



Ambivalences of Inclusion in Day Care Centers for Children with and without Disabilities

Hendrik Trescher^{1*}, Teresa Hauck²

Philipps- Universität Marburg, Bunsenstr. 3, 35032 Marburg

*Corresponding Author: Hendrik Trescher, Philipps- Universität Marburg, Bunsenstr. 3, 35032 Marburg

Abstract: Based on the results of the projects ‘Structural Problems of Inclusive Child Care’ (Hauck 2014) and ‘Inclusion as a Challenge for Inclusive Day Care’ (Trescher 2018), the paper at hand discusses the challenges of pedagogical practice in inclusive settings. By means of structural analyses, we show to what extent mechanisms of regulation and surveillance on all structural levels of inclusive day care (personnel, architecture and design, daily routine) – as practices of subjectivation – affect children with disabilities. Using ethnographic analyses, which give insight into the daily routines of inclusive day care, we reflect upon central ambivalences of pedagogical practice in these settings. Finally, this paper aims at broadening the discourse on inclusive day care of children with and without disabilities by presenting empirical research. In this way, the paper brings attention to (a) practices of subjectivation, which result from disabling structures, and (b) ambivalences of pedagogical practice, which so far have not been sufficiently reflected upon.

Keywords: Inclusive Day Care, Disability, Cognitive Disabilities, Subjectivation, Ambivalence, Pedagogical Practice, Structural Analyses, Ethnographic Analyses, Germany, Disability Studies

1. INTRODUCTION

The discourse on inclusion is largely concerned with the question of how (inclusive) participation of people with disabilities might be arranged within and beyond pedagogical settings. The combined care of preschool children with and without disabilities in Germany has been institutionalized by way of inclusive day care centers since the 1980s¹. In this regard, Cloerkes pointed out – already over ten years ago – that (in Germany) hardly any research is conducted in basic areas of inclusion, because inclusive care of children with and without disabilities has become a matter of course today (Cloerkes, 2007, p. 267), even though practices of inclusive care still warrant critical evaluation (see Kron, 2013, p. 191). From these insights, especially in the context of theoretical perspectives on inclusion, follows a demand for research on the structures and practices of inclusive care of children with and without disabilities. In the course of the development towards ‘inclusive day care centers’, the current situation in these institutions calls for critical reflection, not least to highlight potential inclusive perspectives, but particularly to integrate ambivalences, which are inherent to the paradigm of inclusion (see Trescher, 2015a; 2017b; 2017c), into the current discourse. In this context, the paradigm of inclusion often seems to be primarily defined by ‘mutual learning’ or ‘shared childhood’ (see for example Kron, 2010) and often lacks a theoretically guided definition of ‘inclusion’. Consequently, ambivalences, which arise during apparent inclusive care of children, are no further reflected on. In this context, the question of ‘surveillance’ of children in inclusive day care serves as an example as it refers back to the pedagogical ambivalence between ‘leading’ and ‘letting grow’ (Litt, 1964): The simultaneity of leading and letting grow cautions to “never in the course of responsible leadership forget the right that life itself is entitled to – in reverent and patient letting grow

¹When we speak of ‚kindergarten‘ or ‚preschool‘, we refer to the German institution called ‘Kindergarten’ respectively ‘Kindertagesstätte’. Children that attend the German ‘Kindergarten’ are (normally) between 2 or 3 and 6 years old. At the age of six (respectively in some cases five or seven), children attend the first grade of ‘Grundschule’. The joint care of children with and without disabilities (mainly) takes place in so-called ‘integrativen Kindertagesstätten’, which we refer to as ‘inclusive day care centers’ in the present paper. In Germany, a common distinction is made between ‘inclusion’ and ‘integration’, whereby – in most understandings – the concept of inclusion is more comprehensive than the concept of integration. This means (in most discourses) that inclusion does not regard ‘disability’ as a manifest category. Nevertheless, in the paper at hand, we do not differentiate between these two terms and consistently refer to inclusion.

to never forget the duty, on which is the meaning of pedagogical action is founded – that is the ultimate pedagogical wisdom” (Litt, 1964, p. 81f)². Here, education is considered as a practice of negotiation, specifically as a negotiation of precisely that ambivalence between ‘leading’ and ‘letting grow’. Clearly, surveillance always already entails the potentiality of regulation (see Trescher, 2013a, p. 280) and, thus, constitutes a regiment into the children’s daily routine in the respective institutions. The basic assumption is that when children with disabilities receive more attention and/or care through the pedagogical staff, their actions are more intensely surveilled, which in turn increases their capacity to act and, ultimately, makes their participation in an alleged ‘normal’ day care situation possible. On the other hand, this ‘more of care’ not only involves a significantly higher degree of surveillance, but rather the question arises, whether that surveillance is not also complicit in reproducing ‘disability’. For on the one hand, through the additional individual care the special need for care is manifested in the affected child and, on the other hand, the affected children have opportunities to find niches beyond the staff member’s monitoring. One might ask, how these special arrangements of childhood affect children as a practice of subjectivation. We, then, explore the idea to conceptualize inclusion not as a counterpart to exclusion and discrimination, but rather to consider resisting elements, which inclusive care is subjected to, and to critically reflect on the tensions inherent in pedagogical practice. This reflection occurs against the background of results of the projects ‘Structural Problems of Inclusive Child Care’ (Hauck, 2014), and ‘Inclusion as a Challenge for Inclusive Day Care’ (Trescher, 2018). The results of the first project illustrate that children with disabilities in inclusive day care are subject to considerable regulation and surveillance, which tend to manifest directly on the bodies of children with disabilities. The study reveals, for example, that the spatial structures facilitate a certain proximity specifically of children with the need for care in terms of mobility to respective personnel as the building of the examined day care center is not free of barriers to mobility. One result of the second study, in which we examined three different day care centers (see section 3 and 4), is that pedagogical practice takes place in the tension between the demand for inclusion on the one hand and specializing actions on the other hand. Consequently, the pedagogical staff in inclusive day care faces the challenge to maintain their ability to act within an ambivalent setting. This is additionally impeded by expectations from politics, practice and scientific discourse to put ‘inclusion’ into practice. These ambivalences of pedagogical practice, which are often exposed under a paradigm of inclusion, are central object of this paper. It is decidedly not our aim to criticize the common practice of combined care of children with and without disabilities in general. Rather, the paper aims at highlighting exemplary problems of the institutions under scrutiny in the studies in order to open up a space for continuative discussions. Consequently, the paper intends to provide an impetus for further research in this area and to stimulate a theoretical and, thus, critical engagement with the paradigm of inclusion. First of all, the paper illuminates the topic of inclusive day care in Germany. What follows is an account of the analytical object as well as a brief methodological classification of the procedures used in the study. Central results are presented in the context of an observation of the structures of and practices in the examined four inclusive day care centers. To conclude, the paper carves out ambivalences and structural problems of pedagogical practice in inclusive day care.

2. INCLUSIVE DAY CARE IN GERMANY

In Germany, the combined care of children with and without disabilities in inclusive day care centers has its origins in an initiative of a group of parents. These parents wanted to create for their children with disabilities an alternative to one-way street special institutions, as it is “a rather early route to a special path” (Cloerkes, 2007, p. 265) and, furthermore, the “beginning of segregating processes” (ibid.). Towards the end of the 1970s, the institutions started to develop and implement inclusive concepts (ibid., p. 265f). Today, a lawful claim to inclusive care is detailed in German social law code IX §4 as follows: “Services for children with disabilities or children threatened by disability are planned for and arranged, such that, if possible, children are not separated from their social environment and can be cared for together with children without disabilities” (SGBIX §4). According to a calculation of the Federal Statistical Office, in 2018 20,623 institutions in Germany inclusively

²Some of the literature cited is available in German language only. For a better understanding, the cited parts were translated into English. Nevertheless, the indication of source refers to the original version of the book or article in German.

cared (Destatis, 2018b, p. 11) for a total of 1,151,481 children (Destatis, 2018b, p. 63). These (high) numbers illustrate the traction of the topic and iterate the necessity to engage with inclusive care of children with and without disabilities – empirically, theoretically as well as pedagogically. Education is a key term and maxim in the context of pedagogical action for it is both foundation and aim of pedagogical intervention as well as “central moments in human subjectivation” (Bernhard, 2001, p. 66). Education is to be construed as an interpersonal relationship, which is reflected in the relationship between ‘educator’ and ‘pupil’ (Pongratz, 2010, p. 26). A human being which enters helplessly into the world depends on education and must be guided by experienced human beings (ibid., p. 24). The aim of educational practice is to “help the child or adolescent to maturity” (ibid., p. 25). At the same time, education is geared towards children’s incorporation into societal and social conditions. Balancing these two moments – maturity and paternalism – is the challenge of educational action. Finding a mean between these two poles might be the essential question in all pedagogical endeavors, formulated already in 1803 by Immanuel Kant: “How do I cultivate freedom under constraint?” (Kant, 1967, p. 40). Pedagogical action in inclusive day care therefore is subject to the ambivalences inherent in education. Thus, even inclusive efforts confront these tensions and must engage them. Contemporary discourses on inclusion increasingly “repudiate paradoxical conflicts in education and reduce inclusion to methods” (Herz, 2010, p. 35). This leads to the emergence of polemics and a latent “danger of moralizing” (Prengel, 2012, p. 28). Not least due to this, it is necessary to extensively and methodically examine institutions in which inclusive day care of children with and without disabilities already occurs in order to provide an empirical foundation to contemporary discourses on inclusion. A respective examination has been conducted in the above cited studies.

3. MATERIALS AND METHODS: STRUCTURAL AND ETHNOGRAPHIC ANALYSIS

The studies discussed in this paper combine structural and ethnographic analysis methods. The underlying interpretation method follows the principles of objective hermeneutics (see Oevermann, 2002a, Trescher, 2013a, p. 29ff, Trescher, 2015a, p. 145ff). The objects of investigation of the structural analysis include structural metadata of the respective institution, such as site maps, floor plans, timetables, and staff schedules. These were compiled in a structural description and reconstructively evaluated. All in all, we distinguish three different structural layers, the structure of the personnel, spatial structures, and the structuring of the daily routines. Spatial structures were additionally researched using a direct analysis of floor plans (see Schmidtke, 2006). By means of ethnographic analysis methods, passive and transparent participant observations were conducted to gain insights into the daily routines of children with and without disabilities in the four examined inclusive day care centers. Passive and transparent observations appeared especially appropriate as they are not tied to a staff member and their role-specific behavior, resulting in liberties in observation (Trescher, 2013a, p.23, Trescher, 2017e, p. 65ff).

The structural and ethnographic protocols resulting from the collection of structural metadata und the observations were reconstructively evaluated with the methods of objective hermeneutics to assess the “typical, characteristic structures” (Oevermann, 2002a, p. 1) of objects. Aim of this analysis was “to illuminate the principles at work behind the appearances” (ibid.). The assumption of a social construction of reality is the starting point for reconstructive procedures (Berger & Luckmann, 1966). Following this assumption, the research goal of reconstructive procedures is the reconstruction of reality constructs, “which actors execute in and through their actions. [...] Reality constructs are usually not consciously and intentionally guided acts” (Meuser, 2003, p. 140), but rather occur during daily routines. Reality constructs follow the “implicit rules of social action” (ibid.), which shall be reconstructed in the course of the analyses. This analyses aim at reconstructing the “implicit knowledges and [...] [the above mentioned] implicit rules” (ibid.), hence the ‘objective meaning’. The objective meaning differs from intentional, subjective expressions and denotes the capturing of the dimension of meaning behind these. The objective meaning denotes what actually exists or what is described (Mead, 2000, p. 117ff). Based on this, an action or an utterance is (interpretatively) ‘accorded’ a meaning (Weber, 1976, p. 8), which in turn is the subjective meaning (see also Trescher, 2015a, p. 145). These differences in meaning are crucial to decode the latent structures of meaning behind the objective utterances. Accordingly, the studies were not designed to produce a comparative dataset, but rather to problematize the concrete manifestations of daily routines to discuss the challenges and ambivalences of inclusive pedagogical practices.

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1. Analyses of the Structure

The Analyses of the Structures of the examined four inclusive day care centers are presented and discussed in the following section. We follow the above mentioned structural dimensions: structure of the personnel, spatial structures, structuring of the daily routines. One main result of the structural analyses is that children within the framework of inclusive day care are extensively under surveillance. This is especially evinced (a) in the limitedness of retreat as well as (b) in the ‘pedagogical surveillance’ of living spaces, which ultimately entails the possibility for regulation.

4.1.1. Structure of the Personnel

Compared to non-inclusive so-called standard institutions the structural framework of inclusive day care requires (at least in Germany) a higher allocation of staff. In the examined inclusive day care centers, the staff-child ratio is, accordingly, about 1 to 4; in standard institutions, there are at least twice as many children for each staff member. In 2017, the allotment of staff members in day care centers was on average 1:8.6 (Destatis, 2018a, p. 7). This allocation of staff is quite ambivalent between the opportunity for development, on one side, and constraints through surveillance on the other. (a), the consistent presence of staff members might act as a guarantee for the children’s optimal development for they might receive more attention and care for individual needs. Whereas (b), more staff members are in the group so that children have less space for retreat beyond the (seemingly ubiquitous) pedagogical protectorate at their disposal. This ambivalence of care affects children with disabilities, significantly more since they are under staff member’s scrutiny and their whereabouts and actions are always known. “[T]he details of surveillance were specified and it was integrated into the teaching relationship” (Foucault, 1979, p. 175). In this context, the staff members’ function might be considered as an inclusive moment, a ‘bridge’, so to speak, between children with and without disabilities. As Example serves here, if staff members were to advance the communal activities of children with and without disabilities in order to deconstruct ‘disability’ through daily routines. The ethnographic analyses have shown, however, that this is hardly the case, on the contrary, children that are called ‘disabled’ appear to be clearly identified as such. Thus, eye-level peer contact among children occurs but seldom (see section 4.2).

4.1.2. Spatial Structures

Through “the art of distributions” (Foucault, 1979, p. 141) disciplinary and subjectivation practices occur. These practices can be found in the spatial structures of the examined inclusive day care centers that organize space and, consequently, the individuals acting therein. Presumably, one might encounter the structures described below in various types of day care centers – at least a certain transferability of results is supposed at this point. As examples serve here: The door handles throughout most of the examined institutions cannot be reached by the children. The effect of this is that they are locked in the building, what renders the children as ‘captive’ and leads to a massive constraint of autonomy, which culminates in a degradation of their status as subjects. These practices of subjectivation persist objectively, even if one argues that the children are protected from an ostensibly endangering environment in an act of care. These can, with Foucault, be understood as the principle of distribution, namely “*enclosure*, the specification of a place heterogeneous to all others and closed in upon itself” (ibid., original emphasis). Further, the children are assigned permanent seats and coat hangers. These bear symbols as well as the children’s respective names. Probably, this is done as a way of individualization and the idea to reserve some space for each child. On the contrary, one may discern a principle of distribution that manifests in “the principle of elementary location or *partitioning*” (ibid., p. 143, original emphasis). Accordingly, “[e]ach individual has his own place; and each place its individual” (ibid.). This results in a singularizing gaze that affects every single individual and, thus, offers the possibility “to establish presences and absences, to know where and how to locate individuals, [...] to be able at each moment to supervise the conduct, of each individual, to assess it, to judge it” (ibid.). This gaze that can be described as surveilling manifests in additional spatial structures. Elements of Perspex, for instance, grant visibility of interiors and, thereby, the (potentially) constant visibility of children. As a result, the children only have access to a presumed retreat for, in truth, surveillance by staff members is possible at all times. Similarly, the separation of spaces by putting up shelves, too tall only for children to see beyond, signifies a reversal of the retreat function. It can be stated, that the total visibility always grants total control over the

social situation³, which affects the children as a practice of subjectivation. A critical reflection of such structures remains in demand, “for it appears that the stimulating potential of Michel Foucault’s investigations of historical practices of subjectivation for the pedagogical discourse is far from exhausted” (Rieger-Ladich, 2004, p. 221).⁴ One consequence of these arrangements may be, that an encompassing surveillance of all children might not always and necessarily be conducive to an “education to disagreement and to resistance” (Adorno, 1971, p. 145).⁵ Moreover, the structural analyses show that furniture divides the group room into areas, which can be ascribed to a certain purpose (for example, purpose area ‘drawing’, purpose area ‘playing’, etc.). Following Foucault, this principle can be understood as “rule of *functional sites*” (Foucault, 1979, p. 143; original emphasis). Böhnisch assesses this partitioning of space follows: “the more the socio-spatial environment is functionalized, the more children experience social control as well as social relations of power and domination” (Böhnisch, 2003, p. 80). A structural discrimination for children with physical disabilities is manifested by the non-existent freedom from barriers in the sense of mobility in some of the buildings (e.g. lack of an elevator). Children, who need assistance in for instance overcoming the stairs, experience limited spaces and extended dependency from and closeness to the staff. Accordingly, the degree of disability that is generated by the staff member is reproduced. These children are, disabled in the subject formation, which occurs in the educating engagement of reciprocity between the I and the World (Humboldt, 1960, p. 235). Ultimately it can be said, that the spatially produced order of the examined inclusive day care centers evinces the institutionalization of mechanisms of surveillance and control. These can, moreover, fulfil their purpose independent from staff members – even without their knowing. Through institutional structures power is ‘automatized’ and ‘disindividualized’ (Foucault, 1979, p. 202). “Power has its principle not so much in a person as in a certain concerted distribution of bodies, surfaces, lights, gazes; in an arrangement whose internal mechanisms produce the relation in which individuals are caught up” (ibid.). As a consequence, the children constantly move within the prescribed order – while being surveilled. The regulatory practices that follow from surveillance, as the observations show, affect children with disabilities to a higher degree. A cause for that is that they are not only subject to the organizing and ‘parceling’ mechanisms, but are also in the staff members’ focus of attention and in many ways depend on them (see section 4.2). In both cases the result is a culture of subjectivation⁶, which manifests in diffuseness⁷ and dependency regarding the staff members. This component remains, even if one ascribes a certain necessity to the surveillance of children by way of justification. Here, too, the ambivalent relationship between ‘help and control’ surfaces (Kessl, 2006, p. 69). In the case of children with disabilities, an additional discursively produced subjectivity of dependence and special monitoring may be noted. They are, as the analysis has shown subjectivated and produced as ‘disabled’ in inclusive day care centers. Disability is reproduced on their bodies – and this is a structural problem.

4.1.3. Structuring of the Daily Routines

In most of the examined day care centers, a weekly schedule details the procedures and activities of most of the groups. In one specific group, which will serve as an example, different activities are recorded in a table for the weekdays Monday to Friday from 7 AM to 5 PM. Time slots range from a duration of 30 minutes to two hours and are marked as specific times (say 12 PM to 12.30 PM). In addition, the time slots follow without intermission. The ten-hour time frame during which the

³ This total visibility can be encountered in the mechanisms of Jeremy Bentham’s ‘Panopticon’ (Bentham, 1995, p. 29ff; see also Trescher, 2013a, p. 81f; 2017b, p. 80).

⁴ Kessl (2006, p. 72f), Maurer & Weber (2006, p. 9ff), Waldschmidt (2007, p. 130f) and Opitz (2007, p. 51f) also point out this research demand.

⁵ The critical meaning of the private and its relevance for maintaining dignity in the context of ‘cognitive impairment’ is discussed elsewhere (Trescher, 2015b).

⁶ See Saar, 2013 as well as Trescher, 2015a, p. 211ff; 2017b and 2017d.

⁷ “Diffuse relationships are those in which the one, who wants to avoid or ignore a topic, carries the burden of proof, which presupposes that normally no possible topic is excluded. This corresponds to a relationship between people in their entirety. In specific social relationships, however, the burden of proof is with whoever wants to add a new topic not contained in the specifications of roles. This presupposes that an area of relevant topics was specified conventionally beforehand. This precisely corresponds to the logic of role-like social relations, in which by way of institutionalized norms, ultimately by way of contract, role definitions specify what is thematized in relationships” (Oevermann, 2002b, p. 40; see also Parsons, 1939, p. 461).

children (may) attend the center, illustrates the extent of the institution's power. Thus, the care institution increasingly assumes tasks and functions, which are or were traditionally assigned to the institution of 'family', because the children spend most of their waking hours under the "pedagogical protectorate" (Trescher, 2015a, p. 301) of the institution. Foucault decodes such a structuring of time as an instrument of discipline. Planning time according to the three structural features of "establish[ing] rhythms, impos[ing] particular occupations, regulat[ing] the cycles of repetition" (Foucault, 1979, p. 149) developed from monastery life and had a regulatory impact on further areas of human (communal) life, such as education (ibid., p. 149f). This temporal regulation affects children in inclusive day care as it "penetrates the body and with it all the meticulous controls of power" (ibid., p. 152). Moreover, a rigorous structuring of daily routines is a structural feature of a total institution (Goffman, 1961), which is not to suggest that the observed day care centers are total institutions. It offers, however, respective structural features that may inscribe their power onto the subject. A three-year-old, for example, who attends the center from 7 AM to 5 PM and thus spends almost his or her entire time of waking hours there, is constantly and steadily dependent on the institution and its staff. Often the weekly schedules read 'free play', whereby 'free', in this context, may refer to freedom that is the freedom to do something. Such freedom is, however, severely constrained by the structural frame, because the children cannot choose 'freely' with whom or what to engage since the structural frame, characterized by regulations on all levels, provides only limited opportunities for action. 'Free', on the contrary, might be construed as negative freedom, that is freedom of not having to do something. But negative freedom, too, is constrained by the structural framework as the children are not able, for instance, to leave the institution. 'Play' can be interpreted as 'play' in the meaning of a guided game, for which concrete rules apply, that accordingly limit the 'free play'. 'Play', however, might also imply a sense of fiction, that is the counterpart to reality or 'seriousness' and in this sense, 'free play' offers the possibility of self-actualization while at the same time this kind of play also adheres to generally accepted rules of language. In these two seemingly oppositional interpretations of 'play', the pedagogical contrast between 'leading and letting grow' (Litt, 1964) is apparent. 'Free play' in its actual application is, therefore, significantly dependent on the degree of surveillance of the structural framework within which it unfolds. Looking into relevant literature on pedagogical practice in day care centers, one can consider 'free play' as a meaningful element of developmental support for children. Specifically, the literature highlights the significance of autonomous play for the training of skills and identity⁸. In this context, 'free play' is thought of as an act of autonomy and spontaneity. This subjective meaning, however, needs to be considered against the background of objective meaning, following the analyses, which yielded that, play involves the adherence to explicit or implicit rules.⁹ Objective and subjective meaning, in this context, are situated in a forcefield that ultimately introduces the ambivalence between institutionalized determination and 'free' infantile actualization. Considering the situation of children with disabilities in inclusive day care, a specific form of constraint for 'free play' manifests for them. Their freedom to play with others is often limited since, as the observations show, children with so-called severe disabilities are often excluded from mutual play.¹⁰ Inclusion, as deconstruction of barriers to discourse, hardly occurs in this context. In turn, 'disabled' identities are reproduced (see Trescher, 2015a, p. 244; 2017a).

4.2. Ethnographic Analyses

The results of the structural analyses of the examined inclusive day care centers indicate that all three structural dimensions of pedagogical practice are characterized by ambivalences, which, as already pointed out, have to be reflected upon specifically in the context of inclusionary approaches. Taking this into consideration, we discuss these ambivalences using examples from the ethnographic material. As stated above, the subject of investigation represented ethnographic protocols that were generated in everyday life of the four examined inclusive day care centers. Overall, 57 passive and transparent participant observations were conducted and subsequently – using methods of objective hermeneutics – analyzed. In the following, selected results are discussed focusing on the reflection of ambivalences that take place in pedagogical practice in inclusive day care.

⁸ See for example ECEIS Team of Authors, 2010, p. 189ff.

⁹ On the definition of rule see Trescher, 2013a, p. 31ff.

¹⁰ We discuss additional ambivalences of free play in section 4.2.1.

4.2.1. 'Free Play' as Mechanism of Exclusion

Based on a short extract from an ethnographic protocol, we discuss difficulties and ambivalences of pedagogical practice during periods of so-called free playtime. The following scene took place during such a period of time:

All children are outside and according to Pedagogue 1, it is free play time. Child 1, who is deemed as 'disabled', says loudly: "Who wants to play with me?" The other children do not react. Child 1 asks again (in a very loud tone): "Which child wants to play with me?" He/she is getting louder and screams: "Children, please come to me! Children, you must come to me right now!!" He/she is waiting for a response, but the other children seem to ignore him/her. As time goes by, Child 1 is still on his/her own while the other children play together.

Child 1 in the above protocol tries almost desperately to get together with the other children and play with them – and fails in this attempt. Neither do the pedagogues intervene, nor do they help Child 1 to interact with other children. This short extract illustrates how important the role of the pedagogues during free play time can be – even more for children who are deemed as 'disabled'. Pedagogues can function as a bridge between children with and children without disabilities and initiate as well as stabilize interactions between them. So, it can be stated "that a teacher's presence and support is playing a key role in the frequency with which inclusive interactions occur" (Hestenes & Carroll, 2000 p. 243; see also Walker & Berthelsen, 2008, p. 12). This is even more important for children who have difficulties in initiating and maintaining social contacts and relations. It appears in consequence that this situation of free play functions as a mechanism of exclusion – particularly for Child 1. Furthermore, pedagogical action is marked by the ambivalence of structures that are controlling and structuring (and therefore helpful and important for some children) on the one side and the challenge to provide the children space to explore their interests and social interactions with other children and adults, on the other side. A central insight is that in the structural framework of inclusive day care, the pedagogical task is not, at least not primarily, to care for children with disabilities one-on-one, but rather to promote communal activities of children with and without disabilities so that inclusive processes in daily routines may yield participation. The structurally surveilling framework of inclusive day care leads to regulations, which put the children under the reach of the pedagogical protectorate at all times. As shown above, this affects children with disabilities even more than children without disabilities. Limiting this reach can be seen as a maxim of conceptual and practical considerations. Accordingly, a de-emphasis on temporal structures would contribute to a reduction of the ubiquitous character of structured daily routines.

A similar scene, which is shown in the following paragraph, was observed in another day care institution. The scene took place during a free play situation, as well. Pedagogue 2 placed sets of marbles on the tables in the group room. Wooden rings contained marbles so that these could be moved around inside them. Pedagogue 2 begins to play with Child 2, who is five years old and has severe verbal, cognitive, and physical impairments.

Pedagogue 2 asks: "Shall we go to the table and play with the marbles?". Child 2 responds: "Yes!" Child 2 places two marbles into the ring and pushes them so that they roll along the inner side. A boy joins them, but leaves immediately. At another small table, a group of children plays the same game using many small marbles.

Pedagogue 2 offers to be the playmate of Child 2 and maintains in this role during the entire game. He does not involve a boy who seems intent on joining their game, and thereby fails at fulfilling the 'bridging function' among the children – similar to the scene above. In the same room, albeit at another table, other children appear to engage in the same game. However, those children do not find themselves in a (structurally surveilled) one-on-one pedagogue-child constellation, but in a peer context. This raises the question as to the pedagogue's options of conduct in order to draw Child 2 out of an exclusive game-setting. For such 'playing next to one another' may be considered a constituting structural problem of the institution and, ultimately, it (re)produces the disabled subjectivity of Child 2. In terms of practice a further question arises: Why do not all children play the same game together? This cannot be conclusively answered. Possibly, children without disabilities when interacting with children with disabilities would submit to the additional and surveilling protectorate of pedagogues.

Consequently, they might avoid such regimenting setting – and thus also children with disabilities. The sequence also illustrates that the above mentioned ‘free play’ does not happen for Child 2. Pedagogue 2 determines the point in time, the nature, the social setting, and – the analysis makes this apparent – the duration of the game. In addition to the regulating and surveilling spatial structures, Child 2 is directed by Pedagogue 2 (who in turn is directed by all-encompassing weekly schedules).

4.2.2. Ambivalence of External Demands and the Children’s Behavior and Needs

Another ambivalence that often occurs in pedagogical practice in (inclusive) day care concerns the challenge between external demands, that are often a result of structuring practices as discussed in section 4.1, and the children’s individual needs and their specific behavior. The following extract from an ethnographic protocol exemplifies this ambivalence:

Pedagogue 3 welcomes me and explains that the whole group will go to a playground. Meanwhile Pedagogue 4 asks the children to find a partner and to hold hands with each other so that the children form pairs of two. Pedagogue 4 goes to Child 3 and takes his/her hand. Apparently, Child 3 cannot walk very well because he/she sways whilst standing. Pedagogue 5 pushes a stroller, in which two children with Down’s syndrome sit.

It becomes obvious that the children who are regarded as disabled, experience a particular closeness to the pedagogues, which separates them from their peers. Child 3 and the two children in the stroller have no partner to pair up with. In this particular situation, it seems to be a common practice that these three children are not included as no child tries to get together with them. The closeness to the pedagogues comes along with a separation from the group – and vice versa. The children are organized in different groups and thus governmental practices take place (Foucault, 1991; 2008; see also Angermüller & van Dyk, 2010; Lemke, 2014; and Trescher, 2017c), which eventually result in an ‘order of the children’. On the other hand, one can argue that this closeness is the pedagogues’ reaction to the specific needs of the children, which in consequence allows them to join inclusive day care instead of being separated from children without disabilities as, for instance, in special day care. Taking all these aspects into consideration, it can be concluded that the pedagogues are often subjected under structural external demands (in this case to bring all children to the playground in time). Consequently, this applies to the children as well. They have to follow specific orders, for example, so that eventually the whole group can arrive at the playground.

5. CONCLUSION: AMBIVALENCE AND INCLUSION

It becomes evident that pedagogical practice is ambivalent and represents a challenge for pedagogues that can even be strengthened within inclusive settings, as it is shown in the paper at hand. The demand for inclusion in pedagogical practices potentially leads to more ambivalences with which pedagogues have to deal. Finally, it can be said that coming together in the same space constitutes the basis of inclusion for children with and without disabilities. But this in itself is no guarantee for communal activity and, therefore, does not necessarily lead to participation in a shared life world for children with disabilities. Another problem is that although in the context of togetherness of children with and without disabilities, at least as far as this investigation is concerned, the extant structures normalize ‘disability’ in inclusive day care, they nonetheless manifest it on the affected subjects. Here, pedagogical thought and action must go further. Kron also notes: “The mere fact that heterogeneous groups such as children with and children without disabilities are cared for institutionally under the same roof, does not yet grant an institution or its applied pedagogy an inclusive characteristic” (Kron, 2013, p. 191). In addition, the author introduces concepts and methods that aim at advancing interactions between children with and without disabilities, for example, to “arrange the room for socialization such that organization of groups enables harmonization, demarcation, and consensus among children” (ibid., p. 192). Whether a compelling cause – effect relation can be assessed, remains to be seen. For what matters in the end is the implicit aim for participation in discourse. After all, providing structures that enable inclusion does not necessarily entail participation in a shared life world. On the contrary, barriers to discourse frequently remain intact and/or exclusion from discourse occurs during daily routines. In this context, a structural ‘specializing’ of children with disabilities occurred, resulting from certain blindness to structural problems. Inclusion, construed as a daily deconstruction of such barriers to discourse (Trescher, 2015a, p. 333f; 2017b; 2017c), does not come about in this way. Disability becomes a negative

category, manifesting the construction of otherness and contributing to a reproduction of the dichotomy between 'normal' and 'disabled'.¹¹ Evidently, further empirical research of institutional structures and their subjectivating power is needed to make participation (to discourse) possible. A respective deconstruction of barriers to discourse is considered to be the central pedagogical task at this stage. This process involves crises for all parties and will not occur immediately. Rather, it will be the result of continuous change since ultimately inclusion needs to be considered as a process of deconstruction of barriers to discourse taking place in daily routines. In the context of pedagogical practice, it is essential to reflect upon actions and an attitude within these practices to do justice to the ambivalent setting inclusion is embedded in.

REFERENCES

- [1] Adorno, T. W. (1971). *Erziehung zur Mündigkeit*. Frankfurt am Main: suhrkamp.
- [2] Angermüller, J., & van Dyk, S. (2010). *Diskursanalyse meets Gouvernementalitätsforschung. Perspektiven auf das Verhältnis von Subjekt, Sprache, Macht und Wissen*. Frankfurt am Main: Campus.
- [3] Bentham, J. (1995). *The Panopticon Writings*. London: Verso.
- [4] Berger, P. L., & Luckmann, T. (1966). *The Social Construction of Reality*. New York, NY: Garden City: Doubleday, Inc.
- [5] Bernhard, A. (2001). Bildung. In A. Bernhard, & L. Rothmel (Eds.), *Handbuch Kritische Pädagogik: Eine Einführung in die Erziehungs- und Bildungswissenschaften* (pp. 62-74). Weinheim & Basel: Beltz.
- [6] Berthelsen, D. & Walker, S. (2008). The Social Participation of Young Children with Developmental Disabilities in Inclusive Early Childhood Programs. In *Electronic Journal for Inclusive Education* 2(3) (pp. 1-14).
- [7] Böhnisch, L. (2003). *Pädagogische Soziologie: Eine Einführung* (2nd Ed.). Weinheim & München: Juventa.
- [8] Carroll, D. & Hestenes L. (2000). The Play Interactions of Young Children With and Without Disabilities: Individual and Environmental Influences. In *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 15(2) (pp. 229-246).
- [9] Cloerkes, G. (2007). *Soziologieder Behinderten. Eine Einführung* (3rd Ed.). Heidelberg: Winter.
- [10] Destatis, Statistisches Bundesamt (2018a). Der Personalschlüssel in Kindertageseinrichtungen: Methodische Grundlagen und aktuelle Ergebnisse. 2017. Retrieved November 2nd, 2018 from Destatis.de: https://www.destatis.de/DE/Publikationen/Thematisch/Soziales/KinderJugendhilfe/Kindertageseinrichtung/enPersonalschluesel5225409179004.pdf?__blob=publicationFile.
- [11] Destatis, Statistisches Bundesamt (2018b). Statistiken der Kinder- und Jugendhilfe: Kinder und tätige Personen in Tageseinrichtungen und in öffentlich geförderter Kindertagespflege am 01.03.2018. Retrieved November 2nd, 2018 from Destatis.de: https://www.destatis.de/DE/Publikationen/Thematisch/Soziales/KinderJugendhilfe/TageseinrichtungenKindertagespflege5225402187004.pdf?__blob=publicationFile.
- [12] ECEIS Team of Authors (2010). Freispiel – Situationen mit vielfachen Herausforderungen. In M. Kron, B. Papke, & M. Windisch (Eds.), *Zusammen aufwachsen: Schritte zurfrühen inklusiven Bildung und Erziehung* (pp. 189-202). Bad Heilbrunn: Klinkhardt.
- [13] Foucault, M. (1979). *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. New York: Vintage books.
- [14] Foucault, M. (1991). Governmentality. In G. Burchell, C. Gordin, & P. Miller (Eds.), *The Foucault Effect. Studies in Governmentality with two Lectures by and an Interview with Michel Foucault* (pp. 87-104). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- [15] Foucault, M. (2008). *The Birth of Biopolitics*. Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.
- [16] Goffman, E. (1961). *Asylums: Essays on the Social Situation of Mental Patients and Other Inmates*. Garden City, NY: Anchor Press/Doubleday.
- [17] Hauck, T. (2014). *Strukturprobleme integrativer Kinderbetreuung: Sequenzanalytische Strukturanalyse einer integrativen Kindertagesstätte* (Unpublished Master's Thesis). Johannes Gutenberg-Universität Mainz, Mainz.
- [18] Herz, B. (2010). „Inclusive Education“: Desiderata in der deutschen Fachdiskussion. In J. Schwohl, & T. Sturm (Eds.), *Inklusion als Herausforderung schulischer Entwicklung: Widersprüche und Perspektiven eines erziehungswissenschaftlichen Diskurses* (pp. 29-44). Bielefeld: transcript.
- [19] Humboldt, W. v. (1960). Theorie der Bildung des Menschen. In A. Flitner, & K. Giel (Eds.), *Schriften zur Anthropologie und Geschichte* (pp. 234-240). Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
- [20] Kant, I. (1967). *Über Pädagogik* (2nd Ed.). Bochum: Kamp.

¹¹ One should consider in this regard that the UN-Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, for all the gains and progress it represents, contributes to a manifestation of the category of difference for 'disability'. See here especially Trescher, 2013b.

- [21] Kessler, F. (2006). Soziale Arbeit als Regierung – eine machtanalytische Perspektive. In S. Weber, & S. Maurer (Eds.), *Gouvernementalität und Erziehungswissenschaft: Wissen – Macht – Transformation* (pp. 63-75). Wiesbaden: VS.
- [22] Kron, M. (2010). Zusammen (auf)wachsen – Unterschiedlichkeit erleben. In M. Kron, B. Papke, & M. Windisch (Eds.), *Zusammen aufwachsen: Schritte zur frühen inklusiven Bildung und Erziehung* (pp. 229-230). Bad Heilbrunn: Klinkhardt.
- [23] Kron, M. (2013). Integration als Einigung – Integrative Prozesse und ihre Gefährdungen auf Gruppenebene. In M. Kreuzer & B. Ytterhus (Eds.), „Dabeisein ist nicht alles“ – *Inklusion und Zusammenleben im Kindergarten* (pp. 190-200). München: Ernst Reinhardt.
- [24] Lemke, T. (2014). *Eine Kritik der politischen Vernunft. Foucaults Analyse der modernen Gouvernementalität* (6th Ed.). Hamburg: Argument.
- [25] Litt, T. (1964). *Führen oder Wachsenlassen: Eine Erörterung des pädagogischen Grundproblems*. Stuttgart: Klett.
- [26] Maurer, S., & Weber, S. M. (2006). Die Kunst, nicht dermaßen regiert zu werden: Gouvernementalität als Perspektive für die Erziehungswissenschaft. In S. Maurer, & S. M. Weber (Eds.), *Gouvernementalität und Erziehungswissenschaft: Wissen – Macht – Transformation* (pp. 9-36). Wiesbaden: VS.
- [27] Mead, G. H. (2000). *Mind, Self, and Society. From the Standpoint of a Social Behaviorist* (29th Ed.). Chicago, London: University of Chicago Press.
- [28] Meuser, M. (2003). Rekonstruktive Sozialforschung. In R. Bohnsack et al. (Ed.), *Hauptbegriffe Qualitativer Sozialforschung: Ein Wörterbuch*. Opladen: Leske und Budrich.
- [29] Oevermann, U. (2002a). *Klinische Soziologie auf der Basis der Methodologie der objektiven Hermeneutik – Manifest der objektiv hermeneutischen Sozialforschung*. Unpublished manuscript.
- [30] Oevermann, U. (2002b). Professionalisierungsbedürftigkeit und Professionalisiertheit pädagogischen Handelns. In M. Kraul, W. Marotzki, & C. Schweppe (Eds.), *Biographie und Profession* (pp.19-63). Bad Heilbrunn: Klinkhardt.
- [31] Opitz, S. (2007). Eine Topologie des Außen – Foucault als Theoretiker der Inklusion/Exklusion. In R. Anhorn, F. Bettinger, & J. Stehr (Eds.): *Foucaults Machtanalytik und Soziale Arbeit: Eine kritische Einführung und Bestandsaufnahme* (pp. 41-57). Wiesbaden: VS.
- [32] Parsons, Talcott (1939): The Professions and Social Structure. *Social Forces* 17(4) (pp. 457-467).
- [33] Pongratz, L. (2010). *Sackgassen der Bildung: Pädagogik anders denken*. Paderborn: Schöningh.
- [34] Prengel, A. (2012). Kann Inklusive Pädagogik die Sehnsucht nach Gerechtigkeit erfüllen? – Paradoxien eines demokratischen Bildungskonzepts. In S. Seitz, N.-K. Finner, N. Korff, & K. Scheidt (Eds.), *Inklusiv gleich gerecht? Inklusion und Bildungsgerechtigkeit* (pp. 16-31). Bad Heilbrunn: Klinkhardt.
- [35] Rieger-Ladich, M. (2004). Unterwerfung und Überschreitung: Michel Foucaults Theorie der Subjektivierung. In N. Ricken, & M. Rieger-Ladich (Eds.), *Michel Foucault: Pädagogische Lektüren* (pp. 203-223). Wiesbaden: VS.
- [36] Saar, M. (2013). Analytik der Subjektivierung. Umriss eines Theorieprogramms. In A. Gelhard, T. Alkemeyer, & N. Ricken (Eds.), *Techniken der Subjektivierung* (pp. 17-27). München: Wilhelm Fink.
- [37] Schmidtke, O. (2006). *Architektur als professionalisierte Praxis: Soziologische Fallrekonstruktionen zur Professionalisierungsbedürftigkeit der Architektur*. Frankfurt am Main: Humanities Online.
- [38] Trescher, H. (2013a). *Kontexte des Lebens: Lebenssituation demenziell erkrankter Menschen im Heim*. Wiesbaden: VS.
- [39] Trescher, H. (2013b). Behinderung als demokratische Konstruktion: Zum objektiven Sinn und ‚cultural impact‘ der UN-Konvention über die Rechte von Menschen mit Behinderungen. *Zeitschrift für Inklusion* 4.
- [40] Trescher, H. (2015a). *Inklusion. Zur Dekonstruktion von Diskursteilhabebarrrieren im Kontext von Freizeit und Behinderung*. Wiesbaden: VS.
- [41] Trescher, H. (2015b). Die Würde des Privaten: Zur Diskussion institutionalisierter Lebensbedingungen von Menschen mit kognitiver Beeinträchtigung. *Behindertenpädagogik* 54(2) (pp. 136-153).
- [42] Trescher, H. (2017a). *Behinderung als Praxis: Biographische Zugänge zu Lebensentwürfen von Menschen mit „geistiger Behinderung“*. Bielefeld: transcript.
- [43] Trescher, H. (2017b). Disabling Practices. *Cogent Social Science* 3(1).
- [44] Trescher, H. (2017c). Inclusion as Critique. Deconstructionist Approaches Exemplified through ‘Care’ of People with Cognitive Disabilities in Germany. *International Journal of Social Science Studies* 5(8) (pp. 33-43).
- [45] Trescher, H. (2017d). Subjektivierungspraxen in der stationären Behindertenhilfe. Ein pädagogisches Dilemma. *neue praxis* 47(4) (pp. 354-370).

- [46] Trescher, H. (2017e). *Wohnräume als pädagogische Herausforderung: Lebenslagen institutionalisiert lebender Menschen mit Behinderung*. Wiesbaden: VS.
- [47] Waldschmidt, A. (2007). Die Macht der Normalität: Mit Foucault „(Nicht-)Behinderung“ neu denken. In R. Anhorn, F. Bettinger, & J. Stehr (Eds.), *Foucaults Machtanalytik und Soziale Arbeit. Eine kritische Einführung und Bestandsaufnahme* (pp. 119-133). Wiesbaden: VS
- [48] Weber, M. (1976). *Soziologische Grundbegriffe* (3rd Ed.). Tübingen: Mohr.

AUTHOR'S BIOGRAPHY



Hendrik Trescher is Professor for “Inclusion and Exclusion” at the Faculty of Education at Philipps-University, Marburg, Germany. His main research interests are: Disability Studies, Theories of Inclusion, Political Participation of People with Disabilities, and Education of People with Cognitive Disabilities.



Teresa Hauck is research assistant in the research project “Kommune Inklusiv” at Philipps-University, Marburg, Germany. Currently, she is working on her dissertation on the relationship between theory and practice with regard to how pedagogical staff interprets ‘inclusion’ in the context of cognitive disabilities.

Citation: Hendrik Trescher, Teresa Hauck. “Ambivalences of Inclusion in Day Care Centers for Children with and without Disabilities”. *International Journal of Humanities Social Sciences and Education (IJHSSE)*, vol 5, no.12, 2018, pp. 51-61. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.20431/2349-0381.0512006>.

Copyright: © 2018 Authors. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.