

Religion and Normativity in Pedagogical Situations

Thorsten Knauth

University of Duisburg-Essen

thorstenknauth@t-online.de

Keywords

dialogue in education/ interreligious education, religious heterogeneity, youth and religiosity, dialogical value education, dialogue and conflict

Abstract

Apart from the structural normativity of pedagogical situations, normativity is at stake when people discuss and reflect on issues of (daily) life. Especially when it comes to basic issues of life orientations, ethical convictions, and decisions and religion-related life-stances, normativity forms a decisive situational background. This makes religious and ethical education an exciting domain of pedagogical reflection and interaction with normativity. Four key elements can be mentioned: 1. Pedagogical situations are shaped by ambiguity. 2. Religious positions are normatively charged because they relate to binding values which provide points of orientation. 3. Pedagogical situations which are shaped by religious heterogeneity and normative ambiguity are susceptible to conflict. 4. Quite often there is a conflict zone of subjective relativization of normativity and exclusive rejection of the normative claims of others. This provides a challenging task to relate the different positions to another and to foster real interest in one another.

In the article it is argued that a dialogical value education which is embedded in a sustainable culture of dialogue and interaction can provide a way out of the previously discussed dilemma of subjective relativization vs objective universality of religious normativity. Cemented claims of religious validity and an incurious indifference towards the life of others can be eroded through patient and persistent efforts to immerse students in situations of encounter and dialogue. The work should predominantly try to develop an understanding of how values and orientations have been "grown" in the life of individuals. Encounter and relationship are not always remedies for tendencies of fragmentation and freezing, but they are necessary prerequisites for mutual recognition and exchange.

German Synopsis

Abgesehen von der gegebenen strukturellen Normativität pädagogischer Situationen spielt Normativität eine große Rolle, wenn Lernende über Lebensorientierungen, ethische Fragen und religionsbezogene Weltansichten nachdenken und ins Gespräch kommen. Vor diesem Hintergrund spielen Themen religiöser, moralischer und ethischer Bildung in der Schule eine wichtige Rolle. Im Blick auf das Verhältnis von Religion und Normativität können vier Elemente genannt werden, die für pädagogisches Handeln bedeutsam sind: 1. Pädagogische Situationen sind bestimmt von Mehrdeutigkeit. 2. Religiöse Positionen sind normativ geladen, weil sie mit bindenden Fragen von Lebensorientierung zusammenhängen. 3. Pädagogische Situationen, die von religiöser Heterogenität und Mehrdeutigkeit geprägt sind, sind konfliktanfällig. 4. Ein Spannungsfeld besteht zwischen Positionen einer subjektiven Relativierung von Normativität und einer exklusiven Zurückweisung normativer Ansprüche durch andere. Aus diesem Spannungsfeld resultiert für pädagogisches Handeln die Herausforderung, die verschiedenen Positionen in den Dialog zu bringen und ein wechselseitiges Interesse an der Position der anderen zu fördern. In diesem Beitrag wird die Auffassung vertreten, dass eine dialogische Wertebildung, die in eine nachhaltige Kultur von Dialog und Begegnung Dialogs eingebettet ist, aus dem Dilemma von subjektiver Relativierung und exklusiver Normativität führen kann. Zementierte religiöse Geltungsansprüche und uninteressierte Gleichgültigkeit gegenüber dem Leben der anderen können durch den beharrlichen und kontinuierlichen Versuch erodieren, Lernende in Situationen von Dialog und Begegnung zu verwickeln. Für einen solchen Ansatz ist es vorrangig, bei Lernenden das Verständnis dafür zu fördern, wie Wertorientierungen im eigenen Leben und im Leben der anderen entstanden und gewachsen sind. Begegnung und Dialog sind keine Allheilmittel für Tendenzen gesellschaftlicher Fragmentierung, aber sie sind notwendige Bedingungen sozialer Kohäsion, auf die eine Gesellschaft angewiesen ist.

1. Normativity as an intrinsic feature of the pedagogical relationship

Dealing with normativity is a key element of pedagogy. Part of the pedagogical relationship between teacher and student, tutor and tutee, is the reference to a general goal, objective or task. Thus, pedagogical situations are always concerned with the issue of what specific educational aims are being pursued and of how specific pedagogical actions can be justified in the context of general educational aims.

In a way, the structure of pedagogical action is shaped by the contradictory task of accepting the present—the current—being of the tutee whilst guiding him or her towards the future realm of general aims and duties. Pedagogy is always at risk of exploiting the present state of learners for the future of educational goals which have not necessarily been agreed by the learners.

The German educational reformer, Hermann Nohl, has expressed this basic and persistent antinomy of pedagogy as follows: "...the child is not only a means in itself, but is compelled towards objective contents and goals, to which it is being educated. Those contents are not only meant individually but have a value in themselves. The child cannot be only educated for itself, but also for cultural work, profession and for national community." (Nohl 1948, S.127f)

The emphasis which is placed on the "general" and the objective frame of education is a good example of the ambivalence of educational reform because conceptual tools could not resist the normative power of Nazi ideology for defining the general aim of education. It is clear that pedagogy which does not critically reflect the normativity of the so-called "general" is at risk of serving the ideological interests which dominate the reality of education at any given time.¹

At the beginning of my speech, I deem it necessary to point out that pedagogy is inherently susceptible to transformation into violence and ideology. Therefore, pedagogy must critically reflect on its own normativity on an ongoing, continuous basis. My assumption is that pedagogy can only protect itself from its inherent susceptibility for transforming into violence if education can be conceptualized as a relationship which is sensitive towards subtle power relations. And the implicit risk that pedagogy acts against the backdrop of a normative horizon

¹ This task of critical self-reflection was discussed thoroughly in Peukert's article on approaches of critical pedagogy (cf. Helmut Peukert 1983).

which is not justified can only be counteracted if the justification of norms is established as part of the pedagogical process with all participants.

Apart from the structural normativity of pedagogical situations, normativity is also at stake when people discuss and reflect on issues of (daily) life. Especially when it comes to basic issues of life orientations, ethical convictions, and decisions and religion-related life-stances, normativity forms a decisive situational background. This makes religious and ethical education an exciting domain of pedagogical reflection and interaction with normativity. There is a widespread consensus among pedagogues of religion (in Germany) that the pedagogical treatment of religion is especially fruitful if it is oriented towards subjective positioning and processes of defining personal meaning.

In the face of ongoing dynamic processes of religious pluralization in society and schools, issues of normativity in the pedagogical domain become even more important and challenging. Normative claims for validity are diversified and contribute to conflicts in pedagogical situations. Justifications of pedagogical aims are questioned or blurred and have to be negotiated anew. To put it simply: in religious education (RE) classes, students discuss what is good and what is the truth in the face of diverse ideas about what is good and what is the truth. And pedagogues of religion, experts of school education, and theologians alike discuss approaches and aims of religious education in the context of religious plurality (cf. Kenngott, Englert, Knauth 2015; Lindner, Schambeck, Simojoki, Naurath 2017).

2. Normativity in RE classrooms

I would like to illustrate the question at stake with two examples. The examples show how issues of religion and normativity surface in the reality of classroom interaction. The examples are taken from daily life. They are taken from religious education courses with students of different religious backgrounds and worldviews, i.e. a truly diverse and heterogenous composition of the student body. Both RE courses claim to deal with different backgrounds in terms of religion and worldview in a dialogical way.

(1) Dying for the sake of religion?

The first example is taken from a course with 10th grade students.² The group is working on the topic of Jesus's last days before his crucifixion: the night in Gethsemane, his arrest, and his conviction. One lesson deals with the disciples' attitudes after Jesus was arrested in Gethsemane. A significant majority of students with a Muslim background feel somehow outraged that the disciples abandoned Jesus, and—in Peter's case—even pretended not to know him. Others, especially students with Christian backgrounds, are inclined to defend or to justify the behavior of the disciples. A very passionate and heated debate takes place during the course of the lesson; emotions are boiling.

Two girls in particular, Imen and Svenja, respectively representing the two conflicting positions, are involved in quite a personal and emotional way. Personal attitudes towards religion are mirrored in the positions they defend. One party emphasizes that one has to be willing and prepared to die for religion. The other party stresses more tactical arguments, suggesting that it would not have been very clever to openly show one's own affiliation with Jesus. The consequence would only have been to suffer the same fate, with no opportunity for helping Jesus. However, this argument does not convince the Muslim students at all. Especially Imen, one of the Muslim girls, seems to be completely overwhelmed by her passion and attacks Svenja, the Christian girl, in an almost personal way.

(2) Being tolerant or being honest?

My second example is taken from a 9th grade class with a similar religious composition of the student body. The class is engaging with the topic of homosexuality. The teacher asks the students to role play counseling as a group exercise. Simulating an advice column in a well-known youth magazine, individual cases are submitted to the students who are supposed to give advice, playing the role of "experts on issues of homosexuality."

The cases were as follows:

- (1) Muslim girl with strictly religious parents turns out to be lesbian. She suffers from social pressure and expectations of a future heterosexual marriage.

² The example is taken from a research project which was conducted in the framework of the European Research Project "Religion in Education. A contribution to Dialogue or a factor of Conflict in transforming societies of European Countries" (REDCo). During the course of the project, I conducted ethnographic fieldwork in several RE classes at schools in Hamburg, Germany. Results are published inter alia in: Jozsa/Knauth/ Weiße 2009 and ter Avest, Jozsa, Knauth, Rosón. Skeie (2009).

(2) Girl admires girl from another class in her year, does not dare to approach her. Some students in her class mock her and gossip maliciously.

(3) Girl is in love with another girl. Everyone who is aware of her infatuation puts her down and claims she is sick, but she is simply being who she is.

In a group comprised mainly of Muslim girls, we observe a conversation between Beria and Zahra. Beria encourages Zahra to write that homosexuality is entirely normal. Zahra disagrees, saying that this is not the case. Beria admonishes her to be tolerant because tolerant behavior is being expected during the task.³

(3) Analysis: religion and normativity in the classroom

What do these examples tell us about the relationship between religion and normativity? Four remarks come to mind:

Ambiguity:

Pedagogical situations are shaped by ambiguity. Different patterns of interpretation are brought into communication, which can cause conflicts. The hidden normativity of institutional classroom communication contributes as well. Classroom communication, however, does not accept every interpretation or position. The normative horizon of the school context differentiates between perspectives which are recognized as legitimate and others which do not fit into the normative ground rules of educated behavior. Students understand this hidden curriculum of political correctness, and they balance and negotiate the issue. During these processes, they reflect to what extent, if at all, they can reveal their actual perspectives and positions—even in cases where their actual position is part of the exercise. The challenging question is: To what extent can classroom communication allow for, and even promote, tolerance and acceptance of ambiguity?

Normative charge:

The examples show that religious positions are normatively charged because they relate to binding values which provide points of orientation. At least this is the case when religion is

³ The example is taken from a comparative case study of schools with different RE models in the cities of Hamburg and Duisburg. The research question focused on patterns of dialog in the respective contexts. The case study was part of a wider research project on religion and dialog in modern societies, which was funded by the German government (MBF). For results, see Thorsten Knauth/Dörthe Vieregge, "Religion and Dialogue in Religious Education. A Comparative Case Study in Duisburg and Hamburg", in: Julia Iprgrave, Thorsten Knauth, Anna Körs, Dörthe Vieregge and Marie von der Lippe (Eds.), "Religion and Dialogue in the City. Case Studies on Interreligious Encounter in Urban Community and Education", Münster/ New York (Waxmann) 2018, S. 183-230.

introduced in a mode of subjective experience and sense-making. By positioning themselves, the students reveal their normative ties and belonging. They open up and show the “normative orders” (Forst/ Günther 2011) which they relate to. In the case of religion, the normative orders relate to traditions which shape the identities of individuals and groups. These traditions are not necessarily fully developed. Quite often they are only token and used in an emblematic way. But they illustrate the normative contexts in which individual orientations, values, and positions are embedded. They equip the subject with a sense of belonging to something general which transcends individual existence. The challenging question here is: To what extent can subjects be encouraged to openly show and reflect normative stances?

Conflict:

Pedagogical situations which are shaped by religious heterogeneity and normative ambiguity are susceptible to conflict. The examples show that conflicts can take shape in different ways: they can be touched upon and be expressed very openly, as shown in the first example. Quite often, however, they do not cross the border into open communication and instead remain hidden in the “safe space”⁴ of private communication, which is protected from sanctions. The underlying question is: To what extent could it be possible to create classrooms as safe spaces where potentially objectionable contributions can be expressed without being sanctioned?

Different levels of access to religion:

The examples also highlight very different levels of access to religion which are connected to different attitudes towards the normativity of religion. Many empirical studies show that a kind of subjective personalization of religion is the overwhelming dynamic feature of the religiosity of young people with formal Christian backgrounds.⁵ Young people are very distant towards religion in its institutionalized forms, such as church and traditional beliefs. However, they do not totally refuse religion but instead relate to it in the sense of a “life-faith.” With regard to the vast landscape of religious traditions, they behave like tourists, as one study (Calmbach et al. 2016) has described their attitude. They travel from site to site and take their pick from the pool of religious symbols, rituals, and explanations of life. They create a bouquet of individual religiosity which follows the logic of personal coherence and efficacy (Does it fit me? Does it work for me?). Thus, the validity claim of general normativity is strongly reduced; it is taken

⁴ A decisive factor determining the opportunities and limitations of dialog in RE classes is whether ground rules of communication can be established which allow for trustful exchange and which reassure students that their attitudes and life stances are respected and tolerated; cf. for the discussion of “safe space” cf. Rothgangel, von Brömssen, Heimbrock, Skeie 2017.

⁵ Cf. qualitative research at European Level: Knauth, Jozsa, Bertram-Troost, Iprgrave (2008); for quantitative research in Europe, cf. Ziebertz, Kay2005, 2006 and Valk, Bertram-Troost, Friederici and Béraud (2009).

back behind the lines of subjective convictions which may not necessarily be valid for any other person. The only remaining normativity is the conviction that everyone should live according to their own individual beliefs.

There is another type of religiosity which is clearly differentiated from this kind of radicalized subjectivity. Mainly Muslim youngsters show a strongly normative type of religiosity which is related to a purified image of religious tradition as a binding resource for every question in life. These young people emphasize the life-determining significance of religion (cf. Knauth 2008; Jozsa 2008). They regard religion as a signpost and decisive guide in life. Religion provides clear instructions and prescriptions for shaping life, for managing the ethical decisions and problems of daily life. These youngsters are also convinced that Islam holds the complete truth and is the one and only way to salvation (cf. Knauth/Vieregge 2018 206–210). Laying claim to an exclusive truth and the negative evaluation of other religions and people who do not believe in religion belong to the attitudinal part of this religious profile. We know about this specific structure for interpreting religion as a requirement of a tradition which provides unambiguous rules and answers from several empirical studies that have been conducted over the past twenty years (see also Aygün 2013).⁶

However, for a couple of years now, experienced Muslim pedagogues of religion are concerned about a radicalization of this particular tradition among Muslim young people. Muslim religiosity has come under the influence of Salafist discourse. Without necessarily being part of the Salafi movement itself, Muslim religiosity, guided by the wish for unambiguity and using religion as an identity marker, has picked up prevailing patterns of Salafist interpretations and rhetoric figures. The dogmatization of religion among Muslim youngsters is a real challenge to any educational approach which works with critical reflection and individual reasoning (cf. Kulacatan/Behr 2016; Behr 2017). A very strong theme is the attempt to judge human behavior and human praxis from dichotomic categories of what is allowed and what is forbidden. Criteria for decision are allegedly taken from the Qur'an or deduced from the practice of the Prophet. This verification of religious righteousness is not conducted by the young people themselves but by self-declared experts who spread their sermons via the internet.

⁶ These patterns can also be interpreted against the background of structural disintegration and a lack of social recognition of Muslim youngsters and their families. The study by Aygün makes clear that the experience of belonging to a religious community is an important factor determining the sense and the strength of religious belonging (see Aygün 2013).

3. Pedagogical reflection: how to come to terms with religion and normativity?

My previous remarks on different attitudes with regard to religion provide the background for explaining the difficulties of a dialogical approach to religious diversity. The difference of religious positions is not an incentive or challenge to young people with individualized and subjectively selected forms of religiosity. In the heat of current and permanent processes of individualization, generalized religious validity claims become meaningless. A religiosity which is shaped by exclusivism and which aims for unambiguity does not have an intrinsic motivation to listen to others. How can we deal with the conflict zone of subjective relativization of normativity and exclusive rejection of the normative claims of others?⁷ How can we manage to relate the different positions to another? How can we manage to foster real interest in one another?

The comparative case study by Knauth/Vieregge mentioned previously found that “realising dialogical practice in religious education is a complex and challenging endeavour. To succeed, it needs to balance tensions. In simple terms, the elements of these tensions are organised around poles of proximity and distance in communication. For a dialogue to succeed—in school as well as elsewhere—it must allow participants to contribute their own convictions, their own creativity and spontaneity, and to lay out how they wish to be understood. This opportunity for learners to introduce themselves as they are, unique, self-determined subjects engaging in their own religious quest, allows for a productive, relevant dialogue.” (Knauth, Vieregge 2018, S.226)

My assumption is that a dialogical value education which is embedded in a sustainable culture of dialogue and encounter can provide a way out of the previously discussed dilemma of subjective relativization vs objective universality of religious normativity. Cemented claims of religious validity and an incurious indifference towards the life of others can be eroded through patient and persistent efforts to immerse students in situations of encounter and dialogue. The work should predominantly try to develop an understanding of how values and orientations have been “grown” in the life of individuals. Encounter and relationship are not always remedies for tendencies of fragmentation and freezing, but they are necessary prerequisites for mutual recognition and exchange. Due to space constraints, I can only briefly

mention that dialogical value education⁸ should relate particular traditions of values with individual perspectives and the general claim of democratic education for all. Finally, four conceptional elements must be very briefly introduced:

Value Education needs to work with biographies:

The biographical dimension can make transparent how values evolve from questions regarding shaping one's own life. Especially in situations of cultural and religious heterogeneity, the narrative and reflective self-ascertainment about biographic traits can be an eye-opener for diversity in society.

Value Education produces and reflects experiences:

Values evolve through processes of self-ascertainment and self-transcendence (Hans Joas). They have an expressive face which can be formed by educational processes. Subjects show what they regard as right and wrong, good and bad, true and false, just and unjust. Value education has to create contexts to give space to the affective aspects of value-issues.

Value Education needs social spaces which involve subjects in practice:

Conventional classroom teaching is hardly an adequate place for giving values a practical shape. Contrast experiences, however, can play a significant role because they disturb familiar patterns of perception and experience. Contrast experiences can be made possible in social spaces beyond the own comfort zones which only mirror the routinized habits and desires of the subjects.

Value Educations needs narrative approaches:

During situations of conflict, it becomes visible that persons are guided by values. Conflicts also show that the convincing force of the better argument does not matter in practice. Instead, it is the connection between biography and value orientation that counts. That is why young people should be enabled to tell each other their own stories of value-formation. They should show each other in a dialogical way why they feel attached to certain values and their traditions and, in so doing, they can canvass for understanding of the biographical development of their own orientations.

To put it in a nutshell: The challenging relation between religion and normativity can be met

⁸ The concept of dialogical value education is elaborated in more detail in: Thorsten Knauth, Wertebildung durch dialogisches religionsbezogenes Lernen. Systematische Überlegungen, in: Mirjam Schambeck/ Sabine Pemsel-Maier (Hg.), *Welche Werte braucht die Welt? Wertebildung in christlicher und muslimischer Perspektive*, Freiburg, Basel, Wien (Herder), S. 139–156.

through dialogical approaches which contextualize normative orientations in the life-world and biographies of the students. An alphabetization in dialogue is needed. Continuous encounter is the first step to build up understanding and interest in the stories which we can tell and share with each other.

References

- ter Avest, Ina/Josza, Dan-Paul/Knauth, Thorsten/Rosón, Javier/Skeie, geir (Eds.): *Dialogue and Conflict on Religion. Studies of Classroom Interaction in European Countries*, Münster, New York, München, Berlin 2009.
- Aygün, Adem (2013): *Religiöse Sozialisation und Entwicklung bei islamischen Jugendlichen in Deutschland und in der Türkei. Empirische Analysen und religionspädagogische Herausforderungen*, Münster, New York, München, Berlin.
- Behr, Harry Harun (2017): *Streitfall Koran – Die Heilige Schrift des Islams als Gegenstand des pädagogischen Diskurses*, in: Bernd Schröder/ Harry Harun Behr/ Katja Boehme/ Daniel Krochmalnik (Hg.), *Buchstabe und Geist. Vom Umgang Tora, Bibel und Koran im Religionsunterricht*, Berlin, S. 187 – 226.
- Calmbach, Marc/Borgstedt, Silke/ Borhcard, Inga/ Thomas, Peter Martin/ Flaig, Berthold Bodo (2016): *Wie ticken Jugendliche 2016? Lebenswelten von Jugendlichen im Alter von 14 bis 17 Jahren in Deutschland*, Berlin.
- Forst, Rainer/Günther, Klaus (Hg.) (2011): *Die Herausbildung normativer Ordnungen*, Frankfurt a.M. 2011.
- Jozsa, Dan-Paul/Knauth, Thorsten/Weiße, Wolfram (Hg.) (2009): *Religionsunterricht, Dialog und Konflikt. Analysen im Kontext Europas*, Münster, New York, München, Berlin.
- Knauth, Thorsten/Vieregge, Dörthe (2018): *Religion and Dialogue in Religious Education. A Comparative Case Study in Duisburg and Hamburg*, in: Julia Ipgrave, Thorsten Knauth, Anna Körs, Dörthe Vieregge and Marie von der Lippe (Eds.), *Religion and Dialogue in the City. Case Studies on Interreligious Encounter in Urban Community and Education*, Münster/New York (Waxmann), S. 183–230.
- Knauth, Thorsten (2017): *Wertebildung durch dialogisches religionsbezogenes Lernen. Systematische Überlegungen*, in: Mirjam Schambeck/ Sabine Pemsel-Maier (Hg.), *Welche Werte braucht die Welt? Wertebildung in christlicher und muslimischer Perspektive*, Freiburg, Basel, Wien (Herder), S. 139–156.
- Nohl, Hermann (1948): *Die pädagogische Bewegung in Deutschland und ihre Theorie*, Frankfurt a.M., 3. Auflage.
- Peukert, Helmut (1983): *Kritische Theorie und Pädagogik*, in: *Zeitschrift für Pädagogik*, 29.Jg., S.195 – 217.
- Kenngott, Eva/Englert, Rudolf/Knauth, Thorsten (Hg.) (2015): *Konfessionell – interreligiös – religionskundlich. Unterrichtsmodelle in der Diskussion*, Stuttgart 2015.
- Kulacatan, Meltem/Behr, Harry Harun (2016): *Religious Orientations of Muslim Girls and young Women between Particularism and Universalism*, in: *Frankfurter Zeitschrift für Islamisch-Theologische Studien*, hg. von Ömer Özsoy, Thema: *Universalität und Universalismus im Islam*, H.3 (2016), Berlin, S. 107 – 120.
- Lindner, Konstantin/Schambeck, Mirjam/Simojoki, Henrik/Naurath, Elisabeth (Hg.) (2017): *Zukunftsfähiger Religionsunterricht. Konfessionell – kooperativ – kontextuell*, Freiburg, Basel, Wien 2017.

Knauth, T. (2019). Religion and normativity in pedagogical situations. In E. Gutzwiller-Helfenfinger, H. J. Abs, & P. Müller (Eds.), *Thematic papers based on the Conference "Migration, Social Transformation, and Education for Democratic Citizenship"* (pp. 207-218). University of Duisburg-Essen: DuEPublico. doi: 10.17185/duepublico/47768

Rothgangel, Martin/von Brömssen, Kerstin/ Heimbrock, Hans-Günther/Skeie, Geir (Eds.) (2017): *Location, Space and Place in Religious Education*, Münster, New York, München, Berlin 2017.

Valk, Pille/Bertram-Troost, Gerdien/Friederici, Markus/Béraud, Céline (Eds.) (2009): *Teenagers' Perspectives on the Role of Religion in their Lives, Schools and Societies. A European Quantitative Study*, Münster, New York, München, Berlin 2009.

Ziebertz, Hans-Georg/Kay, William K. (Eds.) (2005): *Youth in Europe I. An international empirical Study about Life Perspectives*, Münster 2005.

Ziebertz, Hans-Georg/Kay, William K. (Eds.) (2006): *Youth in Europe II. An international empirical Study about Religiosity*, Münster 2006.

Religion and Normativity in Pedagogical Situations

Thorsten Knauth

In: Thematic Papers Based on the Conference: *Migration, Social Transformation, and Education for Democratic Citizenship*

This text is provided by DuEPublico, the central repository of the University Duisburg-Essen.

This version of the e-publication may differ from a potential published print or online version.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.17185/duepublico/47768>

URN: <urn:nbn:de:hbz:464-20190201-155947-6>

Link: <https://duepublico.uni-duisburg-essen.de:443/servlets/DocumentServlet?id=47768>

License:



This work may be used under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/) license.