

INTRODUCTION OF THE COEXISTENCE EXPERIENCE INTO AN INCLUSIVE LEARNING ENVIRONMENT: PHILOSOPHICAL-ANTHROPOLOGICAL AND SOCIO-CULTURAL ANALYSIS

Natalia Mrynska

Postgraduate Student at the Department of Cultural Studies and Philosophical Anthropology,
National Pedagogical Dragomanov University, Ukraine
e-mail: natamrinska@gmail.com, orcid.org/0000-0001-7958-9118

Summary

The article aims to improve the interaction between society and persons with disabilities. The author has found the interrelation between a person with a disability and Paul Tillich's "the courage to be". The research attempts to convince the public of the need to involve persons with disabilities, as representatives who are aware of a disability, in inclusive education. As a result of the re-use of L. Wittgenstein's method and "pedagogy of experience" by V. Bederkhanova and I. Shustova, a mutually beneficial synthesis between experience and practice in the dimension of coexistence has been established. The objective necessity of simultaneous use of performance and performativity in pedagogical practice has been analyzed and described. The definition of "bilateral" or "double" inclusion has been formulated. The use of "bilateral inclusion" will expand the social boundaries for persons with disabilities and provide the necessary experience in the pedagogical realm for both children with disabilities and healthy children. The analysis and conclusions prove the effectiveness of involving persons who have faced a disability in an inclusive environment.

Keywords: inclusion, double inclusion, pedagogy, experience, practice, man, disability, teacher, teacher with disability, inclusive environment, representation.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.23856/4806>

1. Introduction

Inclusion is a term that has come into use in the 21st century. The term has stepped out of the shadow of theory and has been primarily oriented to educational processes. Plenty of articles related to inclusion have been published in domestic and foreign scientific journals. They have covered the cases when a teacher with a disability is involved in the "healthy environment of students".

At first glance, the topic deals with social philosophy and requires it to be considered as – following the definition of inclusion itself – "involvement", "attraction", where involvement means a social environment. However, this article emphasizes the philosophical-anthropological aspect. Thus, the research task is to study the importance and significance of such inclusion to a person with a disability and the value of involving persons with disabilities in teaching activities to the community.

According to state acts, inclusive education means the inclusion of children with special needs in a mutual learning process that allows "healthy" children to see "untypical" children in their society and contributes to forming a shared communicative environment. However, there is no communicative model between "healthy" children and an adult with a disability.

Consequently, “healthy children” do not obtain the relevant experience of communication and cannot decide for themselves what type of behavior or “emotional anchor” to use in communication with the relevant persons. This significantly narrows the child’s worldview, especially in modern Ukraine, which is undergoing military conflict and where the number of persons with disabilities is growing.

The purpose of the article is to elucidate the issue of “reverse” or “double inclusion”, which is inextricably linked with the perception of a person with a disability and is subject to rules far removed from the experience and coexistence.

In the context of the abovementioned purpose, the author sets a range of tasks, which go hand in hand with pedagogy and philosophical anthropology. First, it is essential to clarify the mechanism for the impact of experience and practice on an inclusive environment. The author analyzes this issue by relying on the philosophy of L. Wittgenstein. Second, there is a need to analyze how a teacher with a disability can create a coexistent union with a student. The author deals with this task based on V. Bederkhanov’s pedagogical philosophy and her article “Co-existence in education as a method of pedagogy of “experience””.

Methods used in the article refer to L. Wittgenstein’s philosophy and “pedagogy of experience” by V. Bederkhanova & I. Shustova.

Scientific novelty. L. Wittgenstein’s philosophy is used for the first time as part of the study of a disability and inclusion; the pedagogical method of “experience” becomes an analysis of “double inclusion” based on coexistence.

Conclusions. The research has found a direct interrelation between experience and a rule. The term borrowed from L. Wittgenstein’s philosophy – “representation” – is applied. The gap between the influence of “rules” on the subjective feelings of an individual is analyzed. The mutually beneficial interaction between performance and performativity is determined, and the values of both concepts to inclusive education are proved. The article establishes a pattern of coexistence in terms of an inclusive environment. “Bilateral” and “double inclusion” is defined. Based on research findings, the author proposes holding a course for the development and expansion of the environment of “double inclusion”.

Research results. The level of study of the issue of concern has allowed using the contributions of philosophers, educators, and sociologists. L. Wittgenstein’s theory is currently considered in the context of social sciences, in which the concept of rules determines behavior (Rodina, 2020). The phenomenology realm by E. Husserl covers humanitarian issues (Sanzhenakov, 2020). Pedagogical aspects have also been elucidated in L. Wittgenstein’s philosophy, which N. Medvedev thoroughly studies (2019). Pedagogy in the perspective of delving into the learning environment and in direct contact with philosophy opens new opportunities found in research by the following pedagogues and philosophers: V. Bederkhanova, I. Shustova, (2020), S. Alekhina, M. Alekseeva, E. Agafonova (2011). This allows expanding the boundaries, from theoretical philosophical anthropology to practical projects.

2. The courage to be atypical in society

Paul Tillich writes about “the courage to be” a part of a society of democratic conformism, pointing out that “Originally the democratic-conformist type of the courage to be a part was in an outspoken way tied up with the idea of progress. The courage to be as a part in the progress of the group to which one belongs, of this nation, of all mankind, is expressed in all typically American philosophies: pragmatism, process philosophy, the ethics of growth, progressive education, crusading democracy” (Tillich, 1995: 79).

According to Winzer M., inclusion has had a detrimental effect on society (*Winzer, 2009:81*). The scientist notes that formally edited positions and ideas became widely used for marketing and PR than for blurring the lines between “atypicality” and “typicality” of an individual. The desire to root out segregation and discrimination in the West through the asymmetric actions of the authorities resulted in a counter-movement of a conservative society. At the same time, there was an exaggeration of mercy. Some sociologists highlight this fact: “Even those persons with disabilities who live an ordinary life (about a third of them) suppress the feeling of pariah due to a sense of patronage of healthy individuals” (*Stubbins, 1988:2*).

The article was written in 1988, but it is still highly cited. It is not surprising because most works devoted to inclusion deal with the rights of a person with a disability, protect him, take care of him, guard him forgetting that the first objective and desire of a person with a disability is to be socialized. The Constitution of Ukraine guarantees the equality of human rights and responsibilities, but persons with disabilities are often accused of the benefits of their condition – the state cares about them, they are mentioned in the media, ones seek to improve their living conditions, they are provided with aid. However, despite the care of the state, the inadequacy of measures, or rather not entirely right vector of measures, primarily affects the fact that a person with a disability is out of touch with society – one is not socialized.

3. Wittgenstein’s theory

Researchers analyzing L. Wittgenstein’s philosophy highlight the core construction used in his contributions – following a rule to delineate the boundaries of language and the world. The conceptual influence of Wittgenstein’s philosophy shaped some research patterns which have rules but, at the same time, don’t have. To be more precise, rules can’t be understood without practice. (*Wittgenstein, 1994:199, 496, etc.*). The rule is based on the synergy of experience and practice, but practice obeys the rule, and experience subsequently creates additional rules, or even different from the original ones. “A clearly identified core of such concepts is always followed by a tail of peripheral features to which it is often impossible to decide whether to incorporate them in the content of the defined concept” (*Rodin, 2020:36*).

Thus, according to L. Wittgenstein, language has creative power and concurrently obeys the backward patterns of perception. However, the modern world destroys the relevant concept. The meaning of the action was determined by the actor. Now, this meaning is given by the context which escapes from the uninitiated interpreter. This causes the impossibility of applying rules and rules-consistent actions as such because the former and latter presuppose some universality, while contextuality makes the action unique (*Sanzhenakov, 2020: 42*).

4. Performance and performativity

A. Moiseeva, in her article “Wittgenstein and performative turn”, argues that instead of it (a rule), it is possible to pay attention to how the factor of inclusion (i.e., the action of the rule) “works” in the studied practices, i.e., to examine the processes of generation and transformation of rules by participants of rule-consistent activity” (*Moiseeva, 2020: 46*). The scholar develops her idea that the performative concept of language can create new notions in the humanities. At the same time, she divides performance and performativity, saying that performance is internal and is generated from within the person, and performativity – external and seems to set the rules of the game of the external world.

Thus, there is the performative concept of language without the simultaneous combination of performance and performativity – modern living language cannot exist apart of it. As a result, if this does not happen, the relations between I always remain at the level of IT and will never be able to transit to the communication of I and YOU. The relations “I” and “You” mean that one person treats another person as his equal. An individual recognizes in another individual the same personality as he is, tries to understand the inner world of his interlocutor, and does not impose his “opinion”, as well as feelings (the author’s), on him (*Burkhanov, 2013: 17*).

5. Bilateral inclusion

If one considers the above provisions regarding inclusion, then one faces a paradox – there are rules, and the rule itself is meaningless because there is no experience of its application. In other words, communication is always at the level of I and IT. In order to get out of such communication and move into the relations of I and WE, purposeful conscious actions are needed.

L. Wittgenstein states that it is impossible to understand the world without experience; he often refers to comparisons or examples, specifies that successful communication primarily requires defining concepts and frameworks of their perception, i.e., rules. In the philosopher’s opinion, “master” must define conceptual system, and the direct duty of the “slave” is to clarify and produce semantic definitions.

Wittgenstein never touched upon pedagogy directly, but his colleagues did it for him by referring to his philosophy and the technique of grammatical research. J. Medina, M. Peters, and J. Stickney, gave pride of place to L. Wittgenstein’s philosophical methodology into their contributions and applied to fundamentally different areas of philosophy. “Fittingly, Wittgenstein’s way of self-improvement and working on personal viewpoint can be called pedagogical” writes J. Stickney (*Stickney, 2005: 301*). Moreover, we, as philosophers, understand that the construction of dialogue may collapse if we do not introduce conceptual clarity while studying the issue. “A philosopher can help a pedagogue get rid of conceptual ambiguity that hinders fruitful communication: he can teach one to be relieved from the obsessive philosophical images”, wrote PhD N. Medvedev in his work (*Medvedev, 2020: 87*). The outline of L. Wittgenstein’s rhetoric also becomes clear if one analyzes his fragmentary examples of the perception of various concepts. Medvedev writes that if we focus on his examples of life situations, the context of thinking turns to be multifaceted and goes way beyond language. Immersion in these examples and situations reveals complex philosophical truths that are far from grammar.

By referring to the contributions by L. Wittgenstein, the author finds out a lot of problems named “grammatical misunderstanding”. The discovery of the sensory world of ordinary and, at first sight, comprehensible definitions is found quite ambiguous during a thorough examination. Ludwig Wittgenstein writes: “We are so much accustomed to communication through language, in conversation, that it looks to us as if the whole point of communication lay in this: someone else grasps the sense of my words — which is something mental: he as it were takes it into his own mind” (*Wittgenstein, 2018: 176*).

When analyzing this quote as part of the explanations of one person to another (when both have no experience of disability) what a disability is, one faces a paradox – neither of the interlocutors can be honest and immersed, and therefore, cannot cover the concept in detail. “If someone says that “the word of “pain” to take on meaning, it is necessary to recognize pain as such when it occurs”; one can answer, “It is no more necessary than acknowledging the absence of pain” (*Wittgenstein, 2018: 199*).

Speaking of experience, Ludwig Wittgenstein insists that any experience not experienced personally is the “experience of the slave” (*Wittgenstein, 2018: 114*). In the same way, people perceive the experience of others somewhat remotely until this experience directly affects them. Further, L. Wittgenstein notes that no description can satisfy a person without direct impact and calls this “experience of influence” (*Wittgenstein, 2018: 116*). Consequently, the philosopher implies that a person who experiences other’s feelings or follows other’s explanations is guided until he acquires the “experience of influence”, thus separating “phenomenon” and “experience”. According to the philosopher, “phenomenon” is a detached sample, but “experience” gives a causal connection. Only in this case, a person gains experience empirically as if living it himself. He specifies that language cannot convey experience as feelings, moods for personal use, and therefore, the other will not be able to understand this language, that is, to understand my experience (*Wittgenstein, 2018: 140*). The researcher writes: “Individual experience is essential not because each individual has personal experience but because nobody knows whether others have the same experience or something similar” (*Wittgenstein, 2018: 149*).

A. Sanzhenkov (2020) in his article, referring to the phenomenology of Edmund Husserl, concludes that if the meaning of action used to be given by the actor, now (apparently implying the processes of expansion of society) it is filled with the meaning of an uninitiated interpreter (p. 42). But if according to E. Husserl, sciences carry out their constructions on the self-evident ground of the lifeworld”, where the lifeworld is the world of “original evidence”, then the obvious confuses the very construction of inclusive education in which the production of concepts belongs to the interpreter (*Husserl, 2004: 172*).

Developing our thought, we conclude that performance becomes performativity by separating experience from the rule, and, accordingly, cannot denote a phenomenal experience and cause “representation” as such (*Wittgenstein, 2018: 184*).

Hence, any perception of a disability remains beyond the comprehension of people, who are learning to be in the world of a person with a disability and develop skills given these definitions and rules.

The rule destroys the rule itself – inclusion becomes impossible, and a person faces a misunderstanding in the world of relatively healthy people. This will continue until we replace compassion and care with understanding and form our personal opinion about disability through “representation”, which is not regulated by rules but created by imagination during the direct communication of I with another.

L. Wittgenstein writes: “We do not learn to make empirical judgments by studying rules; we are taught to reason and make connections. Thus, a set of arguments becomes conceivable for us” (*Wittgenstein, 2018: 156*). Accordingly, communication with a person with a disability creates a simultaneous “bilateral” or “double” inclusion. Therefore, a person with a disability learns to live in the environment of healthy people, and a healthy person obtains experience from a person with a disability. Consequently, “double inclusion” *is a mutual involvement in the being of the “other” who enriches another’s being with his experience and creates coexistence.*

6. Coexistence in pedagogy as an experience of “double inclusion”

“Pedagogy of experience” by V. Bederkhanova interprets coexistence as the interrelation of human I and WE (*Bederkhanova, 2020: 33*). At the same time, a person isolates himself in conscious engagement through “representation”.

Martin Heidegger discussed co-being and coexistence as the possibility to be natural and concurrently share being with others and repeatedly linked the notions of presence with the

co-being “Based on the common being-in-the-world, the world is always the one that I share with others. The world of presence is a shared world. Being-in is co-being with others. Intra-world-being in is co-presence” (Heidegger, 1997: 118). Hence, the interrelation of co-existence and co-being ensure the integrity of semantic interaction affirming the position of a person in reality. Defragmentation of modern society based on firm views and positions triggers problematic situations in coexistence with a disability and destroys the reflexive stimulator of perception.

In other words, until two people meet, they cannot empathize with each other. Their positions differ, and they cannot model their subjective reality towards other people’s requests. However, co-being triggers co-existence, that is, participation in other’s life with the reflection of self-centered positions. Interaction within co-existence makes it possible to correct the usual notions, and the effect of action in co-existence acquires a double meaning, which is reflected in the subjective existence of the two.

In a broad sense of these processes, two parties are involved: “the world of a person with a disability” and “the world of a healthy person”, but according to reflections, the contact of these worlds is useful to both. In the case of the perception of a person with a disability, one acts as an agent, a person who brings his imperfection to the world. In the case of the perception of a healthy person, he acts as a falsifier of participation, an accomplice. The world expands the boundaries of cognition from the level of rule to the level of possibility; as a result, possibilities create conditions for interaction.

The humanization of educational processes has always meant giving up the authority of the teacher. The teacher becomes a friend, mentor, guide, person who assists in learning without deflecting the process from the basic foundations of life. Thus, following personal principles, the teacher creates a comfortable environment for in-depth study of the subject based on his knowledge, experience and allows including valuable semantic features of an individual. The academic training of social educators and teachers with disabilities expands the boundaries of students’ perceptions.

7. The value of “double inclusion”

After analyzing several articles devoted to training an educator for activities in inclusive space written by the authors of the collection “Inclusive education: theory and practice” presented at the second International scientific-practical conference, the author has identified the necessary features teachers should have to work in the relevant environment, as follows:

- respect for what that is missing in their personal experience;
- understanding that a disability does not always affect mental abilities and does not depend on the physical condition;
- recognition of equal opportunities for all students;
- following true pedagogical goals, priorities, and values;
- teamwork skills.

However, virtually all researchers agree that the experience of a disability should be regarded and respected as a particular system of personal values. This suggests that we must first accept that such an experience is valuable that is incomprehensible to a healthy person, but it should be respected. According to the value system of the axiological approach, personality dominates over form, but a different form is worth accepting and respecting. What if you imagine that a teacher has such an experience (experience of a disability), then the first rule – respect, understanding and value – is already innated in the experience. A teacher with a disability can not only to share his experience but also easily accept the values of other person, a priori.

Professional training in an inclusive environment automatically creates co-existence: psychological, emotional, and existential. Thus, the article by C. Alekhina et al. "Readiness of teachers as the main factor of success of the inclusive process in education" reveals unwillingness of a teacher to work with children with disabilities due to fear (Alekhina et al., 2011: 84). Fear, in turn, gives feedback from other children and gives rise to their fear. However, considering the fact that fear is caused by the lack of experience, experience is crucially important – it can be obtained through "representation".

S. Petrova states that "personality is not a passive recipient of the social environment, it actively influences it, selectively responds to external stimuli, and anticipated behavioral norms" (Petrova, 2016: 69). A teacher with a disability directly interacts with a person who has endured a "limit situation" and has been able to overcome it, outdo oneself thanks to one's spirit.

In a learning environment, where the goal involves not only acquiring knowledge but also the multilevel education of the individual, people who have experienced a disability can show a value of spirit and courage. Due to the fact that such people have experienced and coped with disability, they can influence the formation of the student's character and provide morally, socially and emotionally healthy and favorable conditions for personality formation. The old reference links of a disability with weakness are cut.

When a child in the period of personality formation has a role model of transformation and a rewarding experience of interaction with a person who has one "atypical" peculiarity – "disability", then a detailed understanding of the concept of moral courage will prevail. P. Tillich writes "How is the courage to be possible if all the ways to create it are barred by the experience of their ultimate insufficiency?" (Tillich, 1995: 121). He continues "Courage participates in the self-affirmation of being-itself, it participates in the power of being which prevails against non-being" (Tillich, 1995: 126).

The training of teachers with disabilities at the initial stage of inclusion in children's institutions addresses the issue of readiness of both "unhealthy" and "conditionally healthy" children for co-existence. Theoretically, the idea involves shaping a contributing, creative space where experience is not compiled but lived through.

8. Conclusions

The analyzed interrelation between experience and practice is inextricably linked with the concept of representation. It determines the interaction between a person at the level of I and WE and reveals the potential for fruitful inclusion. This connection provides the necessary experience and expands the boundaries of communication. Spirituality and courage create a reasoned value of human life and raise the spirit. The value of such a connection expands the boundaries of experience and creates the essential incentive for inclusion as a goal for a humanistic society: equal interaction for all members.

The revealed gap between the "rule" and "experience" has formed an understanding of the need to engage in society not only children with disabilities but also adults with disabilities. This will significantly contribute to the child's perception of the world, shape the necessary potential to fulfil their moral and spiritual qualities. The value of the union between performativity and performance is identified: an adult person with a disability acts as an agent. This interaction is also defined as mutually beneficial in an inclusive environment: a person with a disability can act as an influencer in the socialization of children with disabilities.

The regularity of coexistence as the value of penetration into the other's world is established. The author has defined "bilateral" and "double inclusion" which are designated as

“mutual inclusion in the other’s being”. All the conclusions confirm the evident benefit from attracting teachers with disabilities to work in an inclusive environment. It is the interaction of a “healthy” child and a teacher with a disability that can create a strong connection between coexistence and expand the boundaries of perception of the individual both at the stage of adulthood and at the stage of adult life. Coexistence eliminates negative responses associated with misunderstanding or inconsistency of rules and experience and, at the same time, destroys the stereotype of lameness of a person with a disability. It also creates direct contact with the “courage to be” despite bodily imperfection and makes one a full member of society.

References

- Alehina S. V., Alekseeva M. N., Agafonova E. L. (2011). *Gotovnost pedagogov kak osnovnoj faktoruspeshnosti inklyuzivnogo processa v obrazovanii*. [The readiness of teachers as the main factor in the success of the inclusive process in education]. *Psichologicheskaya nauka i obrazovanie*, № 1, 83-92. [in Russian].
- Bederhanova, V. P. Shustova I. Yu. (2020). *So-bytijnost v vospitanii kak metod "pedagogiki prozhivaniya"* [Co-beingness in education as a method of "Pedagogy of residence"]. *Sibirskij pedagogicheskij zhurnal*, № 3, 28-37. DOI 10.15293/1813-4718.2003.03. [in Russian].
- Burhanov, R. A., & Yusupova, F. N. (2013). *Metafizika tuizma Martina Bubera* [The metaphysics of tuism by Martin Buber]. *Diskussiya*, (5-6 (35-36)), 16-23. [in Russian].
- Buharenkova O.Yu., Telina I.A., Timohina T.V. (2016). *Inklyuzivnoe obrazovanie: teoriya i praktika Sbornik materialov mezhdunarodnoj nauchno-prakticheskoy konferencii* [Inclusive education: theory and practice Collection of materials of the international scientific and practical conference]. *Orehovo-Zuevo: Redakcionno-izdatelskij otdel GGTU*. [in Russian].
- Vitgenshtejn L. (2018) *Filosofskie issledovaniya* [Philosophical research]. Moscow: Izdatelstvo AST, 2018. [in Russian].
- Gusserl E. (2004) *Krizis evropejskih nauk i transcendentalnaya fenomenologiya* [The Crisis of European Sciences and Transcendental Phenomenology]. St. Petersburg: Vladimir Dal. [in Russian].
- Medvedev N. V. (2020). *Filosofskaya pedagogika L. L. Vitgenshtejna* [Philosophical pedagogy L. L. Wittgenstein.]. Tambov: Gramota, № 4, 87-91. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30853/manuscript.2020.4.17> [in Russian].
- Moiseeva, A. Yu. Zajkova A. S. (2020). *L. Vitgenshtejn i performativnyj povorot. Epistemologiya i filosofiya nauki* [L. Wittgenstein and the performative turn]. (T. 57). № 3, 44-49. DOI 10.5840/eps202057339 [in Russian].
- Petrova S.I. (2016). *Socialnaya sreda i lichnost* [Social environment and personality]. *Innovacionnaya nauka*. № 4, 69-70 [in Russian].
- Rodin K.A. (2020). *Problema sledovaniya pravilu i mesto L. Vitgenshtejna v sociologicheskikh issledovaniyah: vozvrashenie k Piteru Uinchu* [The problem of following the rule and the place of L. Wittgenstein in sociological research: a return to Peter Winch]. *Epistemologiya i filosofiya nauki*. (T. 57). № 3, 23–33. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5840/eps202057336> [in Russian].
- Sanzhenakov, A. A. (2020). *Vitgenshtejn i Gusserl kak reformatory socialnoj nauki* [Wittgenstein and Husserl as reformers of social science]. (T. 57). *Epistemologiya i filosofiya nauki*. № 3, 40-43. DOI 10.5840/eps202057338. [in Russian].
- Tillih Paul. (1995) *Significance of the history of religions for the systematic theologian. Selected: Theology of Culture*. Moscow: Yurist. [in Russian].

- Hajdegger M. (1997). *Bytie i vremya [Being and time.]*. Moscow: Ad Marginem. [in Russian].
- Stickney J. (2005). *Teaching and learning in Wittgenstein's Philosophic Method*. *Philosophy of Education Society Yearbook*. ed. by K. Howe, N. Burbules. Urbana-Champaign: University of Illinois. 299-307.
- Winzer M.A. (2009). *From Integration to Inclusion*. Washington: Gallaudet University.
- Stubbins J. (1988) *The politics of disability. Attitudes toward persons with disabilities* Ed. H. Yaker. New York: Springer.