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Abstract of Study

This study conceptualises and evidences the role of the emotions in the language of teaching and learning. It fills a gap in educational theory which had arisen from the fact that although there is considerable evidence to show that the emotional state of learners influences their achievement in schools, there has up to now been no way of understanding the how emotions actually affect the mechanisms of classroom discourse.

The study presents the following argument:

It reviews the different research perspectives which can contribute to our understanding of the role of the emotions in the language of teaching and learning. It assesses the strengths of these perspectives and identifies the common ground between them. It then assesses their limitations (in terms of the aims of this study). This points the way for new theory to develop. It looks at the interdependent nature of the relationship between cognitive and emotional development. Understanding the limitations of these perspectives along with an appreciation of this interdependency enables a development of Vygotskian theory (the theory which underpins all the perspectives examined) in order that the role of the emotions in the language of teaching and learning may be understood.

Vygotskian and neo-Vygotskian concepts are then reinterpreted and expanded in order that the role of the emotions can be shown. It is argued that the zone of proximal development is better seen as three dimensional model, where cognition, culture and emotion create each other. This is shown by highlighting the emotional dimension of internalisation, self-regulation and scaffolding, and showing how this emotional dimension is interdependent from the cognitive dimension in these concepts.

Viewing the ZPD in this way allows a fuller appreciation of the relationship between social context and individual in development. It also makes it a more practically applicable model, as is shown when the emotional dimensions of various aspects of classroom discourse are examined and illustrated from practice. This is done by reconceptualising the concepts of action and behaviour and by showing, through the development of theory with reference to practical examples, that the emotional dimension of the language of teaching and learning is an influential factor in the nature of classroom discourse and academic achievement.

Finally the implications of this reconceptualisation are considered. These include the argument that this study allows a more psychosocial perspective on classroom events to be developed than has been possible up to now.
CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

Section 1: Personal background to the study

When I was in the latter stages of my PGCE year, and I mentioned to my tutors that I had applied for a teaching post at a unit for children with emotional and behavioural difficulties (EBD), they were very discouraging. 'Career death,' said one. 'Messy,' said the other. The jury is still out on the first comment, but the second was, I can say for sure, the *mot juste*. In the nine years since then I have come (at least, on my better days) to be able to cope with the mess of teaching children with emotional and behavioural problems. Mess ('a mixture disagreeable to the sight or taste: disorder: embarrassment: confusion: a bungle [Chambers 1989]) has been a regular feature of my professional life since that first post. Anyone who has taught in such a school for a while and who wishes to remember the messes of their early years (to which they in all likelihood made a significant contribution) will know that it is not easy to deal with. Arguments, disruptions, loss of temper, the constant threat of and occasional manifestations of violence can all take their toll. But it is more than that. The lack of clarity and logic are disorienting. Children who work hard to excel themselves, only to rip their work up on completion; others who can never get past their first imperfection. Children who will not sit down long enough to understand what it is they are being asked to do (and then complain that you didn’t tell them), others who don’t want to make any moves at all. Some will not stop talking, others will not utter a word. The enthusiastically planned lessons plans that are rejected outright, or worse, rushed through and minimised to the point where they are no longer recognisable. The knowledge that no matter how much you think you have modified your plans to take their ideas and interests into account, you still risk being wrong due to a mood, an over-reaction or some other unidentifiable factor. The foul language, the sexism, racism and the homophobia, and above all the constant bickering. Short cuts to easier classroom management are on offer: dismissing those who fail to take
your advice, or bullying them into taking it, might keep things a little less messy, but neither strategy will help their already low self-esteem. And the most tiring aspect about this mess is that no matter how much you feel the victim of it, the onus is on you to begin the cleaning up process.

However, all is not gloom and doom. Over the years I have learnt to recognise that there are certain patterns within this disorder. These children are all different, but they do have certain things in common. There are certain groups and sub-groups. And whereas it may be disorientating to realise for the first time that a child is more comfortable with failure and chaos than success and order, to see this in several children allows one to develop a sense of order. It becomes a trend, something which can be accepted and even predicted.

Another thing that I have learnt that encourages a sense of order is that there are always reasons for the behaviours which create the mess, and that whilst they may not be immediately apparent, they are always there if you look for them. Home visits, student records, and research all point to the fact that these children are not, however much it may seem to be the case, acting illogically. There are reasons behind their seeming unreasonableness. They have in their histories experiences such as traumas of separation, bereavement, abuse, neglect, poverty, and learning difficulties which can lead them to the point where they act against their own good.

A sense of order can also be gained from the response that the children receive from their teachers. It is possible to reduce, if not entirely eliminate, the mess. For example, I have learned that it is vital to find something in a child to like if you are to teach them with any hope of success. I have also learned strategies which can minimise the mess and maximise the order, and the fact that these work most of the time shows me that the mess is, in the end, an illusion, and that just as it is possible to find out the reasons behind the seemingly irrational acts of one of these children, so it is possible to do the same to them as a group.

Although teaching this sector of the population has been demanding, one of the reasons I have stuck with it is the sense of exploration that the job entails. Every new child is a challenge to look beyond the behaviour and find who the person is. And
this exploration also takes place on a general level: the question of how we are to think of these children has always accompanied my professional life, and it has been one of the driving forces behind my own studies and research, to which I turn now.

**Development of theory**

In the face of any temptation to dismiss disruptive children, it is important to hold onto the idea that the mess they make might not actually be a mess; it might be a collection of factors the order of which has yet to be discovered. In the nine years I have been teaching these children, I have not been able to come across a book, speaker or course that has been able to make this discovery for me. Certain voices along the way have been of partial use, of course, but events in the EBD classroom have remained impervious to a coherent and comprehensive analysis. This study is an attempt to remedy this gap in our understanding. In doing so, it has had to find a new way of looking at what happens not just in classrooms where there are students with emotional difficulties, but in any classroom where there are emotions present – that is to say, all of them.

This study, then, had a very personal starting point. In my efforts to make sense of the mess in my classroom, I naturally started to develop speculations, hunches and ideas; in other words I began to theorise. This study is the result of the development and formalisation of that theory. Verma and Mallick (1999, p.5) define theory as implying a set of statements describing and explaining the relationship between human behaviour and the factors that affect or explain it. That is exactly what I wanted to do.

This study builds an argument for a new theory. It shows a way of conceptualising the role of the emotions in the language of teaching and learning. It does not chart in full detail the story of the development of that theory. Whilst it does wherever possible explain the origin of the ideas introduced in it, it is not specific about the precise chronological order of their genesis. It does not detail, for example, when I started to look beyond the boundaries of the classroom for children with emotional difficulties, and realised that I was looking at all teaching and learning, i.e. when the ethnographic study of a sub-culture became a reconceptualisation of general theory.
The reason this narrative is not made explicit is partly lack of space, but also it is because the passage from mess to coherent theory was not a smooth, linear one. It involved holding partially formed personal ideas up against established theories, and relating these to practice. At other times the process was reversed, or changed. Initially, I set out with a sense of this being a ‘normal’ piece of research. I did my literature review with clear aims in mind, and I had collected my data. But there was such a poverty of instruments for measuring and analysing what I wanted to measure and analyse that in the end I have not produced a normal piece of research. Rather I have developed the theoretical rationale for the conceptual model upon which future research can be based.

Section 2: General Introduction: emotions, language and learning- an underexplored relationship

This section introduces the focus of the study, the relationship between the emotions, language and learning, by looking at them from several perspectives.

i) The intuitive perspective

There are several aspects of the relationship between the emotions and the language of teaching and learning which seem fairly obvious intuitive starting points for more rigorous investigation.

For example, it seems acceptable to say that acts of learning engender certain emotional states; success in learning, whether it is a developing expertise or a specific achievement, brings with it more positive emotions, whereas failure tends to bring with it less positive feelings.

Though perhaps less commonly accepted, it is not outside the realms of plausibility to turn around this relationship and say that while learning can engender certain emotions, different emotions can encourage or hinder learning too. The idea that a child who feels happy and positive about life will generally perform better than if he or she is anxious, fearful, or depressed is one that seems to make intuitive sense.
Still on an intuitive level, the idea that emotions and language are closely connected is also fairly easy to accept. For example, most people are able to convey complex messages about how they feel about things through many different aspects of language, such as grammar, intonation, and vocabulary, and these messages can be consciously or unconsciously transmitted.

ii) The perspective from my own practice
I include this perspective here because I want to show the context in which my own personal theories began to take shape. There is no one incident which typifies all others, of course, but the following incident shows the dilemma teachers can face when trying to teach a child with emotional and behavioural difficulties:

Field Notes 26/4/99

I taught a lesson to Year 9a which I felt quite clearly showed the three dimensions of the zone of proximal development. The aim was largely a cognitive one. It was an English lesson, and I took in several exotic fruits and foods for the students to taste and describe, the objective being that they would push at the boundaries of their vocabulary, and start developing some material for use in a poem.

The aim of this lesson was largely met; the students enjoyed the tasting, they behaved well, staying on task well (if only because of the promise of more food if they behaved), and in subsequent lessons they composed their thoughts into some rather good poems such as ‘Ode to a pineapple’ and ‘In praise of cinder toffee’. They showed creativity in their language which pleased me, and they were proud of their efforts.

However, there were several incidents which showed the influence of both cultural and emotional factors.

Firstly, the most glaring cultural factor hit me when I handed the first food out. I asked the students to describe it (sections of fresh pineapple) using words beyond the usual ‘nice’ etc. They were puzzled by this request, so I
encouraged them to copy the style of the presenters of food and drink programmes on the TV. I modelled this for them, but was met with blank stares by most of the students. Those who had seen such programmes condemned the presenters as ‘gay’ and would have nothing to do with their style of using language. I realised that such programmes may not be part of their cultural background.

Secondly, the emotional factors. Children with emotional difficulties are by reputation less willing to try new experiences, bad at recognising their own emotional state and their feelings and senses (obviously in this case, taste). They are also poor carers of themselves, and they are comparatively poor at treating themselves; presumably this is something to do with their low self-esteem. All of these factors came through when I sat down next to a boy who informed me that he did not like pineapple (though he had never tried it) or indeed any fruit at all. He found it difficult to think of a food that he did like but eventually came up with a sausage roll. But, he informed me, he couldn’t write about eating it because he never thought about eating it, he just ate it. I tried to draw his feelings out, but this was difficult. Eventually I asked him how he felt when his teeth were going through the soft warm flaky pastry (a fair bit of scaffolding was going on here!) on a cold day when he had been outside all day with nothing to eat. ‘I dunno, I never eat them warm, I just get it from the fridge and eat it straight from the pack’. I could sense this talk was frustrating him, that he’d rather just give it up. And I felt that, in order for this discourse to produce a successful outcome, I had to lower my ambitions for him, that I was asking too much. I could picture a household where little care was taken over food, or over causing pleasure to each other in general. This last bit may be mistaken conjecture, but if I was right, then it seems to me this is a situation where emotional and cultural factors are not only inseparable from one another but impinge upon engagement in the lesson, and therefore upon academic performance.
iii) Research perspectives

The third point of view from which I want to consider the relationship between emotions, language and learning is more formal, and that is comments from respected researchers on the role of the emotions. Woods (1996) maintains that effective teaching has an 'emotional heart' and cites Hargreaves who represents this emotional heart as 'desire':

[Desire is] imbued with 'creative unpredictability' and 'flows of energy'... In desire is to be found the creativity and spontaneity that connects teachers emotionally ... to their children, their colleagues and their work. Such desires among particularly creative teachers are for fulfilment, intense achievement, senses of breakthrough, closeness to fellow humans, even love for them ... Without desire, teaching becomes arid and empty. It loses its meaning (1994, p.12, cited in Woods, 1996, p.26)

Woods goes on to say that teaching without emotion will be inadequate as long as both teachers and pupils are human beings (1996, p. 27)

Such thoughts may chime with our intuitions, and may seem inspirational (they certainly do to me), but their inclusion of so many abstract concepts makes them difficult to situate in formal research. Good theories are built on facts, sound evidence and previous research evidence, and not on mere speculation (Verma and Mallick 1999, p.7). We need a more formal approach to the subject under focus.

There is some research that can contribute to our knowledge of certain aspects of the interrelationships between these three factors. For instance Bloom (1993) shows that the emotions play a large role in infant language acquisition, and that the meaning we attach to each new word includes how we feel about the signified object or concept. And, as this study will show, there has been much partial exploration of this area. Different disciplines, including neurological, psychological, sociocultural and linguistic, have charted aspects of the relationship between emotions, language and cognitive development. For example, Bloom (1993, p. 158) summarises the psychological perspective thus:
The results of this research [into cognition, emotion and language]...especially in the last decade, have shown how emotion and cognition influence each other. On the one hand, we know how an individual appraises the situation in relation to goals and plans can lead to experiencing different emotions.... On the other hand different emotional states and moods can either enhance or inhibit such cognitive activity as recall from memory and problem solving. People tend to perform tasks better when they are feeling good than when they feeling bad, and the kinds of material they can recall can also be influenced by the mood they are in.

There is, however, the problem of how this relationship manifests itself in language. Bloom continues:

However, the relationship between emotion and language, which is itself a part of cognition, has barely been touched on.

Until now, the map charting the relationship between cognition, emotion and language has remained tentative and incomplete, and a consequence of this has been that, as the literature review in this study will show, this has led to a dilemma in the theory and practice of education. It is the dilemma that faced me in the poetry lesson described above, and it is one that faces all teachers. It is this dilemma which this study sets out to solve. The dilemma is this: teachers have no conceptual framework for understanding how their students' emotions influence the discourse of their classrooms. What they do have is on the one hand research which looks at the discourse of the classroom in terms of how meanings are made and the consequent cognitive outcomes, where the emotions are largely ignored, and on the other hand they have research which affirms the considerable influence of the emotions in learning and development but which gives little clue as to the mechanisms of discourse through which these factors take effect.

This lack of a comprehensive coherent conceptual framework may seem rather surprising, and it is worth pausing for a moment to explore possible explanations for this lack, because they have a bearing on the content, style and structure of this report.
There are two parts to this explanation. The first part concerns the status of the emotions as a focus of study. Donaldson (1996, p.342) claims that they have not been considered ‘in the same league as the intellect’, and ‘the very idea that emotion can be genuinely on a par with rational thought has not been taken seriously’. The emotions are, in the educational field at least, a somewhat neglected area of study.

Over the last century, however, the citadel of reason, especially with reference to human development, has been eroded as we have come to give greater credence to the ways in which other aspects of our development live alongside or integrate with our capacity for reason. The growth of psychology, to take perhaps the most obvious example, has opened up ways of appreciating and understanding our emotional lives, and we have developed tools with which we can begin to understand that significant emotional events can shape the ways that people think and communicate. So in one sense this study can be seen as an extension of that trend, a further integration of the studies into the rational and the non-rational aspects of development and learning.

Closely linked with the low status of the emotions as focus of study, is the second part to the explanation as to why there has been this gap in our understanding of their relationship to language and learning, and that is the paucity of the analytical tools we have developed to be able to incorporate them fully into research. Donaldson (ibid.) suggests that it is our lack of a theoretical framework with which to understand the emotions that has kept their status in research low. However, it is also conceivable that the cause might also be the effect; that their low status has impeded the development of such a conceptual framework. Whichever the case may be, the result is clear, as Woods (1996, p. 77) states:

Much has been missed in the use of conventional methods particularly in the area of emotions and feelings, atmospheres, climates, moods and tones. Customary academic writing is unable to reach these areas.

It will therefore cause no surprise to say that this study does not adhere totally to ‘conventional methods’ in its charting of the relationship of the emotions to the language of teaching and learning. So before the study itself is reported, the
methodology of the study needs to be addressed in order to make clear these unconventional aspects, in order that the report can be read with greater ease. However, it is to the aims we turn to first.

**Section 3: Aims of the study**

The study's aims can be encapsulated in the following questions:

- How do the emotions impact upon the discourse of teaching and learning?
- How can the relationship between the emotions, language and cognitive development be conceptualised?

**Section 4: Methodology**

**Early research, and how this study evolved**

The initial impetus for this study was to look at what was going on in classrooms such as mine, where there were children with definite emotional problems. I started by simply tape-recording the interactions of classrooms in my school. The aim at this stage was to be able to isolate instances of interaction where it was the participants' emotions which were the primary factors shaping that interaction. I was not clear about exactly what these instances were like. Moreover, I was not entirely comfortable with the fact that such instances may present the teachers who were kindly recording their lessons for me in a negative light; it may be that such instances were due to a failure on their part to show an understanding of their students' approaches to the interactions.

After a few weeks of recording and/or observing lessons, I had approximately forty hours of lessons recorded on tape. I had also recorded some of my own lessons because I wanted to see if there was anything to be gained from having the 'inside
knowledge' of my own intentions. I also felt that if I were to be critical of these teachers, then I should put own practice under scrutiny too.

I spent several days listening and re-listening to these tapes, trying to isolate moments when emotions were to the fore in the classroom discourse. There were instances where children's fears or anger seemed to be predominant, but overall I was surprised at how difficult these instances were to find. This was rather worrying at the time. I began to be concerned that what I had set out to find was either not there or not identifiable. In the end, however, accepting this state of things was the beginning of the study as it is presented here. Although there were few incidents of 'pure emotion' the whole discourse was, I knew from experience, palpably different to discourses that were typically to be found in mainstream classes. These children were more difficult to teach, the pace of their learning was slower, and the teachers were having to do a lot of supporting in ways teachers in mainstream classes were not expected to. The key to this study, then, was the realisation that (obvious though it sounds now to say it) emotions in this or any discourse are not confined to odd moments of disruption or excitement, but are with us all the time. For the teachers I had recorded, the emotional difficulties of their students were a factor which has to be constantly taken into account. They were part of the discourse, the context, of each word spoken. Elsewhere I chart how these conclusions were arrived at on a theoretical level, but listening to these tapes (I now realise), I came to a very similar conclusion on a practical level.

This realisation was very liberating. Instead of looking for isolated incidents, and going down the torturous road of trying to prove the existence of specific emotions in specific interchanges, I could now look at classroom discourse on a more general level. Furthermore, I could shift my focus away from the essentially negative incidents of where the process of learning and teaching break down in classroom discourse to consideration of all the other times where teachers and learners are working together, getting things right. Finally, this shift in approach to looking at more general, fundamental aspects of discourse on a practical level provided a clearer link to theoretical considerations.

The interactions presented in this study are taken largely from those original recordings that I started out from. Having listened to them so much, I knew that there was more than enough material for me to use to illustrate the points I would be developing. This change in direction did lead me to go into mainstream classrooms,
to get a point of reference, but mainly to test out for myself the theory that if the
emotions are present in any interaction I should be able to highlight them in any
classroom or situation of teaching and learning. This was more than amply borne out.
I also went back to several of the teachers that I had originally recorded to ask them to
clarify certain things that they said.

Overview of methods used

This study reconceptualises educational theory in order that this theory can take into
account the emotional aspects of the language of teaching and learning. It does this
by juxtaposing current theory with practice, juxtaposing different theoretical
perspectives, and developing a new perspective by re-examining Vygotskian and neo-
Vygotskian concepts. This new perspective is grounded in and applied to the
practicalities of classroom teaching, through the use of examples from actual teacher-
student interactions.

As previously stated, this study underwent a substantial change early on in its
development. It started out as an exploration of classroom discourse in a school for
children with emotional and behavioural difficulties. I tape-recorded lessons,
interviewed teachers and pupils, and I did the same in a primary school. I made field
notes of events in my own classroom. Running alongside this collecting of data was
my literature review, which was aimed at finding out what knowledge there was
which could underpin my study.

On both fronts, however, I soon ran into problems. I could not find any directly
relevant literature, and nor could I find any useful tools with which to analyse my
data. It was literally a case of sitting listening to hours of recordings, and asking
myself in what way these were different to dialogues where the learners do not have
emotional problems. As soon as I tried to answer that question, I would find myself
running up against the problem that basic terminology used to describe the
components of the discourse were unsuitable for my purposes. For example, I
thought about the children’s attitude to the task they were engaged with. The concept
of ‘task’, as I was using it, was defined as what the teacher wanted the pupils to do:
write a poem, do a maths worksheet etc. However, it became clear that if I was to
make any headway analysing the emotions of the discourse, a new perspective on such a concept would have to be found. I needed to conceptualise ‘task’ from the individual child’s point of view. Sitting in on some lessons, I began to realise that the task is not the same for each child. Different children could have different objectives to complete or different hurdles to overcome, even though ostensibly they were all engaged in the same activity as defined by the teacher’s lesson plan. Pleasing the teacher, getting through the work as quickly as possible, obstructing others, using the time given as a time to chat, were just some of the many objectives I saw. The hurdles included sitting still long enough to hear what the teacher wanted the pupils to do, and coping with not being the centre of someone’s attention for a while.

As I began to redefine the components of the discourse, so I began to look at models of teaching and learning, and to see in what way they might need redefining. Slowly it dawned on me that the problems I had had at the start of my study were to do with the fact that there was no underlying theoretical rationale for the study I had undertaken. I began to look at the literature more critically, in terms of trying to identify what were the limitations of the approaches to the analysis of emotions and the discourse of teaching and learning. To bring the philosophical assumptions underpinning this literature into relief, I went back to the works of Vygotsky, whose theories on thought and language provide the foundation for so much of the literature I was reviewing.

This step onto such a theoretical level was one of the defining moments of this study, because I discovered that Vygotsky had a surprising amount to say on the role of the emotions in relation to cognitive development and language. It seems that somehow, in the development and elaboration of his theories, other researchers have edged the emotions into relative obscurity. I found this discovery very exciting. Not only could I look back on the literature I had reviewed and the data I had collected and realise that my problems had been due to a lack of an analytical framework, but I could now also look forward, and say what the nature of this framework could and should be. By using and extending Vygotskian and neo-Vygotskian concepts, I could integrate the concepts from the fields of study I had reviewed which up until now had seemed disparate.
The only other potential sticking point was the inclusion of emotions in research. For a while at the start of the study I wondered how I could represent such a concept through a medium that essentially relies on rationality for its claim to objectivity. However, the more I moved towards a theoretical reconceptualisation, the less the question presented itself. This is discussed in the first of the following methodological considerations.

Methodological Considerations

i) Objectivity

As has already been suggested, studies such as this which explore the emotions can set conventional methodological alarm bells ringing. For example, the question arises of how can emotions be identified and made available to analysis with an acceptable degree of objectivity?

The short answer is they cannot. ‘Objective’ implies matters of fact rather than of opinion (Vogt 1993, p.157), and where emotions are concerned, rational means for deducing facts are insufficient. They can help us with broad generalities about the emotions (such as ‘people who smile are feeling happy’) but they are inadequate by themselves for the identification of specific emotions in specific contexts. For such purposes we tend to use other means, such as our ability to empathise. Unfortunately, empathy, laden as it is with the bias of the individual’s own previous emotional experiences, is not an objective research tool.

Identifying and analysing emotions, then, involves an interpretative leap which seems to involve relinquishing the claim to objectivity. There is no certain way of locating a specific emotion; even the person experiencing an emotion cannot be assumed to be a reliable guide.

However, the picture is not as pessimistic as would first appear. This interpretative leap is a process we are all familiar with, if not always good at in everyday life, and without becoming too embroiled in a methodological debate over the existence of objectivity, it is possible to argue that this report has an acceptable degree of
objectivity within it. Vogt's initial definition of objectivity (1993, p.157) as relating to 'matters of fact rather than opinion' was incomplete. He goes on to say that, 'In practice, objectivity boils down to the level of consensus'. This is especially true in fields such as education, where ontological or procedural objectivity are considered by some as invalid goals anyway. This study does not set out to use a method which eliminates personal judgement (Eisner 1993, p.50). It recognises that part of the assessment of emotions inevitably entails a personal judgement, and argues that there are ways of living with this, methodologically speaking. The first way is to make recognition of this fact explicit, which is what this argument has just done of course. Secondly, this study takes a cautious route in its presentation of the emotions, relying on examples which entail interpretative leaps which have a high degree of probability attached to them. The sense of objectivity within this study, in other words, comes from the high degree of feasibility of the examples given, which should engender a corresponding level of consensus. 'True' objectivity, in the most rational sense, is not the aim here, and this admission is at the same time the methodological weakness and strength of this report. It is a weakness because from a totally rational perspective the data cannot be deemed totally valid. Yet it is also a strength because if one perceives the notion of objectivity as the limitations of an overly rational approach, then to consciously loosen one's claim to such a goal by redefining the terms of the objectivity one is aiming for means that one is free to increase the scope of one's research into the richness of the experience of learning and being taught. As Hirst (1993, p.150) argues,

The explanation of human activities in an area like education involves not only the sciences, including the social sciences, but also matters of beliefs and values.

There are a few occasions in this report where interpretations of emotions are presented which the reader may find difficult to accept easily at face value. These are usually when teachers' opinions are given. For example a teacher may interpret a seeming act of aggression as a sign of anxiety. In these cases, the validity of the research does not depend on whether the reader can accept at face value the interpretation being made. The accuracy of the interpretation is less important than
the fact that an interpretation is being made and that this interpretation is an influencing factor on how the teacher acts and shapes the discourse in their classroom.

These considerations of method are not, to sum up this part, an argument for a study which throws objectivity to the wind, and requires from the reader the ability to make vast interpretative leaps into the hearts and minds of others. It is an argument for the use of data which suggests the presence of certain emotions in certain contexts. In fact, this report is structured in such a way that the field data collected has only a minor role. The data and analysis are not the starting point for the conclusions of the study, in the conventional way, i.e. based on the principles of a scientific experiment. This dissertation is the narrative of the development of tools adequate for making sense of what I had been seeing in my professional life as a teacher of children with emotional difficulties. The tools are developed as a response to my experience, but they are developed from the reviewing, integration and extension of current educational theories. The data is used only to illustrate points made on the theoretical level first. The data comes from my initial exploratory recordings of classes in EBD and mainstream schools.

By restricting the data to a minor role, i.e. the illustrations of theoretical reconceptualisations born out of the integration of previous research, the quality of this study does not rest on the ability to prove the existence of emotion $x$ in situation $y$, but on the quality of the argument that precedes the illustration. The reader needs only to accept that the data shows the probable existence of an emotion, and to understand that the emotion in question is an influencing factor on discourse. This understanding will develop (or not) from the quality of the argument preceding the illustration, rather than the validity of the data itself. In most cases, a feasible hypothetical example would have served almost as well, and in some instances this technique has been used.

This study is therefore unconventional because it does not (to return to the metaphor of the map) set out to bring back evidence of undiscovered locations. It seeks not to chart new ground, but to improve how we can chart ground already familiar in such a way that we may understand it better. It uses common knowledge and existing
evidence to develop an argument for the further development of theory. As Grave and Walsh (1988, p. 25), put it:

A good theory is a coherent narrative that allows one to see some part of the world in a new way,

and that is what this study aims to achieve.

Because of the unusual way in which the data is used, it should come as no surprise that the structure to this study is somewhat unusual too. There is no discrete section wherein the data is presented. Instead, it is used wherever it can be of use as a concrete illustration of a theoretical point being made.

ii) Parameters of the study

The initial impetus for this study was my own experience as a teacher in schools for children with emotional and behavioural difficulties. I wanted to set this experience in the context of current educational theories, and develop a theoretical framework for the analysis of what I faced as a teacher. This was not possible without integration and extension of different strands of educational research and theory. This study looks at sociocultural, psychological, and educational perspectives on classroom discourse, language development, behaviour and the emotions. It does not include neurological/neurobiological studies, detailed analyses of specific linguistic features or non-verbal communication. Whilst these lines of research could no doubt be incorporated into a wider ranging study, I did not feel they were germane to the issue here.

At various points the study makes reference to the concept of ‘emotional development’. There are several theories of emotional development, and related psychological traditions. This study does not adhere to any particular model of emotional development. The points it makes about emotional development, which relate mainly to the fact that such development engenders a decrease in an individual’s egocentricity, are sufficiently general to apply to most, if not all, of these models.
iii) Views of children and of childhood: an area of potential bias

It would make things very neat to able to say that in the same way that this study does not adhere to any particular developed model of emotional development, it does not make specific judgements about the nature of children or of human nature. Unfortunately this is not possible. One’s view of the nature of children will affect how one writes and thinks about them, or how one reads about them. This is perhaps particularly true of those children whose actions regularly cause hurt to others or themselves. Neutrality is not an option, and nor is the positivism of the past. As Shipman (1997, p.115) points out:

Children are awkward subjects for social scientists.

Research into what children are and do is often underpinned by philosophical or religious beliefs. Shipman (ibid.) asserts that this was certainly the case in the past:

As long as it could be claimed that the causes of their behaviour lay with God or the Devil, expert confidence was boundless.

Such positivism is probably less common now, but there is a danger that any study concerning children (and especially those whose actions can be very damaging to themselves and those around them) will be predicated upon beliefs regarding the morality, the capacity for good or evil, and the degree of free will that the researcher ascribes to them. How are we to think of them? Models such as Locke’s tabula rasa, Rousseau’s noble savage, Froebel’s flower, Piaget’s young scientist, or little adults (Grave and Walsh 1988) do not seem to help when confronted with EBD children, and to employ some kind of deficit theory, i.e. to feel that these children are lacking something, is unacceptable. It is also difficult to avoid judgement; these are children who break conventions, rules and laws and whose common characteristics (such as increased egocentricity and poorly developed sense of consequence) means that their actions can often impinge on the rights of others. At the same time as we can see that they are perpetrators of wrongs, however, it is also true that they are victims, being far more likely than their peers to suffer from problems including few or no
friends, underachievement, low self-esteem, family problems, abuse, and family trauma. (Cooper 1998 p.47)

The glib catchphrase, ‘mad, sad or bad’ sums up the choices many people feel they have when trying to understand children’s ‘misbehaviour’. Laslett (1988) has traced the history of society’s perception of them. He says that it was only in the 1970s that there was a shift away from the paramountly medical opinion towards educational and psychological opinion in the identification and treatment of maladjusted children. Only in the 1980s did teachers start to pay serious attention to the curriculum for these children.

Different views of what (mis)behaviour constitutes, and what it says about the nature of children in particular, and people in general, need to be dealt with if this study is to have coherence. As has been hinted at above, different views come from different sociohistorical perspectives. The post-modern view, as one might expect, questions the certitude of previous perspectives. Cooper (1988, p. 51) asks:

Are EBDs [emotional and behavioural difficulties] located essentially within the child, within the environment or the interaction between the two? Are children who behave madly, badly or sadly to be held personally accountable for their failure to control themselves? Are they simply victims of mal-socialisation? Or are they disadvantaged by individual psychological or biological problems which place them at greater risk than most of personal, social and educational failure at the hands dehumanising and uncaring social institutions?

Appreciating that behaviour is a socially constructed phenomenon presents us with a way out of the potential quagmire of judgements and views outlined above. We do not need to judge the behaviour of the people in this study (both the learners’ and the teachers’ actions and reactions). In fact we should not, because insufficient contextual information is given to enable that judgement to be made. As will be shown, even the teachers themselves often do not have enough evidence to make judgements about the origins and ethics of some behaviours. Therefore I appeal to the reader to suspend moral judgement of the children presented in this report. They may
be ‘sad, mad or bad’, but which each of them is or is not is not the point here. It is the fact they are exhibiting emotions, rather than the rights or wrongs of doing so, which is of interest here.

iv) Declaration of interest

It is only fair that if I am to appeal for an open mind from the reader, I try to make my own commitments and beliefs explicit. I do believe that as a teacher of children with emotional difficulties I am often left to guess why certain behaviours emerge, especially because whilst they may hurt the victims they also often offer very little benefit to the perpetrator either. I believe that teachers who are good at teaching such children are good because they have learnt to look ‘behind’ the behaviour, and find the child (to use current parlance) i.e. suspend judgement and try to communicate with what the child is trying to say, albeit very clumsily. While tout comprendre, cannot be tout pardonner, it can be a way of moving these children forward in their ability to learn. Cooper (1994, p. 17) cites research showing that children who disrupt classes commonly have seen their disruption as rational and justifiable responses to poor teaching. Whilst the degree of their rationality and justifiability may not withstand much cross-examination, it does highlight for me that disruption in the classroom is above all a form of communication. This is true of the mildest form of disruption (e.g. a pupil’s eyes wandering away from the teacher to the window) to the most extreme. It can be a communication about the learner, the teacher, the subject or the context of the lesson, and the degree of harmony between the child and the rest of the context of the lesson.

v) Generalisability

Consideration of the range of possible reasons for disruptions brings us to another point concerning how we think about children with emotional and behavioural difficulties. The label ‘EBD’ is applied only to a small section of the population, but as always, the problem with labels in education suggests that those who have been labelled are something which those who have not been labelled are not. This is not the case; it is safe to say that few children go through the education system feeling
and behaving uniformly throughout their career. We all have periods of anxiety, anger, happiness etc to varying degrees, and our behaviour varies accordingly. This study does concentrate (though not exclusively) upon a sector of the population who experience an unusual extent of extreme emotions in the classroom, and whose experience is unusually negative. The reason for this focus is simply that the emotions are more evident, and the teachers' responses to them easier to identify. However, the conclusions drawn are relevant to any teaching and learning interaction where emotions are present, which effectively means all of them. This leads to important points concerning the terminology used and the ethics of this study.

vi) Clarification of Terminology

This study should not proceed without a definition of the terms 'emotion' and 'emotional'. However, as emotions do not easily lend themselves to rational explanation, this is not a straightforward task. The dictionary definition (Chambers 1988) defines them by their difference to cognition and will. However this division is challenged by other definitions, such as that of Oatley and Nundy (1996, p.257):

Emotion: a mental state lasting minutes or hours that changes priorities or goals or concerns, that makes ready a particular repertoire of actions, and that biases attention and memory. It is defined rationally (…) It typically points to a goal.

How much emotion, cognition and will are interrelated is in part the focus of this study. I shall not attempt, therefore, a clearer definition in this regard at this point. As a starting point, however, the idea that emotions are mental states that are essentially different in quality from thoughts is a useful one to take forward. They are the feelings of happiness, sadness, anxiety, anger etc. The degree or nature of the feeling is not a factor in the definition. This is important because 'emotion' and especially 'emotional' can be sometimes used to denote an excess of feeling, a 'weakness' in a person's behaviour or a propensity for melodrama. It is also important to note that although the emphasis in this study is how the more 'negative' emotions adversely affect the discourse of teaching and learning, this study does pertain to all the emotions and includes positive influences
on the discourse. Therefore ‘emotion’ and ‘emotional’ do not just relate to anxiety, frustration and anger, though there are times when these are concentrated upon. Related terms are ‘emotional development’, ‘emotional well-being’, and ‘emotional disorder’. These all suggest the idea that there is a path of development for the emotions to take, and to do so or not can affect the individual’s health. However, though these terms are undoubtedly useful, the study does not go into detailed explorations of the different ways in which these terms have been represented. There is not the space for such an exploration, just as there is no space to explore cultural variations in the expression of emotion. The basic idea that each learner has at any one time a certain degree of emotional maturity, and specific experiences in their lives which have affected their emotional development in ways that are unique to them, is one that underpins all theories of emotional development, and this is sufficient here. Emotional maturity or development is explored to some extent at various points of this report, but for the most part the term ‘emotional orientation’ is used to denote this combination of the general idea of individual development and experience of the emotional level.

vii) Ethical Considerations

The ethical considerations of this study could have been very problematical. The negative aspects of classroom interactions, where there is disruption, disharmony and associated negative emotions, is a very tricky area to research, which could be another reason why so little actual research of this type has been done. It would have been difficult to assess such interactions, when the teaching and learning process breaks down, without having to deal with markedly differing viewpoints held with quite a lot of feeling. Not only would this have caused more methodological problems concerning the validity of conflicting perspectives, but it may have also made it difficult to gain access into classrooms.

My decision to concentrate not so much on when the teaching and learning process breaks down, but on what teachers do to prevent such breakdowns, and how they successfully manage the discourse when emotional factors appear to threaten the process, solved several problems. Firstly, it avoided the emotionally overcharged area of failure and blame. Secondly, it allowed me to narrow my focus: what constitutes
successful classroom discourse is a smaller, more manageable subject than what classroom discourse becomes when things go wrong. Thirdly teachers were happy to allow me to observe and record their lessons, and to report the results of my research, showing their strengths rather than any weaknesses they might have. Finally, such an approach is more appropriate to my role as a teacher, especially one within the special needs spectrum, where progress is best achieved by accentuating the positives and minimising the negatives.

There was one other major ethical question which I had to deal with, and that was to do with who benefits from the research. Before I started, I had in mind that this would be a piece of action research, whereby the children I taught would be involved in the process, and empowered by it. However, as I gathered data, and realised that in order to deal with it I needed to go back to the theory and reassess that, then it became clear that this study was decreasing its importance on the local practical level, and increasing its importance on the general, theoretical level. The children tape-recorded in the study were not to be a further part of the process. The study, therefore, will hopefully have a more significant and long-term effect on the general level. In Cameron et al’s terms, (1993) this study was research on and for these children, rather than research with them. However, their participation was so passive and small (the focus was actually the teachers’ response to them), that I feel the study avoided any of the dangers of such an approach; it may have, in some very minor way, consolidated their construction as disabled which has been imposed upon them by the educational system (cf. Brock, 1995), but this will be counterbalanced in the long term by the hope that this study will extend our understanding of children whose underachievement at school is related to their experience of emotional trauma.

Conclusion to methodological considerations: Comparisons with action research.

Although this study cannot be said to be an example of action research, a participatory democratic form of educational research (Kemmis, 1993, p.177), there are several ways in which it corresponds to the principles of action research set out by Kemmis (ibid. p.179), and I want to conclude this section by looking at these and thereby underline the strengths of the methods I have chosen.
The first characteristic Kemmis cites is that the research 'rejects positivist notions of rationality, objectivity and truth'. This has been covered in detail elsewhere, and I do not intend to cover it again here. The second point is that the interpretative categories of teachers must be employed. This is a strength of this study. Not only are teachers' motivations for their actions a central part of the study, but the research has originated from my own experiences as a teacher, not a researcher.

Thirdly, Kemmis makes two points which can be taken together:

[Action research] must provide ways of distinguishing ideas and interpretations which are systematically distorted by ideology from those which are not, and provide a view of how distorted self-understandings can be overcome.

It must be concerned to identify and expose those aspects of the existing social order which frustrate rational change, and must be able to offer theoretical accounts which enable teachers (and other participants) to become aware of how they may be overcome.

One of the main thrusts of this research has been my personal perception that children whose problems reside in their lack of emotional security are often categorised through other means, i.e. their ability to perform academically. Such children often are subjected to interventions which do not improve or actually exacerbate their already low self-esteem. I hope that my research will go some way to remedying this.

Kemmis' last point is that such research must be 'based on an explicit recognition that it is practical, in the sense that the question of its truth will be determined by the way it relates to practice.' Practice in so much educational research falls short of taking on the rather messy world that the children who feature in this study seem to inhibit, and I hope that this research helps to break the ice, and, in this age of inclusion, that studies which do not take into account children who challenge and kick back at the 'system' are seen as having only partial validity in their relation to practice.
Section 5 Rationale

Introduction

There are three aspects to the rationale for this study. The first is the personal level; as I have said, it was out of a desire to understand what was happening in my own classroom that this study originated. Secondly, the issues I was facing on a personal level are linked to wider educational and social issues, and the second part of the rationale explores these. Finally, the impetus to understand how emotional orientation affects cognitive development in the classroom led to a theoretical reconceptualisation of how we view the process of teaching and learning, and so the pursuit of understanding of personal experience became the pursuit of a much more generalisable understanding of the subject under study.

Three Rationales

Rationale 1: Personal experience

As already stated in the general introduction, the original impetus for this study was the desire to be able to conceptualise my own experience and practice. Over the last nine years or so I have witnessed children who display a frightening range of behaviours, the common denominator of which seems to be negation of self and the limitation of the ability to take part in interactions which would foster development. I wanted to know what happens when we try to teach these children who seem to seek conflict, punishment, self-denigration and failure, and who consistently act in spite of themselves and of those around them.

Rationale 2: A Social Issue

If we look at emotional problems in schools on a more general level, it quickly becomes clear that these questions have much relevance for our educational system today. There are an increasing number of children coming into our schools with
emotional problems, and there is evidence to suggest that the emotional problems they are presenting are becoming more severe (Farrell 95). Unlike any other sector of special needs education in our country, the by-word for EBD children is exclusion, not inclusion (Banks 1995).

These facts give several causes for concern. Firstly there is the concern about the effect of emotional problems in the classroom, the cost to others that the result of these problems, misbehaviour (or 'too little or too much emotion', Sylvester 1994) causes in the classroom and beyond. The child with emotional and behavioural difficulties is often perceived as an aggressor, a spoiler of the educational opportunities of others.

But it is also possible to see children with emotional difficulties as victims, not only of their own behaviour, but also of the actions and reactions of others. It is possible to see them as the most discriminated against within the educational system (Parfrey 1995). They are a group among whom the proportion of already disadvantaged children (through abuse, bereavement, family trauma, etc.) is disproportionately high (Cooper 1998). These are children whom the political landscape of our current educational system can actually render more vulnerable (Parfrey 1995, p.128). Their needs are overlooked (Mittler, 1990), they are taught by teachers who are generally untrained in their needs (DES, 1989a, 1985, cited in Cooper et al, 1994) and whose culture is not attuned to the emotional well-being of their students (Collier, 1995). And yet teachers now have more of the responsibility for the management of emotional problems than ever before, as Cooper et al (1994, p3) point out. They sum up the situation thus: 'There has perhaps never been a worse time than the present to be a pupil experiencing emotional and behavioural difficulties in school, or a more challenging time to be a teacher faced with 'difficult pupils'. (Cooper at al, 1994, p.2)

**Rationale 3: Theoretical Importance**

As Collier (1995) points out we can only expect teachers to recognise and then deal with the effects of emotional abuse when we understand these effects. This quest for understanding is the third part of this rationale. Candlin, in his preface to Fairclough’s *Language and Power*, suggests we should study ‘texts which evidence
crucial moments where participants may be placed at social risk during the communication, suffering disadvantage in consequences of the inequalities of communication’ (Candlin, in Fairclough 1989, p. viii). Juxtaposed with Vygotsky’s assertion that the laws of development are the same for all children (Evans 1993), this suggests we have a group of children whose manner of performance in school may have much to communicate to us on, not only how our education system may be flawed, but also how we may conceptualise the way in which all children learn. The theoretical rationale for this study comes from the fact that in striving to understand what goes on in classrooms where emotions are obviously a factor, we can learn something about all teaching and learning situations. In other words, it can show exactly why all students benefit from the methods used by good teachers of EBD children (Cooper et al., 1994).
CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

This review is in five sections. Section one is introductory, and examines why language, and the joint construction of knowledge in particular, is central to the process of teaching and learning. Section two reflects the fact that this subject has not previously been a major focus of research. There is no body of literature that directly pertains to this area. However, there are several fields of research which are of considerable help in the development of a means of conceptualising the construction of meaning in, and the impact of the emotions upon, the language of teaching and learning. These are:

- Views on the construction of meaning between teacher and learner in terms of cognitive outcomes
- views on the cultural aspects of classroom discourse
- general views on how emotions can affect learning

This section looks at what each of these three areas of research can offer to our understanding of the role of the emotions in classroom discourse.

Section three draws out the underlying principles common to all three perspectives. Section four considers the limitations of the first two perspectives cited above, in terms of how they can contribute to our understanding of how emotions can influence the language of teaching and learning. In exploring these limitations, it suggests the direction which a reconceptualisation of theory may take.

Section five marks a change in the nature of the review. The emotional perspective is explored, and ways of integrating this perspective with the other two perspectives are developed. This is achieved by examining evidence for the integration of cognitive and emotional perspectives and the interdependence of cognition and emotion in development. This line of argument leads back to Vygotskian theory. The section ends with a consideration of the status Vygotsky gave the emotions in development.
The chapter establishes a rationale for the reconceptualisation of Vygotskian and neo-Vygotskian theory in such a way that the emotional dimension of the language of teaching and learning can be identified and understood. This reconceptualisation is the content of the consequent two chapters.

Section 1: The centrality of language to learning

The development of the individual’s thought processes and identity through interaction with the social context (Vygotsky 1978, Bruner 1994) firmly places language as central to the way in which we learn. The individual learns by internalising for themselves meanings which have first been created and shared in conjunction with others. Language is at the heart of the dynamic between individual and society.

In looking at language, this study takes as its central focus the unit of analysis proposed by Vygotsky (1986), which is meaning. Meaning involves the word plus the context in which the word is used. It is the point at which the language, the individual and their context meet. This study is an examination of the process of making shared meanings and the consequent handover of knowledge and skills, and how the emotions impact upon this process. An exploration of this process from the different perspectives cited above suggests that there are overlaps between cognitive development and emotional experience. These perspectives, as will be seen, are underpinned by the theories of Vygotsky, who stated that language is not just for communication but for internal growth (Diaz 1990) and as such is ‘both a highly personal and profoundly social human process’ (Vygotsky 1978, p.126). In this statement there is the suggestion that in both intermental and intramental language there is an emotional as well as a cognitive dimension, but it is too vague a statement to help us work out the specific nature of the role the emotions may take. To explore this further and bring the relationship between cognition and emotion into better relief, we need to break down perspectives on the language of teaching and learning more methodically. This is the aim of the following section.

Before going onto that section, it is necessary to address one issue that may seem to stand at odds with the perspective of this study, and that is the issue of power.
The dimension of power

The relationship between the concepts in this study and issues of power and institutional structures may at first seem complex. For example, this study gives examples of students who seem to be opposing the 'official' discourse of the classroom, i.e. the one the teacher is attempting to promulgate. It may be argued that in such instances, the emotions of the participants are not the primary characteristics of this situation, that the participants are reacting to the cultural disparities between home and school practices, and they are simply rejecting their schooling.

Such an view, if it were valid, would indeed seem to undermine the arguments of this study. However, there are good reasons to reject this view, and to replace it with a view of the emotions as a factor to which attention deserves to be paid in any classroom discourse. Firstly, there is the fact that even in situations where there are naked power struggles, emotions are heavily implicated. In classrooms where active rejection of schooling is indeed taking place, it is reasonable to assume that participants' emotions figure quite strongly both in their intentions for doing so and the resultant interactions with the figures of authority. Rejecting and being rejected are often experiences which involve heightened emotions, often related to the perceived threats to the self-esteem of the participants. Some of the extracts, therefore, may well show students trying to reject their schooling per se (rather than the context of a specific lesson). This study does not differentiate between students who are generally disaffected and those who are struggling with specific contexts. Both are valid subjects of study, because the emotional aspects of classroom discourse affect both types of student.

Secondly, and following on from the first point, it is not beneficial to think of the concepts of emotions and institutional power structures as separate entities. This may be tempting as the former can easily be thought of as pertaining to the inner life of individuals, while the latter can be thought of more in socio-political terms. However, there is considerable overlap between the two. For example, Fairclough (1988) remarks that the field of counselling, while purporting to be person-centred, can
actually be more reflective of the needs of the institutional context in which it takes place (1988, p.227).

When examining the interactions presented in this study, then, it is necessary to bear in mind that the power issues in the discourse are not ignored, but are treated as one dimension of the discourse, one factor which contributes to the construction of meanings in the classroom.

In some of the examples, there is clear resistance by students to share in the process of constructing meanings with the teacher. Whether this resistance derives from institutional or individual factors is not always explored, as it is not the focus of this study. The processes by which institutional factors affect the emotional aspects of creating shared meaning are explored (see the discussion on facilitative, authoritative and authoritarian modes of intervention). The focus of the study is how emotions play a part in the establishment of joint understandings, and as has been documented elsewhere (e.g. Maybin, 1993, Fairclough 1988) meanings can be reached through conflict and confrontation as well as through collaboration and consensus. This study shows that emotions play a significant role in both modes of establishing meaning.
Section Two: Different perspectives on how meanings are made in classroom discourse

i) Views on the construction of meaning between teacher and learner in terms of cognitive outcomes

Recognition of the centrality of talk to learning has meant that significant study has been made of language in the classroom. How teachers create joint meanings with their students through cognitive supporting them in order that their students can internalise the meanings for themselves has been the subject of study most notably by Mercer (e.g. 1995). And although the zone of proximal development (ZPD) (Vygotsky 1978) has up to now been an abstract concept which is difficult to relate to the realities of the classroom (Maybin, Mercer and Stierer, 1992) it is recognised as having much appeal to teachers. The assertions that learning with assistance is a normal, common and important feature of human mental development and that a person's problem-solving ability can be expanded if another person provides the right kind of cognitive support (Mercer 1995, p.71) place the teacher at the heart of the learning process. They also provide a framework for understanding this process. Thus we can think of the teacher as the discourse guide (Mercer, ibid., p. 83) who plays a significant role in shaping the meanings that are jointly constructed in the classroom, the meanings which develop out of highly framed situations and which are internalised by the learner. Mercer details the guidance strategies that teachers use (such as direct elicitations, confirmations, rejections, and repetitions) (ibid., p.26) and the categories of talk that can take place in the classroom (disputational, cumulative and exploratory) (ibid., p.104) which can promote or hinder academic achievement and cognitive development.

This perspective also sheds light on the role of the learner. The notion of reciprocity (Wertsch 1985) underlines the fact that that shared meanings are, to state the obvious, not the domain of just one mind. The process of making meanings can be a fragile one. This is because they do not derive from language alone, but from the social context too. Language is seen not as a neutral resource, a transparent conduit
(Maybin 1993, p. 132) through which individuals can send a neat package and know how it will be received. Meanings are provisional and frequently contested. Language is not just performing tasks, but about expressing, constituting and reproducing identities and power relations (Fairclough 1989). Teachers do not just pass on words, but ways with words (Heath 1983). Thus meanings are context specific and linked with certain social practices. The zone of proximal development may help to describe the nature of the journey that is development, and we may be able to work towards some decontextualised notion of what cognitive development entails, but the route to that development is always culturally based and therefore specific to each socio-historical context. This perspective shows that education is not just about passing things on; it is the development of the ability to question and interact successfully with one’s environment, i.e. the application of skills and knowledge within the practices of the individual’s environment.

This perspective provides a model of language and learning, which despite its limitations with regard to the conceptualisation of the role of emotions in the language of teaching and learning (discussed in the next section), can be used as a foundation upon which to develop the reconceptualisation of theory in this study.

This perspective also provides the rationale for the second dimension of the zone of proximal development. The role of context in the creation of meaning means that cultural factors have to be considered in order to understand the relationship between making meaning and learning.

ii) The cultural dimension to the language of teaching and learning.

There has been much work done on the cultural aspects of the creation of shared meaning within the classroom. An understanding that language is always context-related, that one situation can give rise to a multiplicity of perspectives (Gee 1997) and that all teaching, even the teaching of the tools of language, is a culturally specific and an ideology-based construct (Street 1993), has given us a way of understanding how disparities in the ways of making meaning between different cultural groups can lead to the successful or the impaired creation of shared meaning within the classroom.
We know that this disparity can lead to underachievement (Heath 1983, Sola and Bennett 1993, Rockhill 1993) for students whose home language and literacy practices do not match those of school. We know the solution to this is to ensure that teachers have a moral and cultural vision sufficiently wide to take in the variety of perspectives that their students bring into the classroom (Giroux 1993) in order that the learners’ experiences are a central part of the foundations upon which meaning is made (Freire 1972), and that learners learn to speak with their own ‘voices’ (Morgan 1997). Thus good teachers are those who are sensitive to the total social context in which their students live (Goodman 1990) and need to accommodate the variety of perspectives that arise within their classroom discourse (what Edelsky [1991] terms ‘multi-discursive classrooms’). The danger of the failure to allow learners to share in the building of the meanings in the classroom is exclusion from the educational process itself (Goodman 1991). Avoiding this is not a straightforward task, as different discourses have different levels of status, and therefore simple legitimisation of discourses considered alternative to the mainstream is not sufficient. An appreciation of their strengths, weaknesses and how they relate to more powerful discourses is imperative too (Giroux 1993, Edelsky 1991).

To a teacher faced with children with emotional and behavioural difficulties, these concepts have much appeal in the attempt to understand practice, not least of which is the portrayal of the classroom as a site of struggle (Sola and Bennett 1993, Lankshear 1997). The cultural aspects of classroom discourse are major factors in the shaping of attitudes to schooling, the creation of disaffection and its consequences for an individual’s achievement. Teachers not only have to make sure the discourse they are asking students to enter matches their cognitive abilities, but their cultural roots as well. There are two dimensions to consider, two dimensions to the zone of proximal development (Cole 1985).

The importance of this line of research, then, to the exploration of the role of the emotions in teaching and learning, is threefold. Firstly, cultural factors are an essential part of the process of making meaning. Secondly, they have been used to explore the notion of conflict in the classroom. And thirdly, they seem to move us closer to appreciating how we might begin to conceive the role of the emotions in the
language of teaching and learning, because studies into conflict in the classroom necessarily begin to use emotive terms such as 'frustration' and 'disaffection'. As Oatley and Nundy point out, 'the acquisition of cultural skills cannot be divorced from emotions and attitudes towards these skills, or towards the adults and institutions that transmit them' (1996, p. 259).

Having considered the relationship between making meaning and learning first in terms of cognitive outcomes, then in relation to cultural factors, the focus has narrowed from consideration of a universal process, the acquisition of knowledge, to focussing on the ways in which this knowledge is acquired by specific groups. The next section takes the focus down to the level of individuals.

iii) Perspectives on the emotional dimension of the language of teaching and learning.

There is no doubt that a child’s emotional state affects his or her academic performance in school (Fahlberg 1991). We know this from looking at the extremes of negative emotional experience; attachment disorders, bereavement, bullying, abuse, and other such causes of emotional trauma all have significant effects on a child’s academic performance at school (Fahlberg 1991, Smith 1995). Such is the importance of the child’s emotional state that it has been suggested that the level of a child’s self-esteem is as influential a determinant on performance at school as is the child’s IQ (White 1995, cited in Farrell 1997), and there is much evidence to suggest those better equipped to cope on an emotional level leave school with better grades than those who are less well equipped (SCCC 1996).

However, though there is widespread recognition that feelings are a powerful influence on the capacity to reason (Damasio 1994, Donaldson 1996), there is no model for understanding the way in which this influence takes shape. Where does this gap in our understanding leave the teacher of children with emotional difficulties, who is faced with the realities of the influence of the emotions in every class? Laslett points out that these teachers have looked for explanations outside the 'mainstream' of educational research. Such is the gap in our understanding of how emotional factors impact upon classroom discourse, the four authors most frequently
consulted by teachers in EBD schools were not primarily concerned with the more academic outcomes of teaching at all: Wills, Bettelheim, Winnicot and Dockard-Drysdale (Dawson 1980, cited in Laslett 1998, p. 14). This dichotomy continues today. It continues in research where there is a gap between the research that provides a model of how meanings are made in the classroom but seems to ignore the influence of emotional factors, and the research that affirms the considerable influence of emotional factors in classroom discourse but does not provide an explanation of how this influence is manifested within the discourse.

If this gap exists in theory, it might be presumed to exist in practice too. In fact, as I later show, teachers can and do sometimes manage the emotional aspects of classroom discourse. Nevertheless, I would argue that the gap does exist to some degree. Perhaps it is represented by those moments when teachers can appreciate on a general level that some of their students may be suffering emotional trauma or have attitudes and emotions which do not fit easily into the discourse of the classroom, but they still feel frustration when that trauma or those attitudes translate into an obstacle to the joint construction of meaning in the classroom, and the consequent underachievement of the students concerned and quite possibly of other students as well. I know from personal experience it can be very difficult to experience sympathy for and frustration with a student simultaneously, especially if one has no rationale for beginning to unpack the problem the student presents.

The next sections begin to move closer to developing such a rationale, of beginning to bridge this gap in our understanding by drawing out the common features of these three perspectives – and to try to integrate the cognitive, cultural and emotional aspects of the language of teaching and learning.

Section 3: Common ground between perspectives on the cognitive, cultural and emotional dimensions of the language of teaching and learning.

There are two main ways in which the perspectives discussed above overlap. These are discussed in turn.
i) The importance of social context in the joint construction of meaning

The first element of common ground is in the importance of the social context in the joint construction of meaning. Cognitive and cultural perspectives hold that meanings are always embedded in and transmitted through social practice. Skills and knowledge are culturally specific. To take part in classroom discourse means taking part in a culturally based interaction which designates activities, roles and even identities to the participants (Fairclough 1989).

The same is true of the child with emotional difficulties. Their identity, the ‘EBD’ label is a definition that defies objectification (Peagram 1995) because it refers not to an individual alone, but an individual in relation to a certain social context. Their behaviour is only definable as such in the specific context it takes place. And whilst it may be tempting to label ‘misbehaviour’ as such, such labelling may say more about the gap in between the meaning the dominant culture in school draws from such acts and those drawn by the participants themselves. Cooper et al (1994) cite the research of among others Reid (1985) and Cronk (1987) which shows that so-called disruptive pupils often view their disruptive acts as rational and justifiable responses to the situation they find themselves in the classroom, and that views of what constitutes problem behaviour vary from teacher to teacher even within the same school. As Cooper et al state (1994, p.17) the importance of this does not lie in who is right or wrong, but in the situated nature of behaviour problems.

ii) Participation in the construction of meaning as a means of empowerment

Researchers of classroom discourse who have concentrated on the cognitive outcomes and those whose focus is the cultural aspects of the discourse both maintain that one of the main ways individual empowerment can be achieved is through critical reflection, the process by which the learner can assess their own contribution to the construction of meaning. This is true also of advocates of emotional empowerment. To increase a student’s ability to contribute to the joint construction of knowledge is
the aim of all advocates of empowerment, no matter whether the student is
disempowered because of cognitive, cultural or emotional factors.

Goodman (1995), for example, suggests that this reflection is one of the basic tenets
of whole language teaching. The teacher maximises the student’s contribution by
both attempting to centre the curriculum around the student’s experiences, and by
getting the student to critically review their cultural orientation in relation to the
dominant culture, and to see how this relationship may disempower them (Edelsky
of children who have emotional difficulties. They point out that the only way to
encourage children to overcome the deleterious effects of abuse is to teach them the
ability to understand (and thereby change) the dynamics of the power-based
relationships they find themselves the victims of. The more they can participate in the
joint construction of meaning, the more effective the teaching and learning dialogue
will be.

To give an example of the overlap between those perspectives which consider the
language of teaching and learning from the point of view of cognitive outcomes, and
those which concentrate on emotional outcomes, we can compare the methods
advocated by each approach. In the literature on emotion, empowering the learner
through increasing their contribution to the creation of shared meaning (often referred
to as ‘finding their own voice’) is achieved through counselling and good listening
practices (Bovair and McLaughlin, 1993). The main features of these processes
include restatement, clarification, summarising and other mechanisms which have
obvious parallels with Mercer’s description of what teachers do to guide the joint
construction of academic knowledge (recaps, elicitations, confirmations etc.). The
process is the same; a directed sharing of meaning which incorporates the learner’s
experiences and background and which ends when the control of the creation of
meaning is handed over to the learner. In this way, the student learns to develop their
own ‘voice’, their own perspective on the world which mediates their experiences and
takes them on to the next level of development, whether on a cognitive or emotional
level.
Towards an integrated approach

To end this section, it can be noted that the similarities between cognitive, cultural and emotional perspectives on the joint construction of knowledge are so strong that it could be asked why they are considered discrete. To answer this question, we need to look at the historical context of our educational system, our attitudes and treatment of deviant behaviours, and the influence of the medical profession who at one time took responsibility for the management of children who were either ‘mad, sad or bad’ (Cooper et al, 1994). As Porter (1998) points out, the way deviant behaviour is viewed and treated by society is constructed in no small part by the way in which those who presume to take charge of them view themselves and the interventions they can offer, the nature of which is governed significantly by the resources available at the time. In recent decades, the responsibility has shifted very much onto the shoulders of teachers, but it was when the conceptual model of intervention was predominantly medical that the belief sprang up that therapy was one thing and education was another (Laslett 1998). Laslett adds to this the belief that:

The fact that this dichotomy is unreal and educational progress and achievement has a direct bearing on personal and social adjustment was not properly explored. (1998, p.9)

To explore this properly, we can look at the limitations of the approaches which concentrate on cognitive outcome and of those which focus on the cultural aspects of making meaning, and see how this dichotomy, this separation of cognitive and emotional factors, has led to these approaches having limitations in the development of applicable theory. These limitations are explored in the next section.
Section 4: Limitations in the different perspectives on the construction of meaning in the language of teaching and learning

Introduction

This section explores the limitations of perspectives which focus on the cognitive outcomes of classroom discourse, and then the perspectives which focus on the cultural aspects of the discourse. It does not explore the limitations of perspectives which focus on the emotional aspects of classroom discourse, because (as previously stated) no such perspective has yet been developed with specific regard to the mechanisms of discourse in the classroom. The way in which such a development is possible is explored in this section, through considering the limitations of the first two perspectives.

i) Limitations of perspectives which focus on the cognitive outcomes of classroom discourse.

The first intimation I had that there was a limitation to the cognitive perspective to classroom discourse came in the form of a gut reaction. It was not an appraisal of literature or of data that was rational or founded on anything other than my own experience. However, I was unwilling to discount it, as I felt that it may provide some guidance as to where answers to the questions being asked in this study might be found. This approach was justified; it proved a good starting point, and it is therefore appropriate to start off this section with a description of it, despite the fact that in order to do so I have to depart for a paragraph from the conventions of academic writing.

The feeling I want to describe is a mixture of frustration, incredulity, and guilt. It is a feeling which thrives in the gap between theory and practice. As a teacher of children with emotional and behavioural difficulties I had grown used to studying theoretical models, being enthused by their apparent usefulness but knowing at the same time they will be only partially applicable in my classroom. A recent example of this happened when I was watching some videos of good practice in teaching the Literacy Hour, where a single teacher holds court to thirty compliant children, who are willing
to sit placidly and only take their share of one thirtieth of the teacher's attention. I would like to say the guilt has disappeared, that after teaching children with emotional difficulties for several years I have accepted the fact that I cannot create a situation like that. The children I have taught just do not sit as still as the children in that video under most normal circumstances. Personally speaking, I think that young children in our society who do not have emotional problems do not do it naturally very often either, and it is here that the incredulity and frustration creep in. Proponents of models of cognitive development in the classroom need to be able to display their models working without hindrance, and so it is understandable they have gravitated towards classrooms where the hindrances are fewest, where the teacher can concentrate on the students' academic progress, without being distracted by social or behavioural problems.

A question arises at this point, and this is, ‘What are normal circumstances?’ We know that the teacher is not the only factor in the regulation of the classroom discourse, and that children do bring in emotions to the classroom, sometimes in the form of problems, sometimes not. How much classroom time is normally diverted from interventions aimed at academic advancement to interventions aims at smoothing out social, emotional and behavioural issues? Conversely, we can ask, how much time is saved by children whose emotional state is such that teaching is made easier? The question is of what is normal is too complex to be answered here, if for no other reason than because it raises subsequent questions as to whether human beings are ever capable of behaving in a purely rational way. Oatley and Nundy (1996) point out that if children did spend the majority of their time in school concentrating on academic matters, then we could expect them all to leave school with expertise in (if nothing else) learning. Obviously this is not the case. Classrooms where there is minimal attention paid to factors other than the cognitive cannot be considered the norm.

Thus it seems fair to say that cognitive models show us how successful learners learn, but give little insight as to how and why the model breaks down for those students who are less successful. For example, Mercer's idea of language as a social mode of thinking (1995) is an extremely helpful way of conceptualising the process of
academic advancement, as are the concepts which derive from this, such as the three ways of talking and thinking that he presents (ibid. p.104). These three ways are:

- Disputational talk: characterised by disagreement and individual decision-making, with few attempts to pool resources or offer constructive criticism
- Cumulative talk: partners build positively but uncritically, 'common knowledge' through accumulations - repetitions, confirmations and elaborations
- Exploratory talk: critical engagement - challenge and counter-challenge. Compared to the first two types of talk, knowledge is made more publicly accountable and reasoning is more visible in the talk.

These three categories relate to pupil-pupil talk, of course. On the one hand this way of looking at talk is a very useful tool for a teacher to reflect on the types of talk that are promoted in their own classroom, and for possibly modifying their own practice in order to promote such talk between their pupils. On the other hand they seem to be describing different levels of emotional maturity. Children whose emotional problems are so great they find it difficult to see beyond their own needs, or children who have not yet cast off the egocentricity of their early years, will find it more difficult to engage in exploratory talk. Mercer states that there is no evidence to show that anyone is incapable of exploratory talk (1995, p. 108) and I would agree with him; given the right circumstances (which usually means away from their peers), all the children I teach will adopt a way of talking that makes their reasoning visible and they will contribute to a debate. However, given their low self-esteem, their culture of verbally attacking one another, their relative lack of empathy, and their intolerance of ambiguity, all of which are common characteristics in insecure children (Smith 1995), there is much less likelihood of exploratory talk when there is a group of these children together. The reason for this is neither the teacher's ability to set up the right procedures in the classroom, or the children's academic level, but the children's emotional state.
Cognitive models of how meanings are constructed in the classroom are often based in situations where other factors can be ignored or minimised. An example of this is Bruner’s (1985) exploration of scaffolding (dealt with more thoroughly in the section on scaffolding), where the choice of mother-infant dyads means the participants were in tune with each other both emotionally and culturally, and so the focus could be purely on the cognitive factors.

Those studies which try to demonstrate what good practice is rarely make the degree of contribution of the learners clear. This idea of reciprocity is an extremely important factor. It is too easy to underplay the fact that children sometimes arrive in our classrooms emotionally unready to take part in the academic discourse that the teacher is trying to set up. This may be because to focus on disparities between pupils can lead to the construction of a deficit model, and it is fair to say that researchers are generally concerned with countering such assumptions. For example, the work into the cultural dimension of the construction of meaning has provided the evidence for the opponents of ethnocentric viewpoints. And Maybin, whose explorations of the ways in which children make meaning outside the classroom counter assumptions by ‘demonstrating something of the richness of the resource which all children have at their disposal, and the intensity and urgency of their endeavours to achieve (...) understanding’ (Maybin 1993, p.148). Whilst it has been recognised that such assumptions have existed because of the educational world’s blindness to the egocentricity of its own vision (cf. Street 1993), we still need to recognise that different individuals have different attitudes and feelings in the classroom, and that these play some role in the degree to which they can adapt to the dominant discourse of the classroom. Although there is much that the teacher can do to create the environment most conducive to the academic advancement of their students (Moss 1999), the reciprocity of making meaning, the fact that it takes two, means that the student’s role cannot be neglected. To opine that all students can fit into models showing the successful transference of knowledge, is to sell short those who do not fit. We need to find a way of acknowledging and explaining the lessons of reality, i.e. that some students can slip into classroom discourse better than others, for reasons related to their emotional orientation, without it becoming a matter of judgement or grounds for condemnation of those students who are unable to do so into some type of deficit theory.
Assessing the theory of cognitive development in the language of teaching and learning

If we address the issue of the limitations of these perspectives which focus on the cognitive outcomes of the making of meaning in a classroom on a more theoretical level, we can conceptualise them more clearly. We can do this by looking at this passage from Mercer, as he explains the centrality of talk to learning in Vygotskian theory:

(Vygotsky differed from Piaget in two main ways). First he argued that language has a strong influence on the structure of thought. It is from him that I draw the idea of language as both an individual and a social mode of thinking. And secondly he emphasised that cognitive development is a social communicative process. He drew attention to some features of human learning and development which are quite normal and commonplace, but which have been too often ignored or undervalued in psychology. One is that learning with assistance or instruction is a normal, common and important feature of human mental development. Another is that the limits of a person’s learning or problem-solving ability can be expanded if another person provides the right kind of cognitive support. (Mercer 1995, p.71)

Moll (1990, p.7) suggests that English-speaking scholars interpret the concept of the zone of proximal development, the unit of study of the dynamic interaction between individual and social context, rather too narrowly, thereby ‘robbing it of some its potential for enabling us to understand the social genesis of human cognitive processes and the process of teaching and learning in particular’ (ibid., p. 45). I would suggest that this is represented here by the narrowing of social context into the term ‘cognitive support’. Mercer’s work clearly outlines the cognitive processes that go on in a classroom, and as such it provides a useful theoretical model for understanding a part of classroom discourse. However, to understand the other parts of classroom discourse, or to understand what the whole of classroom discourse looks like, we need to keep a fuller understanding of all the factors that go to make up the social context in which the interactions take place.
ii) Limitations of cultural perspectives on the joint construction of meaning in the language of teaching and learning.

The limitations of cultural (or sociocultural) perspectives on the joint construction of meaning are similar to those perspectives which focus on the cognitive outcomes discussed above. In both perspectives there is an insufficient appreciation of what constitutes the social context. However, this limitation is expressed in a different way. Sociocultural theory is immature (Cole 1995) in that while it may assert the role of the social context in individual development, it finds the two concepts – social context and the individual – difficult to define. It is particularly vague and ambiguous when it tries to define the interface between the two, the transaction between context and individual which leads to the individual developing cognitively through socially mediated behaviour.

These ambiguities are perhaps best seen in the claims – often made by proponents of sociocultural perspectives – that cultural disparities between an individual’s social practices and those dominant in the educational establishment they attend can result in underachievement. For example:

> Because of unexamined beliefs about gender, race, or ethnicity, teachers’ attitudes toward particular students often result in their not recognising students’ potential. In such situations, students’ attempts at invention or interpretation of conventions are easily rejected because they do not fit the school’s or the teacher’s values, expectations, and knowledge. (Goodman and Goodman 1990, p.246)

The argument is that cultural disparity results in a lack of shared meaning between teacher and learner, and therefore there is less for the learner to internalise, and less learning takes place. Worse still, students often react to this lack of shared meaning by creating alternative meanings shared amongst themselves to the exclusion of the teacher (Sola and Bennett 1994) or they fail educationally (Rockhill 1994). This argument has many strengths, but the problem is that the individual is represented in these interactions as the objects, the victims of an inhospitable social
context. They may feel emotions such as frustration, sadness or anger, but these are seen as the result of their failed interactions with their supposed teachers.

One suggestion to remedy the problems of cultural disparity is for schools to widen their moral and cultural vision, to create in Edelsky’s (1993) words a multi-discoursal classroom, where different ‘voices’, different language practices are identified and incorporated into the school discourse.

This view, while it may have much to commend it, has been recognised by sociocultural theorists themselves as somewhat idealistic. It is idealistic because it presents too simplistic a view of events in the classroom. Cultural factors do not only reside outside individual learners, but are also brought into the classroom and reconstituted by them through their interactions. Learners are not just the objects, they are also active agents in the definition of the social context (Morgan 1997). The idea of a multi-discoursal classroom is idealistic because it fails to reflect the fact that oppression is often immanent, it is not an external factor against which learners and teachers can always unite. Some beliefs that learners bring into the classroom inhibit the rights of others. The idea of neutrality behind multi-discoursal classrooms is therefore not often tenable. Meanings are arrived at through struggle as well as collaboration. The cultural disparities that hinder academic achievement may be due to beliefs inherent in the dominant school discourse, or they may be due to attitudes that a learner may have which is oppressive to themselves or others.

Emancipation from oppressive phenomena such as bullying, racism, sexism and the like is not just a question, therefore, of a simple redefinition of the social context of school. It also often involves internal changes in the belief systems of the learners. A critical consciousness cannot be mandated (Britzman, cited in Edelsky, 1993). Individuals have to take an active part in the development of new-shared meanings for emancipation or empowerment to take place, and moreover they have to want to do so. Edelsky (1993) cites the example of children who resist empowerment through exposure to democratic procedures in the classroom because they are unable or unwilling to translate these practices to other parts of their lives.

Sociocultural studies are therefore insufficient in how meanings are made in the classroom because they cannot clearly differentiate between the role of the individual and that of the social context in the interaction. This is a dilemma which, up to now,
sociocultural theorists have been unable to answer, but which pervades every sociocultural research agenda (Wetsch 1995, p. 57).

We can go some way to sorting out this confusion as to the nature of the identity of the individual in relation to the social context (Smolka et al 1995, p.171) by looking at the role of the emotions. They are often to be seen on the periphery of sociocultural studies, usually in the form of the frustration or disaffection that learners feel when there is a lack of shared meaning between them and their teachers. The role of the emotions can be explored by looking at Lankshear’s example (where he compares the different performance of two classes in the same school) to show the crucial role of cultural factors in achievement, in which there is this confusion between the roles of individual and social context:

5M and 5S come from very different social groups, having very different prior and ongoing discursive experiences and histories. They met on the same site, but from very different starting conditions and with very different ‘raw materials’ available to them. (Lankshear, 1997, p.28)

What is the role of the social context here? The culture difference seems to be one which is situated largely within the individuals concerned here. The following statement seems to confirm this:

Insofar as students like those in 5M secure passes in competitive exams at all, they are very often in low status subject areas. Within prestige subjects particularly, like English and the sciences, exam success is tied closely to abilities, attitudes and dispositions that go far beyond the mere recall and reproduction of information. Scholastic achievement draws heavily on discursive practices and associated language uses which emphasise developing positions by argument and debate. (ibid., p.29)

Lankshear’s example shows that there are cultural factors which affect how meanings are made. Because of their cultural experiences, some students find it harder to take
part in 'argument and debate' (cf. Mercer’s exploratory talk). But here there is a
strong suggestion that the children themselves are active in their own marginalisation.
They are bringing ‘attitudes and dispositions’ which affect their engagement with the
discourse of the classroom. Looking at the emotions that the children bring into the
classroom does two things. Firstly, it allows for differentiation between the
individuals in each group; they will not all have the same attitudes and dispositions.
We therefore have a way of differentiating between cultural factors (i.e. those which
affect groups) and those factors which affect individuals, i.e. emotional responses to
cultural factors. And following on from this idea that the meaning constructed by the
teacher with some pupils might not be the one which all pupils draw from the
interaction is the suggestion that we need to be looking for two meanings instead of
one. We need to be looking at socially mediated meanings alongside subjective
meanings. This reflects the Vygotskian view that language is ‘a highly personal and
at the same time a profoundly social human process’ (Vygotsky 1986). To be able to
look at the interface between individual and social context in a way which
incorporates the individual’s subjective interpretation of events and at the same time
the socially mediated meanings, and to see the relationship between these two
meanings as transactional, allows us to develop an approach which more clearly
defines the role of the social context in development and the role of the individual.
Identifying the role of the emotions in subjective and shared meanings, seeing them as
an influential factor in the creation of both meanings, rather than just states resulting
from the interaction between individual and social context, is crucial to our extended
understanding of the process of development. The next sections explore the way in
which this psychosocial approach can be developed by an appreciation of the role of
the emotions in the language of teaching and learning.

Section 4: Emotional perspectives on the joint construction of
meaning in the classroom.

This section cannot focus on the limitations of perspectives on the emotional factors
in the joint construction of knowledge in the classroom, for the simple reason that
there are no such specific studies (Oatley and Nundy 1996). Instead it seeks to start
to fill this gap somewhat by looking at the relationship between emotions and learning. In doing so, it moves towards the central purpose of this study, i.e. the development of a means of conceptualising theoretically the relationship between emotions and classroom discourse.

This section is divided into three parts:

i) An examination of attitudes to the current separation of cognitive and emotional perspectives on learning

ii) The interdependence of emotion and cognition in development

iii) The relation of Vygotskian theory to the role of emotion in development

i) An examination of the current separation of cognitive and emotional perspectives on learning

There is evidence from a growing number of sources, including research into the brain, that our physical and emotional well-being are closely linked to our ability to think and learn effectively (SCCC 1996). There has over recent years been a growing interest in the benefits of understanding this relationship, with terms such as 'emotional intelligence' (Goleman 1996), 'emotional literacy' (Bocchino 1999) or 'emotional work' Varma (1992), all of which try to identify this link. On top of all this, it might be said that the importance of the emotional realm in our development is intuitively obvious (Oatley and Nundy, 1995, p. 257). Donaldson (1996) describes the link between emotional and cognitive development thus:

We interpret the world that we encounter, we struggle to make sense of it, and this interpretative activity is a large part of what we mean by cognition. It yields what we call understanding. How could it be divorced from the position of what we take to matter and what emotions then arise? If we misinterpret something, inappropriate emotions may well follow and the outcome of that may be seriously undesirable.
The point is that emotions, most of the time, are not disjoined from what we think and believe. Indeed the relationship is so close and intimate that to study human cognition without taking emotion into account is really an odd enterprise. How can we have come to take it as normal? Only by concentrating on a narrow cognitive bandwidth, not much in use, and ignoring all the rest. (1996, p. 327)

Donaldson goes on to provide a socio-historical explanation of why 'emotion, even of the highest kind, is not placed in the same league as the intellect' (ibid. p.342):

[Focusing on cognition only] has seemed to be a justifiable research strategy because of the power of a modern Western fable: the fable of Reason. The story goes like this. Reason is the great glory and crowning achievement of the human mind. It is logical, hard nosed, and compatible with the materialistic worldview. And it is chiefly to be found among adults, especially males, who have had a lengthy, traditional, western education. These people - the members of this small group - have the distinction of being able to function rationally most of the time. Regrettable lapses do occur, even in them; but such lapses are commonly due to the interference of emotion, which is an altogether lesser function. To feel it is unworthy. To display it is more unworthy still. (ibid. p.327)

The basic assumption that underpins our education system, that students can focus their minds on material to be learned without influencing, or being influenced by, the affective parts of their brain (Ross Epp and Watkinson 1996) has an impact on the practical and theoretical level. On the practical level, this compartmentalisation of the cognitive and affective can lead to discourse practices in school being abusive in different ways:

- it assumes the same level of affective stability for all students and an equal ability to suspend the affective in favour of the cognitive
• it implies there is more value to the cognitive and that the affective, that is the elements of learning which are associated with the personal, are less worthy of development than are cognitive elements (Ross Epp and Watkinson, 1996, p. 8)

The limitation of the degree to which students are allowed to bring their personal resources to the classroom means that there is a far greater likelihood of the dominant form of knowledge being what Ross Epp and Watkinson called ‘colonialised knowledge’, that is, the ‘acceptance of a preordained set of curricula which reflects the experiences and values of the dominant group, while denigrating that of the disadvantaged groups.’ (ibid., p. 3)

Our theoretical understanding of cognitive processes is distorted by the division of the cognitive and emotional aspects of personal development not only because the process of enculturation is mistakenly divided into two separate parts, but also because it is the result of a system that sees unwelcome behaviour as a factor to do largely with the individual’s free will, rather than as an expression of the disparity between the child’s discourse and the predominant one (ibid. p.10).

Vygotsky pointed out (Vygotsky 1986) that this separation led to a major weakness in traditional psychology. Mercer (1993, p. 93) sees the divisions in the disciplines relating to development and learning as having grown closer in the years since Vygotsky levelled that criticism at traditional psychology, but Vygotsky’s question, ‘Why is every critical moment in the fate of the adult or the child coloured with emotion?’ (Vygotsky 1987, p. 335) still has not been answered. This study suggests that until it is we cannot claim to fully understand the process of development and learning, and the full nature of the interaction between the individual and the social context.

ii) The interdependence of emotion and cognition

There is much debate about the relationship between cognition and emotion (Denham 1998, p.5), and whether the one precedes the other or vice-versa. Much of this debate entails expertise in disciplines that are outside the competence of this study, such as neurology and cognitive science. However, the point we can take
from these debates is not which element comes first but that they are non-dissociable, two aspects of the same process (Sroufe 1995, p. 117). Sroufe quotes Piaget and Inhelder:

There is no behaviour pattern, however intellectual, which does not involve the affective factors as motives; but, reciprocally, there can be no affective states without the intervention of perceptions or comprehensions which constitute their cognitive structure. (1969, p. 158)

Thus in a process remarkably similar to the way that cognition and culture create each other in the zone of proximal development (Cole 1985), we can say that emotional development and cognitive development are interdependent. Thus for Dunn (1995), early emotional interactions provide the schematic structures for social understandings on which culture and individuality depend. And Varma (1992), when addressing the situations that the developing child meets which are of potential benefit or of potential harm to the child’s progress, stresses the value of the emotional ‘work’ that the child has done in the past, which will either enable him or her to cope with the next challenge and move forward, or not. Developmental progress, the internalisation of new structures, is not just cognitive, but is a new level of behavioural organisation, a new level of acting on the world (Diaz et al, 1990). Essentially, emotional development is the same as cognitive development; it is the increasing of self-regulatory behaviour in a widening variety of situations. A major factor in the growth in the capacity for self-regulation is the decrease in the need for emotional gratification in the shorter term (Diaz et al, 1990, p. 131/2).

This similarity between cognitive and emotional development suggests that the zone of proximal development should be seen as having an emotional as well as a cognitive and cultural dimension. This is explored in chapter 4. Before that, however, the rationale for a three-dimensional zone of proximal development is reinforced by considering what Vygotsky’s views on the role of the emotions in development were.
iii) How emotion is integrated into Vygotskian theory

The attempt to identify the role of the emotions in the joint construction of meaning in classroom discourse leads us to re-examine the theory upon which the vast majority of the research presented up to now in this study has been based, Vygotskian theory. Perhaps rather surprisingly, Vygotsky is quite categorical about this role, at least on the theoretical level:

When we approach the problem of the interrelation between thought and language and other aspects of mind, the first question that arises is that of intellect and affect. Their separation as subjects is a major weakness of traditional psychology, since it makes the thought process appear as an autonomous flow of ‘thoughts thinking themselves’ segregated from the fullness of life, from the personal needs and interests, the inclinations and impulses of the thinker. Such segregated thought must either be viewed as meaningless epiphenomenon incapable of changing in the life or conduct of a person or else as some kind of primeval force exerting an influence on personal life in an inexplicable, mysterious way.

The door is closed on the issue of causation and origin of our thoughts, since deterministic analysis would require clarification of the motive thoughts that direct thought into this or that channel. By the same token, the old approach precludes any fruitful study of the reverse process, the influence of thought on affect and volition. Unit analysis [the study of meaning] points the way to the solution of these vitally important problems. It demonstrates the existence of a dynamic system of meaning in which the affective and the intellectual unite. (1986, p. 10)

Thought is not begotten by thought; it is engendered by motivation, i.e. our desires and needs, our interests and emotions. Behind every thought there is an affective-volitional tendency which holds the answer to the last “why” in the analysis of thinking. A true and full understanding of another’s thought is
possible only when we understand its volitional basis. (1986, p. 252)

The strength of Vygotsky's convictions with regard to the importance if not the primacy of the emotions in the role of cognitive development means that, if we are to understand the nature of this importance, a re-examination of his theories and the theories that have built upon his ideas is necessary. The next two chapters do this and show that it is possible to place emotions as one of the cornerstones of development and learning.
CHAPTER 3

REVISITING VYGOTSKIAN THEORY

Introduction.
The aim of this chapter is to argue for the use of the concepts of Vygotskian and neo-Vygotskian theory to enable an understanding of how emotions affect the language of teaching and learning. These concepts have been the subject of many debates in recent decades. The complexities of these debates are such that it is necessary to argue for the use of these concepts on a fundamental level, rather than trying to use them in a way that reflects the intricacies of the debates that surround them. This does not mean that I am limiting the impact of this study by using crude tools. As the following paragraphs argue, using the concept of internalisation in a ‘basic’ way is to use it in a way that all neo-Vygotskian theorists can relate to. Such a use is not a dilution of its strength as an analytical tool. It is a way of allowing a previously ignored aspect of its definition to be taken into account. Thus by standing back from the debate between about internalisation and appropriation, and the tension between semiotic and activity based analyses, we can bring a new dimension to these issues. The rest of this introduction details how this can be achieved.

As Daniels (1996) records, the development of Vygotskian theory has been characterised by the evolution of two schools of thought. Tulviste (1988) summarises these two schools thus:

Interestingly, while attempts to develop Vygotsky’s work in Russia have not foregrounded semiotic mediation but have foregrounded the analysis of social transmission in activity settings, much of the work in the West has tended to ignore the social beyond the interactional and to celebrate the individual and the mediational processes at the expense of a consideration of the socio-institutional, cultural and historical factors. (Tulviste [1988] in Daniels 1996, p. 9)
There is then, it seems, a cultural disparity in attitudes to the interpretation of Vygotskian theory. The problem centres around the dilemma of 'how to have an active, creative human subject which constructs social meanings, at the same time that this subject itself must be a social construction.' (John-Steiner and Meehan, 2000).

The debate between semiotic and activity based analyses, which in turn affects definitions of or debates around the terms 'internalisation' and 'appropriation', hinges upon the view of the exact relationship between the individual and society that a particular analyst has. Such attempts to link the social and psychological levels of analysis have not reached any sense of conclusion (Tulviste, 1996, p.4). Daniels (1993, p. 52) refers to the 'many unresolved issues in the extension of Vygotsky's ideas'.

However, the fact that certain debates are seemingly insoluble at this point does not render the concepts involved useless. Minick (1996, p. 49) states that there is a basic common ground between the two schools of thought:

What unites them (Eastern and Western schools of neo-Vygotskian analysis) is a shared conviction that Vygotsky and his intellectual descendants in the Soviet Union have developed a conceptual framework that overcomes many limitations of other attempts to represent the relationship between the social and the individual in psychological development.

Thus this chapter leans heavily on the notion of internalisation that is encapsulated in the overlap between these two schools. Certainly, it needs to be acknowledged that, because of the tensions of the debates mentioned above, this concept is not yet completely refined. Whether one should see this concept as 'semiotic uptake', 'appropriation of meaning' (Packer 1993, p.257) or an inheritance of cultural meanings that constitute an intellectual bequest from prior generations (Cobb and Yackel 1996) depends on the resolution of a debate which I do not intend to state a position on in this study. I feel it expedient for the purposes of this study to acknowledge simply that the concepts used here are somewhat crude in their definition. However, I do not feel that this detracts from the study. In fact, as section 4, chapter 5 shows, to be able to take this step back from these debates is a liberating experience. By utilising the concepts of Vygotskian and neo-Vygotskian theory in
order to conceptualise the role of the emotions in the development of individuals thorough interaction with their context, we can move a step closer to understanding the dilemmas which underpin these debates, i.e. how to view the relationship between individual consciousness and development in sociocultural or psychosocial terms.

Section 1: reinterpreting Vygotskian and neo-Vygotskian concepts

Given the conviction and clarity of his comments on the interdependence of emotion and cognition, it seems strange that these have not informed more strongly the subsequent theories and findings of researchers who have developed Vygotsky’s ideas. Perhaps this is a function of the bias towards rationality that Donaldson cites above. It could also be due to the fact that although he wrote of the value of changing the tools of thinking available to a learner in order to help them develop, the problem has been that Vygotsky never detailed how exactly this transformation was to be effected (John-Steiner and Souberman, 1978, and Wertsch 1990). Vygotsky gave us the idea that human mental functioning reflects and constitutes its historical, institutional and cultural setting, but he did little in the way of specifying how his approach would apply to concrete settings.

The next section addresses this problem by revisiting several key Vygotskian and neo-Vygotskian concepts, and examining them in the light of an understanding of the co-dependency of cognition, culture and emotion. Such an approach shows that these concepts can be expanded through consideration of the emotional aspects of an individual’s interaction with the social context, and that it is possible to gain a more complete picture of the relationship between development and thought which has not been ‘segregated from the fullness of life’.

Internalisation

Vygotsky posited that development proceeds from the intermental to the intramental, that learners internalise their interactions with others. But we know that this does not
just refer to the actual words of the interaction. Because words are inseparable from
their contextual meaning, learners internalise the practices in which the words are
embedded, the ‘ways with words’ (Heath 1983). In *Thought and Language*
(Vygotsky 1986) Vygotsky stresses that what is internalised along with the word is
the meanings, thoughts, needs and desires that are part of the fabric of each word. The
memory of an interaction is more than just a declarative one, based on what was said.
It is also procedural (Winkley 1996, p.57); that is, the way in which the interaction
took place is also taken in. So for example children do not just internalise what their
parents say, but they internalise the whole of the relationship with the parent,
including how they relate emotionally to that parent. This can have a profound
influence upon the way they interact with others. This ‘internal working model’
(Winkley 1996, p.56) surfaces in the classroom, when the child responds to the
teacher as if he or she were their parent. Of course, this phenomenon is a familiar one
in fields such as psychology and psychotherapy.

Thus the first point to make about internalisation is that learners bring resources to
interactions which play a significant part in shaping that interaction. Furthermore,
these resources have at least in part been shaped by the emotional orientation of the
learner, that is their needs and the degree to which and the manner in which these
have (or have not) been met by the members of their entourage.

However, it is not just in the shaping of the resources that learners bring to an
interaction where emotions are significant. The act of learning itself involves the
emotions because learning is essentially a transition between one’s old self and a
transformed, or reorganised, self. As an individual learns new words and concepts,
they learn new practices to go with them, and this behavioural reorganisation means
that their identity undergoes change too. Learning is a process which entails a period
during which the learner moves away from the old way of knowing something to take
on a new way. Of course, they cannot fully appreciate what this new way is until the
process of learning is complete. Thus there is a period of transition when
rationalisation is an inadequate tool for coping with and controlling the situation. At
such times the individual’s cognitive resources are inadequate and their sense of
identity is at its most vulnerable, and this state of transformation engages the
emotions. They are a way of experiencing a situation on terms that do not rely on a coherent rationality:

Emotions (..) serve a very important function in our lives: they help us maintain and enhance our sense of well being. They help us develop, protect, and restore our personal identities. (Dupont 1998, p. 78)

So there are points in the experience of learning when the process is not so much related to rational issues such as understanding concepts, but to emotional issues such as joy at achieving something valued, sadness at personal loss or failure, anger at a threat to one’s security or identity, pride at doing well (ibid.), and maintaining a sense of composure during episodes of transition.

This transitory loss of self-control is when the learner looks to depend on the teacher's consciousness to see them through the phase of transition. Such a handing over of control can be a very emotionally demanding experience for a learner, and the teacher has to earn the learner's trust by setting the right targets, inspiring the learner to engage all their faculties, to direct the interaction in the right way; in short to loan a consciousness which will justify the learner’s trust and ensure success.

This transitory loss of self-control can be explored in more detail and with greater reference to Vygotskian theory by looking at the similarity between self-regulation and the maintenance and enhancement of self-esteem through learning. This shows the interdependent relationship of cognition and emotion. Learning does not just involve the taking on of new concepts or skills; internalisation of new tools of thinking involves not only transformations of how one acts, but also who one thinks one is. The concept of self-esteem neatly encapsulates the interdependence of how an individual acts and their self-identity. Self-esteem involves:

- the sense of being safe, of physical and emotional security.
- the sense of intrinsic worth and being valued for oneself
a sense of identity; the feeling of having a sense of self in relation to other activities and to the activities of daily living

- a sense of affiliation, the feeling of belonging and being linked to others

- a sense of competence; a feeling of empowerment and being able to cope with life

- a sense of mission: having a sense of what one wants to achieve

(Winkley 1996, p.60)

This view of self-esteem allows us to see the interdependency between cognitive and emotional factors, and the way in which internalisation involves them both. How the individual thinks and feels about him- or herself will affect how they interact with and manipulate their environment to their benefit. And vice versa: how they interact with their environment will affect their feelings and thoughts about themselves. Broadly speaking, the more cognitively developed an individual is, the greater their capacity will be for enhancing self-esteem through being able to cope in the world. This will allow them to feel more emotionally secure. And the more emotionally secure or developed an individual is, the more he or she will be able to employ strategies to cope with the stresses of the behavioural reorganisation that internalisation involves.

This conceptualisation of self-esteem and its influence on learning can be framed in Vygotskian terms by noting the similarity of its features to those involved in the process of self-regulation (the end product of internalisation, when the teacher has constructed a meaning with the learner which the learner can now take on for themselves without any more external help). Graham Harris and Reid (1998) explain self-regulation in terms which clearly integrate both the cognitive and emotional aspects of the inner monologue. The salient features of self-regulation include the degree to which a learner can:

- direct attention to salient events, stimuli, or aspects of a problem
- interpret or control automatic or impulsive responses
- create and select among alternative reactions
• focus thinking
• aid memory for steps and procedures
• direct the execution of a sequence of action or steps
• cope with anxiety or other emotional reactions
• spell out criteria for success

(Graham Harris and Reid 1998, p. 208)

These features can take place on a conscious or unconscious level.

The interdependence between cognitive and emotional factors in learning are even more evident when Graham Harris and Reid provide an example of this self-regulation in action, by looking at what instructions a learner may be using to direct his or her behaviour with regard to developing writing skills. They suggest the following categories (with examples of the questions and statements that a learner may employ):

Problem definition:
• What is it I have to do here?
• What am I up to?
• What is my first step?

Focussing attention and planning
• I have to concentrate, be careful...think of the steps
• To do this right, I have to make a plan
• First I need to ..., then ...

Strategy
• First I will write - brainstorm as many ideas as I can
• The first step in writing an essay is
• My goals for this essay are ...; I will self-record on ...

Self-evaluating and error correction
• Oops, I missed one; that's okay - I can revise
• Am I following my plan?

Coping and self-control
• Don’t worry - worry doesn’t help
• It’s okay to feel a little anxious; a little anxiety can help
• I’m not going to mad; mad makes me do bad
• I need to go slow and take my time

Self-reinforcement
• I’m getting better at this
• Wait ‘til my teacher reads this!
• Hooray, I’m done!

(Graham Harris and Reid 1998, p. 209)

This list has certain culturally specific features – there is a slight American feel to the questions and statements, for example - but it provides an example of the way in which engagement with a learning task engages both the intellect and the emotions. Most interestingly, it presents the act of learning as being guided by an inner monologue. This monologue can be conscious or unconscious - the point that Graham Harris and Reid are making is that bringing this monologue onto the conscious plane will help children become better learners. The idea of most interest here is that of the inner monologue as a site where cognitive and emotional factors interact both on the conscious and unconscious level to compose the meanings that guide behaviour and development. This idea makes it easy to see that emotion and cognition are closely related to each other; if the task is too difficult for the learner to get to grips with on the cognitive level (e.g. the learner cannot define the task and plan clearly) then there will be more dependence on the coping and self-control mechanisms. And if a learner feels very positive about themselves, they will find it easier to engage these mechanisms, to take on more difficult tasks than a learner who feels less positive about him- or herself.
This concept allows us to see the nature of the relationship between a learner's emotional maturity and their capacity to learn. Emotional maturity - being clear about the personal identity one values, recognising when that identity is threatened, and being able to do something to construct, protect or enhance it (Dupont 1998) - will affect the nature of this monologue, the way in which a learner approaches a learning activity. The more appropriate the monologue is to the activity the better the learner will fare. The more negative a learner feels about themselves, the poorer their self-esteem, and the poorer their ability to self regulate when they are learning.

This view of learning allows us to conceive of learning as a three-dimensional process, where culturally, cognitively and emotionally things have to be right for the successful handover of knowledge or skills to take place. Past views of the interrelationship between culture and cognition (cf. Cole 1985) have enabled us to understand how cognitive or cultural disparities between the discourse of the teacher and that of the learner have led to the breakdown of the teaching and learning process. Adding the dimension of the emotions enables us to understand what is happening when the teaching and learning process breaks down because of disparities in the emotional orientation of teacher and learner. An example of this would be the frustration a teacher can feel when trying to educate an attention-seeking child, whose emotional disposition (by which I mean the culturally specific way in which a person has reached their particular level of emotional maturity) is such that rather than looking to learn, their primary motivation may be to engender situations where they are punished (Laslett and Smith 1996). In such cases teachers can find their attempts to teach subverted to the point where they become 'unwilling partners in a dance' (Mellor 1997). Without a way of framing interactions in emotional terms, we would have no way of analysing or changing the potential for learning in such cases.

**Scaffolding**

The individual’s inner monologue of learning is what teachers support when they try to affect that learning, and teach. The monologue then becomes a dialogue. The struggle to make meaning becomes a shared task. When this works well, the teacher fills the gaps in the learners monologue, provides support in whichever part of their self-regulation the learner is struggling, be it cognitive, emotional or a mixture of the two. The teacher’s intervention gives the learner support on whichever aspect of self
regulation the learner’s monologue is weak on, and increases the learner’s self-esteem through attention, direction and praise, allowing the learner to develop or maintain the behaviour necessary for the completion of a task which alone they would not have achieved.

When the teaching intervention does not work well, because of the failure to perceive where exactly the learner’s capacity for self-regulation needs support in order to achieve successful completion of the task, then the learner will be left with too much work to do with inadequate resources. This could impact on any area of self-regulation; problem definition, focusing attention, planning, strategy implementation, self-evaluation, error correcting, coping and self-control, or self-reinforcement, but once the learner has begun to feel that the task is going to end in some form of failure, the emotional experience of enhancing the learner’s self-esteem through learning becomes something quite different. The learner may exhibit an over-dependency on the teacher to try to ask for more support than the teacher feels able to give. Or, if failure has become a regular feature of their learning, then negativism about their work, themselves, their teacher and their peers may become the meaning they internalise as they struggle to protect their self-esteem. If they lose this struggle, they may internalise meanings which damage their self-esteem and they may become negative about themselves. These forms of negativity are cited by Kaufman, Pullen and Ackers (1998, p. 365) as being among the most common behaviour problems in the classroom.

There is then, an emotional aspect to the scaffolding that teachers provide their learners. Teachers provide learners with a loan of consciousness which performs the function of providing the appropriate amount of cognitive support to allow the learner success in the task with as much involvement by the learner as possible (Bruner 1985). However, they also provide support to the learner’s emotional state too, the emotional aspects of self-regulation. The emotional aspects of scaffolding have not, up to now, been acknowledged, despite the fact that the notion of scaffolding offers something which psychology otherwise lacks - an effective conceptual metaphor for the quality of teacher intervention in learning (Mercer 1993, p. 96). The concept has until now remained remarkably difficult to apply to the classroom in any practical way (Maybin, Mercer and Stierer 1992). Suggested reasons for this have been the
failure to specify the nature of the quality of care-giver/child interactions (Diaz et al., 1990) and the relative lack of emotional intimacy and intuitive understanding in the classroom compared to the parent-child dyads that Bruner (1985) used in his experiment.

Given that the skills teachers teach are always located in social practice (Barton 1994), and that social practice inevitably has an emotional component (Dunn 1988), it is not surprising to find the role of the emotions has been a sticking point in the application of this concept to the classroom. And if we look back to Bruner’s original experiment, we find evidence that the emotional state of the children in the experiment was a prerequisite for learning to take place, although this is somewhat overlooked in the experiment. He says that how an adult gets a child to venture into the zone is very obscure, but then provides details which he calls unimportant but which in the light of the examination of the emotional aspects of self-regulation and internalisation, now seem vital: the care-giver’s genuine interest in the children, her responsive goodwill, and that she induced the children to try. ‘Once the child is willing to try, the tutor’s general task is that of scaffolding’, Bruner writes (p.29) and in doing so, separates the emotional support from the cognitive. Common experience tells us that small children do not ‘switch off’ emotionally when they ‘switch on’ their academic faculties, and this is born out by the theory presented here.

The emotional aspect of scaffolding shows that we need to add a third dimension to the zone of proximal development. To the cognitive and cultural we need to add the emotional dimension. These three dimensions are interdependent. They all interact to create the meanings which are socially mediated and internalised when development takes place.

Their integrated nature makes it wrong to think of scaffolding being purely cognitive or purely emotional. Interventions which seem to be the one or the other (e.g. a factual explanation as opposed to a simple expression of reassurance) cannot be said to relate to just one of the aspects of self-esteem or self-regulation. Factual explanations support problem definition but in doing so they also ease pressure on coping strategies, the management of anxieties. They affect the learner’s sense of competence which affects the other aspects of self-esteem, such as the sense of
affiliation (by feeling able to succeed, the learner can feel more part of the classroom discourse). The same can be said for more emotional support, which releases the learner from managing the more emotional aspects of the inner monologue and releases more energies into the cognitive aspects of the activity they are engaged in.

Section 2: The three-dimensional zone of proximal development

Diagram 3.1
The three-dimensional zone of proximal development

The conceptualisation of the ZPD as three-dimensional, represented diagrammatically here, has some important theoretical implications which are discussed below. Before that, however, it is worth pointing out that adding this third dimension does not change its basic premise, that what a learner can do with assistance today they will be able to achieve independently tomorrow, has not been disputed. Nor is the interdependence between the process of child development and the socially provided resources for that development (Moll, 1990). The ZPD is not a model which needs radical revision, but further exploration and explication.

The theoretical implications of adding this extra dimension are now discussed.
The first implication is that the limitations of the ZPD as a practically applicable model are reduced. In its two dimensional definition, it had been seen as limited in its use, and unsuited to the practicalities of the classroom (Mercer 1995). It had been seen as lacking because while it underlines the importance of social assistance to learners, there has been little success in defining exactly what this assistance entails (Moll 1990). This study supports Moll’s view that in general, it has been thought of in terms which are too narrow to make anything more than a useful way of theorising about the dynamic relations between individual learner and their environment. We now have a model which conceptualises the transaction between a greater range of universal factors in development (cognitive and emotional development), culturally mediated factors (socio-historically constituted ways of maturing) and how these factors relate to individuals in specific contexts (how socially mediated meanings are internalised into subjective ones). Secondly, this model presents us with a means of identifying and isolating the emotional dimension of the language of teaching and learning. The rest of this report is devoted to this. We can identify the emotional aspects of activities that are designed to foster cognitive development, and we conceptualise how and why learners’ emotional states can foster or hinder their overall development. These two aspects of the emotional dimension of the ZPD are exemplified below.

On a theoretical level we can now appreciate the interdependence between these three dimensions, that the zone of proximal development is the place where the three create each other as development proceeds. But what does that mean on a practical level? The concept of the zone of proximal development suggests that support to the learner must be offered at an appropriate level. Cognitively and culturally speaking, this is fairly straightforward. It means that the teacher must ensure that the tasks set are not too complex or too easy, and that they are in terms of reference which the learner can relate to. But what about the emotional dimension? How can a teacher ensure that a task is appropriate to the emotional orientation of the learner? The rest of this report is aimed at answering that question, and it starts by looking at two general illustrations of the emotional dimension of teaching and learning.
Two illustrations of the emotional dimension of the zone of proximal development.

i) The emotional dimension to types of classroom talk.

Both in teacher-pupil talk, and in pupil-pupil talk, the quality of the talk is an important factor in determining the amount of learning that goes on in a classroom. Talk which is characterised by a critical engagement with the subject, challenge and counter challenge (categorised by Mercer 1995, p.83, as 'exploratory talk' although only in reference to pupil-pupil talk) is obviously more constructive than talk which is characterised by disagreement and individual decision-making, or talk where participants accept each other's contributions uncritically (again, these ideas are borrowed from Mercer, ibid.). It is certainly more constructive than talk where participants are not prepared to wait for their turn to speak, or where the talk is used as a vehicle for seeking attention, expressing pent-up feelings, or for denigrating others.

If the task set by a teacher is to take part in a discussion, then, there may be several reasons why a learner fails to complete this task, and these reasons can be related to the diagram above. It may be that the learner is not able to complete the task for cognitive reasons; they are simply not developed enough to be able to take on complex or differing perspectives. Or it may be on the cultural dimension that there is a mismatch between learner and task; the learner may come from a home background where there is little opportunity for practising the type of talk favoured in the classroom.

Alternatively, it may be for emotional reasons that the learner is unable to engage in such talk. Bennathan and Boxall (1998) provide a framework for the identification and assessment of emotional difficulties, and the criteria for assessment they use reflects the general fact that children who are emotionally underdeveloped are too egocentric to accord the perspectives of others equal status to their own. For example, the characteristics of an emotionally secure child include the ability to give purposeful attention and to participate constructively in activities, whereas some of the characteristics of emotionally insecure children can include general negativity of
mood, hypersensitivity to perceived criticism and low concentration span, none of which are ingredients for successful discussion and argument.

Although the focus here is on the emotional dimension of talk in the classroom, it would be a mistake, however, to see the three dimensions as separately as they are presented in this example. They each impact closely upon the others. Whatever the reason for a learner being unable to engage in exploratory talk, the result is a relative impairment in their ability to learn and develop, to mediate their experience on any of these three dimensions, through the development of their self-esteem which encapsulates their sense of identity, worth and competence.

ii) Two teachers talking about a pupil

The data which now follows was taken from interviews with two teachers and concerns a boy, Robert, who was attending a school for children with emotional and behavioural difficulties. At the time of the interview Robert was aged 13, in year 9. One of the teachers interviewed was his English teacher, whose classes he attended with six or seven other boys. The other teacher was the learning support teacher, who both supported him in class and saw him individually to help him improve his literacy skills. Robert’s level of literacy skills were reflected by test scores which showed spelling and reading ages of around eight years. Both his teachers felt he was struggling to make any progress, despite the fact that his learning support teacher had devised a course especially for him within the context of her studies for a qualification in helping dyslexic learners.

Both teachers felt that it was difficult to ‘connect’ (as his English teacher put it) with him in the classroom when work was involved (he was fine when the conversation was just social). They both highlighted his emotional problems as instrumental in this:

Learning support teacher (LS): Well I think because of Robert’s emotional problems or something that I can’t quite understand, he doesn’t seem able to tune into those sorts of teaching methods, even though they’re the most up-to-date that we could devise for him, including lots of multi-sensory stuff, not
just paper and pen; visual cues, talking and listening, all sorts of cues. That did not help him learn in that way.

English Teacher (ET): When I did a home visit there the feeling of grief from the loss of Robert’s brother when Robert was eight when you walk into that house that is palpable I’ve got no proof but it’s my feeling that it’s very much tied up with that and Robert’s role in the family and Robert and his family need to address that emotional crisis before any real learning can go on.

This is not to say that Robert’s emotional problems blocked his ability to learn per se. The problem resided not simply in the resources he brought to the classroom as much as in the interactions that were conducted there. Robert did the set tasks, but somehow the meanings of this supposedly intermental activity did not translate into the desired behavioural transformations with regard to his literacy skills.

There were activities which both teachers felt increased the possibility of meaningful interaction, and these provide clues as to how the mechanisms of the classroom discourse that Robert took part in were at odds with his emotional state:

LS: I think embarrassment was a big factor with him as well because he was always worried if other people saw that he couldn’t write, he’d do anything to cover that fact up in the classroom, surreptitiously copy things and would not admit that he couldn’t write, but now in a one-to-one situation he’s admitting that there are things that he can’t do and asking for help, which he won’t do in a classroom, which is a big step

ET: He used to cry in the classroom when we used to ask him to write, even with lots and lots of support, d’you remember? There’d be tears. We did get him writing I remember that one story on homelessness and you took him away didn’t you to get him onto the computer on his own and I think that’s the way. .. there was too much embarrassment or fear for him

LS: He finds it difficult to ask for help because there are lots of people who could take dictation for him. He finds that so difficult

ET: We did get him to produce work and then something would happen and it would be one step forward and three steps back.
On the computer as well, Robert was more able, in terms of his emotions, to engage in meaningful activity. His learning support teacher said that on the computer he was ‘more willing to have a go, because he feels that he can make mistakes, and he can ask for help’.

But it seems that there was something in Robert that militated against the development of trust. He rejected, it seems, the teacher’s help in filling the cognitive gaps because of the fact that the emotional gaps in his inner monologue were unassailable. There was not the build up of trust that marks successful teacher-learner interactions over time (what Mercer calls the ‘long conversation’). This trust is generated from the intimacy of shared meaning where the learner can come to rely on the teacher to know what gaps to expect in their inner monologue and how to overcome them, through the appropriate management and support of their learning activities. We cannot say how events in Robert’s past have affected his self-esteem (his sense of safety, competence, affiliation etc.) but it may be that without specialist intensive help the emotional gaps in Robert’s inner monologue will continue to hamper his ability to engage in certain tasks in certain contexts.

This illustration of the emotional dimension of the ZPD is a very general one, with only vague pointers as to how the emotional factors of the language of teaching and learning are manifested in actual classroom practice. In order to bring these into sharper relief, the theory generated in this chapter is further explored in the next in a way that brings it closer to practice.
Chapter 4 Further exploration of the emotional dimension of the zone of proximal development

Introduction

In the previous two chapters several concepts were explored on a theoretical level:

- The interdependence of emotional and cognitive development
- The three-dimensional nature of the zone of proximal development
- The emotional aspects of language in the process of self-regulation and learning

These concepts have been explored by looking at the inner monologue of self-regulation. It has been shown that this inner monologue has interdependent cognitive and emotional dimensions, and that this it has a close relationship with the socially mediated dialogue between teacher and learner. This corresponding dialogue between teacher and learner has been given a secondary role, being highlighted in terms mainly of how it can support the gaps in the learner’s inner speech when taking on new concepts or skills. It is now time to redress the balance, and shift the focus to reflect fully this dual function of language. Exploring the emotional aspects of meaning-making allows us to do this, by exploring how socially mediated understandings are translated into internalised individual thought structures. We can do this because consideration of the emotional aspects of discourse allow us to access subjective understandings. By subjective is meant that which

\[
\text{can be defined as that combination of conscious and unconscious thoughts and emotions that make up our sense of ourselves, our relation to the world and our ability to act on the world. (Crowley and Himmelweit, 1992, p.7)}
\]

This chapter explores how those subjective understandings are appropriated by learners through shared understandings constructed with teachers. It looks at the relationship between meanings constructed in the classroom, and internalised
meanings in individual minds. This method of analysis provides an opportunity to illustrate the theoretical points developed in previous chapters with examples from practice. It is possible to provide such examples because of the fact that the gap in theory identified earlier in this study is not totally reflected by a gap in practice.

Many teachers work hard to ensure that their discourse has the optimum emotional features for the maximisation of shared meanings to develop in their classrooms, and it is possible to use examples of these features to back up the argument of this chapter. This chapter, then, is similar in approach to the previous one – it reconceptualises Vygotskian concepts in order to accommodate the emotional dimension of teaching and learning, but it does so by making more explicit links to actual practice.

This chapter takes two key Vygotskian concepts – action and behavioural transformation- and considers them from a psychosocial perspective, drawing out the emotional aspects of both, and reconceptualising them in a way that allows us to appreciate that at the same time that language is a social mode of thinking (Mercer 1994), it is also a social mode of feeling, because it is when thoughts and emotions are combined that the individual/subjective process of making meaning can be understood. This allows us to expand the notion of social in the way that Moll uses it in the following statement:

English-speaking scholars interpret the (zone of proximal development) more narrowly than Vygotsky intended, robbing it of some of its potential for enabling us to understand the social genesis of human cognitive processes and the process of teaching and learning in particular. (Moll, p.7)

To understand that ‘social’ includes the emotional as well as the cognitive and cultural dimension gives us a way of accessing the interactions between learner and the context in which they develop.

Structure of chapter

Section 1 looks at the emotional dimension of the Vygotskian concept of action. Section 2 looks at the emotional dimension of the Vygotskian concept of behaviour.
Each of these sections starts of with a redefinition of the term in question. The concepts are then are explored by looking at how emotional factors can influence the nature of the meanings that are made in the classroom in relation to these concepts.

Section 3: The Teacher as Discourse Guide
This section brings together the two previous sections by examining how teachers actively seek to manipulate the discourse in the classroom in order to create the best emotional context or discourse for learning to take place. This includes a further exploration of the emotional aspects of scaffolding.

Section 4: The Contribution of the Learner
The first three sections make explicit the teacher’s role in the creation of shared meanings in the classroom, and this section draws together the ideas about the learner’s contribution to the emotional aspects of the language of teaching and learning. In particular, it looks at the concept of the emotional resources a learner brings to the joint construction of understanding.

Section 1 The emotional dimension of action

Introduction

Action is important in Vygotskian theory because it is through acting on the world in socially mediated ways that internalisation (learning) takes place (Vygotsky, 1978, p.56). In order to understand the nature of mediated action, we need to look at the meanings teacher and learner create together and how these shared meanings affect and are affected by the subjective meanings that learners bring to the classroom and develop as a result of the interaction. It is through action that these meanings are created.

A study of action, then, needs to combine both an examination of the physical activities that teachers and learners collaborate in, and also what meanings are ascribed to the event. This is complicated by the fact that these meanings do not just relate to what is being done, but also why and how. This section is therefore
separated into four parts, with each part looking at one aspect of the process of making meaning through action. Part 1 looks at the meanings that can be created in relation to the act of learning itself, and considers how teachers and learners may interpret this act. Part 2 looks at the emotional dimension of interpreting concepts in the classroom, the content of curricula. Part 3 looks at emotional dimension of the interpretation and production of texts, and what it means to be literate. Part 4 looks at how meanings are made through styles of talk, and how these affect and are affected by the emotional dimension of classroom discourse.

**Part 1) Interpreting the act of learning**

This first part looks at how teachers and learners interpret the act of learning itself.

When I first set out to look at what learners do in classrooms, and what they learnt, I went to the lesson plans of the teachers whose classes I was observing. It took me a while to realise that this notion—that learners do what teachers want them to do, and therefore they learn what teachers want them to learn—has a fundamental flaw. If we are looking at both meanings created in the classroom (social and subjective), then it is necessary to look at the perspectives of both teacher and learner. Allowing for subjective interpretations in the classroom changes our understanding of what learners do there. We have to move away from the rather structuralist notion that a task set by a teacher is the one done by the learner—a straightforward transfer of meaning from speaker to audience, as it were. Instead we should take a more post-modern view of how meanings are made, acknowledging their fleeting, precarious nature, and the fact they are bound up with the identities and social practices of the participants. Above all we should allow for a multiplicity of perspectives. Meanings in the classroom, this view suggests, spring from a wide variety of sources, only some of which are controllable by the teacher (Rogoff, 1995, p.147).

To take a psychosocial view of how meanings are made, we need to look not only at the intended meanings the teacher is hoping to construct with the learner, but also the ‘actual processes by which children engage in cultural activity and the ways they transform their participation’ (Rogoff, 1995, p.157), i.e. the subjective meanings children make about the activities they engage in.
Acknowledging the possibility of multiple, shifting meanings in the classroom makes a kind of intuitive sense to me as a teacher of children with emotional and behavioural difficulties. For example, I could set a group the ‘task’ of writing a story. However, this is no one simple task. It can involve a plethora of other activities, depending on the subjective perspectives of the children in the room. For some, starting a story is a major difficulty in itself. For others, the problem is finishing, and coping with praise, disappointment or just the pressure of reviewing their achievement. There are also the activities of asking for help, ignoring distractions, ignoring the need for instant gratification, working around learning difficulties. Each individual can seem to be attempting something different according to their subjective interpretation of events in the classroom.

To put this onto a less intuitive level, to explore more rigorously the process of subjective meaning making, and to begin to bring into relief the emotional aspects of activity in the classroom, we can look at an example where an activity seems to be slow getting off the ground. This is a teacher and student (year 9) who we shall meet at several points in this chapter. Here, the teacher has set the group the task of writing, and the pupil, Chris, is reluctant to join in.

Teacher (T1): Now Chris what I’d like you to do (.) and if you do this I’ll let you do some of your wordsearch (.) I’d like you to write

P1: I don’t want to write!

T1: Miss Griffiths, did you give this lovely yellow book to Christopher so he could write his sentences in?

T2: Or a story

T1: Or a story (.) where do you want to write it? (.) You don’t want to write it in here why not?

P: I don’t want to write!

P2: Miss it doesn’t matter if you get your spellings wrong

T1: Well said Sam. Why doesn’t it matter Sam?

P2: Because they can easy be checked afterwards
T1: Yep (. ) We’ve got this lovely yellow book and all I see is empty pages (. ) Why don’t you want to write?

Chris’s honesty about his emotional orientation to the task is very useful here. It shows us that underpinning every academic discourse there is an emotional one which can support or undermine it. Chris’s truth is subjective and limited. He is stating a subjective feeling about the activity of the classroom, and that is he does not want to be part of it. The lesson on writing is still going ahead – they are still talking about writing- but Chris has shifted the focus from the cognitive help the teacher was presumably going to give, to the emotional issue of Chris’s desires in relation to the activity. The teacher, if she is to construct a joint understanding with Chris has been forced to reinterpret the situation. She has to ask and answer the question of why Chris does not want to write.

I asked the teacher later for her thoughts on why Chris was reluctant to write. She felt that for Chris, writing meant engaging with many of his fears; fears about not being able to write as well as his much younger sister, about being reliant on lots of support but not liking to ask for it, and about seeming inferior to his peers. He had been happy to write on many other occasions, especially when working one-to-one with a teacher away from his peers. He was being asked to write about one of his favourite subjects, so it was not the content but the context which she felt he was objecting to.

We can relate these comments to the point raised in the previous chapter that activities which take learners onto a new level of self-regulation have an emotional dimension because they are affected by self-esteem. Self-esteem, as has been shown, involves a number of concepts in which the cognitive and emotional overlap. The list used before is repeated in brief here, with some related questions that may appear the learner’s inner monologue in this particular situation. Self-esteem includes:

- A sense of competency: am I able to do this?
- A sense of safety: what are the risks involved? Can I handle failure? Can I handle success?
- A sense of self-worth: what does doing this activity say about me to others and to myself?

- A sense of identity: does this activity relate to who I am or who I want to be?

- A sense of affiliation: does this activity enhance my bond with a particular group (e.g. the pro- or anti-school groups)

- A sense of mission; can I see any purpose in doing this?

The teacher can, through the way the activity is set up and conducted, provide support on any of these aspects of self-esteem. This support could be overtly cognitive; breaking the task down into manageable parts may increase the sense of competence and therefore incline the learner to see the activity in a more positive light. Or the support could be more on the emotional dimension, such as reassurance, affirmations of self-worth. Whatever support is given, it needs to have sufficient repercussions on both cognitive and emotional levels in order that the learner perceives it to be one that enhances rather than threatens their self-esteem. If it is successful then the learner will engage more fully with the original activity (i.e. the one intended by the teacher) on both a cognitive and emotional level.

The fact that the emotional engagement in an activity seems a pre-requisite to cognitive engagement echoes Vygotsky’s assertion cited in the previous chapter that ‘thought is not begotten by thought; it is engendered by emotion’. Bruner (1985) states that it is ‘unclear’ how teachers get learners to enter the zone of proximal development but I would suggest that we need to think of the zone as stretching to include this initial stage of creating the desire to begin the process of creating shared meaning. The desire is an essential part of the engagement in the activity.

Chris could have been less honest about his willingness to engage with the activity. He could have attempted to get away with going through the motions of the activity without really engaging with it in a way that was meaningful to him. This is what Bloome (1993) calls procedural display. However, it would be unfruitful to think of this as an example of someone simply not engaging in a classroom activity. Chris may not be doing the activity the teacher wanted him to do, but he is doing something, creating some form of meaning, and presumably if it carried on he would internalise
some meaning from it. Again, the same categories encompassed by the notion of self esteem would pertain here. He could internalise negative messages about his sense of competence, affiliation, mission etc. which would again have both a cognitive and emotional component.

To sum up this section so far, we can say that juxtaposing the two forms of making meaning in the classroom (social and subjective) shows the uniqueness of each act of teaching and learning. To appreciate this fully we need to look at the relationship between what teachers ask learners to do and how this relates to each individual’s sense of self at that point in time. The factors which affect this relationship can be long term (such as a sense of mission relating to future examinations) or short term (such as the attraction of writing in a ‘lovely yellow book’). They can relate to the personal teacher-learner relationship (the more the learner respects the teacher the greater the sense of self-worth to be gained from earning their positive regard) and to the other people in the classroom (the sense of affiliation may be enhanced or threatened by a willingness to join in the ‘official’ discourse of the classroom, depending on the nature of the learner’s peer group).

Part 2. Interpreting concepts in the classroom.

This part looks at the emotional dimension of the language of teaching and learning in terms of the relationship between the level of emotional development a learner has reached and their ability to relate to certain types of concept which may figure in the curriculum they are studying.

There are two aspects of emotional development of interest here. The first relates to the fact that increasing emotional maturity brings with it a decreasing gratification in the short term (Greenfield 00). Thus learners who are more emotionally mature will be able to delay the need to get to the end of a problem, and work through more complex and extended problems, or towards longer-term goals, more methodologically. They are more able therefore to develop an appreciation of consequentiality, which can support their understanding of how concepts are related. This can take the form of being better able to solve logic problems (in maths for example) or being better able to plan the sequencing of paragraphs in an essay.
The other aspect of emotional development is that it brings with it a decreasing egocentricity. The viewpoints of others become more accessible. This is important in a number of ways. Firstly, the more emotionally mature learner is better able to appreciate where the teacher is 'coming from', and thus is more able to take an active part in the facilitation of the development of shared meaning in the classroom. Secondly, different school subjects involve appreciation of others' perspectives in different ways. For example, geography and history often involve appreciating the viewpoints of peoples from different sociohistorical contexts. Another example is in English, which can involve the appreciation of narrators or characters in novels etc., or the development of awareness of the needs of the audience when speaking or writing. Thirdly, on more general level, an appreciation of others' viewpoints is often a central tenet in the overall aims of schools, relating to the combating of prejudice, tolerance of ambiguity, and the development of concern for others.

Alongside a consideration of these general features of emotional development, we need to recognise that this development can take many paths, that each individual is different, and that they can react to specific concepts in very specific ways. For example, I observed a teacher having a problem with a student in a lesson dealing with alcohol abuse. It later turned out that this student was worried about this issue with specific regard to her parents. Another example concerns a group of boys from a mainstream school, who interpreted the relationship between George and Lenny, the central characters in Of Mice and Men by John Steinbeck, as a homosexual one. This meaning was partly influenced by cultural phenomena—their socially accepted ways of expressing affection between males were different to those in the book—but it seems it was also influenced by their emotional orientation. The teacher involved in the lesson felt the views they were expressing were intended more as statements concerning their own sexuality and affiliations, rather than about the book itself.

Part 3. Interpreting texts

The ability to use and the practice of using the tools of reading and writing has always seemed to me to be one of the areas of school life which provokes the more intense reactions from children with emotional difficulties. Why is it that many such children
seem happier to take part in a variety of other school activities but when asked to write put up a great deal of resistance?

The answer may well lie in the closeness of one’s literacy practices, abilities and skills to one’s sense of identity and self-esteem. The greater one’s participation in a wide range of literacy practices, the more one can develop a sense of competence, self-worth, and affiliation. Our abilities to produce and interpret texts is closely tied up with our sense of self (Street, 1993) (Barton and Padmore 1993).

To this link between literacy and identity can be added the fact that reading and writing both have an affective component. Reading something often (if not always) invokes an emotional response, on a conscious and/or unconscious level. A good example of this phenomenon is Bettleheim’s (1989) psychological exploration of the meanings that can be drawn from fairy tales.

The same phenomenon happens with writing too. Styles of writing can reflect emotions and attitudes shown in other aspects of a person’s life. For example, children whose response to severe abuse has been to live in fantasy worlds often make great imaginative writers but struggle with factual writing. Others who are more emotionally withdrawn can find factual writing preferable to creative writing. And children whose lives are characterised by disorder can reflect this in their writing, either at text level (e.g. sudden disorienting changes in plot, character or style), sentence level (e.g. incorrect conjugation of verbs, confusion of 1st/3rd narrator) and even word level (haphazard spelling, substitutions of similar words, such as ‘with’ and ‘which’).

Although the evidence I am presenting here is from my field notes, I cannot claim that the links being made here are completely reliable. As stated in the first chapter of this report, making causal links to the emotions is a slippery business. However, I present these as examples of which their plausibility is their strength. The next examples show that others make these links too.

One student in my class wrote a poem based on a study of the film The Shawshank Redemption. One of the themes of the film is the maintenance of hope against seemingly overwhelming odds. I gave the students the opportunity to put themselves
in the place of one of the characters in the films, and complete 10 sentences beginning with either 'I hope' or 'I fear'. The student in question chose the 'I fear' frame, and his list of fears included, 'Life, death, punishment, family, freedom, being raped, perverts, myself'. His carer told me that there had long been a suspicion of sexual abuse in the boy's early history. In fact, he had recently made a very partial disclosure. She opined that teachers were in the best place to facilitate the kind of emotional exploration and expression that she felt was in evidence here.

Acknowledging the emotional dimension of making meaning through texts, and the emotional aspects of the process of becoming literate, means that we can conceptualise a means for evaluating the personal development of children through interaction with texts. At a recent parents' evening, the parents of one boy who had made good progress in his reading and writing over the year were most pleased about the effect they thought this improvement had had on his behaviour. His improved ability to communicate, they felt, made him more able to connect with other people, express himself, and had lessened the anger and frustration which had led him to be removed from his previous school. There is, of course, no way of knowing if these parents are right in their deductions, but their comments illustrate the suggestion that we need to be aware that there is an emotional dimension to the development of literacy skills and practices, and the purposes to which they are put. This suggestion is made in the Kingman Report (1988):

Language plays an important role both in exploring and defining responses and feelings and in shaping the kind of people we become.

**Part Four. Interpreting through spoken language**

Although the ideas in this part have been largely covered elsewhere in the report (see comments in chapter 4 on the emotional aspects of disputational, cumulative and exploratory talk), it is worth reiterating that the styles of speaking and listening, reading and writing that are employed in classrooms throughout the curriculum have emotional dimensions to them. The styles of language used in each classroom will reflect the current emotional orientations of the learners in the class as well as the wishes of the teacher regarding what and how it is the students are to learn. The ways
in which teachers manage interactions, correct mistakes, and the degree of freedom they allow their students to experiment with ideas, take ownership of the floor, express personal opinions, will all have messages with regard to the esteem the teacher accords to the students in the classroom. And as with literacy, there is a close link between oracy and self-esteem. As MacLure (1993) points out, rationales for developing oracy can include personal growth as well as developing tools for learning.

**Section 2 The emotional dimension of behaviour and behavioural transformation**

**Introduction: a psychosocial approach**

To complete the picture of what goes on in the classroom on the emotional dimension, we have to look at not only the activities that teachers set up, but the way they guide their learners through these activities. We need in short to look at the notion of behaviour, and how teachers attempt to manage behaviour in their classrooms. There are two concepts of behaviour that are relevant here. The first is behaviour in the theoretical, Vygotskian, sense: the idea that the internalisation of culturally produced sign systems brings about behavioural transformations and forms the bridge between early and later forms of development (Cole and Scribner, 1978, p.7). Language changes thought, which in turn affects behaviour through increasing the ability to self-regulate.

The other notion of behaviour in the classroom is a rather more gritty, more practice-based notion. It is to do with keeping control, dealing with disruption, strife, and with mess. This second notion may seem at first to have little to do with the first, but this section explores the rich link between them. It does so by again adopting a psychosocial approach, whereby the relationship between the shared meanings of dialogues and the subjective inner monologues of the learner are explored through the consideration of the emotional dimension of the language of teaching and learning.

The link between emotion and behaviour is a very close one. This is evidenced in part by the epithet ‘EBD’, the notion that emotional difficulties are often associated
with behavioural problems. Sylvester (1994) outlines what, I would suggest, is felt by many on an intuitive level with regard to emotion and behaviour:

> We know emotion is important in education. It drives attention, which in turn drives attention, which in turn drives learning and memory. But because we don’t fully understand our emotional system, we don’t know exactly how to regulate it in school, beyond defining too much or too little emotion as misbehaviour (Sylvester 1994)

To integrate these two concepts we can refer back to the inner monologue of the learner, as he or she takes on a new activity. They are bringing both cognitive and emotional resources (both of which are culturally shaped) to the situation. These resources will be stretched to some degree, presumably, if the learner is having to work to take concepts that are unfamiliar to them but within their reach with assistance from a more able other person, the teacher. It is the teacher’s job to ensure that wherever the gaps in the learner’s monologue appear, they are filled temporarily by dialogue, a temporary loan of consciousness. These gaps may be largely cognitive, or largely emotional, but they are never one to the exclusion of the other, because in the learner’s inner monologue the two dimensions are interdependent. Coping strategies, for example, include both the ability to choose other planning strategies when initial ones fail, and also the management of emotions which may jeopardise the situation. If a teacher steps in to scaffold, by defining or limiting the number of strategies a learner should employ, then this may well have an effect on both the cognitive and emotional level. The greater the degree of intimacy between a learner and teacher, the greater the cognitive and emotional reciprocity, the less chance there is of the gaps in the learner’s inner monologue of making the activity end in failure.

We can link the concepts of behavioural transformation and (mis)behaviour in the classroom by framing them in terms of trying to create shared and internalised meanings. The two concepts can then be seen as different points on the same spectrum. If we look at the two extremes of this spectrum, by looking hypothetically at successful and unsuccessful attempts at creating shared meaning, we can see that
behavioural transformation is a result of the former and 'misbehaviour' is a result of the latter.

The behavioural consequences of a successful construction of shared meaning

In the positive model, the teacher and learner are getting things right in the classroom, and therefore there is a high degree of shared meaning between them. Getting things right includes, of course, the emotional and cognitive dimensions. The following is adapted from a list of features that Kaufmann, Pullen and Akers (1998, p.365-7) consider as teacher interventions suitable for minimising the incidence of misbehaviour. The list can be seen as a range of cognitive and emotional interventions for keeping channels of communications clear and maximising shared meanings.

Teachers should:
- be consistent in responding to behaviour
- be rewarding of the right behaviour
- have expectations appropriate to the learners' abilities
- be tolerant of individuality
- provide useful instruction
- provide desirable models of behaviour
- avoid irritability and over-reliance on punishment as a control technique
- be willing to try out new approaches
- discourage over-dependence by the learner
- appreciate the difficulties a learner may have in concentrating and paying attention
- appreciate the point at which a learner may become upset under the pressure to achieve
- minimise any negativity or aggression shown by one learner to others

There is nothing particularly innovative in this list. It reflects the widely accepted notion that children learn best when they feel safe, valued and supported (cf. Cooper et al 1994). The interest here for us is that all these features of teacher interventions
are designed to maximise the amount of shared meaning between teacher and learner on the cognitive, emotional and cultural levels. If this is happening, then the structures of thought and feeling of the learners will develop, and they will be able to move onto higher levels of behavioural transformation in the future.

The behavioural consequences of failure to create shared meanings in the classroom

The negative model is much more messy than the positive one, as there are (bitter experience has shown me) many ways of a class going off the rails. But on a general theoretical level all these ways can be characterised by a lack or scarcity of shared meaning. There is research (cited earlier) to show that at times of conflict or disruption learners are not being naughty or evil, but are in fact responding to the situation as they see it in the most rational way possible. When gaps in the inner monologue of learners are not bridged by dialogue with the teacher, the learner's coping strategies may well become strained beyond their limits, and at that point the meaning of the activity may change for the learner. In such situations we tend to see behaviour that shows the learner:

- asking for support in inappropriate ways
- showing signs of the inner monologue struggling but failing to cope
- (in perhaps the worst case scenario) taking on a different activity altogether in order to express sadness, anger or other emotions at being ignored, or changing the criteria for success – there are times when it is more important to look streetwise than to look smart, and if a learner’s self-esteem is threatened because the task they are involved in threatens their self-esteem by undermining their identity and affiliation to school, they may well choose to join a different peer group whose sense of mission and competence does not accord with the meanings the school promotes.

Kaufmann, Pullen and Akers (1998, p.365-7) provide a list of the most common characteristics known to contribute to what they call ‘academic and behaviour
management' problems. Each one of these features can be related to the fact that there is a lack of communication of meaning between the teacher and learner, and that therefore the learner’s cognitive and emotional resources are under too much pressure and there is a consequent failure, a negative effect on self-esteem. The features are:

- Overdependency on the teacher
- Difficulty concentrating and paying attention
- Becoming upset under pressure to achieve
- Sloppiness and impulsivity in responding
- Teasing, annoying, or interfering with other children
- Negativism about work, self, teacher and peers
- Extreme social withdrawal or refusal to respond
- Physical or verbal aggression towards teacher or peers

The learner will have a behaviour problem in the teacher's eyes simply because there is no shared meaning – the learner is bound to be acting in a way the teacher cannot understand.

These two 'models' are rather crudely presented, but they are sufficient to show that self-regulation (or lack of it) is a key factor in both behavioural transformation and in the manifestation of disruption or other forms of underachievement in the classroom. They also show clearly the role of the emotions in the social origins of self-regulation. Whelan (1998) extends this idea by linking 'emotional maturity' to the development of conscience and a sense of responsibility towards oneself and others. He defines emotional maturity thus:

Emotional maturity is not an absence of emotion. It is not the total control of one's emotions so that one is exclusively rational. Emotional maturity means being clear about the personal identity one values, being able to recognise when that identity has been or is being threatened, recognising and even seeking opportunities to enhance and personal identity- and having that
repertoire of actions and economy of affect that will enable one to construct, protect, or enhance that most valued personal identity. (Whelan 1998, p.8)

For those learners whose identities are being developed positively, school is a place where learning enhances self-esteem, conscience and the development of self-control:

Because personal identity is always a social construction developed in a context of social relationships, emotional maturity has a great deal to do with the development of interpersonal ethics. It has to do with the internalising of rules and standards for how we treat ourselves and others. (ibid., p.9)

We can see then that the emotional dimension of behaviour in the classroom is an extremely important factor not just in terms of the cognitive advancement of learners, but for their commensurate emotional and overall social development as well. It affects the degree of shared meaning which can be constructed in dialogues between teacher and learner, which in turn is a crucial factor in the further cognitive and emotional development of the learner. This is true for individual interactions and for the ‘long conversation’ (Mercer 1995), the meaning drawn from the sum of the previous interactions between a learner and a teacher, or between a learner and their school. Too many interactions where shared meanings have failed to be made can result in negativity and disaffection.

Language as a site of struggle

Between the two scenarios presented above – a successful and a failed attempt to create shared meaning – there are of course a vast range of situations which are ongoing, where the attempt to make meaning is a constant process rather than a developed state. This means that each situation is a precarious one. Moreover, meanings are not always arrived at harmoniously, by willing collaborators, of course. Language is a site of struggle (Fairclough 1989) and the asymmetry of discourse in the classroom which reflects the fact the teacher’s job is to create a situation where the creation of shared meaning is feasible, desirable and useful for the learner to join
in with, may well be challenged by students who wish to assert other meanings in the classroom.

Influencing the behaviour of the learner, guiding them through an activity is in effect to define the nature of the activity itself, if we look at the concept of activity from the perspective developed in the previous section. So the points raised about the relationship between activity and meaning in the last section are again pertinent here. By guiding the learner's behaviour through an activity the teacher seeks to make sure the meaning created is one which allows the learner to increase their level of self-regulation. They will do this by establishing a meaning that will extend the learner's self-esteem, by increasing their senses of being safe, self-worth, competence, affiliation and mission.

This can be illustrated by two examples from practice. The first returns to Chris and his teacher, and the attempt to get him writing. In this episode, the teacher is sitting with Chris and giving him some intensive support. Below is an analysis of this interaction (the full transcript of which is in the appendix).

Chris's teacher uses a variety of interventions to guide his behaviour through the activity which, taken from a perspective which separates the cognitive and emotional aspects of teaching and learning, could be divided into three parts. These are presented below in order to consider the strengths and weaknesses of this 'traditional' view:

Firstly, there is the 'unclear' business (Bruner 1985) of getting the learner to want to enter the zone. For this she sets clear expectations, rebuts attempts to change the agenda, sets short term rewards (the 'lovely' book and a wordsearch) and she points out that everyone else is doing the activity.

Secondly she makes interventions which are seemingly aimed at cognitive support. She scaffolds the start of the writing by asking questions, making suggestions, breaking down words he cannot spell. She also encourages reflection and metacognition.

Thirdly she makes interventions which could be seen as 'emotional and behavioural'. She overrides his urges to disrupt the activity, acts as a surrogate conscience.
(vocalising the rights and wrongs of his actions, and their consequences), affirms the worth of what he is doing, ignores his attempts to be negative (at one point deliberately misinterpreting a negative comment as a positive one) and she maintains an overall positive outlook.

This ‘traditional’ analysis shows much of what the teacher does, but it shows it in such a way that it divides the social context into separate parts and makes the different parts seem independent of each other. An integrated approach shows that in order for Chris to develop cognitively by engaging in this activity it is necessary for him to behave in a way that he seemingly cannot manage by himself because of some gaps in his inner monologue. An integrated analysis of this interaction shows that the cognitive and emotional aspects are interdependent, and that to get him to behave in a certain way is to define the activity itself. The teacher intervenes to make Chris act in a way that supports his self-esteem. She creates a sense of safety by showing she is prepared to work with him without judgement on an area of his performance which she believes he feels ashamed of. She supports his sense of self-worth by being quick to praise, slow to censure. His sense of affiliation is supported by the message that he can join the rest of the class in this work, rather than trying to create an alternative, subversive value system. His sense of competence is fostered by her breaking the activity down into manageable parts, and his sense of mission is supported by all her interventions, which imply that this in activity worth doing.

The benefit of this analytical approach is that it allows us to see that these different aspects of an intervention are interrelated, that each type of intervention has ramifications on the other types. By guiding his behaviour, Chris’s teacher provides cognitive and emotional support for him, and with this support he achieves more than he could have done alone.

The second example shows that even when the intervention is not so clearly related to specific cognitive support, and is more seemingly related to behaviour only, the same principles apply. There is no essential difference between cognitive and emotional support because the two dimensions are interdependent. An integrated analysis, which looks at the interaction in terms of making shared meaning, is therefore the best way to characterise this intervention. In this situation there is a struggle for meaning,
which the teacher ‘wins’ by ensuring that the elements of the student’s self-esteem are restored. In this instance, the student (year 10) has just had an altercation with the learning support assistant, and the teacher moves to re-establish a successful way of sharing a meaning about what is going on, in order that the student can go back to regulating his own working:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transcript</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assistant</strong>: That’s typical of you! You’re so rude!</td>
<td>Judgement external to teacher – student relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teacher</strong>: (goes over to sort the problem) Get your book Terry.</td>
<td>Teacher attempts to take control of situation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>P1</strong>: Miss has got it</td>
<td>Some attempt at shared meaning as teacher repeats student’s words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>T</strong>: Miss has got it come on sit up</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>P1</strong>: I’m not doing it!</td>
<td>Teacher reacts to student’s expression of anger with one of his own</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>T</strong>: Come on!</td>
<td>As student is prepared to sustain his anger in the face of the teacher’s, the teacher changes his tack. He is still trying to impose a meaning (the judgement ‘silly’) on the student, but his tone of voice shows he is not relying on force to gain control.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>P1</strong>: I’m not doing it!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>T</strong>: (softer) Don’t be silly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>P1</strong>: No if she</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>T</strong>: (gentler still) Don’t be silly come out</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
here with me

(Outside the classroom)

PI: I'm not doing it
T: Now then I'm not going to advise you tell you what to do (.) but what I am going to say is stop and think. go have two minutes walk round and stop and think what is worth what(.) you have done well in Award Scheme you've enjoyed some bits of it you've hated some bits of it (.) what is worth what(.) is it worth me swallowing this and forgetting it so that I can continue and be successful in Award Scheme or is this really getting to me that much that I'm going to let it cost me cost me accreditation cost me self-respect cost me relationship with adults(.) I'm not advising you 'cause I don't think I have to and I don't think you'd listen anyway
P1: (laughs) (.) I’m not doing it  
T: Come on, I’m going to the office, come with me  

(Teacher and pupil leave, return a few minutes later whereupon pupil gets to work)  

By engaging this student in a dialogue, this teacher provides a loan of consciousness to him by adopting his voice and speaking in the first person for the student and by creating the right emotional climate for the student’s successful return to work (removing him from the situation long enough to cool down). He considers the situation from the student’s point of view and he fills in the gaps of the student’s self-instruction. He gets the student to reaffirm his sense of affiliation and mission. He has replaced the student’s original meaning of the event with another, one which allows the student to return to relying on his own resources once more.  

These two examples can also be used to illustrate the fact that behavioural interventions which guide learners through activities have an inherent judgement about the learners’ level of development on the emotional as well as the cognitive plane. Just as a teacher should not ask a learner to undertake a task that is so in advance of their cognitive level they could not attempt it even with guidance, nor should they ask a learner to do something that lies equally beyond their emotional development. Chris’s teacher seems to appreciate that he needs a lot of support to get through this task, and the teacher in the second example, had he had a different view of the student’s level of
emotional development, might have decided that he was overreacting and left him to rue his actions. Presumably he felt the student was not capable of the emotional maturity necessary to cope with such a situation by himself.

Assessing levels of emotional maturity, though I would suggest it is something all teachers do, is a complex process, and it is a major factor in imposing a meaning on a situation. For example, one teacher I recorded made this statement to a class:

Teacher: (firmly) look you haven’t time to argue you’ve only got time to get on with this now come on! You should need very little help with this very little!

Is this an attempt at creating a shared meaning, or imposing a meaning, at gaining consensus, or through intimidation? I asked the teacher himself for his own account. He explained it by saying that he was not trying to control the students, but trying to get them to control themselves,

I am making the emotional statement to stand in the stead of the one they should be making themselves but they are not able to make, because of poor self-esteem or whatever. But I wouldn’t be saying it to them if I didn’t feel they had the emotional wherewithal to cope with it, if I hadn’t set them up with the task properly.

The teacher was affirming their sense of mission, of purpose. His claim to be able to do this rests on the belief that in this particular context, there were no other gaps in the learner’s inner monologues. Cognitively and emotionally, they were, he believed, able to do the task.

If this teacher has got it right, he may well be supporting his students to develop greater ambition, a greater sense of mission, which is part of their self-esteem, and raise the degree of self-regulation in their inner monologue. If he has it wrong, then it may be that some of his students are not, on an emotional level at least, ‘with him’. They may be going through the procedures of the activity he has set, but putting a different emotional interpretation on the activity, perhaps for fear of incurring his
displeasure. Again, this type of dialogue without substantive content, is what David Bloome calls ‘procedural display’ (1993), associated with a passive alienated stance. The generation of true shared meaning is the way to avoid this, but the complexity of judgements relating to learners’ emotional states, especially in group situations, can make this difficult to achieve.

Summary to sections 1 and 2

Conceptualising what goes on in classrooms as socially mediated activity allows us to see how aspects of classroom discourse which have traditionally been seen as separate entities – such as task, support and control – are in fact all interdependent factors in the richness of the social context in which cognitive and emotional factors unite and in which inter- and intra-psychological meanings are made.

Section 3 The teacher as discourse guide

This section draws the two previous sections together, and looks at a way of conceptualising teacher interventions in the language of teaching and learning in a way which reflects the fact that manipulation of the activities in the classroom and manipulation of learners’ behaviour happen at the same time. Exploring the emotional aspects of activity and behaviour has allowed an appreciation that the two concepts are interrelated. Through manipulation of activity and behaviour together, teachers create dialogues with their learners, the meaning of which supports and develop the inner monologue of the learner. These shared meanings reflect the cognitive, cultural and emotional orientation of the learner at the moment the dialogue starts, and the direction the teacher and learner want to go on the paths that the learner’s development might take.

We can return to Mercer’s comments, quoted earlier in this report, about the nature of the support that teachers give to learners:
(Vygotsky differed from Piaget in two main ways). First he argued that language has a strong influence on the structure of thought. It is from him that I draw the idea of language as both an individual and a social mode of thinking. And secondly he emphasised that cognitive development is a social communicative process. He drew attention to some features of human learning and development which are quite normal and commonplace, but which have been too often ignored or undervalued in psychology. One is that learning with assistance or instruction is a normal, common and important feature of human mental development. Another is that the limits of a person’s learning or problem-solving ability can be expanded if another person provides the right kind of cognitive support. (Mercer 1995, p.71)

We can now prevent the ‘social communicative process’, the discourse of teaching and learning, being narrowed down to ‘the right kind of cognitive support’. The social communicative process, if it is to be properly conceptualised, has to be one in which the emotional dimension of language, as well as the cognitive and cultural, has to be taken into account. The next part of this section looks at a way of conceptualising this integrated view of teacher intervention in more detail.

An integrated view of teacher intervention

Scaffolding, the loan of consciousness that supports the learner through gaps in their inner monologue and which extends that monologue to be able to take in new concepts, is a process which involves a temporary intensification of the degree of shared meaning between teacher and learner. This intimacy has cognitive, cultural and emotional dimensions. In order to be able to conceptualise this intimacy, I looked at a field of study that has concentrated on the process of meaning-making within individual minds perhaps more than the field of education has, and that is the field of counselling. Whilst it is clear that teachers do not have the time or training to engage in psychotherapeutic evaluations or interventions of their charges, much of what they do in order to create intimacy and facilitate learning has a great deal in common with
the less intense interventions on the psychotherapeutic spectrum (see Cooper, Smith and Upton 1994 pp.61-63), characterised as support and counselling (as opposed to the more intense exploration and analysis).

Thus it is from that field that we can find the beginnings of a framework which can be used to characterise theoretically how teachers intervene to support their students emotionally as well as cognitively and culturally, how they manipulate the interface between shared and subjective meanings. Heron (1990, cited in Bovair and McLaughlin 1993) categorises counselling interventions thus:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authoritative</th>
<th>Facilitative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prescriptive - directing the behaviour of the client</td>
<td>Cathartic - enable client to discharge, to abreact painful emotion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informative - impart knowledge or information to the client</td>
<td>Catalytic - elicit self-discovery, self-directed learning and problem solving in the client</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confronting - raise client’s consciousness about some limiting attitude or behaviour of which they are relatively unaware</td>
<td>Supportive - affirm the worth and value of the client’s person, qualities, attitudes or actions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It struck me that these interventions all fall within the repertoire of interventions used by teachers. Teachers use the facilitative mode to give a high degree of ownership of the process of creating shared meaning to the student. The emotions play a key role in the development of shared meaning: they are explored and affirmed. There is a high level of trust and a commensurate high degree of approval. They also use the authoritative mode, whereby the meaning created is one which has been more imposed by the teacher, and which the learner is invited to share after its completion, rather than participate in its initial construction. There are times when a teacher tells the learner to do something without the learner being (initially at least) able to see the point of doing it. It comes from an acceptance of the teacher’s authority by the learner, and is based within their relationship. For example, I recorded this interchange on a playing field at a primary school’s sports day. The teacher was addressing two boys who had ignored the request made by the head teacher to all the children to sit down near her so that the trophies could be presented:

Teacher: You’ve been asked to sit down
Boy: I’m thirsty
Teacher (raising voice): Would you please sit down as you have been asked
(Boys sit down)

The teacher overrides the boy’s personal needs with the needs of the group. The meaning the teacher imposes on the event (that it is time to participate in a group activity rather than it being time to attend to personal desires) is accepted by the boys. They took no part in its construction, but they seem to accept it.

Most teachers in all probability use both these modes of intervention. However, a teacher whose mode of intervention is predominantly authoritative runs the risk of decreasing or losing the chance to create shared meanings in their classroom, because if the answer to the pupils’ question, ‘Why is this so?’ is always, ‘Because I say so’ eventually the supplementary question ‘Well, who are you to say?’ will be asked, in one form or another. Thus the reciprocity of understanding, the intersubjectivity that is vital for the creation of shared meanings is best achieved through interactions which are mainly in the facilitative mode.
We can therefore represent the zone of proximal development in the following diagrammatic form:

These two types of intervention are not the only ones that teachers use. Two more shall be added later when the way in which teachers scaffold their learners through changing from one mode of intervention to another is explored. The focus now, however, is on how teachers attempt to maintain that facilitative mode of interaction in their dialogues with learners. There now follows a list of strategies (concentrating on the emotional aspects of discourse) which teachers use to guide the activity and the behaviour of their learners in order to ensure that a facilitative mode of intervention is possible, and the degree of potential shared meaning is maximised. This list is illustrated with examples from actual practice.

**Guidance strategies**

1) **Creating an appropriate emotional climate**

Kaufmann, Pullen and Akers (1998, p.365-7) list what teachers can do to promote learning and positive behaviour in their classroom. This is cited in the previous section. It reflects the widely accepted notion that children learn best when they feel safe, valued and supported (cf. Cooper et al 1994). The two examples given here of
teachers getting the behaviour and activity they want from their class show that the features on this list can be achieved in very different ways. First, a teacher of a class of year one pupils in a primary school, getting children ready to begin work after returning to class from an assembly:

Teacher: I am going to close my eyes and sing it again and by the time I have finished I want you sitting in a perfect honey bear circle (.) that would make me very happy so can you do it? Here we go (sings) (...) (interrupting the song) am I going to be happy? (finishes song) yes I am happy that's great.

This contrasts notably with the teacher's style in the next extract. This is a teacher with a group of year 9 boys with emotional and behavioural difficulties, again welcoming them into her room:

(Sounds of many pupils moving around and background chatter)
Pupil 1: You're not sitting next to me! Miss he's not sitting next to me!
Teacher : Right guys you need to sit somewhere you cannot see the paper of the person next to you
P1: (laughs derisively at the person who's trying to sit next to him)
T: This is very similar
P1: Told you that
T: John? (.) very similar to GCSE Art can you just move along here
P2: Alright
(Sounds of desks moving and students chattering)
T: Chris you need to find yourself a chair
P3: He can't sit there he might tell him the answers
T: (softly) Get out of here
P3: (laughs)
P4: If I get every one wrong what does that mean?
T: Andrew, you won’t get every one wrong

P4: I will because I am gonna let James copy me I’m gonna get every one wrong on purpose

P1: I’ll probably get every one wrong

(More chatter)

P5: Where are the questions?

T: You haven’t got them yet, I’m waiting for you to settle down a little bit (. ) I’d like you to calm down a little bit if you were coming in this morning and this was your actual exam half of you would have been kicked out by now you’re not to come in and chatter you’re to sit down sit you’ve got in front of you the answer paper and a pencil what I’d like you to do is fill in your name where it says (Teacher starts giving instructions to a now quiet class)

Here are two teachers who are clear about what they want. Both want an orderly class prepared to work. The teacher in the second passage starts off with a group of children who are not being particularly pleasant to each other, who do not seem in the right frame of mind for the task in hand, and who seem to need a restatement of the ground rules of the classroom. They do get a restatement, but it is delivered calmly. Indeed, through the chaos of the boys’ entry into the room the teacher has remained calm and friendly. She seems to remain impervious to the mood of some of the boys. She retains her humour and warmth, and in the end she gets what she set out for. Like the primary teacher, she makes sure her mood is the one that prevails; they change their mood to fit in with hers, not vice-versa.

The warmth in this case has been also created by the use of the students’ names, and by the epithet ‘guys’. The teacher of the infants goes on from this extract (as we shall see later) to manage to get through twenty-two names of the twenty-four pupils in the room in the first five minutes of the lesson. Teachers seek to create an atmosphere of intimacy in order to help provide a foundation for the emotional and cognitive discourse of their lessons. This may well entail the suppression of their normal (i.e. outside the classroom) response that they would make if they were not in the role of teacher.
ii) Dealing with the negatives

Managing a class is not simply a question of the teacher creating an atmosphere on their own. They have to do so in partnership with the students in the room. Thus maintaining an atmosphere of positivity in the face of sometimes considerable threat is another skill the teacher needs to possess. There are two main ways in which these threats can be dealt with in the facilitative mode:

iia) Interpreting Students’ interjections

Many teachers of children with emotional difficulties are aware of the need to predict or look out for anxieties and deal with them as pre-emptively or as promptly as possible. The first way of doing this is when formulating the task; hence one teacher interviewed said that he felt he achieved control through creating an environment where everyone felt they could achieve. The other way is to deal with them as they arise, as they inevitably do:

‘The job here is as hard as it is because of the emotional triggers that these kids have’ (teacher, EBD school)

Anxieties are often not expressed explicitly, but in ways that on the surface could be taken as threats to the stability of the emotional climate of and general activity in the classroom. Teachers therefore often ignore the style of a message in favour of interpreting the content, as in the extract below:

(Sounds of general chatter)
P: Fucking tosser!
T: Andrew
P1: Sir
T: Is there something wrong?
P1: John Simons is what’s wrong
T: Come here
P1: He’s a spazzo!
T: Come here come here (. ) come on you’re not going to get upset in here (. ) tell me what’s wrong

P1: He comes up to me and goes ‘You alright Andrew you alright’ yes John ‘You want a pen you want a pen’

T: Listen

P1: He’s smiling at me I swear he’s queer

T: Umm maybe he just likes you (. ) why don’t you sit in and work in here then you don’t have to hear him Andy Andy this is me this is me and I’m trying to help (. ) why don’t you sit and do your thing in here?

P1: Is it alright if I sit in here?

T: OK

The teacher here interprets the threat to the classroom discourse as an expression of anxiety. In effect he is rejecting a perspective which excludes the pupil’s perspective and which could regard the pupil as simply a threat. He does the opposite of this; he modifies his stance to take greater account of that pupil’s perspective, and brings to the fore the pupil’s emotional state. He responds to the increased level of anxiety on the part of the pupil by creating a sense of intimacy through the use of the pupil’s name, especially the shortened form, by getting physically close to the pupil (more specifically, by getting the pupil to approach him, and to remove himself from the context he was in), and by suggesting an alternative way of working in order to find a practical way of reducing the pupil’s anxiety. He refrains from distancing himself from the pupil’s perspective, which would have been caused by making explicit any judgements regarding the bad language or the homophobic remark. But there is something else that he does, and this brings us to the heart of the role teachers play in the emotional discourse of the classroom: he takes charge of the pupil’s emotional state: ‘You’re not going to get upset in here’. In effect he is rejecting the meaning that the student seemed to be creating (along the lines of, ‘this guy is a weirdo and I can’t cope with this’) and replaces it with a meaning which is more conducive to the successful pursuance of teaching and learning activities (along the lines of, ‘this is a minor problem which can be overcome and moved on from’).
ii b) Overtly taking charge of the emotional climate

In the extract above, the teacher assumes control of the individual’s emotional state, when he tells him, ‘You’re not going to get upset in here’. The pupil seems to respond positively to this.

Teachers also do this with groups of pupils. For example, a primary teacher who is dealing with a problem outside her room but who has to come back in to deal with the increasing noise inside:

T: What would actually make me really happy I’m sorry it has to happen is if I walked out came back three seconds later class was sitting here like this that’s what would make me happy that’s what would make other people happy OK?

Teachers can claim the right to decide on what makes people happy. They can also claim to be able to identify emotions in their pupils, and will impose a meaning with regard to the pupil’s emotional state, sometimes whether the pupil likes it or not:

P2: (mumbling/ moaning)
T: (to group) If you’re quiet honestly you’ll get it done much quicker. (To Ben) If you start sulking Ben ‘cause you haven’t got a ruler you’ll be stymied
P2: I’m just saying Sir
T: No you’re not just saying you’re sulking
P2: I wasn’t Sir, I was just |
T: I know Ben but when you just start saying ‘I’m just saying this I’m just saying that’, that’s usually a sign that you’re sulking. You’re worried about this, I’ve taken the ruler off you that’s fine, there’s another one over there Mark, on Mark’s desk I could go and get it but you don’t even need it you just need to listen but if you’re sulking you won’t listen so would you stop?
P2: Sir
T: Right good

Of course this intervention is only facilitative if the student accepts the teacher’s interpretation willingly. Otherwise it is an authoritative one.

iii) Boundary setting

Teachers act as arbiters of what is considered acceptable, emotionally speaking, in their classroom. One teacher sends a boy on an errand to get information from his classmates with the assurance that he won’t let the others ‘bite his head off’. This promise of protection is needed:

P1: Why are the fridges in Tesco ozone-friendly?
P2: Oh yeah here (taking out his notes)
P3: Don’t let him copy!
T: Err be nice Stephen

In some of the primary classes I observed, it was clear that whilst children were seemingly happy to respect the principles of democracy necessary for exploratory talk in whole group discussions under the supervision of the teacher, without that supervision - in small groups or when the teacher went out of the room – the level of their discussion changed. Verbal bullying and sexism could soon become features of the discussion, but would quickly disappear with the reappearance of the teacher. The children seemed to know the teacher’s boundaries, and her presence was often all that was needed to enforce them, and to change the meaning of the situation.

Boundary setting is not a straightforward issue. In the extracts above it is when they are restating their boundaries that teachers are most likely to adopt a neutral tone. Comments on positives are infused with emotion, but comments on negatives have that emotional level much reduced. Teachers appear keen to get through the restating of boundaries as quickly as possible, and get back to the more positive business of moving the pupils forward on to achievement. Boundary-setting is, it seems, an area of difficulties from an emotional point of view. This is probably due
to the fact that by stating the limits of what is acceptable to them, teachers are inevitably moving away from the facilitative mode and are raising the possibility of rejection, a failure in their attempt at shared meaning. In fact, as I show later, there is more to boundary setting than there at first appears, and it is a significant factor in the emotional aspect of scaffolding of pupils by their teachers.

iv) Picking out the positives

Teachers also avoid conflict by picking out the best bits of an interaction in order to be able to respond positively.

Pupil: (who has already been trying the teacher's patience with a succession of negative comments about other students' work) Sir!
T: Yeah
P1: (grandiosely showing his work) Perfect drawing by a perfect human being
T: (matter of fact tone) Yeah that's good that's exactly what we want. so now we need to go on to tackle the next...(etc.)

Responding to the most acceptable aspect of a student's contribution (here it is the student's wanting the teacher to consider and praise his work) rather than the less desirable aspects (the student's manner is rather pompous and borders on rudeness—it proposes a meaning which few would want to share) is not easy. There are times when teachers show they are only human, and their 'normal' (i.e. non-classroom) responses come out:

T: Excellent. so we need a picture to show. well the dirty bit's easy isn't it? what can we draw to show that it's dirty
P1: Er. shit? (laughs)
T: (loud exasperated sigh) Shall I just ignore what you said just then?
The four modes of teacher intervention

All these strategies are a part of teachers’ attempts to manipulate the ‘social communicative process’ that constitutes the context of their students’ learning. Attempting to keep interactions in the facilitative zone is not always possible, and there are times when the authoritative mode is not sufficient to determine the students’ actions either. We therefore need to add two more modes of interaction to the teacher’s repertoire, each of which reflect a different way of making meaning. The first of these is authoritarian, where the origin of the meaning that is imposed upon a situation is no longer the relationship between teacher and learner, but from outside that relationship. Usually these are the rules of the establishment the teaching and learning takes place in, and could well be manifested by the citation of school rules or the intervention of other members of staff. The last mode of intervention lies clearly outside the zone of proximal development. Because no shared meaning is created, the student is rejected. Our zone of proximal development now looks like this:

Diagram 4.2: The four modes of teacher intervention in relation to the zone of proximal development

Characterising the interventions of teachers in this way allows us to develop view of scaffolding which reflects the cognitive, cultural and emotional dimensions of
teaching and learning together. Teachers scaffold the behaviour and activity of their learners by remaining in the facilitative mode for as much of the time as possible and, when it is necessary to go into the other modes, by employing strategies to get back to the facilitative mode. The following brief interchange shows a very simple example of this:

(Pupil gently bouncing a rugby ball on his desk while the teacher is trying to speak)

Teacher: Graham

(Pupil ignores him)

Teacher: Graham you know the score is we usually put that in the cupboard yeah? No, put it in the cupboard please (. ) ta (. )

Graham is a man with a funny shaped ball

The first intervention, the teacher speaking the pupil’s name, is facilitative/authoritative; the sub-text is: ‘I am asking/telling you to remember who you are, where you are, and who you are speaking to’. When that does not work, Graham gets an explicit reminder of the rules, which is a move towards the authoritarian mode (a citation of a more impersonal rule). Graham eventually acts because the teacher tells him to. The teacher then attempts to bring the interaction back to the facilitative with a joke, a very specific instance of shared meaning. As long as Graham finds the joke funny, the facilitative mode has been restored.

Two more examples follow which show a greater movement through the four modes of interaction, and in which the cognitive and emotional aspects of the interventions can be seen. The full transcripts of both interactions are included in the appendix. Brief descriptions and the analysis are focused on here. One example is the attempt to get Chris writing, which is pursued a little more, but first the focus is on the year one teacher we last saw asking her children to sit in a ‘perfect honeybear circle’. Having got all of them sat down, she explains the maths and art activities she wants them to do, and the analysis concerns the language she uses to do this.
The primary teacher, as the children come in, introduces them to the two activities she has lined up for them (first a maths activity then an art activity) in a way that communicates support for their self-esteem, their inner monologues. She does this by:

- **Looking for and promoting the positive** - she gives the impression that 'snappy maths' will be fun and successful, and she praises very publicly those pupils who are doing what she wants (sitting quietly at the start of the session). She also picks out the best bits of interactions, such as when a pupil tries standing like a statue instead of sitting as she had asked. This cleverly guides the pupil to behave how she wants but the fact that she recognises his attempt to be a statue (i.e. being quiet and still) signals approval and recognition that he is part of the group.

- **Establishing a ‘prevailing mood’** - despite the hubbub of the children returning from assembly she remains calm, quietly spoken, and overtly interested in having a fun lesson (she turns sitting down and being quiet into almost a game).

- **Creating intimacy** - she expresses pleasure at seeing her pupils, uses almost all the pupils' names, remembers what some pupils did well the week before.

- **Avoiding confrontation** - instead of telling one pupil (pupil F) who seems reluctant to do as asked, simply to come and join the group, she gives him a job to do (shut the door) and then says that at the end of the job he can come and join them. The job may well be simply a device for getting him thinking as part of the group and making him feel important in the context of the classroom.

- **Taking overall charge of the groups’ emotional state** - when she later has to leave the room to take out pupil F, the class descend into a game of ‘Simon says’ which is both loud and in part anti-social ('Simon says hit a girl'). She asserts that stopping the game will make her happy and everyone else happy too.

- **Signalling her own emotions** - she apologises before enforcing boundaries, as well as saying what makes her happy, her likes and dislikes.

- **Boundary-setting** - she gives clear instructions about what constitutes acceptable attitudes and behaviour.

- **She ensures that the activity** - working through a few maths sheets and then going on to ‘the art job’ of sticking triangles onto paper - is commensurate with the majority of the pupils academic and emotional abilities. All the pupils (even including pupil F, when invited back into the class) seem able to do the task (there
are available a range of worksheets at differing degrees of difficulty). The pupils seem to have the emotional maturity to cope with the bustle of a crowded classroom, the necessity of often working alone without seeking too much of the teacher's attention, and the coping strategies to deal with getting things wrong from time to time and having to correct them.

In this situation and the attempt to get Chris writing, the teachers are working hard to set up a facilitative mode of interaction. And in both cases there is a large degree of success. Chris starts to write, and in the primary classroom the children are enthused and get stuck into the activity. The fact that the children complete the activities set, seem happy, and respond to the teacher when she addressing them as a group (the pantomime-like question and response interchange about the easiness of the task show the degree to which she is 'in tune' with them and they with her). This success suggests that here are two teachers getting things right. The primary teacher has enabled them to work on an academic and emotional level that they would have found difficult to achieve had they not had her support. The children are employed in an activity which is meaningful to them, and so the teacher's interventions as she goes around the class can be largely facilitative. And Chris begins to take an active part in his writing.

However, in each situation the success is not total. Chris's writing dries up when the teacher moves away from him and he is left to regulate himself. He gets involved in the negative interaction with peers that the teacher's presence had helped him to avoid, and he loses his sense of mission and with it his ability to plan and cope. He starts to experience failure. In the primary classroom, there is one pupil (F) who finds it difficult to sit and listen to the guidance about the task. In contrast to the intensity of the shared meaning created between the teacher and the rest of the class, the dialogue between pupil (F) and the teacher is characterised by discord (see appendix for full analysis). The egocentricity of his speech makes his comments very difficult to connect with.

The response of both these teachers is to change the mode of intervention away from the facilitative, where the meaning of the event is created by teacher and pupil
together, to an authoritative mode where the meaning is imposed on the event by the teacher alone. Chris’s teacher comes back over to him and says:

Right I’m going to go away I’m going to come back in two minutes and I want to see this sentence written in your book ok? Yep there’s a pen there’s a book off you go

Pupil F is led outside the classroom and told:

Come and sit just here until I’ve told the class what to do because you’re interrupting. I’ll come and get you as soon as we do the job as soon as we start, sit down please

In both cases, the limits of the teacher’s facilitative support have been reached. Unless the learner in each case starts to make more of an effort to contribute to the joint understanding between them and the teacher, there are problems ahead. The primary teacher used a number of strategies to include F in the group, but he continued to make comments that showed he was not tuned into the meaning the rest of the class were constructing with the teacher. The question pupil F is asked at the point just before he is removed is, ‘Are you able to do this?’ which is in direct contradistinction with the message behind the support she is giving the rest of the class, an expression of faith in their abilities. Pupil F returns a few minutes later, when the class are settled into their work, and he performs all the tasks competently (which highlights the specificity of the activity; for him what was lacking was not the cognitive skills demanded by the maths, but the level of emotional development necessary to be part of a group without being the centre of attention). He completed the rest of the lesson successfully, and took his work up to show the teacher and gain praise; after a temporary rejection, the facilitative mode of interaction was successfully restored. Chris, however, did not respond to the authoritative intervention of his teacher, and her reaction to this was to change modes yet again. She threatens him that if he does not do his work, he will be sent to the deputy head of the school. In the facilitative mode Chris was invited to contribute to the shared meaning through a willingness to engage with the task in hand. In the authoritative mode he is asked to accept and go along with the teacher’s interpretation of events.
Now, in the authoritarian mode, Chris’s contribution to the meaning of events is irrelevant. He either obeys the power structures (which no longer lie within the bounds of his relationship with the teacher, but are to do with the power structures which contextualise their relationship) or he will face the consequences. The ultimate consequence, should he continue to refuse to enter into the process of creating joint understandings relating to his learning, would be rejection, either from the classroom, or even from the school.

These examples, each from very different educational environments, show that in the attempt to maximise the shared meaning between teacher and learner, teachers can and do manipulate the emotional aspects of the language of teaching and learning in their attempt to support to their students’ development. They do this by remaining in the facilitative mode for as much time as possible, where culturally, cognitively and emotionally, the inner monologue of the learner is best supported by the teacher-learner dialogue. These two examples show a glimpse of how difficult it sometimes is to extend that support to every student. Failure to take into account these emotional aspects can jeopardise the desired outcomes of classroom discourse. The next chapter, which looks at the implications of this study, returns to the dangers of ignoring the emotional aspects of classroom discourse in more detail.

**Conclusion to section 3**

We have seen, then, that although consideration of the emotional dimension of the language of teaching and learning leads to an greater appreciation of the uniqueness of each context because of the subjective meanings that learners bring to each learning situation, teachers have strategies for guiding and developing these meanings. They use warmth, intimacy and humour to promote and intensify the degree of shared meaning, especially with those students who are struggling to participate in the construction of the meanings of the classroom.
Section 4 The emotional resources of the learner

The study has shown that there are emotional factors which influence the meanings that teachers and learner construct together, and the way in which these meanings are internalised by the individual learner. Attention has been paid to the mechanisms by which these meanings are made, and how they are manipulated by the teacher. It is time now to focus specifically on the learner, and especially to make explicit something that has been more or less implicit throughout the study so far, and that is that different individuals bring different emotional resources to the classroom. These resources (which one teacher referred to as 'emotional wherewithal' and another as 'emotional competence') are what Obholzer (1992) calls emotional work. Speaking of their entry into adolescence, Obholzer says:

The inner world of the child with accompanying skills and problems is now put to the test. (...) a child that has a ‘good enough’ (to borrow Donald Winnicot’s term) experience of the world, and a capacity to communicate with and love others, will now embark on the opportunities and stresses of adolescence to enrich his inner world and to lay the foundations for adult functioning. The deprived child too, will have an opportunity to re-enact his deprived state of mind and way of relating. And, in turn, he will be met with the same response he has had before, either from the same people, his parents, or others who stand in their place or, with luck, he will have the opportunity of a different response and thus the chance to review his picture of the world. This emotional ‘work’ then forms the basis of the individual’s capacity to cope with and develop the opportunities and stresses arising from adult life.
(Obholzer 1992, p.173)

The inner monologue that a child brings into the classroom will therefore have strengths or weaknesses which will be essentially (though never solely) related to the state of emotional development. This will positively or negatively affect the learner’s engagement in the dialogues and interactions in the classroom.
There is a need therefore for educationalists to develop a vocabulary that can deal with this aspect of the teaching and learning interaction. It is perhaps especially important to ensure this vocabulary is free of judgement, given that in over 80% of negative interactions in the classroom, teachers see the cause as relating to ‘within-child’ or ‘home-based’ factors, as opposed to less than 3% relating to ‘in-school’ factors (Peagram 1995, p. 37). To develop a vocabulary that locates the problem within the interaction rather than within the child is important to avoid this deficit model.

There are as many paths to emotional development as there are learners, of course. However these paths can be seen to travel in a single general direction, and there are factors such as decreasing egocentricity and increasing ability to delay gratification in the attainment of goals, that are commonly acknowledged to underpin the notion of emotional maturation. And as long as the role of the social context is acknowledged in the construction of identities and behaviour, then there are ways of developing a taxonomy of emotional resources that learners bring to the classroom. There are assessment methods such as Boxall Profile (Bennathan and Boxall 1998) which do just that. This profile provides a way of assessing learners in terms of their emotional development through their behaviour and activity in the classroom. Interestingly, it advertises its worth by referring to the process of joint construction of knowledge in the classroom. For example, it quotes a teacher who uses the profile:

Confronted with a child whose anxiety-provoking behaviour seems to make no sense, the Profile is where you start. It gives you insights and suggests points of entry into the child’s world (ibid, p. 4)

Developing a sense of where a learner is at, building a reciprocity of understanding between teacher and learner, is, as this study confirms, essential for teaching and learning to take place. The Boxall Profile is one example of how that understanding may be reached on the emotional dimension. It allows a differentiation between emotional states which promote cognitive development, and those which are ‘self-limiting’, which hinder further development. It covers the same ground covered in earlier sections in this chapter: the way in which learners engage in activities: the meanings they draw from their engagement; their ability to accepts constraints and
freedoms; their ability to maintain internalised standards; and their ability to collaborate in the construction of joint understandings, with their teachers or their peers.

The Boxall Profile is designed for use with children with a considerable degree of emotional disturbance. Its use by teachers in mainstream schools is not being recommended here. However, it shows a way of developing a vocabulary about the emotional resources that learners bring to the classroom, and it is the extension of this vocabulary that would, I suggest, go a significant way to resolving the dilemma mentioned at the start of this study concerning the lack of a conceptual framework for understanding how their students’ emotions influence the discourse of their classrooms. It shows that we need to be aware of, examine and react to how learners act and react on an emotional level in order to maximise their educational progress. This study provides the conceptual framework for this as well as the justification for the adoption of a vocabulary for integrating cognitive and emotional development in the classroom.

To end this section, and indeed this chapter, we can return to Vygotsky’s ideas that behind every thought is ‘an affective-volitional tendency which holds the answer to the last ‘why’ in the analysis of our thinking’ Vygotsky (1986 p.252). The idea that the emotional need of a learner is the impetus behind thought and language development is represented diagrammatically. If we conflate emotional and cognitive development into one concept, that of social development, then we can see how emotional needs are the initial impetus in both language use and acquisition (through social interaction) and cognitive development (as part of a more general social development). This process is represented diagrammatically on the following page. Diagram 1 shows a pattern of development characterised by the satisfaction of emotional needs through successful interaction leading to positive social development. Diagram two shows impaired social development resulting from a failure to satisfy emotional needs through social interaction.
Diagram 4.3
Showing the relationship between emotional need, language and learning when there are sufficient resources to meet that need.

**EMOTIONAL NEED**

- Urge to communicate
- Emotional need

**SOCIAL UNDERSTANDING**

- New emotional need reflecting previous personal growth
- The child's social understanding is further refined

Meaning made through others seeking out and building on the child's urge to communicate.

There is an intimacy of shared perspectives (loaned consciousness) through the matching of emotional, cognitive and cultural discourse, characterised by preponderance of facilitative language.

A step towards greater self-regulation
Having successfully participated in a social interaction, the child has not only satisfied his/her immediate needs but internalised the social structures of the interaction (which can be subdivided into cultural, cognitive and emotional categories).

Diagram 4.4
Showing the relationship between emotional need, language and learning difficulties when there are insufficient resources to meet that need.

**EMOTIONAL NEED**

- Urge to communicate
- Emotional need

**SOCIAL UNDERSTANDING**

- Greater/more desperate emotional need

Disparity between emotional need and the resources in the social context, leading to impoverished response by others: a lack of intimacy of shared perspectives, resulting in less facilitative, more authoritative/authoritarian use of language in interactions.

Child's disturbed emotional state means that it is more difficult for others to share his/her perspectives. Interactions are characterised by decreased (and over time, decreasing) levels of meaning.

Not only are the child's immediate needs unmet, but there is less progress to self-regulation, as the child is given fewer positive structures to internalise.

The child may internalise structures which are abusive/negative/self-limiting.

Social understanding remains poorly developed through habituation to low levels of shared meaning in interactions. The structures internalised are either of ill-defined structure or are reflective of abuse.
The terms ‘social interaction’ and ‘social understanding’ include both the cognitive and emotional dimensions of interaction and development respectively. It is worth pausing to reflect on what is meant by ‘emotional need’. This could be the spur for cognitive development. For example, when a baby is upset because they are thirsty, this need drives the need to act, i.e. to communicate, and as they act and develop their capacity for shared meaning, they learn to act with increasing sophistication. Hence they develop through crying, reaching, pointing and eventually speaking. They learn to satisfy their emotional needs alongside their physical needs, as contentment is restored each time the transaction is successful. Alternatively the emotional need could be for the intimacy of shared perspectives as an end in themselves.

To sum up, we can say that the learner’s emotional resources are a vital ingredient in the process of developing shared meaning, and as such can play an influential role in learning. Unless all the aspects of the subjective meanings that learners bring are taken into account, the chance of shared meanings being developed are much reduced. Indeed, if there are no shared meanings being developed in the interactions between a student and their teachers, it could be that the vicious circle described in diagram 2 results. This would seem to bear out Tudge’s (1990) assertion that there is a possibility that the zone of proximal development could work backwards, i.e. be a conceptual model of a ‘learner’ whose abilities to act on the world are eroded by contact with their inhospitable social context.
CHAPTER 5

IMPLICATIONS OF THE STUDY

Recognition of the emotional dimension of the discourse of teaching and learning has significant implications in many areas, both on a practical and theoretical level. As a general introduction to this chapter, it can be said that this study probably has more impact as a rationale for further research, rather than as a piece of finished research in its own right. Some of the points which follow are therefore no more than suggestions as to the direction future studies might take.

The chapter is divided into four sections:

- Practical implications for all teachers
- Practical implications for teachers of students with special needs
- Research implications
- Theoretical implications

These are now taken in turn.

Section 1: Practical implications for all teachers

The view of teachers as deliverers of pure knowledge and skills has been eroded by studies showing how knowledge is jointly constructed in the classroom, and by a growing recognition of the cultural specificity of the handover of knowledge and skill. Recognition of the emotional dimension to the discourse of teaching and learning further distances us from this view of teachers as simple deliverers of their subject, and provides a way of conceptualising the other aspects of their art. For some teachers this recognition may serve as a vindication of work they already do and of things they already know on an intuitive level about cognitive and emotional development complementing each other.
Just as the increasing recognition of the influence of cultural factors has led to a greater recognition of the diversity of ways of knowing and communicating, so might a similar growth in the recognition of the influence of emotional factors. A report by the Sub-Group on Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties to the National Advisory Group on Special Needs (1999) acknowledges the need for such recognition:

There should in every school be teachers who are skilled in behaviour management and who have a broad understanding of the causes of EBD. (p.1)

Teachers in mainstream should have more training on child development, including social and emotional development, developmental norms and behaviour management techniques. (p.2)

Any teacher who is wont to write off a child as behaving too badly to learn as much as their peers may need to reconsider how they make such judgements in the light of this study, which provides the rationale for understanding ‘behaviour’ or ‘misbehaviour’ as an integral part of a learner’s engagement with the curriculum and discourse of the classroom. This is obviously one of the lines of future research opened up by this study. We need to explore the extent to which there is discrimination against children whose emotional maturity or orientation means they lie outside the resources of the teacher, class or school. Research has shown that schools tend to think of children with emotional and behavioural difficulties only in terms of their behaviour (ibid. p.3).

The inclusion of such children in the discourse of schools has parallels with the inclusion of children from ethnic minorities, insofar as a greater understanding of where the child is coming from can lead to more appropriate teaching methods being employed. However, there is a marked difference between these groups that have both suffered from discrimination. The inclusion of ethnic minorities into the mainstream of education is clearly morally correct, whereas in some instances at least, the inclusion of children with emotional difficulties can have a deleterious effect on the educational opportunities and even the physical safety of the other students in the classroom, and so the ethics of this debate are not so clearly defined or widely accepted. The issue of how such children should be included in the
curriculum needs further exploration and debate, but a greater recognition of the role of emotional factors in classroom discourse may inform that debate significantly. As educators we need to be able to frame ‘misbehaviour’ in a way that does more than condemn a child with emotional difficulties to exclusion from single interactions, or lessons or even schools. This is particularly important in the current educational climate, with the numbers of children being labelled as having emotional difficulties, displaying problems at a younger age, and being excluded (either voluntarily or compulsorily) on the increase (Farrell, 1995, p. vii), and with some estimates of the number of children suffering from disorders such as anxiety, depression and psychosis as high as 20% (Dowling, 2000, quoting a Mental Health Foundation Report). As there is a substantial degree of concern about the pressures the current educational experience places on children (‘Climate of fear harms children’ ran a recent headline in The Independent), it seems that we need to reconsider our educational system’s treatment of children, especially with regard to the vulnerable and disadvantaged, a sector of the school population in which children with emotional and behavioural difficulties figure largely (Cooper 1998).

As early intervention in problems of this nature are essential (DFEE 1999), it would seem logical for all teachers to be aware of this dimension of their classroom discourse in order that they have some conceptual framework for dealing with such problems as soon as they arise, or for the early identification of problems for which the teacher may need extra support. Also, if teachers are aware of the interdependency of cognitive and emotional factors, then awareness of the best ways of managing emotional factors will help their academic aims for their pupils too. It would seem sensible then to make awareness of the role of emotional factors in the language of teaching and learning part of the curriculum for initial teacher training. There is governmental recognition that ‘emotional development goes hand in hand with intellectual development’ (ibid., p.3), and of the particular importance for children with emotional difficulties to be given ‘every opportunity to develop their communication skills’ because a ‘lack of such skills can be a contributory factor to children developing EBD and can exacerbate their difficulties’. It would seem vital then to have a conceptual understanding of the nature of the interdependency of emotional and cognitive factors at the level of teaching and learning.
The exploration of these factors in this study was undertaken on a general level, with some specific reference to oracy and writing. Further research could make explicit how emotional factors affect other areas of school learning. There are some areas of the curriculum, for example, where the emotions may well play a greater role than in others, such as in drama and the expressive arts. But there are also more general areas which need further exploration and clarification, such as how children speak and listen in any area of the curriculum.

Acknowledging the emotional aspects of teaching and learning further enables teachers and schools to recognise and make choices about the type of education they wish to provide. The DFEE report cited above makes several statements about the choices schools should make:

Developing children as rounded people and active members of the community is at the heart of what school is about. (p.3)

Schools should aim at far more than merely containing the manifestations of pupils' emotional and behavioural difficulties. (p.3)

How far schools can attain these goals in the face of other pressures which may hinder their progress is open to debate and to further research. However, this report can make a contribution to that debate and to legitimising the work that is done by those teachers or schools who focus on the emotional development of their pupils more than others, but who up until now have no proper educational rationale to explicitly underpin and justify what they do.

This study provides the beginnings of a way of thinking about the emotional life of children in the classroom, and there are many areas of school life and ways of learning which it would be beneficial to study from this perspective. These include:

- The difference in the emotional 'climate' between primary and secondary schools.
• The differences in the emotional lives of boys and girls at school, and how they influence engagement with the curriculum.
• The emotions involved (or not) in the experience being taught through ICT.
• The cultural specificity of the expression of emotion in classroom discourse.

Section 2: Practical implications for teachers of students with emotional problems

For those teachers who are dealing with children who have emotional difficulties, a greater recognition of the ways in which the language of teaching and learning functions in mediating the emotional factors in operation when such children engage in classroom activities. Acknowledgement of the interdependency of cognitive and emotional factors and an understanding of how this interdependency works could bring about significant change in how these children are taught. If learning can be hampered by emotional factors, then it is logical to assume that appropriate emotional intervention can enhance the ability to learn. What constitutes such appropriate intervention, and how the mechanisms of school can accommodate these (in curriculum formation, assessment procedures, etc.) in specific settings is a matter for further research. This study could provide the rationale for such research by asserting the fundamental principle that cognitive development can be encouraged through the quality of the emotional support that is offered to learners.

The EBD sector now has its own rationale. It can now take a leading role in developing a curriculum which has as an explicit aim the emotional well-being and development of its pupils. The development of this approach could justify Cooper's assertion that all students benefit from the methods used by good teachers of EBD children (Cooper et al., 1994).

Section 3: Research implications

This study has significant implications for research. As the discussion on the practical implications has shown, there are many important areas which can be addressed from the perspective of the emotional factors within the discourse of teaching and learning. Recognising a third dimension to the language of teaching
and learning transforms how we should think about many areas of educational discourse. Research into how meanings are made in the classroom needs to show an awareness of this dimension. There are two main ways in which this can be achieved. Firstly, if researchers decide to focus on learners who do not 'mess up' research and the development of theory by displays of 'misbehaviour', then they need to be explicit about the implications of choosing to exclude those learners for whom the emotional aspects of classroom discourse play a significant role.

Secondly, this study not only creates a rationale for considering aspects of teaching and learning from a new perspective, it also provides the impetus for the further integration of different research perspectives on education. For example psychological explorations into what constitutes emotional development (a concept presented in a rudimentary way in this study) could be combined with curriculum development studies in order to explore how emotional development could be a more explicit aim of schools.

Other future research agendas could include:

- Assessments of how teachers in mainstream schools perceive their roles in relation to the emotional development of their students
- Greater classification of how specific emotional states affect engagement with the curriculum and classroom discourse.
- The further development of appropriate assessment procedures for children with emotional problems in mainstream and special schools.

The most exciting aspects of this study in terms of research, however, can be seen by looking at the theoretical implications of this study. The next section argues that consideration of the emotional dimension of the language of teaching and learning can remove the limitations inherent in sociocultural research perspectives, and greater research potential through making the ZPD a more robust, potent and practically applicable model.
Section 4: Theoretical Implications

Refining our understanding of the zone of proximal development

It has been widely recognised that the ZPD has had its limitations (Moll 1990, Wertsch 1985, Vygotsky 1986), especially in its practical applicability. However, this section shows that if we integrate the emotional dimension of teaching and learning with the cognitive and cultural dimensions, then we have a much more robust and developed theoretical model which helps us to understand better what happens when an individual learns something.

Wertsch (1995) explains the usefulness of the zone of proximal development:

The ZPD gave us a way of conceiving of the dynamic relationship between and individual and their environment, and how each may be transformed by interacting with the other. It is by interacting with society that the individual develops. Thus the study of learning has become the study of the relationship between mental functioning and the cultural, historical and institutional settings in which it occurs. (Wertsch 1995)

Bruner’s (1985) experiments with mothers teaching their very young children gave us perhaps the clearest view of the ZPD in action. He introduced the notion of scaffolding to explain how the cognitive support that the mothers gave enabled the children to learn the task. As is argued earlier in this report, Bruner’s choice of subject (intimate mother-child dyads) helped to diminish the role of the other two dimensions to the talk of teachers and learners; there was no cultural disparity, and emotionally the mothers were presumably closely attuned to their children.

It is the lack of recognition of these dimensions that has made the ZPD such a difficult model to apply to other situations. Another example of attempts specifically to apply the ZPD is cited by Diaz et al (1990), who report on several studies (including their own) which tried to alter children’s classroom behaviours or tendencies to be impulsive by training them to parrot adults’ speech in the hope that
this language would become internalised and become part of the children’s self-
regulatory mechanisms. None of these studies were successful.

Why has our understanding of the process of learning remained at the level of a
model which despite the recognition that the study of mind, culture and language are
internally related, has not been refined beyond Vygotsky’s sparse theoretical model
or Bruner’s basic experiments (Bakhurst, cited by Rogoff 1995)?

This study leads to two possible answers to this question. The first regards the
addition of a third dimension to the ZPD. To the universal elements in the process of
cognitive development and the group-related elements of cultural specificity must we
add the individually-specific elements of emotional orientation, and this third
dimension dramatically increases the possible number of permutations of routes to
human development and learning. To put this in practical terms we can take the
subjects of the experiments cited by Diaz. A young teenager in a situation where
they are, say, being taunted by a peer, and becoming aggressive, may have an adult
verbally modelling a response that is within the teenager’s cognitive and cultural
range, but lies too far outside of their emotional range to be assimilated. For instance
a choice between two meanings relating to a burgeoning argument - for example
between “He is only saying that because he is upset” and “How dare he say that, I
must hit him!” - may well depend on the level of anger which the participant feels,
rather than any specifically cultural or cognitive interpretations of the situation. We
need a view of the ZPD which takes into account the multiplicity of the ways in
which meanings are constructed in the three-dimensional matrix posited by this
study. Rogoff’s (1995, p.147) view of how people learn through the making of
meaning is a far more fragmentary and transient model than that which could be
inferred from Vygotsky’s model and Bruner’s experiment and seems more
appropriate to the multiplicity of possible meanings suggested by a three-
dimensional model of development through socially mediated action:

The interpersonal plane of analysis represented by guided participation is
made up of the events of everyday life as individuals engage with others and
with materials and arrangements collaboratively managed by themselves and
others. It includes direct interaction with others as well as engaging in and avoiding activities assigned, made possible, or constrained by others, whether or not they are in each other’s presence or even know of each other’s existence. Guided participation may be tacit or explicit, face to face or distal, involved in shared endeavours with specific familiar people or distant unknown individuals or groups - peers as well as experts, neighbours as well as distant heroes, siblings as well as ancestors. It includes deliberate attempts to instruct and incidental comments or actions that are overheard or seen as well as involvement with particular materials and experiences that are available which indicate the direction in which people are encouraged to go or discouraged from going. (Rogoff 1995, p.147)

While I am not suggesting that the creation of shared meaning is so precarious that teachers cannot realistically hope to retain significant influence over the meanings constructed in their classrooms, it is beneficial to our understanding of how people learn to realise that there exists a multiplicity of opportunities for making meaning and that these will be partly be determined (in part) according to each individual’s emotional orientation. So teachers have to accept the possibility that what might seem like a well-crafted and expertly delivered curriculum to them and the majority of their pupils may be interpreted altogether differently by a pupil whose emotional orientation is different. Therefore I would suggest that the zone of proximal development has remained a rather crude model not because of any conceptual inaccuracy, but because of our failure to appreciate the ‘fullness of life’ (Vygotsky, 1986, p. 10), the richness of the relationship between the social context and the individual to which Vygotsky was referring when he first conceptualised the zone. Appreciation of the interdependency of cognitive and emotional factors in human development and learning goes some way to improving our understanding of this dynamic.

The second way in which this study can refine our understanding of the ZPD is closely related to the first, and involves how we conceptualise the interface between individual and the context with which they interact. As argued in the literature review, sociocultural theory has been unable to provide a clear conceptual basis for this. This argument is now recapped and further developed here.
When an individual interacts with their context, there is a sense that they and the activity they are participating in become one:

The use of 'activity' or 'event' as the unit of analysis - with active and dynamic contributions from individuals, their social partners and historical traditions and materials and their transformations - allows a reformulation of the relation between the individual and the social and the cultural environments in which each is inherently involved in the others' definition. None exists separately. (Rogoff 1995 p.140)

The boundary (between individual and activity) itself is questioned, since a person who is participating in an activity is a part of that activity, not separate from it. (Rogoff 1995 p.153)

But it is equally clear that we need to be able to differentiate between individual and context as well. The idea of intersubjectivity carries with it the notion of two entities which, while they may be closely interacting, are separate nonetheless. Thus at the heart of sociocultural theory there is a confusion that is all-pervading:

When we go through the process of explicating assumptions about the relationship between mental functioning and sociocultural setting research agendas often can be seen to fall into two general categories, depending what is given analytic primacy. In one category are approaches grounded in the assumption that it is appropriate to begin with sociocultural phenomenon and the generate analyses of mental functioning. In the other are approaches which assume that the way to understand sociocultural phenomena is to start with psychological and other processes carried out by the individual. (Wertsch 1995 p.57)

As an example of how this dilemma pervades research, we can look again at Lankshear's (1997) examination of two classes in the same school, which he asserts, differ in their academic performance because of cultural factors. He states that the underachieving group do so on the one hand because of their 'experiences and
histories' and on the other because of their 'abilities, attitudes and dispositions' (Lankshear 1997, p. 28/29). Although such research gives a clear basis for understanding that cultural factors can affect academic performance, it is severely limited in its ability to help us understand how cultural factors affect individuals. There is ambivalence as to whether this underachievement was caused by context or factors that are mainly within the individual. This ambivalence is due to the lack of a conceptual framework which could help how to ascribe cause and effect at the interface between individual and context. Wertsch comments on this confusion:

The fact that this debate seems to go on and on with no principled resolution in sight should tell us something – namely, that the academic dispute over whether to give psychological or sociological or cultural processes analytic primacy may reflect a more general debate that is not resolvable through rational argument. (Wertsch 1995 p.58)

He goes on to say that one of the reasons for this debate being unable to be resolved through rational means is due to the fact that the debate is ‘not grounded in empirical fact and logic, but in valuations of individual and society’ (ibid. p.59). When we look at the interface between individual and society and try to ascribe attribution for action and reaction, it is easy to see that other non-rational factors do impose themselves. The most obvious example of this in this context is the label of ‘behavioural difficulties’ which we can imagine is unlikely to be bestowed upon a child without a fairly extensive history of teachers making judgements about that child that are not just logical, but heavily grounded in ethics and philosophical stances about what children are like.

This study does not provide a comprehensive conceptual framework for understanding all the factors that impinge at the interface between individual and social context. However, an understanding of the role of the emotions allows us to move a step closer to doing so. It provides a way of showing how cultural factors are negotiated on an individual level. If a pupil is being unfairly excluded from the discourse of a classroom because of a cultural mismatch between school discourse and their own, it is on the emotional level that much of this transaction will be negotiated (whether through the generation of resentment, the internalisation of low
self-esteem or whatever). Being able to conceptualise this allows an understanding of how different people with the same cultural origins can act differently within the same context.

To sum up this section, it can be said that the limitations related to the ZPD have been due not to the model itself, but the paucity of our understanding of the concepts with which it is related. Language is not just a social mode of thinking (Mercer 1995), it is also a social mode of feeling, and to understand this is to take a step closer to a fuller appreciation of the dynamics of the interaction between individual and social context. The incorporation of a consideration of subjective ways of making meaning alongside socially constituted ones allows researchers to approach many issues from a different, more theoretically potent and practically applicable psychosocial perspective.
CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSION AND EVALUATION

Section 1: Conclusion

The Literature Review of this study looked at three sets of perspectives on classroom discourse -- those concerned with cognitive outcomes, those concerned with cultural factors, and those concerned with the effects of emotional trauma upon learning. By showing how we may begin to conceptualise of the interdependency of cognition and emotion, this study provides a rationale for the integration of these three perspectives. Mercer (1994, p.93) states that Vygotsky wanted to redesign psychology as part of a:

unified science of human thought, language, culture and society. This has encouraged the hope amongst some psychologists and educational researchers (..) that a neo-Vygotskian theoretical perspective (..) could help build new theoretical links between different disciplines which are concerned with language use and teaching and learning in social context.

By expanding our understanding of the social context to take into account the emotional aspects of language, from the transient moods brought in from the playground to the more permanent and deeper underlying emotional orientations that are the domain of psychotherapy, this study has provided a step towards that unification. It does so by providing a rationale for understanding language not just as a social mode of thinking, but also as a social mode of feeling. Every communication has an emotional element which helps to shape its meaning and the context of further communication. Emotions are always there, they shape how meanings are made and understood and as such they are an essential aspect of the discourse of teaching and learning. This study has provided the rationale for, and the beginnings of, the exploration of the ways in which emotions can shape discourses
and learning, but there is much more ground that can be covered in this area of research.

Section 2: Evaluation

The nature of this study – a reconceptualisation of theory – and the limited use of raw data (to illustrate rather than prove concepts) mean that there is little under the surface of this study, as it were, to evaluate. One way of evaluating this study is to assess the coherence, clarity and strength of argument presented, because in taking as my raw materials already existing bodies of research and developing them, there is little else to be assessed. It is a method which, if done well, has a transparency built into it. I tried to answer the question of how can we conceptualise the role of the emotions in the language of teaching and learning by using existing research, assessing the limitations, and then going back to the philosophical concepts upon which this research was based. I found that these concepts could be developed to provide an answer to the question. This enabled me to go back to the research and develop ways of incorporating the emotions into a model of teaching and learning. Given that the study was at the level of a reconceptualisation of theory, the workings are (as in a maths problem) perhaps as important as the final answer, and therefore they have been made as explicit as possible. Thus we can say that in a sense the study’s transparency is its own justification.

The previous paragraph is a little disingenuous, however, for several reasons. Firstly, it needs to be said that although I have tried to build a logical and clear argument in this study, this does not reflect the evolution of thought that I went through to get to the views and perspectives presented in this report. Also, not all the workings are shown in this particular problem. As I said at the start of this report, the evolution of this study has been guided in part by the juxtaposing of theoretical concepts with my own practical experience as a teacher of children with emotional difficulties over the past nine years. I have been unable to incorporate a description of the way these two factors have combined to inform this report; at times I have been guided by intuitive feelings that a certain direction is worth pursuing because it feels right on both levels. Such feelings have a place in such a report only if they can be analysed rationally as
to why they are right, and this process has informed much of the structure of the argument of the report. This is a valid technique to adopt because it makes sense to have the report be as readable as possible. But it does mask some of the process I went through.

This raises a second point, which is that although I have tried to assert a concept—the interdependency of cognition and emotion in the language of teaching and learning—which has a sense of the universal about it, I have done so in a way which is not universal at all, but in a way specific to my own time, culture and personal experiences and expertise. If this concept is valid, then presumably it could have been explored and explained using other routes. This begs the question of whether I have used the best route possible. I could have perhaps adopted an approach that was more psychological. For example I could have studied the concept and manifestations of emotional contagion, the process through which we take on the moods of others through interaction (Hatfield et al 1994). Or I could have taken a more explicitly linguistic approach (concordance analysis of teachers’ speech may help to show exactly how much time and effort they give to emotional factors in the classroom). There are other approaches too, such neurological studies, which may have helped or even been a more preferable route. Some of these routes were inaccessible because of lack of expertise, but I justify the route I chose mainly because it is the most accessible to teachers. I originally came at the problem from the perspective of a teacher, and I wanted to retain this orientation as much as possible.

The third point relating to possible bias that I wish to raise stems from the findings of the study itself. As it is stated within the study that all communication contains within it an emotional dimension, it should be possible to identify within this report just such a dimension. Whether this is actually possible is not a question I wish to pursue with great degree of certainty, but it is worth considering for just a moment. Perhaps the way in which my arguments are presented could be analysed from a psychotherapeutic perspective. And it was not until I was well into this study that it struck me that my research fitted in well into the rest of my life from an emotional point of view. I come from a background where emotions were not a ready part of the dialogue (not, I would suggest, an unusual phenomena for a male born in the North of England in the 1960s), and much of my professional life has been the exploration and
the legitimisation of the role of emotions in other people's lives and my own. Whether one can assess this research in this way is mere speculation on my part, but it is an interesting point nonetheless.
References


http://www.dfee.gov.uk/sen/ebdsubgroup.report.doc


Goleman, (1996) *Emotional Intelligence: Why it can matter more than IQ*


Hatfield, E., Cacioppo, J.T. and Rapson, R.L., (1994) *Emotional Contagion* 
Cambridge, Cambridge University Press


Independent, The, (2/8/00)


Mittler, P. (1990), *Too Difficult to Address?*, Times Educational Supplement. 23 February 1990, p.26


The Open University


Appendix 1: Two transcripts

The following transcripts form the basis for a significant part of the analysis in chapter 5 of the main report. They are reproduced here for information only; an understanding of the analysis in chapter 5 does not require a full reading.

Transcript 1: The primary teacher

The following is a transcript of a primary (year 1) teacher starting her class off to work at the beginning of a lesson. The children are just returning to class:

(Background: many voices)
T: OK we need you on the carpet (.). That’s alright yeah we will(.). Hi Emma Nice to see you pack lunch good good good(.) excuse me but we’re on the carpet Robin (softly) come on come on please
P: Apple
T: No it’s not apple time it’s actually because we had an early assembly it’s work time (.). well done to Terry who’s remembered that it’s not assembly time uh it’s not playtime now it’s actually work time ‘cause we had an early assembly look at her sitting there she’s just like a statue actually that’s brilliant and Rebecca
P: I’m standing like this
T: No we need statues that are sitting down (.).
actually everyone who’s everyone who’s around Terry is like a statue too because Tim’s sitting really still
P: Where shall I sit?
T: just by my feet here(.) and Caroline’s hardly moving her eyes and Mark’s just really still in the corner
F: (raised voice) Where is the blue one the dark one that
T: And George is very still (.) John John not now please
P: he 's apologising
(Still some chattering but now much reduced)
T: Right (.) Could you go and close the door F and then come and join us on the carpet please (class go quiet) OK this is what I do every Friday I walk over and just show you the work because do you remember when you've done your art then you have to do your snappy maths you have to kind of fit it in when the classroom's all messy. Last week when people did. do remember people like Jolene and Caroline they did not only do one like they were supposed to do they did three sheets they did everything. some of these are hard today though 'cos they've got about . eighty and numbers like that on it.
(some children mumbling about the task)
T: I'm going to just show them to you . these are called number steps are you going to listen oh do you want no it's fine [to a withdrawal teacher] you have can have who you want you can have Nasreen or Alal today [To F] I said then come and sit down please. (Takes F by the arms) Not now not now. Ok you need to listen because I'm not going to tell you any more about this so after this you're going to have to do it by yourselves Shh Luke D. are you looking OK (lighter tone of voice) these are called number OH (sigh of frustration) sorry maybe if you sat on your bottom Fay then F would see how to do it too (to F) are you able to do this?
F: Yeah
T: Maybe if I show you the class sitting on their bottoms can you do the same please
F: Wahoo!
T: They're sitting with their legs crossed (.) if the arrow on the page points up that means that you are going to count to number steps up so if that was one that would be an easy one you'd write two three four five six seven till it stopped
F: (shouting) Easy peasy lemon squeezy
T: Or if it started on number five you would have to start counting on number five five six seven eight nine ten
(several voices count with the teacher)
F: I can't see the board
T: If the arrow on your page however is a down arrow
P: Easy
T: Easy? You think this is easy?
Several Pupils: Yes
T: (Raising voice to claim the floor again) You might have to start at 93, 92, 91, 90, 89, 88, 87, 86, (theatrically) that's not easy is it?
(Many pupils) Yes!!
T: Well I'll see how. that's that is the hardest one. Hi Tessa. well you can choose it's up to you to choose because you go over and get them. right eyes this way concentrating for the art job. one. large. triangle
P: it's an isosceles
T: it is but that's a triangle it's a large isosceles triangle
P: Isosceles!
T: Can I make sure that people that people are really
listening to the job please. Just going to wait for people to listen. I’m afraid that Oliver’s not quite ready and Robin’s not quite ready Shh! On your bot
F: (with a bit of string) My worm!
T: On your bottom please
F: My worm!
T: (confidentially) Stand up a minute and we’l
F: You touched my worm is that your worm?
(Leads pupil out by the hand)
T: Come and sit just here until I’ve told the class what to do because you’re interrupting I’ll come and get you as soon as we do the job as soon as we start sit down please
(Returning to class who have become noisy, many shouting ‘Simon says. The class had obviously played this game on a previous occasion when the teacher had had to leave the room, only this time some of the ‘Simon says’ suggestions are verging on the unpleasant)
T: (returning) One(.) large(.) Triangle(.) Can I just ask you sensibly(.) It’s a good idea but that(.)it’s making people a bit silly doing that because it’s making people like James say do something unkind to people so I don’t really like it
P1: He said kill each other
T: What would actually make me really really happy I’m sorry it has to happen is if I walked out came back three seconds later class was sitting here like this that’s what would make me happy that’s what would make other people happy OK? Jessica are you looking one large triangle (goes on with explanation)
The analysis in the main report claims that for one boy the nature of the discourse is different. For pupil F the emotional support the teacher extends to the rest of the class is not there to the same degree. This results and is characterised by a lack of shared meaning, which is evident if the interactions between this pupil and the teacher are extracted from the transcript:

F: (raised voice) Where is the blue one the dark one that
T: Right (. ) Could you go and close the door F and then come and join us on the carpet please

T: (Takes F by the arms) Not now not now

T: OH (sigh of frustration) sorry maybe if you sat on your bottom Fay then F would see how to do it too (to F) are you able to do this?
F: Yeah
T: Maybe if I show you the class sitting on their bottoms can you do the same please
F: Wahoo!
T: They’re sitting with their legs crossed(....... ) so if that was one that would be an easy one you’d write two three four five six seven till it stopped

F: (shouting) Easy peasy lemon squeezy

F: I can’t see the board

T: Shh! . On your bot
F: (with a bit of string) My worm!
T: On your bottom please
F: My worm!
T: (confidentially) Stand up a minute and we’ll
F: You touched my worm is that your worm?
(Leads pupil out by the hand)
T: Come and sit just here until I’ve told the class
what to do because you’re interrupting I’ll come
and get you as soon as we do the job as soon as we
start sit down please

The lack of shared meaning or intimacy is evident here, and the teacher is unable to
give messages of support to the pupil. Indeed, she explicitly questions whether he is
able to complete the task of sitting quietly with the others in order that he may take
part in the activity of the lesson.

Transcript 2: Getting Chris writing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transcript</th>
<th>(Preliminary) Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pupil 1: I don’t want to do that I want to do this Teacher: Ok well my idea was that we can use some of the words in your wordsearch and we can put them in here and then Karl’s making up his sentences about owls isn’t he that’s what he likes most (. ) so I thought we can get some words into your folder to do with dinosaurs OK? So which word are you going to try and find next?</td>
<td>Suggestion inviting the student to work Cognitive scaffolding: breaking the task down</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil 1: Do my wordsearch Teacher: Yeah but what about my idea of putting some words from the wordsearch into here so</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
we could make up some sentences about
dinosaurs? (...) Hmm? (...) Now if we’re
going to write a story about dinosaurs what
words might we need? Give me some words
that we might need (...) How about this
scribing dinosaur thing? (...) Describe
describe the Chris describe the time when
dinosaurs ruled (...) what do you think the
earth looked like? do you think that the earth
looked like it does today?
Pupil 1: No
Teacher: Ok so what did it look like
(...) Teacher: Nothing in there? nothing coming out?
What about the story we started about Dino
the dinosaur what words do we need to start
that story? We started with I think ‘Once
upon a time didn’t we? didn’t we? so shall
we use some of those words? (writes and
says) ‘Once upon a time there’ (...) what else
do we need? What other words do we need to
make that a sentence?
Pupil 1: (sullen) Hello
Teacher: (Brightly) Hello? One of your dinosaurs
might say hello (...) Yeah?
Pupil 1: Umm
Teacher: umm (...) Ok I’m just going to start
putting some words down (...) could you just
get some scissors for me Chris? From Miss
G. Could you just go over there and get
them for me?
Pupil 1: (dramatically) I need the scissors! (comes
back with a pen too)
Teacher: Did you ask Miss G if you could borrow that? Do you want to ask her if it’s hers? Do you think if someone borrowed something of yours without asking you would be very happy?

(a few minutes later, after more similar interaction)

Teacher: Karl have you got any more card?
Pupil 2: Chris has
Pupil 1: No
Teacher: Has Chris got some in his drawer?
Pupil 1: No
Pupil 3: I saw him take it off the table where Karl had it
Pupil 1: No it isn’t in there
Teacher: Well shall we look anyway?
Pupil 1: No
(Teacher looks)
Pupil 2: Chris has got it under his seat
(Teacher takes it out)
Teacher: Ok ‘Once the world was ruled by
Pupil 1: Dinosaurs
Teacher: Dinosaurs so we need quite a big card to write dinosaurs (.). Ok so what does dinosaurs start with? what letter?
Pupil 1: Duh
Teacher: Right okay now there’s one word missing in that sentence Chris ‘Once
Pupil 1: ‘Once the world’
Teacher: Good
Pupil 1: ‘was ruled’
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher: ‘ruled’ hang on Calvin I will in a second</th>
<th>Maintaining focus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pupil 1: by</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher: Well done ‘dinosaurs’ so the word that’s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>missing is?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil 1: By (.) Bye bye!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher: What does ‘by’ start with? What letter?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil 1: umm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher: (over-pronouncing) Buh-aye</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil 1: Buh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher: Buh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil 1: Miss could you ask my Mum if I could</td>
<td>Emotional support:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not go next week</td>
<td>boundary setting by asking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>student to consent to behave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher: That’s what I’m going to do I’m going</td>
<td>acceptably</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(.) can you put the scissors down Chris</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>because I don’t want you</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil 1: I’m just</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher: (more firmly) I don’t want you to hurt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yourself</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil 1: I don’t want to go. I don’t want to go</td>
<td>Emotional scaffolding:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to that thing</td>
<td>despite the student’s refusal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher: I’ll talk about it with you in a second</td>
<td>to comply with her request,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>but I need you to put the scissors down because</td>
<td>the teacher does not change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>they’re quite dangerous</td>
<td>the nature of the interaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil 1: Can’t we just watch a</td>
<td>by becoming angry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>video Miss</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher: Can you put the scissors down for me?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C’mon, put the scissors down there, because</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>they are dangerous (.) and also they’re not</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yours, they’re Miss Griffiths’ right we’ve got</td>
<td>Acts as ‘surrogate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>our first sentence about dinosaurs I’m going</td>
<td>conscience’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to muddle the words up and ask you to put</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>them in the right order</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mixing the words up means that Chris must bring some level of meaning making to the activity.