Journal of Identity and Migration Studies
Volume 15, number 2, 2021

Precarious Recognition: Knowledge, Power, and Social Placement of Refugees

Anselm BÖHMER

Abstract. Refugees often are addressed by categorising them as part of a social group. These categorisations emerge when refugees' identities are labelled as Others. One field of this labelling process is education. Currently, we know too little about the intersections of knowledge, power and social placement by educational practices for refugees. Assuming the viewpoint of educational migration research, this paper reports material-semiotic approaches to these intersections by analysing interviews with educational experts (n=8).
The overall finding of this study suggests that social inclusion via educational practices is referring to those Others by educational and subjectivating arrangements of work, language, and culture. Identified practices are inter alia creating a dichotomy of organisation and social spaces, precarious participation in everyday life and maintaining standards that defy critical discussion. These findings explain how educators can be actors of precarious identifications even within settings dedicated to including refugees. Education thus turns into an instrument of governing immigrated Others by creating a precarious social space while continuing to promote the promise of inclusion.

Keywords: *othering*, *placement*, *situated epistemology*, *material-semiotic performance*

1. Introduction

Learning is a process taking place not only in classrooms and seminar rooms, but also in informal settings such as groups, cafés or chatrooms. Employing these informal settings is an everyday experience for most people living in societies of late modernity. For refugees, however, informal spaces and settings are of greater importance as legislation often does not easily grant access to formal educational environments. Underpinning these legal and also social structures are creations of knowledge (Mannheim 1982; sceptical, Foucault 2020; 1972) concerning the Other (Hall 1997; Said 2003) as a group of difference (Brubaker 2004). Therefore, applying categories as indicators of difference is a strategy enabling discussion of those groups of others and organising educational programmes for them as well.

Due to growing numbers of immigrants in the Summer of Migration 2015 (Federal Government 2016), German society at large and its educational system in particular found themselves exposed to increasing pressure. It provoked demands to rethink everyday practices and educational competences of refugees. This was founded on the inclusion of a huge number of additional members in the fabric of society. Thus, the educational system needs to be considered since education is one of the sources of social inclusion (Juvonen et al. 2019). In both formal and informal educational settings, i.e. in school and in non-institutional contexts, aspects of integration and disintegration can be observed as an expression of the state of societal coherence. From 2015, new educational challenges arose, not only in terms of quantity - due to higher numbers of immigrants as such – but also of quality, e. g. in the design of educational processes for refugees – language acquisition, vocational training and others.

A research project has been developed to acquire more detailed knowledge about practices in education for refugees.[1] Referring to interviews with actors from this field, this paper shows some of the findings, highlighting the use and acquisition of knowledge and their consequences for education policies in supporting social inclusion. Therefore, following a short introduction (1), aspects of education and positioning frame the research context of this paper (2). After introducing the research approach (3) and methodological considerations (4), selected findings of this study are presented to show the intersections of knowledge, power and social positioning in educational scenarios (5). Finally, suggestions on how to achieve individual, social and organisational inclusion in everyday life and in intersectional axes of hegemonic and subordinate positions are discussed (6).

2. Research Context

Migration is a perennial reality European societies are facing – but with varying experiences in matters of education (OECD 2019; 2015a; 2015b). Reasons for integrating migrants – and refugees in particular – vary widely since there are economic, political, educational, humanitarian or other justifications for public education programmes for refugees. Understanding these programmes requires conceptualising the rationale, policies and practices of their intended inclusion through education. This framework helps understand the very specific versions of knowledge purveying these educational programmer.

[1] For more details see chapter 4 of this paper.

Marginalizing the education of refugees

Not that much is known about the education of refugees and related processes of marginalizing forced migrants in terms of knowledge, power and social positioning (for some approaches concerning the USA see Erickson 2020; for Germany see Schmidt, Jacobsen and Krieger 2020). Therefore, differences in ratings, attributions and competences of refugees have to be considered (Bakoben 2020; Brücker et al. 2016) – and what the educational response should look like (Auernheimer and Rosen 2017; Barz et al. 2015; SVR 2016). Multiple aspects of inclusion suggest assuming the multiple embedding of different persons in different social and societal contexts (Amelina 2013). Seen in this light, education turns into a multi-complex process of including persons, in national and/or societal contexts, in the mode of learning and subjectivation (Amelina 2012). Education in this kind of skill promotes developing specific – and different – modes of policies and organisations (Abamosa, Hilt and Westrheim 2019) but also of habitus, self-relation and relation to the outside world (Bourdieu 1984; Bourdieu and Passeron 1990).

Thus, heterogeneity develops into a core epistemic concept in social and educational contexts (for an initial overview of Othering Knowledge in European Schooling see Szalai 2010).[2] Society breaks up into lots of various definable categories – such as race, class and gender, to name the 'classic' concepts of intersectional theory (Crenshaw 1989), or as sexual identity, disabilities etc. (sceptically, Butler 2008). Therefore, differences are the main challenge to social inclusion and, together with forms of everyday life in late modernity (such as mobility, modes of neoliberal socialisation etc.), establish affiliation and membership as available options, both in partial and in multiple forms of coherent and inclusive social networks and their inherent knowledge (Amelina 2013; Kohl 2020; for different 'ecosystems' of refugees see Dryden-Peterson, Dahya and Adelman 2017).

An important field of inclusion is institutional education. Since ample large-scale research has been performed over the last nearly 20 years, we know for a fact that Western educational systems display profound differences in providing chances and efforts, depending on race, class and gender. To explain this fact, some draw on reasons inside the families, like educational aspiration and calculating educational

[2] Referring (besides others) to Althusser's view of permanent renewed subordination under economic necessities and Spivak's critique of subalternation by Eurocentric epistemologies, an intervention into a hegemonic class-structure and its globalised normality of education is required there. See Althusser 2001; Spivak 2012; 1988.

effort (conservatively, Boudon 1974) or the different habitus and its consequences for the assessment of individual educational success (Bourdieu and Passeron 1990). Within this framework of ways how educational differences develop, it is important to consider that there must be systemic reasons like the importance of language or social difference, etc.

Attention is drawn to research into signification and social spaces that might help explain some educational differences of refugees and their descendants. If such explanations can be developed, socialising effects through education will be indicated, showing that formal education supports or even creates social differences. On the other hand, it is conceivable that these effects can be explained by analysing categories and processes of labelling. Thus, a research project focusing on educational processes of refugees should not merely investigate formal learning but also has to take a closer look on categories used to explain informal learning and on social spaces that may host it.

Specifically, educational research has to focus on notions of heterogeneity in educational processes or social contexts, investigating categorically guided descriptions of differences and The Others. With these concepts, the project described below aims to 'consider the multiplicity and inconsistency of actors' social positions in cross-border arenas' (Amelina 2012, 285) by asking about distinct practices in spatial and signifying processes.

Knowledge – situated othering

According to the standpoint theories of embodied knowledge, to know somebody as someone means to examine certain features as a symbol and an expression of subjectivity – of both the examined and the examiner. Hence, knowledge of individuals or groups is not only an expression of their characteristics, but also of the examiner's standpoint. This position helps access 'a rich tradition of critiquing hegemony without disempowering positivisms and relativisms and a way to get to nuanced theories of mediation' (Haraway 1988, 578).

By abandoning an absolute position of knowing and power (the 'One God' position; ibid., 587) and assuming a relational position instead (Butler 2016), different positions of perception and different views of knowing become accessible (Harding 1993, 56).

Considering that 'objects of knowledge are material-semiotic generative nodes' and, accordingly, 'boundary projects' (Haraway 1988, 595) allow for assuming

new views on material-semiotic connections, interpreting them as knowledge that 'stands for […] a certain representative meaning', and, finally, producing a notion of 'symbolic representation as a dimension of representation per se' (Lombardo and Meier 2017, 1). However, even observers of marginalised persons are able to acquire another, *different* 'representative meaning' regarding their objects of view because of the *different* positions and perspectives. At their position of power, the powerful develop not only a semiotic perspective but also a material context of *different* everyday life and even of *different* learning, characterising a social meaning of differences.

This elaboration of material-semiotic differences stimulates an interpretation of a situational, embodied and thus temporally and spatially unique position of representation and power. Neither an affirmative and essentialist nor a critical and constructive structure explains these relations of different social positions and groupisms while a material-semiotic performance of social positions does. Thus, social knowledge means social creation, use of powerful resources as well as positions and material structures reflecting socially established differences. Situated and socially established knowledge 'attaches meanings, norms, values, and beliefs' (ibid.: 2) of definite social positions in discursive manner.

Everyday life and everyday learning

Examining societal and systemic responses to these educational challenges entails analysing data from everyday life and learning. Therefore, it has to be asked about those behaviours usually described by persons, e. g. in educational institutions, in their interactions with public administration – and in the articulations of respondents' self-perceptions themselves.

This broader range of investigation opens up when inclusion is conceptualised as involvement into practices, structures and relationships in 'everyday life' and related modes of learning. Everyday life is then a kind of – presumed – self-evidence of both pursuing one's life and of practicing normatives[3] characteristic of this framework of normality, social inclusion in specific networks and routinised practice. By constructing such concepts of everyday life, societal factors in late modernity display a tendency to shape subjectivity, to develop and manage the own productivity, to become a kind of 'entrepreneurial self' (Bröckling 2016).

[3] Normatives are defined as a 'norm-oriented level of governing' (Böhmer 2017, 47).

Therefore, in addition to understanding how refugees are branded or even interpellated as Others, it is also important to understand how they are introduced into the educational system and its demand for developing an 'entrepreneurial self'.

Education in and for the purpose of everyday life then means becoming an entrepreneurial subject and being included in an entrepreneurial society providing aspects of subjectivation, subjection to an order of work and productivity and involvement in this kind of social 'normality' as workforce in a distinct manner and process, to become a specific subject between different social positions of modern working society.

Critique of everyday hegemony and marginalisation

Critical angles of theories on education and space (Bourdieu 1991; 1984; Butler 2008; 1997; Butler and Athanasiou 2013; Foucault 2008; 2007b; 1997) can be connected with notions of education as a recent practice of subjectivation (Böhmer 2014), not for the sake of using affirmative approaches but of adopting a critical stance on current developments in education. These concepts permit asking not only about everyday practice but also about everyday hegemony and its effects on the inclusion of people – and, as a result, on their social positioning.

Referring to those aspects of inclusion and everyday life, it has already been shown that recent societies prefer to subjectivate individuals into a formation of 'entrepreneurs' in their various manifestations. Current educational theories examine how to combine this with an educational tendency of enlightenment, emancipation and a self-referential and self-responsible subjectivity. It is evident that this is an ambivalent format of socialisation: free to decide when and how to work – but not free to decide that to work, included (when following working tendencies) – marginalised (when not), self-determined about time, place, labour and daily life – not about the goal of this life: profit, competition, success, social position.

The processes of social recognition depend on these forms and on the respective responses to the ambivalences. The common view, then, states that individuals can meet the respective standards and bear their consequences for everyday life – or fail and be marginalised into various groups of vulnerable or repressed individuals. Subsequently, combining societal, social, spatial and educational concepts in a critical mode allows to examine transnational processes of informal learning and to highlight possible types of subjectivation. Thus, an

alternative educational model of socialising by education may be developed.

Seen in this light, educational analyses assume a critical quality by reviewing these processes and their inherent concepts of normality and standards. A theoretical approach based on the findings above therefore has to integrate knowledge of informal learning processes of people concerned, the relevance of signifying people as distinct others, the concepts of normality, recognition and inclusion as well as the concepts of non-standard, accusation and precarity.

The question of processes and structures producing a particular form of subjectivity provides insight into societal norms, forces and power constellations. Figurations of subjectivity and their basic axes of knowledge, power and ethics as well as politics are included (Foucault 2008).[4]

3. Research Approach

Analysing the applications of knowledge, categories, and groupism (Brubaker 2004) is essential to reveal prospects of refugee learning in informal and formal settings. Therefore, different aspects of education and space will contextualise the topic of research and place the findings in a light of educational theory of forced migration and social creation. Some selected results of this field are used to highlight structures and processes within. They represent inclusive claims and precarious consequences of these systemic settings. Finally, they open the path to initial approaches of an educational theory of space and signification in the everyday practice of dealing with forced migration.

Considering signification in educational practices and the learning results, the data presented give reason to distinguish epistemic categories of social, public and educational spaces. The exploratory hypothesis suggests that refugees are branded as extremely different, requiring different structures, pathways and tools to learn and to be included in society through education.

With the purpose of using the theoretical framework described above, different operational steps of research have been implemented in this project presented here:

1. The description of learning a new language was examined as a tool in settings of a ‘monolingual habitus’ that still seems to be very important for the

[4] In this light, subjectivation, recognition and self-assertion merge into an interdependent complex. This is another facet to consider but cannot be examined in full here.

educational system (Gogolin 2013).

2. Even more important than language-related research producing the outcomes discussed here may be the question of how differences are marked and constructed in everyday life in a new country.

3. To answer the previous, experts from public space management and education projects have been interviewed. In addition, people active in formal and informal learning setting have been included in the study.[5]

Specifically, the research process has focused on perspectives on social networks of refugees, on social interaction with volunteers, on contact with other people in actions of everyday life, and on structures and processes of formal and informal learning.

4. Methods and Methodology

The research project examines individual and structural processes designing groups of others through education and the creation of social spaces, employing a qualitative methodology to reconstruct individual perspectives and aims through semi-structured interviews, using content analysis (Mayring 2015). In a second approach, a semiotic methodology is used to explore power, positions and signification (Laclau 1990). The aim is not to seek essentialist knowledge (Laclau 1983) but a reconstruction of subjective elements of knowledge about a specific social phenomenon – forced migration. Due to the aforementioned challenges, initial steps into this field have been performed through expert interviews. This approach underlines the importance of acquiring more insight not only into individual viewpoints but also positions, techniques and relations in labelling identities of refugees in the investigated area that was a town in Southern Germany.

Therefore, as part of the Refugee Spaces research project (conducted by the author), experts have been interviewed to get first insights into their knowledge and practices of constructing social positions by signifying refugees. The main focus was to better understand their attitude about refugees, refugee's everyday life and the risks and chances of signifying different social positions in the investigated field. By combining these pieces of knowledge, the project is able to enrich the possibilities of understanding and learning modes of 'constructing refugees as a different social

[5] Another part of the project interviewed refugees about their experiences of everyday life and their learning experiences. These responses have not been used in this paper because they are beyond the main focus of research.

group'. To better understand this knowledge, the interviews (n = 8) were conducted from April to June 2017.

5. Results

As previously explained, two levels of results have been achieved this way: On one level, practices of signification are examined. By using specific signifiers in specific situations of grouping people, creating different modes of subjectivities, groups and othering (Hall 1997), the 'knowledge of the others' can be described in its emergence. On a second level, intersecting epistemic categories of social, public and educational spaces are shown to explain the creation of hegemonic and subordinate positions in a neoliberal society (Foucault 2008; with regard to asylum-seekers in Denmark Kohl 2020).

Othering on the level of signifying processes

On the level of signifying people as Others, strategies and efforts of actors in these fields become intelligible for the purposes of creating types of knowledge. This is performed by referring to those Others through educational and subjectivating arrangements of work, language and culture.

A first result of the survey shows that everyday practices entail certain modes of subjectivation. Interviewed educators have pointed out that refugees need close contact to their families – in the country of immigration, but often even more so in the country they have left. Regarding everyday practices such as schooling or work, it can be difficult to understand why such intense contact can be important – at the moment, school or work seem to play a more relevant role (1, 200ff.; 2, 176ff.)[6]. This may befit the organisation's processes and culture, but sometimes actors seem to create a dichotomy of organisation on the one hand and the everyday life of refugees on the other (2, 30f.). In these cases, othering does not only reach individuals but strives for fields of 'our' (organisational) normality vs. 'their' daily life (Hall 1997, 48). Factors in the processing of Othering are not only individuals with their social and semiotic practices, but creating otherness addresses also their embedding in social, organisational and semiotic structures such as societal

[6] References to the interviews are listed with number of interview and line number of transcripts. Translation of German interviews by the author.

normatives or even institutional workflows and linguistic practices.

In another context, a certain understanding of integration could be identified. One interviewee pointed out that her idea of integration referred mainly to recognising refugees and – from time to time –coming into contact with 'locals' (2, 583ff.). By defining integration in this way, a subjective positioning of individuals and their group is achieved. This does not begin with social interactions in a field of everyday contacts but creates a specific mode of self-reference. This particular self-referential subjectivity is not perpetuated by persistent social interactions with native residents but by maintaining an intersubjective relation to individual views and experiences. Participating in various practices and networks of different people sharing a social space does not seem to be a goal of social integration for this interviewee.

Educational practices in refugee families have not been actively criticised by another volunteer. Instead, she preferred to interact via learning through modelling (3, 363ff.). She did not discuss her viewpoint but clearly expressed in her behaviour that with regard to a specific educational practice, 'here in Germany this is not feasible for us' (3, 366). The same interviewee also disclosed a structural normativity by signifying a specific kind of educational interaction. Restricted to showing rather than telling, her normative position was not accessible to interviewing and discussion. She was simply sure of her normative idea and lived it out in her organisational practice, effectively preventing further discussion and critical questions. This created another version of integration – being wrong about differences and only being able to reaffirm a 'Western' normative. Another example of this mode of unquestioned notion of normality was the interaction of gendered groups: If men and women acted in the same manner, they were labelled liberal (3, 369ff.; 3, 798ff.). But such a label that would not take their (maybe different) basic backgrounds into account does not necessarily show the same rights of gendered groups but maybe only same practices of different social positions. Whether there are actually the same rights and consequences has not been questioned by most interviewees (with regard to everyday challenges such as housing, work etc. 6, 440ff.).

A further signifier could be identified as well: refugees seem to perceive the domestic population as friendly and generally open-minded (3, 500f.). The description of this general relationship of two obviously homogenised groups cannot be consistent with all experiences of the interviewees. Rather, a mode of harmonious

normality may be described here. In this context, the labels 'friendly' and 'open minded' characterise a relationship between volunteers and refugees to be portrayed without further ado. By arguing in this way, the speaker's position is supported and legitimised as acting correctly and rightly.

This positioning of volunteers in relation to the needs of refugees could also be found in a later sequence. Here, respondents were asked about the most important approach for volunteers in their work with refugees. The responses indicated that volunteers would ask refugees about their needs and implement the answers. This sheds a light on the needs of refugees but not the needs of volunteers (3, 748ff). This argumentation reinforces a certain type of normality, identifying positions of power and also agency. But between the various groups of actors, no discursive negotiation is possible or even considered necessary.

Summing up these primary aspects of subjectivation in everyday practice, different qualities of othering came into view: creating a dichotomy of organisation and social spaces, marking integration as a mode of self-reference, but with little participation in everyday life, avoidance of discussions, instead practicing normatives as having no alternative, declaring these groupist labels harmonious and exemplary, focusing on (gendered) practices, not on their (social) conditions and consequences, semantically establishing positions of power and agency.

When looking at the subjectivation potentials of education, the first insight was a position of educational differences. It was not a national difference that has been noted but one of urban and rural dissimilarity (1, 36ff.). This generates not a national education system but a general difference of urban and rural education. Subjectivity created this way is not a nationalist but a globalised creation, unifying national differences for the sake of urban advantages.

Individuals in such a neoliberal mode of perception and knowledge must be motivated and bring a solid educational background to find a good job (1, 100ff.; 2, 328ff.). This also provides better chances for refugees not to be deported, the interviewee suggested (1, 90ff.). This view can be combined with an educator's goal: 'In general, everything they learn is how to be German and how to immerse into our society, in our everyday culture, as we say […].' (2, 21ff.) Another important element of this work-oriented culture suggests that individuals can qualify their own limits (2, 600ff.). In a workfare society, social integration and becoming a recognised subject has to involve work and language simultaneously (3, 234ff.). Most refugees call this their motivation, too (3, 222ff.). Thus, the combination of learning the new country's

language and getting a job there is a specific expression of how the interviewees read their society: It is not only a labour society but one whose language is homogenised, a society in need of workers with self-reflection and knowledge of their socially relevant limitations.

One educator identified migration and lack of education (2, 42ff.). Her answer to this notion was not to tackle education and make up for the lack of knowledge of the students but to optimise learning strategies and support some awareness of being a (now more) competent learner (2, 48ff.; 2, 299ff.). This version of competence-based empowerment was accomplished by the presence of the educators and their team (2, 61ff.; 2, 615ff.) so that their attendance and authority seem to guarantee educational quality and outcome. On the other hand, another educator claimed that their role and purpose was to ensure that students attended school (5, 290ff.).

Another educator interviewed refused to tackle trauma effects of refugee students: 'We are not trained for that.' (2, 192ff.) The position of the educator is designed with these aspects in mind, to be present, powerful and competent, combined with a rejection of the less favourable experiences of students.

Unlike educators, most refugees cannot claim a powerful and socially recognised position. These social differences are produced in educational practice (3, 775ff.). The only exceptions were one person from Iraq who was attributed the habitus of a former academic (3, 299ff.) and another from Syria who was attributed a 'domestic' habitus (3, 583ff.).

As a conclusion of the analyses related to educational aspects, it can be stated that educational work can overcome national differences for the sake of urban advantages. Further, a linguistically homogenised labour society can be identified, that needs workers with self-reflection and knowledge of their socially relevant limits. The position of educators has been interpreted as present, powerful and competent, combined with rejection of less favourable experiences of students, and the task and purpose of educators were results of their powerful position. Recognised social positions were not accessible to refugees; with exception of a kind of 'higher' habitus.

As it already been shown, education, work and language are very closely tied here to organising the social integration of refugees. This layer of subjectivation now has to be identified in the creations of the interviewees in detail.

The first problem mentioned by an interviewee is that often, educational certificates are not recognised by public authorities. Even well-educated refugees therefore may not apply for better jobs with higher wages and better social status.

They only can apply for jobs most other applicants do not want to get because these jobs are too uncomfortable, exhausting or have little prestige: 'Bakers, for instance … jobs where you have to get up early. Landscapers and stuff like that, physically hard work.' (1, 274f.) Therefore, many refugees have adapted to this situation and adjusted their vocational aspirations (1, 282ff.; 1, 416ff.). In contrast, this interviewee mentioned that most refugees would be satisfied with these jobs because they knew them from their countries of origin (1, 288ff.). Once again, the importance of motivation and willingness to succeed in internships is underlined. Furthermore, both motivation and willingness are said to be more important for success than previous educational efforts (1, 310ff.). These viewpoints may help understand the quality of internships and jobs refugees can achieve. But they seem to contradict the position mentioned before that most refugees had to take those jobs that other applicants did not want to accept.

Again, motivation for internships seems to be needed and is said to be present in almost every refugee working there (1, 439ff.). Another educator was also highly motivated to enable refugees to get jobs, but she stressed this importance for those jobs that do not get enough domestic trainees yet (2, 90ff.). In a neoliberal understanding of work-based socialisation, two different views meet here in a specific complex – the 'entrepreneurial self' and its workforce. (Cf. 2.3 of this article.) They are qualified by their own drive, economic subjectivation of their own streamlining of labour market qualities (Foucault 2007a). By taking such a view, refugees become what the educators interviewed would want them to be: workers in fields avoided by others. Education is part of a socialising process creating social differences by educational differences. This problem has been known for a long time (Bourdieu and Passeron 1990) but now it is entering a new cycle of realisation. The societal structure of social difference is renewed and reinforced by educators and the educational system – with education producing a hierarchic position in the social space of society (Bourdieu 1984). The educators interviewed in this project comment on these processes, in other words, this social hierarchy developed from educational processes and work practices is evident to them. Education then supports and enforces social differences by creating differences applicable in new practices of classism.

To summarise these findings: If refugees can achieve internships and jobs, they often seem to get those other applicants did not want to take. Reasons for this were that refugees' certificates might not be accepted, their goals in the assignments have been adjusted to these legal limitations. Also, in these jobs, motivation and

willingness to fit into organisational requirements seem to be more important than a previous educational background. These aspects are leading to a distinct performance of refugee-subjectivity. Further, positions in the working space are created by a special formation of subjectivity in general ('entrepreneurial self' and its workforce). Finally, this subjectivity can be created with support from educators.

Other fields such as religion and culture could be analysed to reveal further structures and strategies of creating Others. That much is methodologically clear: these approaches do not fully cover all possible variations and the answers given in the interviews are not representative. They only show some potential way of how othering develops in dealing with refugees. At the same time, the answers given in the interviews are not unsystematic. They arrange themselves within a field of social structures and ordered positions. Thus, the answers analysed here show some typical modes of treating the education of refugees, their ways into labour and their socialised places in all these processes. The given answers thus open up a glimpse into some of the methods of creating Others via signification inside the discursive field of hegemony and precarity of forced migration examined here (Laclau 1990).

In all areas mentioned here, the fundamental practice is transparent: setting up a dichotomous social field in which othered groups can be 'integrated' as being different and not standard, yet participating. They are recognised as Others in the social field and as a result made precarious via educational inclusion. Such a non-standard position establishes the normality of those who have the power to define (Foucault 2004). At least this 'normality' applies to groups labelled Non-Standard Others.

These policies of making groups precarious, detaching them from being accepted as familiar and part of the range of hegemonic social recognition means that such individuals are grouped, made precarious and used as workforce in positions domestic workers often do not want to occupy. The findings presented above reveal this fact with regard to everyday practice, education and work. These areas of creating dichotomous othering can be described as a neoliberal version of subjectivation (Foucault 2008; 2007a). It can also be portrayed as a version of socialising individuals as indicated members of groups of Non-Standards, i. e. Others (Brubaker 2004). This strategy not only enforces social positions and societal hegemonies, it also creates options for developing a kind of coherent identity – for individuals as well as for social groups. The examples of surveyed educators showed that they were only talking about refugees as Others, but in doing so they secured

for themselves a position of power to define, rule and judge people in terms of a working society. The interviewees revealed not only their subjective views and positions but also disclosed socialised position as members of a social group, an organisation, an institution and, as a result, a societal field.

Nevertheless, the findings pointed out some potential steps a society can take to support a specific historical structure of vertical and horizontal differences. Refugees seem to become a group made to enforce societal structures by being integrated into the lower places of labour and education – and consequently into precarious recognition. But there is not only a process of social construction but another of intersecting disadvantaged positions. To better understand this intersection, it will be analysed more extensively in the following part.

Intersecting epistemic categories of social, public and educational spaces

A more metatheoretical approach to the data presented before allows for the distinction of epistemic categories of social, public and educational spaces, such as transnational, transcultural and transsubjective affiliations of individuals, groups, networks and institutions. Hence, the data show a crossover of those spaces and their inherent logics and cognitions because social aspects are addressed in public and in (not only: formal) educational spaces, public perspectives generate resonance in educational (that is: formal, but in a more subversive form in informal settings as well) and in social spaces, and educational processes and outcomes are negatively affected by social processes (like inclusion or precariousness), in public debates and their political implications.

When asking about the coherence of these results and their levels, social spaces of refugees can be reconstructed as very mutable while – for the individuals in question – as inclusive as possible (with regard to spatial, subjective and social qualities). Thus, the generated knowledge of refugees and their educational processes are marked by specific categories and translated into a 'precarious inclusion', i. e. a precarious mode of participation in everyday life, education and labour that as a rule provides mainly marginalised and insecure positions. In detail, some findings of this project concerning a precariousness of Othered are as follows: Social positioning occurs through using certain spaces declared dangerous, such as train stations or other public spaces, and assign them to using Wi-Fi, to meet people or just to spend time there (1, 195ff.; 1, 423ff.; 3, 634ff.). Labour shortages in some

occupational fields shape the perceptions and assessments of students in school (1, 14ff.; 2, 402ff.; 3, 236ff.; 5, 53ff.) and also of young refugees in everyday situations in urban settings (6, 182ff.; 7, 529ff.; 8, 460ff.). Political effects of reducing immigration seems to enable more intense integration activity (1, 416ff.).

Political aspects also include the assumed criminality with which some groups of refugees were labelled upon becoming visible in public spaces (1, 423ff.). The reason for their visibility was their lack of access to job markets because their educational certificates were not accepted, and they, excluded from the more profitable submarkets.

Another aspect of educational impact on social processes is the knowledge some refugees may have acquired before they immigrated. They are able to interact in social processes in a way not accessible to those without such knowledge – such as language, law, etc. (3, 311ff.).

Practices of othering and the intersecting spheres of social, educational and public spaces thus organise and structure everyday life and the ways of subjectivating knowledge about refugees. These processes are both affirmative of common structures and hierarchies of knowledge about the othered and transformers of those given structures: especially for the refugees as seen by the questions of how their everyday life is conducted and how they focus on their previously existing educational plans.

6. Discussion: Different Knowledge Structures

This analysis noted some effects of producing societal fields with dichotomous knowledge: of organisation and social spaces, of different working levels, of the standard and the non-standard and of We and The Others. The effect of groupist labelling as harmonious and exemplary sustains social and societal forms of status in the modus of knowledge. Within these practices, positions of power and also skill are semantically established to defend hegemonic positions. These positions are understood as present, powerful and competent. In turn, positions in the working space are set up with a special subjectivity in mind (‘entrepreneurial self’ and its workforce) widening the gap between people in desired jobs and people in just precarious employment. Educators play an essential role in creating those subjectivities and the allocation or denial of desired social positions.

These responses are not objective, validated reports but views of actors

expressing a social and public environment while assuming a specific position of potential construction and affirmation of knowledge systems. The data provides insight into the viewpoints of refugee learning in informal settings driven by socially labelled differences within the knowledge system of the actors and their discursive field. In this discursive field, societal normality is reorganised by grouping very different individuals into a box named Refugees, ascribing to them certain characteristics, tasks and 'non-standard' features of socialising processes.

But 'marginalised lives provide the scientific problems and the research agendas – not the solutions – for standpoint theories' (Harding 1993, 62). Further research is therefore needed to better understand the marginalised perspectives of refugees, their requirements and their desires in the everyday struggle for normalised acknowledgement. The aim is to create more and different forms of knowledge structures about the strategies and technologies of 'producing the others within' but even more to understand the differences of the individual positions – above all, those of persons in low positions and their knowledge.

A methodological limitation must be acknowledged: the number of interviewees. This explorative research is neither representative nor covers a large section of the examined field. All this has to be expanded upon in future research. But this paper provides a first insight into practices and processes performed in the examined field – and in other fields as well. It opens a view on the heterogeneous sides of the issue, preventing a homogeneous illusion of The Refugees and even creating once more a 'real' group of 'othered'. Hence, this paper presents issues of 'realising the others', even though more strategies and techniques could be found.

7. Conclusion

Since such a kind of research may become 'a resource for maximising objectivity' (Harding 1993, 69), it supports the view that othering is one (but not the only) instrument of reconstructing social differences by socialising and educating refugees – and acquiring knowledge about them. This may help analyse social, educational and spatial inclusion in everyday life and in intersecting spheres of hegemonic and subordinate positions in Western society and in their educational processes. Finally referring to Laclau, the complex of social, public, and educational practices 'is not only the infinite play of differences. It is also the attempt to limit that play, to domesticate infinitude, to embrace it within the finitude of an order' (Laclau

1983, 22). But it is just a 'vain attempt to institute that impossible object: society' (ibid., 24.). This attempt seems to be as desirable as it is impossible to achieve.

References

Abamosa, Juhar Yasin, Line Torbjørnsen Hilt, and Kariane Westrheim. 2019. "Social Inclusion of Refugees into Higher Education in Norway: A Critical Analysis of Norwegian Higher Education and Integration Policies." *Policy Futures in Education* 18 (5): 628-647.

Althusser, Louis. 2001. "Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses." In *Lenin and Philosophy and other Essays*. Translated by Ben Brewster. 121–176. New York: Monthly Review Press.

Amelina, Anna. 2012. "Socio-spatial scales as social boundaries? Or: How do migration studies profit from including 'space' in the sociology of social boundaries." *Migration Letters* 9 (3): 273-288.

Amelina, Anna. 2013. "Transnationale Inklusion als ein multilokales Phänomen. Ein Abschied vom Assimilationsparadigma der Migrationsforschung?" In *Die Integrationsdebatte zwischen Assimilation und Diversität. Grenzziehungen in Theorie, Kunst und Gesellschaft*, edited by Özkan Ezli, Andreas Langenohl, Valentin Rauer, and Claudia Marion Voigtmann, 119-155. Bielefeld: transcript.

Auernheimer, Georg, and Lisa Rosen. 2017. "Lehrer-Schüler-Interaktion in der Migrationsgesellschaft." In *Lehrer-Schüler-Interaktion. Inhaltsfelder, Forschungsperspektiven und methodische Zugänge*, edited by Martin K. W. Schweer, 435-463. Wiesbaden: Springer VS.

Böhmer, Anselm. 2014. *Diskrete Differenzen. Experimente zur asubjektiven Bildungstheorie in einer selbstkritischen Moderne.* Bielefeld: transcript.

Böhmer, Anselm. 2017. *Bildung der Arbeitsgesellschaft. Intersektionelle Anmerkungen zur Vergesellschaftung durch Bildungsformate.* Bielefeld: transcript.

Bakoben, Sandrine. 2020. "Integration durch Bildung? Nutzung von Bildungsangeboten durch afrikanische Geflüchtete." In *Nutzen, Nicht-Nutzen und Nutzung Sozialer Arbeit. Theoretische Perspektiven und empirische Erkenntnisse subjektorientierter Forschungsperspektiven* , edited by Anne van Rießen and Katja Jepkens, 199-219. Wiesbaden: Springer VS.

Barz, Heiner, Katrin Barth, Meral Cerci-Thoms, Zeynep Dereköy, Mareike Först, Thi Thao Le, and Igor Mitchnik. 2015. *Große Vielfalt, weniger Chancen. Eine Studie über die Bildungserfahrungen und Bildungsziele von Menschen mit Migrationshintergrund in Deutschland.* Essen, Düsseldorf: Self-published.

Boudon, Raymond. 1974. *Education, Opportunity, and Social Inequality. Changing Prospects in Western Society.* New York: Wiley.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1984. *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste.* London: Routledge.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1991. "Political Representation: Elements for a Theory of the Political Field." In *Language and Symbolic Power*, edited by John Thompson, 171-202. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bourdieu, Pierre, and Jean-Claude Passeron. 1990. *Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture.* 2. Ed. London: SAGE Publications Ltd.

Bröckling, Ulrich. 2016. *The Entrepreneurial Self.* London: Sage.

Brücker, Herbert, Nina Rother, Jürgen Schupp, Christian Babka von Gostomski, Axel Böhm, Tanja Fendel, Martin Friedrich, et al. 2016. *Flucht, Ankunft in Deutschland und erste Schritte der Integration. IAB-BAMF-SOEP-Befragung von Geflüchteten. BAMF-Kurzanalyse 5|2016.* Nürnberg: Self-published.

Brubaker, Rogers. 2004. *Ethnicity Without Groups.* Cambridge, London: Harvard University Press.

Butler, Judith. 1997. *The Psychic Life of Power. Theories in Subjection.* Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Butler, Judith. 2008. *Gender trouble. Feminism and the subversion of identity.* 2. Ed. New York: Routledge.

Butler, Judith. 2016. "Rethinking Vulnerability and Resistance." In *Vulnerability in Resistance*, edited by Judith Butler, Zeynep Gambetti, and Leticia Sabsay, 12-27. Durham, London: Duke University Press.

Butler, Judith, and Athena Athanasiou. 2013. *Dispossession. The performative in the political.* Cambridge, Malden: Polity Press.

Crenshaw, Kimberle. 1989. "Demarginalizing the Intersection of Race and Sex. A Black Feminist Critique of Antidiscrimination Doctrine, Feminist Theory and Antiracist Policies." *University of Chicago Legal Forum* 1: 139-168.

Dryden-Peterson, Sarah, Negin Dahya, and Elizabeth Adelman. 2017. "Pathways to Educational Success Among Refugees: Connecting Locally and Globally Situated Resources." *American Educational Research Journal* 54 (6): 1011–1047.

Erickson, Frederick. 2020. "Culture and the Production of School Inequality." In *Handbook on Promoting Social Justice in Education*, edited by Rosemary Papa, 567-582. Cham: Springer.

Federal Government [Bundesregierung]. 2016. *Migrationsbericht 2015. Drucksache 18/10700.* Berlin: Deutscher Bundestag.

Foucault, Michel. 1972. *The Archaeology of Knowledge and The Discourse on Language.* New York: Pantheon Books.

Foucault, Michel. 1997. "Of Other Spaces: Utopias and Heterotopias." In *Rethinking Architecture: A Reader in Cultural Theory*, edited by Neil Leach, 330-336. New York: Routledge.

Foucault, Michel. 2004. *Abnormal. Lectures at the Collège de France, 1974–1975.* New York: Picador.

Foucault, Michel. 2007a. *Security, Territory, Population: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1977–78.* Translated by Graham Bruchell. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Foucault, Michel. 2007b. "What is Critique?" In *The Politics of Truth*, by Michel Foucault, 41-82. Los Angeles: Semiotext(e).

Foucault, Michel. 2008. *The Birth of Biopolitics: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1978–79.* Translated by Graham Bruchell. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Foucault, Michel. 2020. *The History of Sexuality: 1: The Will to Knowledge.* London: Penguin Classics.

Gogolin, Ingrid. 2013. "The "monolingual habitus" as the common feature in teaching in the language of the majority in different countries." *Per Linguam* 13 (2): 38-49.

Hall, Stuart. 1997. "Old and New Identities, Old and New Ethnicities." In *Culture, Globalization, and the World-System. Contemporary Conditions for the Representation of Identity*, edited by Anthony D King, 41-68. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Haraway, Donna. 1988. "Situated Knowledges: The Science Question in Feminism and the Privilege of Partial Perspective." *Feminist Studies* 14 (3, Autumn): 575-599.

Harding, Sandra. 1993. "Rethinking Standpoint Epistemology: What Is "Strong Objectivity"?" In *Feminist Epistemologies*, edited by Linda Alcoff and Elizabeth Potter, 49-82. New York, London: Routledge.

Juvonen, Jaana, Leah M Lessard, Ritika Rastogi, Hannah L Schacter, and Danielle Sayre Smith. 2019. "Promoting Social Inclusion in Educational Settings: Challenges and Opportunities." *Educational Psychologist* 54 (4): 250-270.

Kohl, Katrine Syppli. 2020. "Ambiguous Encounters: Revisiting Foucault and Goffman at an Activation Programme for Asylum-seekers." *Refugee Survey Quarterly* 39: 177–206.

Laclau, Ernesto. 1983. "The Impossibility of Society." *Canadian Journal of Political and Social Theory/Revue canadienne de théorie politique et sociale* 7 (1-2): 21-24.

Laclau, Ernesto. 1990. *New Reflections on the Revolution of our Time.* London, New York: Verso.

Lombardo, Emanuela, and Petra Meier. 2017. "Capturing in words what a symbol symbolizes? Challenges for studying symbolic representation from a discursive approach." *Politics, Groups, and Identities* 5 (3): 1-6.

Mannheim, Karl. 1982. *Structures of Thinking. Collected Works Volume Ten.* London and New York: Routledge.

Mayring, Philipp. 2015. *Qualitative Inhaltsanalyse. Grundlagen und Techniken.* 12. Edition. Weinheim, Basel: Beltz.

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development [OECD]. 2015a. *Education at a Glance 2015. OECD Indicators.* Accessed March 1, 2021. Paris: OECD Publishing.

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development [OECD]. 2015b. "In It Together. Why Less Inequality Benefits All." Accessed March 1, 2021. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264235120-en.

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development [OECD]. 2019. *PISA 2018. Ergebnisse (Band I): Was Schülerinnen und Schüler wissen und können.* Bielefeld: wbv Media.

Sachverständigenrat deutscher Stiftungen für Integration und Migration [SVR]. 2016. *Doppelt benachteiligt? Kinder und Jugendliche mit Migrationshintergrund im deutschen Bildungssystem. Eine Expertise im Auftrag der Stiftung Mercator.* Berlin: Self-published.

Said, Edward William. 2003. *Orientalism.* London: Penguin Books.

Schmidt, Katja, Jannes Jacobsen, and Magdalena Krieger. 2020. "Soziale Integration Geflüchteter macht Fortschritte." *DIW Wochenbericht* 87 (34): 591–599.

Spivak, Gayatari Chakravorty. 1988. "Can the Subaltern Speak?" In *Colonial Discourse and Post-Colonial Theory*, edited by P Williams and L Chrisman, 66-111. Hemel Hemstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Spivak, Gayatari Chakravorty. 2012. *An Aesthetic Education in the Era of Globalization.* Cambridge, London: Harvard University Press.

Szalai, Júlia. 2010. *Being 'Visibly Different': Experiences of Second-Generation Migrant and Roma Youths at School. A Comparative Study of Communities in Nine Member States of the European Union.* Budapest: Center for Policy Studies.