? Available at: <https://ukraine.rlp.de/de/kita-und-schule-shkola-ta-ditjachii-sad/schule/> (Accessed May 11, 2023).

Schreier, M. (2012). *Qualitative content analysis in practice*. Los Angeles: SAGE.

Statista (2023). Anzahl der registrierten Flüchtlinge aus der Ukraine in den Mitgliedstaaten der Europäischen Union. Available at: <https://de.statista.com/statistik/>

[daten/studie/1356654/umfrage/anzahl-ukrainischer-fluechtlinge-in-den-eu-staaten/](https://de.statista.com/statistik/daten/studie/1356654/umfrage/anzahl-ukrainischer-fluechtlinge-in-den-eu-staaten/) (Accessed May 02, 2023).

SWK (2022). *Ständige Wissenschaftliche Kommission der Kultusministerkonferenz: Unterstützung geflüchteter Kinder und Jugendlicher aus der Ukraine durch rasche Integration in Kitas und Schulen. Stellungnahme der Ständigen Wissenschaftlichen Kommission der Kultusministerkonferenz (SWK)*. Bonn: SWK (2022).

Trauner, F., and Turton, J. (2017). “Welcome culture”: the emergence and transformation of a public debate on migration. *Austrian J. Politic. Sci.* 46, 33–42. doi: 10.15203/ozp.1587.vol46iss1

Whiteman, R. (2005). Welcoming the stranger: a qualitative analysis of teachers' views regarding the integration of refugee pupils into schools in Newcastle upon Tyne. *Educ. Stud.* 31, 375–391. doi: 10.1080/03055690500237348

Zick, A., and Krott, N. (2021). Einstellungen zur Integration in der deutschen Bevölkerung von 2014 bis 2020. Studienbericht der vierten Erhebung im Projekt ZuGleich - Zugehörigkeit und Gleichwertigkeit. IKG- Institut für interdisziplinäre Konflikt- und Gewaltforschung. Bielefeld: Stiftung Mercator.