4 Challenging Disabling School Policies

Since 2003, the »Training Room Program (TRP)«, a time-out model that is based on the American »Responsible Thinking Process (RTP)«, has become established in German schools in response to students' increasingly challenging learning and social behavior. School administrators and academics alike recommend the implementation of the TRP as part of their efforts to conform to the UN convention in order to ensure the success of inclusive schooling for students with emotional and social needs. But in doing so, formal inclusion and temporary exclusion within the school become interconnected.

The results yielded by this program evaluation show that there is to date no convincing empirical evidence as to the effectiveness of the TRP. On the contrary, the data indicate that the TRP actually has a negative impact on teaching and learning processes and on the culture of the school as a whole. While the TRP aims to enhance levels of classroom discipline and relieve pressure on the teacher, the program simultaneously impedes the development of a participative and empowering learning culture, even though it is precisely this factor which is indispensable for the successful inclusion of learners with emotional and social needs. The TRP's educational ideals and its conception of human beings are

also a serious cause for concern. The conclusion outlines alternative concepts which are more suitable for the provision of inclusive schooling for students with emotional and social needs.

In Germany, the »Training Room Program (TRP)«, first emerged shortly after the turn of the century. It was Balke (2003), Bründel and Simon (2003, 2007, 2013) and Claßen and Nießen (2006), whose publications and internet pages first introduced the program into the practice of school teaching, together with the teacher training programs for which it provided a base. The theoretical roots of the TRP are embedded in the »Responsible Thinking Process (RTP)« developed in the USA by Ford (2004), a program which in turn was based on control theory (Powers 1998; Marken 2002).

It is difficult to accurately estimate the number of German schools which are working with the program. In North Rhine-Westphalia, 142 secondary schools were working with the TRP when Balz (2004) conducted his survey. If we extrapolate this number to the total number of schools in this Bundesland (N=2.740), then the result is 5.2%. Recent statistics are not available from the other 15 Bundesländer. Interviews with local education authorities together with research undertaken on the internet would appear to support the estimate that approximately 10%-15% of all German schools, according to region, are working with the TRP. Some schools work with the TRP, but do not make this information externally available. The TRP is also used to some degree in modified forms and under different names (e.g., »Island Room«).

The stated aim of the TRP is to instill discipline in the classroom, thereby enabling lessons to take place *without interruption*. The TRP is based on the following principles: »Every teacher has the right to teach without interruption whilst at the same time bearing the responsibility for providing high-quality classes. Every student is entitled to high-quality classes whilst at the same time ensuring that classes can proceed without interruption. Teachers and students must show respect for their mutual rights and shoulder their respective responsibilities« (Bründel and Simon, 2003, p. 38). If a student fails to abide by these rules, the

teacher can ask the student to leave the classroom and go to the training room. The teacher decides when the student should leave.

Before this happens, the teacher will ask the student if he is prepared to cease his disruptive behavior. Depending on his answer, the student will be allowed to remain in the classroom or will decide to go to the training room. In the training room, a teacher or social worker will be waiting for the student and will call upon him/her to reflect self-critically upon his/her disruptive behavior. During this process he must acknowledge e.g. the following: »What did I do? I annoyed my teacher. I ran around the classroom. I was being noisy. I was quarrelling with the person sitting next to me. I called out in class without putting my hand up first. I was rocking back and forth on my chair.«

Students who are not in possession of the necessary reading and writing skills at this stage are permitted to put a cross next to a series of pictograms. The next step requires the student to make suggestions for improving his learning and social behavior and to record these considerations in a plan laying out how he/she will return to class. Only by doing this will he/she be given permission to return to his/her class. When he/she does, he/she must present his/her completed plan to the teacher who has excluded him/her from the class. After considering what the student has written in his plan, the teacher will then decide whether the student is allowed to rejoin the lesson. If the student goes on to disrupt the class again, then the entire process is repeated.

If the student is sent to the training room three times in all, then his parents or guardians are summoned to the school for a training room meeting. This discussion will only take place during the training room's opening times. If a student refuses to enter the training room, he will be suspended from the school with immediate effect. He will only be allowed to return to the school once a training room meeting has taken place. If a student refuses to leave the school after he has been informed of his suspension, Balke (2003, pp. 41-42) recommends the police be called: they will then remove the student from the premises.

Numerous ministries and education authorities together with academics in their roles as political advisers (e.g., Klemm and Preuß-Lausitz, 2011, p. 105; Preuß-Lausitz 2011, p. 108) recommend the implementation of the TRP or comparable programs in inclusive schools in order to effectively implement the UN convention particularly in respect to students with emotional and social needs.

The purpose of this summative or outcome evaluation is to look at the results of the TRP, at the degree to which it accomplishes its specific goals, at the educational value and impact of the TRP, and what might point to changes that should be made in order to improve the program in subsequent implementations or when planning new programs and interventions. The objectives of this evaluation lie in the answers to the following questions: What is the impact on students with emotional and social needs? What is the overarching impact across the teaching and learning processes in a class? What is the impact on the teachers? What is the overarching impact across the broad culture of the school?

For methodological considerations, the author draws on the literature which evaluates education programs (Patton 2002; Wall 2014; Yarbrough et al., 2011). From these sources, the author has selected a »status design« to determine the current state of affairs regarding the TRP in German schools. The procedure used to collect data to answer the evaluation questions listed above included the following: A review and examination of all available material including the program descriptions and instructions which are currently in use, critical discussion papers by other authors (Goeppel 2002; Jornitz 2004; Pongratz 2010), radio broadcasts and television reports which have examined the program critically, and quantitative studies looking into the effectiveness of the TRP (Balz 2004; Wollenweber 2013).

Additionally, the author drew on qualitative data which he collected over several years at two schools which use the TRP by systematically observing the »training rooms« as well as the classes being taught at these schools, together with the participative observation of staff meetings. Furthermore, the author evaluated »focus groups« (Patton 2002, pp. 385-390) with teachers in the context of in-service training courses

which the author ran at various schools and across the various school types. Primary importance here was given to the »decision-making model«. Additionally, the author made use of the »transactional model« (e.g., Patton 2002, pp. 171-172), by involving people who had been directly affected by the TRP and by exploring their different perspectives.

The TRP evalution undertaken here has its theoretical basis in the disciplines of critical-constructivist education and teaching methodology, especially where Klafki (2007), in the German context, sourced and developed the philosophical ideas of the Enlightenment, the educational concepts of Classicism and the socio-critical currents of educational philosophy in the 20th century. Here, the educational ideal is aligned with the principle of responsible freedom in the Kantian sense.

Against this background, education signifies the ability of the students to act autonomously, to participate actively and to promote solidarity with others. In cases where children and adolescents come from unstable social environments, as is often the case with students with emotional and social needs, efforts to educate them must have an emancipatory character in order to increase their chances of social integration. A comparable approach has been developed in the United States under the heading »Teaching for Social Justice« (e.g., Michie 2004, 2009). It involves the creation of an enabling, empowering pedagogy which can address students' life situations, their cultural contexts, their social and economic upheavals, their life experiences and problems.

All this takes place on the basis of good educational relations and on the basis of a project-orientated and participative teaching methodology in the course of which students are actively involved in cooperative learning whilst participating in the design and development of the whole teaching and learning process. Klafki's work also includes these kinds of practical, educational approaches, as does the literature on inclusive education (e.g., Ainscow et al., 2006; Mastropieri and Scruggs, 2009).

A further theoretical point of reference in evaluating the TRP is provided by evidence-based knowledge in the field of education and teaching methodology for students with emotional, social and behavioral needs (e.g., Cole et al., 2013; Garner et al., 2014; Sailor et al., 2009;

Visser et al., 2012; Walker and Gresham, 2014). Any intervention which seeks to control a student's behavior must always be carefully considered to ensure that it is actually in keeping with the educational ideal described above. Foucault's (1995) critical discourse addressing the operational structures which are built into social institutions therefore represents an absolutely essential theoretical point of reference in this discussion paper (e.g., Pongratz, 2010).

What is the TRP's impact on students with emotional and social needs? Bründel and Simon do not specify what they understand by a good lesson. Balke (2003), in contrast, defines a good lesson in reference to Csikszentmihalyi (2008) as being one that »flows«, in which the students are completely and enthusiastically involved, and where they are immersed in the subject matter. Now, to safeguard the learning flow for the majority of the class, the one student who is obviously unable to find a point of access to this learning flow and so does something else, something unexpected and therefore disruptive, must leave the classroom. Having been separated from his/her class and sent to the training room, the student must think of reasons why he/she has been unable to find a way into the learning flow in which his/her classmates now find themselves.

But was it actually even possible for this supposedly disruptive student to find a point of access to the general learning flow of this class? Were the exercises and the material provided explained in a way that was appropriate for this student? Did the teacher really provide the necessary educational support? Was the educational relationship between the teacher and the student sufficient to make the student feel that the teacher was being encouraging and supportive? Did the teacher really invest the necessary care in adapting the material to the abilities of the student? Did the teacher make available active approaches to dealing with the material, as well as forms of cooperative learning and interaction with other students? Would it not have been more appropriate from the start to develop a learning flow which would have included all the students in the class? Did the teacher make every effort to identify what a learning flow might look like for this particular student?

In actual fact, the TRP seems to make the one student who is apparently not functioning in the class responsible for the failure of the lesson. It is this one student who must undergo a process of change and adapt to the prevailing conditions within which the teaching and learning process is taking place. The mechanisms of the TRP force the student to discipline himself (Jornitz 2004, p. 109). The world of the TRP simply does not take into account the complexity and interplay between the manifold conditions and factors existent in a teaching and learning context of this kind, where the conduct of the teacher is also of crucial importance. The following statement made by one of the teachers in the focus groups reflects this attitude: »Since we introduced the TRP I am very pleased to say that the students who used to be consistently disruptive in class have been forced to give up their disruptive behavior.«

If the student wishes to leave the training room again, he is forced into a state of »documented conformity« (Jornitz 2004, pp. 109-110). He is forced to acknowledge his disruptive behavior and then to put down his good intentions in writing in order to be granted permission to return to his class. Only by doing this can he escape the stigma of being the outsider. Even if the literature dealing with the TRP makes reference to a »negotiated return«, in reality the student has nothing to negotiate. Goeppel (2002, p. 52) sees the student's position as being downgraded to that of a »supplicant«. How honest and sustainable are the promises the student makes to improve his/her behavior when they are written down under duress in the training room?

Furthermore, the process of clarification takes place at one remove from the classroom, in an entirely different place. This approach will not provide any long-term solutions. Jornitz (p. 117) states that there will be a boomerang effect and the problem will come back again. This is because the teacher who excluded the student from the class in the first place should be involved in finding the solution.

A 14-year-old Roma boy with emotional and social difficulties was sent to the training room on dozens of occasions. The boy was aware of the fact that his parents had not previously attended a training room meeting and that they were unlikely to do so in the future. The reason

given by the boy's parents was that they did not have access to a vehicle which they would need to travel to the rather remote, rural school. Towards the end of the series of training room exclusions, the boy was suspended from his school for a six-week period because the parents continued their refusal to attend a training room meeting at the school. When the school's inspector responsible heard of the situation, he found himself in a dilemma. On the one hand he had approved the introduction of the TRP at that school, but on the other hand the long period of suspension to which the boy was to be subjected as a result of the TRP was not in accordance with the statutory regulations at schools which were in force at the time. The committee which was normally required to meet to discuss long periods of suspension had not done so, neither had it debated the case, neither had this statutory committee taken an official decision. The positions between the family and the school became increasingly entrenched. When the situation became deadlocked, the school's inspector decreed that the boy move to a school in the adjacent school district. A school that acts in such a manner is exhibiting a disregard for the human right to education (Kenworthy and Whittaker, 2000). A »culture of silence« comes into being (Gibson 2006). Voices, like that of the Roma boy, fall silent.

The Training Room Program claims it encourages students to take responsibility for themselves and freely take their own decisions. Any student whose behavior continues to be at variance with the rest of the class even following a warning by the teacher has, as far as the TRP model sees the situation, decided of his own free will to leave the classroom and go to the training room. It was his own decision to go (Bründel and Simon, 2003, p. 44). But are boys or young men with extremely problematic family backgrounds, where abuse is taking place and where the youngsters are traumatized etc., truly able to behave with such a high degree of responsibility and freely take decisions for themselves?

Claßen and Nießen (2006, p. 92), as well as Bründel and Simon (2007, p. 144) also recommend using the TRP in contexts where children with attention problems and hyperactivity are present. Claßen and Nießen in particular argue that the straightforward structure of the TRP and

the way in which it imposes order lowers the level of excitability among children suffering from ADHD. But can teachers really hold these children fully responsible for their behavior, considering the specific complexities of their conditions?

Claßen and Nießen (2006) are stigmatizing children and adolescents with emotional and social needs when they write on the back of their book: »Nobody should suffer from *antisocial* behavior.« In order to provide this group of young people with genuine opportunities for learning and personal development, this kind of deficit thinking must be dismantled (Garcia and Guerra, 2004). In this context, highly critical statements were voiced in the focus group containing teachers: »I don't get the impression that the students have very much respect for the idea of the TRP. But they know they have to adhere to its rules. Of course the TRP has meant that we have some quieter classroom sessions than we did in the past. But quite a bit of the communicative spontaneity and authenticity has been lost in our interactions with the students. Their relationship with us teachers is now more strategic and less open than it used to be. In the eyes of the students we have turned into technicians who are operating a machinery of power. Students who come from seriously problematic backgrounds simply do not understand what we are doing and why we are doing it.«

What is the TRP's impact across the teaching and learning processes in a class? Let us examine several statements voiced by teachers in one of the focus groups. One point of view that was aired on more than one occasion was the following: »Now that we have the TRP, the students have a clearer point of reference telling them what constitutes good classroom behavior«. But there was also a degree of concern, as we can see in the following statement which was made by another teacher: »The TRP directs the perceptions and thought processes of all students towards a model of conformity. The omnipresence of these rules and the constant feeling in the room that a disruptive classmate might be excluded from the class dominates the attentiveness of the students. If a child is rocking back and forth on their chair then other students immediately start looking demonstratively at the poster on the wall listing the

rules, reminding me by doing so of my responsibility to finally begin the questioning ritual which will get the errant student back on track. My old ideas about teaching are of no use to me any more as a specialist teacher. I have the feeling as though the whole student body has become conditioned since we introduced the TRP.«

The TRP has an impact across the entire teaching and learning process in a class because all of the students in a school with the TRP have one specific educational experience. They learn that those students who are not sufficiently in a position to adapt to the prevailing conditions in the teaching and learning process must leave the class in order to then subject themselves, outside the classroom, to a process of self-discipline. The students also observe that there is no deeper, fundamental educational consideration given to the processes at work in the classroom and the students' social experiences underlying them. The learning behavior expected from the students within the parameters of the TRP can be characterized as follows: »I am quiet and pay attention. I sit at my desk. I look to the front of the class and follow the lesson. When I wish to say something, I raise my hand« (Bründel and Simon, 2007, p. 99).

In the referential world of the TRP, the concept of movement which is integral to many educational games and cooperative, interactive forms of learning, no longer seems to exist. Bründel and Simon (2003, p. 29) portray a situation in which the necessary processes of clarification and consideration which arise in a more pedagogically orientated classroom actually run contrary to their conception of teaching in the sense of academic instruction. The achievements of German educational theory since the 1970s have been displaced, including independent, process-orientated, cooperative student-orientated and real-world-orientated learning in which students could be active in discovering new knowledge for themselves. There is no place here for student participation, student voice and empowerment projects (Nind et al., 2012; Robinson and Taylor, 2012; Scanlon 2012; Sellman 2009), just as there is no space in classroom teaching to address the children's particular social and cultural backgrounds from which their specific social, emotional and be-

havioral difficulties emerge in the first place (Michie 2004, 2009). Instead, the concepts of uniformity, conformity and discipline prevalent in the 1950s are being revived once again.

What is the TRP's impact on the teachers? In summarizing the main result of his empirical study, a survey of teachers, Balz (2004, p. 2) states that teachers find the TRP helpful. Bründel and Simon (2007, p. 151) use the results of Balz's study to underscore the positive effects of the TRP: »Teacher satisfaction with the program: 89%, reduction in classroom disruption: 82%, improvement in the quality of lessons: 72%, improvement in the classroom atmosphere: 73%.« These results are of limited validity. Simply asking the teachers in schools with the TRP about the program after a relatively short time-span certainly does not provide a comprehensive and conclusive picture.

In his empirical study on the effectiveness of the TRP, Wollenweber (2013) found neither positive effects on the behavior of the children nor any significant improvement for teachers. There was no reduction in the numbers of sick days taken by teachers, something which Bründel and Simon used in their argumentation to indicate teachers' exposure to high levels of stress. But there is no solid empirical evidence for the effectiveness of the TRP with regard to improvements in the work-related and social behavior of the students in the classroom.

Statements made by teachers in the focus groups suggest that the TRP can result in a hardening of teachers' attitudes: «I like being able to get rid of very disruptive students simply and easily. Unfortunately, our school runs an internal policy stating that only one student from any given class can be sent to the training room at any one time. But if things get a bit out of hand in the fifth or sixth lesson I just wait until the one student has returned from the training room with his plan before sending the next one there. Lots of working hours have been invested in the training room that are no longer available for creating small, differentiated study groups, and the colleagues just sitting there in the training room can also do something for their money.« Another teacher said: »Relations with my students have become more superficial and distant since we introduced the TRP. I am starting to see the students as objects. They

mean less to me emotionally than before. My attitudes have hardened. That's the only way I can serve the system. That is a loss.«

The TRP cannot result in long-term, durable improvements because it is based on a negative, deficient image of young people. Bründel and Simon (2003, p. 14) write that nowadays, in general, students lack expertise and a sense of responsibility and that young people have become used to blaming others for their own failures. The two authors use euphemistic phrases such as »the students do not know…«, »the students are unaware of…«, »the students have not learned to…«. The TRP channels the teachers' awareness in the direction of these deficits and the resulting breaches of school rules. In the end, the questioning ritual envisaged by the Training Room Program ends up governing the teacher's perceptions, thoughts and actions: »What are you doing? What does the rule state? How are you going to decide? If you disrupt the class again, what's going to happen then« (Bründel and Simon, 2007, p. 42)?

What is the TRP's impact across the broad culture of a school? Are the designers of the Training Room Program really interested in freedom? This seems highly questionable when reading the profoundly self-contradictory Eisenhower quotation which the authors use to elucidate the management principles which form the basis of the TRP: »Leadership is the art of getting someone else to do something you want done because he wants to do it« (Bründel and Simon, 2013, p. 15). Surprisingly, Bründel and Simon (2003, p. 134) claim that the Training Room Program is »thoroughly steeped in humanist thinking« even though freedom and humanism are very strongly related. Let us read a statement on this subject by a teacher in one of the focus groups: »I am pleased we adopted the TRP. Now we can take really decisive action. Now we've finally got rid of that damned freedom-orientated education. I always hated having to negotiate with the students. Now the focus has returned to the class subject and it was about time after the PISA-shock!«

It seems to be rather more the case that the conception of the human being in the TRP literature is that of someone who needs to be externally controlled and moulded into shape by the mechanisms within social institutions. It is the very same, pessimistic image of human beings being

driven by their desires and instincts that we find in the works of Machiavelli and Hobbes, where only strong state institutions are in a position to control people of this kind and keep them in check. But are we entitled to limit freedom in the name of freedom? Pongratz (2010, p. 63) therefore sees the TRP as the practice of »governmental punishment«. For Jornitz (2004, p. 106), the TRP's attitude to the subject of freedom seems like the »overdoor to a re-education camp«.

Hence, when the TRP was introduced into the school where another of our focus-group teachers was working, his reactions to the changes in his school culture were correspondingly negative: »The change in the culture of my school was a really difficult time for me. A large group of teachers who up to that point had really been instrumental in the formation of the school's climate of learning thanks to their project-orientated, attachment pedagogy, were pensioned off. Then a new, younger generation arrived and immediately began installing the TRP. They managed to establish a majority and get the principal on board too. Many of the middle generation teachers who had always found it hard to engage pedagogically with challenging students seemed to get a new lease on life. They suddenly started striding down the corridors with an entirely new sense of self-confidence.«

The bureaucratisation and archiving of personal data which goes hand in hand with running this program must also be critically examined. The TRP produces a potpourri of referral forms, self-evaluation questionnaires, students' plans for returning to their classes, and minutes taken during the discussions documenting the allegedly disruptive behavior of the students and how they intend to improve it. All of these documents are archived and serve as the basis for whatever actions are taken subsequently (Balke 2003, p. 87; Bründel and Simon, 2003, pp. 109 and 189). If we take recourse to Foucault's (1995) critical discourse, the generation of knowledge about individuals in the context of social institutions, and the generation of power, are very closely interconnected here.

The TRP requires all teachers in a school to be involved in the program in equal measure and to collaborate in its implementation (Bründel and Simon, 2003, p. 193). The program does not envisage individual

approaches by single teachers. Of course, any one teacher can decide not to send his students to the training room, but if the duty roster determines that it is that teacher's turn to supervise the training room, then he has to carry out this duty whether he wants to or not. In a school which the author studied at close quarters over a period of two years, one teacher refused to carry out the task of supervising the training room because the program did not correspond with his pedagogical values. This resulted in him being forcibly transferred to another school district.

At another specialized school which the author studied, again over two years, one teacher reported the following: »A seven-year-old boy was brought to me crying and shouting in the training room by his class teacher. He crawled under the desk and cowered there. It seemed to me to be neither possible nor sensible to talk to the student about him writing out a plan detailing how he wanted to return to the class. Instead, I asked the boy about his interests. I waited. The boy stopped sobbing, stuck his head out and looked at me inquisitively. Then he told me about his interest in airports and of matters aeronautical. I suggested he draw an airport on the board in chalk. As he was drawing, the seven-year-old commented on his picture and I was impressed by his enormous expertise on the subject. I asked him questions about what he was drawing, whereupon he went into even greater detail on the subject. When the class teacher collected the boy at the end of the lesson, I presented him to her without any written self-evaluation and with no plan for his return to the classroom. She reported this to the school principal who then issued me with an official warning for undermining the school rules.«

In cases where teachers refuse to implement the TRP, Claßen and Nießen (2006, p. 32) seek to return them to the general path adopted by their colleagues by removing their recourse to the disciplinary measures which were previously enshrined in the statutory regulations for such situations. In particular, it is no longer possible to convene a meeting of the class committee consisting of the allegedly problematic child, his parents, the elected representative of the parents in the class, the elected representative of the school, the teachers concerned and often the school principal as well. The aim of this committee is to discuss the alleged

problematic behavior of the student and to explore potential solutions. This committee can order a student's temporary suspension from the school or decide upon other disciplinary measures as laid down in the statutory regulations. It is important to note here that the participation of the school's and the parents' elected representatives provides a safeguard against any arbitrary decision-making by the school staff.

In contrast, the TRP operates outside the statutory regulations. Many schools in Germany have stopped working with attachment pedagogy. At the same time, these schools are making no effort to apply the knowledge base which currently exists internationally in the field with regard to the promotion of children's emotional and social development at school and in the classroom. Instead, they are reverting back to the principle of confrontation. They are practicing a rigid, punitive and paramilitary form of education (Herz 2012). These schools also readily adopt the TRP into their program. The »friendliness« which Bründel and Simon (2003, p. 50) continue to recommend no longer has a part to play in this process. On the contrary, the direction that education is now taking is being dictated by Ferrainola's principle of intervention which was practiced at the Glen Mills Schools for adolescents and which was predicated on *breaking their will*.

The author (Broecher 2016) has evaluated extensive qualitative data from a similar school: »Here, everybody is free to do what I want« is printed on a card on the door to the principal's office. The (female) principal stated assertively: »Here, everybody is helped, if necessary against their will.« A teacher at the school reported the following: »I already told you about my colleague, Mrs. Brandl, who sent one of her students, Nico, to me in the training room where he was supposed to stand on a piece of pink blotting paper for 40 minutes. As the teacher on duty, I was supposed to supervise this. After Mrs. Brandl had gone, I asked the student to sit down. I talked to him about the reasons that lay behind his being here and how he came to be in Schwarzegg. We also talked about his life situation at home. In the end he said to me: ›Nobody has ever talked to me like this at this school. When I came here to this school, my

parents and I thought that they'd be able to help me. But you don't get help here. For most people it just makes things worse.‹‹

In the context of a school culture like this one, the TRP becomes an instrument of dehumanization. Blunders of this kind reveal that something fundamental is missing from the program, namely a positive conception of human beings, a code of ethics, a pedagogical philosophy into which it is clearly written that the young people who attend a school might expect to receive truly respectable and seriously well-intentioned educational support, and not this kind of chicanery. Because the TRP itself circumvents the values of freedom and veracity, it is itself highly susceptible to corruption.

Apparently, the inclusion of students with emotional and social difficulties is to be furthered by schools reverting back to the old methods of exclusion, albeit temporary. Following the closure of ever more specialist special-needs schools, a new location must be found, away from the classroom, where disruptive students can be sent and where they will be subjected to some kind of special treatment. This place is called the »training room«. An idea is being revived from the time of segregated special education (Mousley et al., 1993) which was thought to have become obsolete long ago. The »cycle of exclusion« (Razer et al., 2013) which encompasses teachers and students alike therefore continues to exist. Old patterns of thinking are sustained. Those students who are unable to achieve the degree of conformity expected in the classroom are required to leave in order to practice their conformity outside the classroom.

This interconnection between formal inclusion and interior exclusion (Hodkinson 2012) must be called into question. Bründel and Simon (2007, p. 9) are convinced that the TRP arrived on the scene in German schools just at the right moment: »… at a time when a paradigm shift was taking place in education and psychology, away from the illusion that a teacher had to endure everything and that a school was a place where everyone should feel at ease« (Bründel and Simon, 2007, p. 9). Nevertheless, questions remain as to whether the TRP is an appropriate mechanism for fostering responsible, self-regulated behavior, because

autonomy, self-determination and co-determination by the students is simply omitted.

The conceptual world of the TRP sees the students as objects, not as subjects with their own experiences and viewpoints. Any school which installs the TRP runs the risk of becoming a »disabling school« (Jauhiainen and Kivirauma, 1997) in which the processes of dehumanization (Malacrida 2005) can easily gain the upper hand. Why has the TRP become so widespread in Germany in particular, and not in other European countries, or in the United States? The reason might lie in the two parallel historical strands which have driven German pedagogical thinking and actions in the past. By making reference to Merseburger's (2005) Weimar studies, we can trace these two developmental strands back to the polar opposites of »mind« and »power«. In the »mind« category we would find Anna Amalia, Johann Wolfgang von Goethe and Friedrich von Schiller. In contrast, the concentration camp situated on the Ettersberg in direct proximity to Weimar would represent the »power« category: the mechanised, organised, bureaucratised, insensate subjugation and elimination of any deviations from the norm.

Education as shaped by the humanities has ceased to exist wherever the TRP has been implemented in schools. Gone are the educational traditions which were rooted in Classicism and the Enlightenment on the one hand, and in the socio-critical discourse of Adorno, Horkheimer, Fromm and Marcuse through to Habermas and Honneth on the other. Instead of entering into a process of self-reflection with students in the classroom, the new school environment, under the inauspicious influence of the TRP, produces conformity and a »pathology of normality« (Fromm 2011). The »mechanics of power« (Foucault 2001), as constructed and implemented by the TRP, forces all those teachers who still abide by their deeper pedagogical beliefs which are based on the principle of freedom, into a position of protest (to the point of being forcibly transferred!) or silence. Control and subjugation, including that of the teachers themselves, have become the dominant principles.

Perceived disruptions in the educational practice of teaching and learning in school can also serve as the wellspring for deeper cognitive

processes when teachers understand how to address and work through the events that take place in their classrooms, together with the social and cultural processes which underlie them. After all, all students have much to learn from this kind of approach to teaching and education and, guided by a spirit of cognitive curiosity in the classroom, there is good reason to believe that students' destructive behavior will decline and their constructive behavior will increase, together with the inclusive energy of the entire school community. In cases in which children's and adolescents' emotional and social development is particularly vulnerable, it is imperative to create a good, stable educational bond; to give careful consideration to engaging with their emotional and social needs; to arrange an appropriate learning environment and to develop an appropriate teaching methodology (Boorn et al., 2010; Broecher 2015 a; Cooper 2011; Doyle 2003; Popp et al., 2011).

All of these points can be supported by teachers' interventions to direct and stabilize student behavior which already exist in the form of School-wide Positive Behavior Support (Broecher 2015 b; Hill and Brown, 2013; Sailor et al., 2009), interprofessional work (e.g., O'Connor 2013), family participation (e.g., Lewis 2009; Sheldon and Epstein, 2002) and community work (e.g., Klein 2000). It is upon this basis that concepts need to be explored for the professional development of teachers who have been in the school system for a longer period and who now find themselves confronted with the inclusion of students with emotional and social difficulties (e.g., Lane et al., 2014; Naraian et al., 2012) so that they no longer see the need to reach for a time-out model of such questionable efficacy as the Training Room Program.