



<https://helda.helsinki.fi>

Helda

---

## Creating and combining models of Intercultural competence for teacher education/training : On the need to rethink IC frequently

Dervin, Fred

2020

---

Dervin, F 2020, Creating and combining models of Intercultural competence for teacher education/training : On the need to rethink IC frequently. in F Dervin, R Moloney & A Simpson (eds), Intercultural Competence in the Work of Teachers : Confronting Ideologies and Practices. Routledge Research in Teacher Education, Routledge, Abingdon, Oxon, pp. 57-72. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429401022-5>

---

<http://hdl.handle.net/10138/345712>  
10.4324/9780429401022-5

---

unspecified  
acceptedVersion

---

*Downloaded from Helda, University of Helsinki institutional repository.*

*This is an electronic reprint of the original article.*

*This reprint may differ from the original in pagination and typographic detail.*

*Please cite the original version.*

## Chapter 4

### Creating and Combining Models of Intercultural Competence for Teacher Education/Training - *On the need to rethink IC frequently*

Fred Dervin

**Abstract:** This chapter discusses two models of Intercultural Competence for Teacher Education/Training that have been developed both in Europe and China since the mid-2000s. It provides readers with a rare insight into the critical and reflexive thoughts that accompany the process of creating, revising and complementing two models. While the Postmodern Model is based on interdisciplinary ideas proposed by the ‘West’ (but not necessarily ‘belonging’ to it), the second Model, the Confucian Model, represents a shift towards including less discussed ideas in the scholarship on IC for teacher education/training (Confucian ethics here). The author shows how the models can complement each other, while diverging in terms of assumptions and principles. The combination of the two Models represents an original way of reflecting and implementing interculturality as a lifelong learning goal in teacher education and training.

**Keywords:** Intercultural competence, teacher education, Confucian ethics, interdisciplinarity

## Introduction

This is Passage Four of an important excavated text from early China called the *Guodian Chu Slips* (郭店楚簡, dated 300 BCE):

四海之内，  
其性一也。  
其用心各异，  
教使然也

(“As for everyone within the Four Seas,  
their nature is one.  
That they are different in the way they use their minds  
is brought about by education.”)

The slips, which were used for teaching, were found in Guodian Tomb (Hubei Province, Central China) in 1993. The tomb belonged to a noble scholar, teacher to a royal prince. This Passage summarizes well one of the main messages of this chapter: People are different and similar within and across societies, cultures, languages and countries (“the Four Seas” in the quote). It is through the conditioning of their environments, societies, interactions with others and education that people build up difference. In this chapter I argue that one of these conditioning elements, education, should help break such patterns and shake up the divide between the ‘oneness’ of nature and the tendency to construct interculturality as something problematic. Teacher education/training appears to be the best place to bridge this gap as it influences the “practice of teachers in schools and colleges and thereby [it has] a strong effect on the quality of educational experiences for learners” (Menter, 2016: 3). This means that teacher education/training should broaden the minds of student teachers, teacher educators and researchers by providing them with new and alternative perspectives on what it means to meet people across today’s multifaceted borders – be they national and/or social.

The notion of interculturality has been with us since the beginning of times (in Law, philosophy, theology, etc.), although we had to wait until the mid-20<sup>th</sup> Century for the term to be formally introduced in research. Since then a certain number of Western-centric ideological approaches to IC have spread to the entire world, without always taking into account the “social lives of concepts” (Hann, 2016). What is striking about current, often static, models of IC is their insistence on making interculturality monological (self-centered, ignorance of the other as a *real* companion in developing and constructing IC) and their lack of ethical reflections, beyond imposed ‘neo-liberal’ ideologies such as autonomy, criticality, creativity, and tolerance (amongst others). I consider this chapter, in combination with the preceding chapters, as a contribution to the critiques of these issues.

In what follows, I review and reflect on two interdisciplinary models of IC for teacher education/training, that I have developed since the 2000s. I present the differences and similarities between the models, show how complementary they could be and why they are relevant for teacher education/training. It is important to note that the second model is in the process of being developed and that it is thus a work in progress.

### ***Some words of warning about interculturality***

Before we start exploring the two models of Intercultural Competence, I feel the need to share warnings about the very notion of interculturality (see volume introduction as a companion). Ideological as it is, the notion of interculturality must always be regarded from critical and reflexive perspectives in order to clarify one’s position towards it. This can allow us to avoid giving the impression, as much as possible, that *our* models are THE right models, the only alternatives to other models of IC.

As I am about to present two complementary models of intercultural competence it is important to remind readers that any discourse on interculturality is ideological, political and that they represent both visions and convictions. This means that through education, whenever we propose, implement, and discuss interculturality, we impose values, behaviours, attitudes, expectations, discourses, *willy-nilly*. Although we may believe that certain visions of interculturality are better than others, we must accept that, objectively, no one can claim to be right or wrong, better or worse in their visions of interculturality. This also means that one must be transparent about the way(s) one defines, problematizes and uses the notion of interculturality. It also requires being clear about the ethical issues that derive from it, for us, as educators but also for other educational partners (students, parents, etc.). In this sense I agree with Hannah Arendt (1966: 468) who claims that education that aims to “destroy the capacity to form (any convictions)” *cannot but be* totalitarian.

There is a clear lack of agreement about the notion of interculturality in research, practice and decision-making today, and the multiplicity of approaches and meanings needs to be discussed and clarified to make the notion more useful and its uses more transparent. Ignoring this warning might do more harm than good for those who are ‘forced’, through education, to work on/with it and to use it. Finally, being transparent about the visions/convictions hiding behind the notion might help us be clear about the geo-political ideas that guide our understanding. We cannot ignore that most models of Intercultural Competence today find their origins in Euro- and North American contexts.

My second warning goes hand in hand with the previous one. Hannah Arendt (Cited in

Weissenberg, 2000: 22) is inspiring when she asserts that: “I have always believed that, no matter how abstract our theories may sound or how consistent our arguments may appear, there are incidents and stories behind them which, at least for ourselves, contain in a nutshell the full meaning of whatever we have to say.” So, my second warning is that one should always bear in mind that, for interculturality, one cannot ignore the influence of the personal on the way we problematize the notion. As a human experience that triggers encounters, emotions, feelings, amongst others, research and practice discourses of interculturality cannot do away with experiences. This means that a given vision of interculturality is not only influenced by political, ideological, theoretical and societal discourses but it always falls under the guise of the personal and reflects somehow a *mélange* of these influences. People who know me well will find easily the influences of these on my own writing about interculturality. For example my current interest in China has had a big influence on my rethinking IC.

The third warning about interculturality relates to the concept of power. Although it has often been treated as neutral transactional encounters, interculturality encompasses and contributes to unbalanced power relations. These may relate to the intersection of different identity markers that are made relevant in encounters (gender, sexual orientation, race, social status, linguistic identity, etc.). The *inter-* of interculturality always comes first. Interculturality is, like any encounter between social beings, about interaction, co-construction, clashes, etc. Within the context of interculturality, relations outweigh the individual. This also applies to the way we theorize and educate/train for interculturality, pushing and doing away with ideas from what we consider the ‘periphery’, outside the accepted paradigms. This chapter also contributes to questioning this problematic and widespread attitude.

## **1. Towards teachers’ critical and reflexive Intercultural Competence: The Postmodern Model (2008-2016)**

### **1.1. Introduction to the Model**

The first model under review corresponds to the ideology of Critical and Reflexive Interculturality as it has been developed by (European) scholars such as Abdallah-Preteuille (2006); Holliday (2010); Piller (2010); Dervin (2016, 2017). The Model was inspired by thinkers from different fields such as anthropology (Bensa, 2010; Wikan, 2002), sociology (Bauman, 2004; Maffesoli, 1993); philosophy (Bergson, 1900; Jullien, 2012), social psychology (Gillespie & Cornish, 2010); and psychology (Laing, 1967; Watkins, 2000). M. Bakhtin’s *dialogism* (1982), H. Bergson’s *process philosophy* (1900), and M. Maffesoli’s (1993) and Z. Bauman’s (2004) *sociology of postmodernity* represent turning points in the way this Model was designed and used. Its basis occurs at theoretical, methodological and socio-representational levels. Although it aims at developing theoretical and methodological reflexivity it does not lay so much emphasis on ethics in social relations. Its starting points, as we shall see below, derive from a view of relations which is somewhat sceptical and pessimistic. Its main assumption is that we are all involved in processes of representing self and other, often in negative ways through multiple -isms such as *racism*, *culturalism*, *eurocentrism*. At the same time, the model is somewhat idealistic, as it suggests that such issues can be ‘removed’ and somewhat ‘healed’ through education.

### **1.2. Assumptions**

The Postmodern Model is based on the following assumptions, which guide the core principles presented in the next subsection:

- Every educational context is intercultural; one cannot experience education in terms of encounters and learning without ‘doing’ interculturality.
- Whenever people interact, different identities are negotiated between them although one or two of these identities might become crystallised (e.g. race and/culture);
- Interculturality is about the negotiation of everyone’s diversities with others (internal plurality beyond mere ‘culture’);
- Interculturality is about the *inter-* of encounters (interaction, interconnection);
- Interculturality is about unbalanced power relations; Consequences: People manipulate each other, and are deceitful. A lot of research on the use, misuse and abuse of the concept of ‘culture’ in intercultural encounters has made a convincing case for shifting away from the all-cultural (ex. Piller, 2011). Culture is often used as “an imprisoning cocoon or a determining force” (Baumann, 1996 – “*in my culture, we don’t do this!*”).

### 1.3. Core principles

Seven principles have derived from these assumptions:

1. Intersectionality must be practiced in education, beyond an overemphasis on the triad of culture, ethnicity and race. Socio-economic/politico-historical categories must be used to try to explain, understand and solve intercultural issues.
2. Educators must identify undertones and nuances in their students or the relations taking place in a given school rather than facile generalizations and ready-made assumptions. As a consequence, they are able to notice and potentially act upon representation, stereotypes, xenophobia (fear/hatred of the other), xenophilia (‘exaggerated’ love of the other), etc.
3. In order to do so, perspectives that take into account the “collective ego” (Maffesoli, 1993), rather than individualistic approaches must be adopted. The self always acts in interaction, with and/or against the other, in often unscheduled, incoherent and inconsistent ways. Educators must thus always put interactions first rather than individuals.
4. In interaction with the other, the self gets to negotiate its difference. Although people are different across and within groups, there is a need to take into account similarity too. Choosing one side of the difference-similarity continuum with the other represents a bias that needs addressing. Nie (2011: 28) calls it “the oppositional habit of thought”. In accordance with Hannah Arendt (1958: 155): “If people were not different, they would have nothing to say to each other. And if they were not the same, they would not understand each other”. Total opposition has too often been used as a key to intercultural dialogue. The model argues that it contributes to create ‘radical others’. What is needed is tools to reflect on shared humanity (Nie, 2011: 11).
5. Intercultural encounters are neither objective nor a-political. Discourses of skin colour, culture, language, ethnicity, coupled with gender, social class (see 1.) reflect ideologies. Educators must thus pay attention to politically coloured statements and actions, and the power differentials that go with them. It means for instance that educators must avoid certain typical ‘let it pass’ attitudes and behaviours (e.g. racist slurs must be discussed in class). They must also pay attention to the choice and use of words (e.g. ‘migrant’ learners; ‘African’ habits).
6. Since representation of self, other, contexts of interaction, amongst others, are central in the Model, educators must bear in mind that interculturality is, like any other act of interaction, somewhat playful. Representations do trigger dreams and nightmares, attraction and repulsion, exoticism and normality, which influence the way one

interacts with others. In general, these aspects are invisible to the observer's eyes but, also, often to the one who experiences them. Following Karl Kraus (2014: 34), we could argue that "To reconstruct the world it is necessary to strengthen the real backbone of life, the imagination." This is what the Helsinki Model suggests interculturality is about.

7. Although the previous principles and assumptions might appear testing for teachers, the final principle is a reminder that intercultural competence cannot always function the way we wish it to function. As a consequence, although success is something to strive for, failure in achieving the previous principles or in making our student teachers grasp and negotiate their core values and ideas, must also be considered, especially as a way to dig deeper into the principles.

#### **1.4. Examples of applications in teacher education**

The Postmodern Model has been taught in many different countries (China, Finland, France, Luxembourg, amongst others) over the past decade. It has been used in initial teacher education at the University of Helsinki (Finland). Having been taught and practiced the assumptions and principles of the Model, Finnish student teachers have used it during their practicums in schools. With the Model, student teachers are made to reflect on their own practices, on their mentors' practices but also on interactions at school more generally. It is also meant to help them make their own pedagogical and ethical decisions. In what follows, we share some examples of narratives from a cohort of student teachers' diaries from Helsinki where they explain how they were able to notice teachers'/their own implicit and explicit representations and potentially discriminatory discourses/actions by using the Model. They wrote down these narratives during a three-month practicum in a Finnish teacher training school in 2014. For an in-depth analysis of similar narratives, see Dervin and Hahl (2015).

In the first example, the student is surprised at the fact that a teacher puts the spotlight on a Black student (the only Black student in her class) to ask him how he feels about an advertisement that the student teacher had just shown to the whole class. The ad showed an African American rapper being passively aggressive to a female model to advertise for a fragrance. When the student teacher asked the class to respond to the ad, no one reacted. This is when the mentor takes over and points at the Black student: "He answered to my mentor's question in humorous indifference but his crouched shoulders and mumbling voice seemed that he was put into an awkward spot [sic]." A very similar example is shared by a student teacher about another teacher who insisted on asking a Black student about the kinds of fruits that 'people eat in your culture'. Obviously embarrassed by the question, the Black student was almost in tears and told the teacher that she had no idea because she was born in Finland and had never been abroad. The student teacher tries to explain the teacher's behaviour, not by e.g. accusing her of being biased or racist, but by suggesting that "maybe she wanted [the student] to share that special knowledge with the rest of the class."

The next example follows a similar pattern but it relates to a student teacher's decision to use a picture of the Neanderthal in his history lesson. The student teacher calls it "a small blunder on my part." In his class, the student teacher has a student who, he asserts, looks like the picture of the Neanderthal that he projected on the wall for the students to see. When the picture starts showing, he realises that this may serve as a bullying trigger for the student, and he panics. He notes: "I feared that she would find the situation awkward but at least on the surface she was cool as a cucumber". As a consequence of his 'fear' the student explains that "this true story reminds me of important it is to check the teaching material to avoid making 'different' students

feel embarrassed [sic].”

The final example is more explicit than the previous ones and links up interculturality to social class. In one civics class, a student teacher witnesses the following: “The civics teacher taught communism by first asking the students to put all their money on the desks. This of course gave everybody in the classroom some idea of the economy and social class of the students. This aspect was probably ignored by the teacher.”

### **1.5. Critiques of the Postmodern Model**

The Model was developed in Finland by myself and has led to multiple publications (Dervin, 2011, 2015, 2016, 2017; Dervin & Hahl, 2015; Dervin & Layne, 2013, etc.). It can be regarded as critical in the sense that it has helped to question so-called culturalist (where culture explains all the problems faced) and/or ambiguous models of intercultural competence (Dervin, 2016).

However, over the years that I developed the Model I have not felt fully satisfied with it. My multiple stays in other parts of the world and interactions with other researchers and students have opened my eyes to the fact that the Model still tends to be theoretically and methodologically Eurocentric, based on ideologies developed mostly in the ‘West’ (postmodernist ideologies). Furthermore, the Model also has a rather negative flavour by assuming that people manipulate each other somewhat constantly, that they are ‘bad’ and must be ‘unmasked’ for their ‘sins’ of essentialism, culturalism, etc. (Belleau, 2015). As a consequence, it lacks individual and interactional ethical aspects. Stays in China and engagement with students and scholars from around the world have allowed me to become aware of these biases and problematic assumptions, and to look for some alternatives and complementary perspectives.

### **2. The Confucian Model (2017-...)**

For many consecutive years now, I have spent time in China, lecturing and doing research. It is through my renewed encounters with Confucian ethics, that the development of the second Model started, as a complement to the first one. I had been aware of the *Analects* of Confucius but I often felt that I misunderstood their meanings. The *Analects* is a collection of ideas attributed to the Chinese philosopher Confucius, compile and written by his followers. Confucius (551-479 BCE) was a teacher, editor, politician, and philosopher. Confucius is the Latinized word for his Chinese name Kongzi or Kongfuzi (Master Kong). Confucianism, his ‘philosophy’, emphasizes constant self-improvement and continuous social interaction.

Confucianism has been discussed but also (mis-)used in scholarship on intercultural communication education (Dervin, 2011). Other Chinese schools of thoughts such as Daoism, Mohism, and Legalism, which have been ignored in this scholarship, will be explored in my future publications.

The Confucian Model does two things that the Postmodern Model did not (at least explicitly): it lays a strong emphasis on individuals’ interpersonal reflexivity and ethics, and it represents an attempt to shift from Euro-Anglo-centrism to Chinese thought (and/or to combine both). This Model also translates my own recent shifts in the way I see intercultural encounters. At the time of writing the Model is still a work in progress, not fully developed and should be considered as such in this chapter.

Some readers, like one reviewer of this chapter, might feel that this Model is theoretically poor and that it ‘only’ derives from Confucian principles. There have been many discussions about Confucianism for instance in philosophy. Many European thinkers have asserted that Confucianism is neither a ‘theory’ nor a ‘philosophy’ (e.g. Heidegger and Derrida, see Yao, 2000). However this represents a strong bias that we interculturalists must question. The ‘West’ does not have the right to judge what is theoretical and/or philosophical, usually based on their own criteria. If we want to rethink IC, I argue that we need to rethink the way we see ‘research’ and ‘theory’ today.

## 2.1. Difference and similarity between the two models?

In this first subsection, I discuss the difference and complementarity of the two models. In order to do so, we take a detour via Greek mythology and Chinese folklore with the figures of Sisyphus and 吴刚 (Wu Gang). These two figures should be treated as ‘ideal-types’ here and not as static truths. As myths, they represent a conveniently limited method for comparing the starting point of two models. As such they are not meant to represent the ‘West’ and China.

The two different characters have a lot in common as both were punished for something they did. Their punishment consisted of having to perform an endless hard job. Sisyphus, a king from Peloponnese (Greece), was punished for his self-aggrandizing craftiness and deceitfulness. Sisyphus also killed travellers and guests, thus breaking the basic Greek rule of generosity and courtesy. Punished by Zeus, he was forced to roll an immense boulder up a hill, only to watch it come back down the hill. Endlessly, he would push it back up. The story of 吴刚, from the Tang Dynasty (618-907), has many different versions. The one retained here, tells of 吴刚 having found a teacher to help him in his quest for immortality. Yet, 吴刚 did not show enough interest and motivation to follow the teachers’ precepts (for instance when he was taught to play Chinese chess, he gave up after two days). As a result, like Sisyphus, 吴刚 was sent to the Moon to chop a laurel tree. However, every time he would chop it, the tree grew back again and again.

To us, the case of Sisyphus is symbolic of the Postmodern Model. The Greek King was actually a rogue, a deceiver and someone who wanted to get rid of the other. The vision of the Human that he depicts is rather negative in a sense. It is an image of someone who cannot be trusted. In other words, he sinned so he is punished. As asserted before the Postmodern model relates to the ideas of ‘good’ and ‘bad’, as well as sins such as culturalism that deserve to be eradicated. In other words, the Model sees *the Human as a ‘bad’ person* whom we should educate and punish. The story of 吴刚, on the other hand, can be considered more positive. Wu Gang was a ‘good’ person. Although he also had to perform a never-ending task, the reason why he was punished relates to laziness and a lack of enthusiasm – neither deceit nor murder like Sisyphus. This sets a different tone for the Confucian Model: *People are good and mean to be good*. This Model was inspired by Confucius (551-479 BCE) and Mencius (372-289 BCE). The latter uses the parable of a man seeing a child about to fall in a well to explain that man is good:

He would certainly be moved to compassion, not because he wanted to get in the good graces of the parents, nor because he wished to win the praise of his fellow villagers, nor yet because he disliked the cry of the child (Mencius, 2A: 6).

In terms of similarities and complementary the two Models have a lot in common. Both Models require constant work, and constant, endless training and education. No one can claim to be

able to follow and ‘perform’ the Models perfectly. Furthermore, the two Models aim at triggering discussions and negotiations of things that are often silenced in education (e.g. negative representations, conflicts, modesty, etc.). Finally, the combination of the two Models can help student teachers/teachers think about what is happening in the classroom, in relation to what is being taught-learned, and beyond the classroom.

## **2.2. The Confucian Model**

### **2.2.1 Why Confucius?**

In fields other than education, scholars have noted the benefits of including Confucianism in today’s research. For H. Fingarette (1972: vii) “Increasingly I have become convinced that Confucius can be a teacher to us today – a major teacher, not one who merely gives us a slightly exotic perspective on the ideas already current. He tells us things not being said elsewhere; things needing to be said. He has a new lesson to teach”. Nie (2011) explains that “[Confucianism] is now reviving and increasingly recognized as a valuable resource for cross-cultural dialogue, for inspiration about human life, and for envisioning the future of the world”. Finally Yao (2000: 283) goes as far as explaining that “Confucian education is far from being useless and antiprogressive. It can be adapted and transformed not only to become part of modern life, but also to contribute to a more comprehensive education system for a ‘post-modern’ society”.

In a study I published in 2011 I noted the problematic misuses and abuses of Confucius in research on internationalization of higher education emerging from the ‘West’ (Dervin, 2011). As such, working from a Confucian perspective is problematic especially when one needs to rely on translations of the *Analects* from the Chinese language. There are currently about 500 different translations and interpretations in English. So it is important to justify the choice of translations. Yao (2000: 246) also notes that there is, as a consequence, not one kind of Confucianism but many: “an array of social, cultural and spiritual traditions”. For Cheng (2008), Confucianism has witnessed several waves of globalization. McArthur (2010: 148) explains that “over the centuries, rulers, including Chinese emperors and Japanese samurai lords, philosophers and educators throughout East Asia and even Western philosophers have generally construed the life and teachings of Confucius in a manner that has suited their own agendas”. This means that Confucius’ ideas can allow “multiple and sometimes contradictory interpretations” (Nie, 2011: 135). Bueno (2018) gives a good example of Confucius’ multifacetedness in the Brazilian context, where the philosopher has been used for different purposes: religion and worldview (The religious Confucius, The Christian Confucius, The Esoteric Confucius, The Chinese mystical Confucius), politics (The Political Confucius) and education (Teacher Confucius). In my work, I use Anne Cheng’s (1981) translation of the *Analects* into the French language and that of Puett and Gross-Loh (2016) in English. Both have commented extensively on their understanding of Confucianism in lectures given around the world. I also use Huang’s (1997) translation as a counterbalance to the two previous translations. Huang’s translation is more literal than other translations and seems to capture well the subtleties of the Chinese version.

### **2.2.2. Beyond the misunderstandings of Confucian ethics**

Nie (2011), Cheng (2008) but also Puett & Gross-Loh (2016) explain for example that Confucius is often seen in the ‘West’ as a rigid traditionalist while his ideas appear to be very ‘postmodern’ when they are read carefully. A few scholars have written about the kinds of

stereotypes about Confucianism in the ‘West’ and China. Often reduced (wrongly) to the keywords of *collectivism*, *social orientation* and *harmony* (e.g. Chang 1997) it is important to note that Confucians actually opposed the society in which they lived, calling for everybody to have equal opportunity for growth. For example, Confucius did not encourage conformity and submissiveness toward authority; he believed that everyone is complex and changes constantly (no single, unified being) and that every encounter and experience offers a chance to actively create a new and better world. Creel (1960: 1) explains that “Tradition paints [Confucius] as a strict pedant, laying down precise rules for men to follow in their conduct and their thinking. The truth is that he carefully avoided laying down rules, because he believed that no creed formulated by another person can excuse any man from the duty of thinking for himself”. One can see here many links with the Postmodern Model. A major difference between the two models is the fact that Confucius was calling for us to elicit positive reactions in those we interact with, which means, training our emotions, engaging in a constant process of self-cultivation to react in the ‘right’, ethical way to each particular situation. Reflexive altruism, concern with the good of others, is the main learning objective for Confucians. Confucius does not issue moral commands in the *Analects* but stimulates our moral sentiments. The Postmodern Model, through its emphasis on critical theory and methodology, is often perceived as highly moralistic.

The main outcome of Confucianism is called the *Dao* (the Way; 道). This Way represents the path we forge constantly through our choices, actions and relationships. It is thus created anew every moment of our lives and represents an endless potential to transform us and the world in which we live. In order to follow the Way, people are urged to consider the use of rituals. This word has often been misunderstood in the ‘West’ as it is usually seen as negative in our neo-liberal world (*rituals make us follow blindly*). For Confucius, rituals are the daily moments that can make us become different and better human beings, especially when we are able to break away from our own patterns. When we meet people, we respond emotionally to them (in Chinese: Ren Qing 人情). However, we could learn to respond in better ways, with ‘propriety’ (in Chinese: Yi Li 义理). Propriety refers to the process of cultivating our emotions so that we internalize better ways of responding to others, breaking from our ‘normal’ ways of being to develop different sides of ourselves. Rituals in the Confucian sense, are transformative and allow us to be different people for a moment. Ritual training represents an interesting perspective for IC training as it teaches us to “break” from our current selves, transform both self and potentially the society at large, shape us into becoming more “humane”. Ritual training is not conforming to existing social orders, but, in an endless process, sensing how to act appropriately and spontaneously, with compassion and understanding, in every situation (Puett & Gross-Loh, 2016).

## 2.4. Core principles

The core principles of Confucian ethics can be summarize as the way to be *junzi* (君子), an omnipresent figure in the *Analects*. The idea of *junzi* has been translated in many different ways in English: “Superior man”; “gentleman”; “exemplary person”; “moral person”; “nobleman”. Although these translations appear unsatisfactory, what they all reflect is the ethical significance of this figure. For Confucius, striving to become *junzi* is leading us to the *Dao* (see above). Throughout the *Analects*, the figure is characterized as follows:

- Junzi is an intellectual resister
- Junzi does more and speaks less

- “A gentleman is ashamed if his words outshine his actions.”
- Junzi is loyal, obedient and knowledgeable
  - “Junzi should be harmonious, but can have different opinions and should not just follow blindly.”
- Junzi aims for the long-term benefit of others
  - “A gentleman helps others to fulfill good, not vice.”
- Junzi transcends personal concerns and prejudice
  - “A gentleman is at peace and ease, but not arrogant.”
- Junzi disciplines himself and considers the consequences of her/his actions
  - “With righteousness as the essence, a gentleman should act according to the rites, express himself with modesty, and achieve it with faithfulness.”
- Junzi grasps the value of virtues.
  - “The noble man is not a utensil” (thinks broadly and does not limit himself quickly to a certain world-view ).

All these characteristics can help *junzi* to perform and negotiate *ren* (*humane conduct* in English, 仁).

## 2.5. Complementary of the two Models for teacher education and training

One can easily see how the characteristics of the Confucian Model can 1. complement the Postmodern Model, with more individual-interactional and reflexive perspectives based on similar ideologies (e.g. modesty, broad thinking, centrality of the other) and 2. add important ethical perspectives (goodness, harmony, openness).

Both Models also hint at the fact there is no endpoint to IC, that it is a life-long endeavor to negotiate again and again.

Like the principles of the Postmodern Model, the principles of the Confucian Model can be used for peer- and self-assessment by teachers and student teachers to reflect on their IC. Summative assessment is, for obvious reasons, out of the question. If introduced alongside the two models can help those involved in teacher education/training reflect on interculturality theoretically, methodologically, and ethically. They represent together a strong addition to discussions on aspects of IC that are often pushed aside such as resisting, critiquing, and discussing goodness, modesty and the role of imagination.

The following table summarizes the principles of the two Models. In the ways the Models are formulated, one can notice the different and similar purposes that they serve: the Postmodern Model clearly urges its users to reflect on theoretical and methodological positions, while the Confucian Model calls for ethical positions that seem to fit well the objectives of the other Model. Note that the location of principles of the Models on the same row merely follows the order of presentation in the chapter and does not mean that each principle has an equivalent in the other Model.

Postmodern Model	Confucian Model
Use intersectionality	Resist intellectually
Identify undertones and nuances	Be modest

Take into account the “collective ego”	Be harmonious but critical
Work from the difference-similarity continuum	Be good to others
Place power and ideologies at the centre of intercultural analysis	Be open
Problematize interculturality in relation to imagination	Be self-critical
Bear in mind that interculturality can be both successful and a failure	

**Table 1 – Principles of the two Models**

### Concluding remarks

The composer and conductor Pierre Boulez (2015: n. p.) summarizes well what we face when we do interculturality, if we replace the word *music* with the latter: “Music is a labyrinth with no beginning and no end, full of new paths to discover, where mystery remains eternal”. How to deal with this mystery is a challenge for preparing teachers. This chapter has presented two complementary Models of Intercultural Competence, which offer some reflections on “new paths to discover”. In these concluding remarks, I must first insist that the Models should not be considered as set formulas for how educators should act in a school.

I agree with Hannah Arendt (1954: n. p.) when she writes: “Education is the point at which we decide whether we love the world enough to assume responsibility for it, and by the same token save it from that ruin which except for renewal, except for the coming of the new and the young, would be inevitable. And education, too, is where we decide whether we love our children enough not to expel them from our world and leave them to their own devices, nor to strike from their hands their chance of undertaking something new, something unforeseen by us, but to prepare them in advance for the task of renewing a common world.” “Renewing a common world”, I believe, is what educators should strive for. One cannot always win as far as interculturality is concerned – in other words: *It may work or it may not, depending on contexts, emotions, interlocutors, moods, etc.* What matters is the theoretical, methodological and ethical groundings that teachers are presented/confronted with to reflect on how to ‘do’ interculturality with and for their students. These should change through their engagement with scholars and practitioners, and through their experiences and encounters. Static, macdonaldised and taken-for-granted Models of IC represent a danger for education.

The Models under review modestly try rethink IC, bearing in mind that they are not perfect and that they might lead to success and/or failure. Long-term engagement with them in initial and in-service teacher education could have an influence on (student) teachers. 'Transformation' has already been examined for the Postmodern model (e.g. Dervin, 2015; Dervin & Hahl, 2015). Our goal is now to see how the second Model can be implemented in teacher education in different contexts, and be used, and modified hand in hand with the first one.

Education for/with interculturality is a never-ending story for which we must fight. *If there is ethics of education, this fight must be it...* French poet and critic Nicolas Boileau wrote about the art of writing in 1674: "Make haste slowly; do not be discouraged, but return to the work frequently". The French original for the end of the English quote reads "*vingt fois sur le métier remettez votre ouvrage*". This translates literally as "put your work twenty times upon the anvil" (a large block of metal upon which another object is 'worked') (Mould, 2011: 69). This summarises well the message of the two Models: If you don't succeed at first, try, try again. IC is a never-ending process, an eternal theoretical, methodological and ethical endeavor....

## References

- Abdallah-Preteuille, M. (2006). Interculturalism as a paradigm for thinking about diversity. *Intercultural Education*, 17 (5), 475-483.
- Arendt, H. (1954). *The Crisis of Education*. Available at <http://www.digitalcounterrevolution.co.uk/2016/hannah-arendt-the-crisis-in-education-full-text/>
- Arendt, H. (1958). *The Human Condition*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Arendt, H. (1966). *The Origins of Totalitarianism*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Bakhtin, M. M. (1982). *The Dialogic Imagination*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Bauman, Z. (2004). *Identity*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Baumann, G. (1996). *Contesting Culture: Discourses of Identity in Multi-ethnic London*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Belleau, J.-M. (2015). *Ethnophilie*. Rennes: PUR.
- Bensa, A. (2010). *Après Lévi-Strauss*. Toulouse: Anacharsis.
- Bergson, H. (1900). *Laughter. An Essay on the Meaning of the Comic*. New York: Kessinger Publishing's Legacy Reprint Series.
- Boulez, P. (2015). Boulez 90: New Dialogues at the National Sawdust. [http://concerts-boulez90.com/pdf/Programme\\_National%20Sawdust.pdf](http://concerts-boulez90.com/pdf/Programme_National%20Sawdust.pdf)
- Bueno, A. (2018). Confucius for Brazilians. *International Journal of Latin American Religions* 2(1), 117-124.
- Confucius (1981). *Les Entretiens*. Translated by Anne Cheng. Paris: Points Seuil.
- Confucius (1997). *The Analects of Confucius*. Translated by Huang, C. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Chang, H. C. (1997). Language and Words: Communication in the Analects of Confucius. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology* 16(2), 107-131.
- Cheng, A. (2008). *Can China Think?* Paris: Editions du Collège de France.
- Confucius (n.d.). *The Analects*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Classics.
- Creel, H. G. (1960). *Confucius and the Chinese Way*. New York: Harper.
- Dervin, F. (2011). A plea for change in research on intercultural discourses: A 'liquid' approach to the study of the acculturation of Chinese students. *Journal of Multicultural Discourses*, 6 (1), 37-52.

- Dervin, F. (2015). Towards post-intercultural teacher education: Analysing 'extreme' Intercultural dialogue to reconstruct interculturality. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 38 (1), 71-86.
- Dervin, F. (2016). *Interculturality in Education*. London: Palgrave.
- Dervin, F. (2017). *Critical Interculturality*. Newcastle: CSP.
- Dervin, F. & Layne, H. (2013). A guide to interculturality for international and exchange students: An example of hostipitality? *Journal of Multicultural Discourses*, 8 (1), 1-19.
- Dervin, F., & Hahl, K. (2015). Developing a portfolio of intercultural competences in teacher education: The case of a Finnish international programme. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, 59 (1), 95-109.
- Fingarette, H. (1972). *Confucius: The Secular As Sacred*. New York: Harper.
- Gillespie, A. & Cornish, F. (2010). Intersubjectivity: Towards a dialogical analysis. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour*, 40, 19-46.
- Hann, C. (2016). A concept of Eurasia. *Current Anthropology* 57(1): 1-27.
- Holliday, A. (2010). *Intercultural Communication and Ideology*. London: Sage.
- Jullien, F. (2012). *L'écart et l'entre: Leçon inaugurale de la Chaire sur l'altérité, 8 décembre 2011*. Paris: Galilée.
- Kraus, K. (2014). *In These Great Times. Selected Writings*. Amsterdam: November Editions.
- Laing, R. D. (1967). *The Politics of Experience and the Bird Paradise*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Maffesoli, M. (1993). *La contemplation du monde*. Paris: le Livre de Poche.
- McArthur, M. (2010). *Confucius: A Throwless King*. New York: Pegasus Books.
- Mencius* (n.d.). Harmondsworth: Penguin Classics.
- Menter, I. (2016). Introduction. In: Beauchamp, G., Clarke, L., Hulme, M., Kennedy, A. et al. (Eds.). *Teacher Education in Times of Change*. Bristol: Policy Press, 3-17.
- Mould, M. (2011). *The Routledge Dictionary of Cultural References in Modern French*. London: Routledge.
- Nie, J.-B. (2011). *Medical Ethics in China*. London: Routledge.
- Piller, I. (2011). *Intercultural communication: A critical introduction*. Edinburgh: EUP.
- Puett, M. & Gross-Loh, C. (2016). *The Path*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Yao, X. (2000). *An Introduction to Confucianism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Weisseberg, L. (2000). Introduction: Hannah Arendt, Rahel Varnhagen and the writing of (auto)biography. In: Weisseberg, L. (Ed.). *Arendt, Rahel Varnhagen: The Life of a Jewess*. Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 3-69.
- Wikan, U. (2002). *Generous Betrayal*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.