PART 2

THE RECONTEXTUALISATION OF PARTICIPANTS
Chapter 1: Introduction

The following two texts, one taken from an observational study of 'the continuity from preschool to infant school' (Cleave et al., 1982), the other from a 'read aloud' story for young children (Morgan, 1985), deal with essentially the same episode, the same activity in the chain of activities that makes up the social practice of 'the first day at school', but they represent it rather differently.

2.1:1 Addressing the child by name is very important. The wise teacher also finds out the correct way to pronounce it and uses the form to which the child is accustomed, such as Penelope. Besides giving new entrants a name badge to wear, some teachers make a game of remembering names: badges are covered up and children have to guess each other's name.

(Cleave et al., 1982, p.113)

2.1:2 "Now I'll just get a card for your name", said Miss Laurie, looking in another box, "Then I'll go and ring the bell and let the others in. Now what shall I put on this card? What do they call you at home?" "Mary Kate", said Mary Kate, wondering what else they could call her.

"Right", said Miss Laurie, "That's what we'll call you then. That way we shan't muddle you up with the other Mary."

Mary Kate said nothing. She wasn't sure she liked the idea of another Mary.

(Morgan, 1985, p.32)
In the first text the children are referred to generically ("the child" in general, "children", "new entrants") and in terms of what they do, of their role in the social practice of initiation into schooling ("new entrants"). Reference to the teachers is sometimes generic ("the wise teacher"), sometimes specific ("some teachers"). The text also distinguishes different kinds of teachers (there are "wise teachers", and hence, by implication, also "unwise" ones) and groups them "statistically": "some teachers" use the strategy of "getting-to-know-you" games, others do not. In the second text the participants are referred to as specific individuals and some of them have names ("Mary Kate", "Miss Laurie"). And where the first text distinguishes between different kinds or groups of teachers, the second differentiates between the children: apart from "Mary Kate", there is "the other Mary" and there are "the others" - a differentiation between "self" and "others", rather than one between kinds of participants or groups of participants.

This means, in my use of the term, that the fields of the two texts are not identical: each is based on a different kind of knowledge about the participants and the other elements of the social practice. The knowledge that underlies the first text is a generalised kind of knowledge in which children are an undifferentiated group, identified not as individuals, but in terms of their role in the social practice, and in which teachers are known according to the ways in which they enact the social practice ("wisely" or otherwise). The
knowledge that underlies the second text is a knowledge about specific, individual participants, with a unique identity and a unique fate. It is impossible to say which of these two ways of knowing is closer to reality. One can see the first text as the transformation of observations of specific individuals into generalisations; but one can also see the second text as the 'individualisation' or 'personalisation' of a more general scenario. Both texts transform, both recontextualise reality, the one into a context in which objectivated knowledge is transmitted to teachers, for the sake of regulating and guiding their ways of dealing with 'new entrants', the other into a context in which children are told a story that makes them identify with a specific character who responds positively to the transition from home to school, in order, perhaps, that they too might respond positively to this transition. What I understand by field, then, is the version of reality, the knowledge about a social practice that belongs to a specific context, and therefore informs and is informed by other aspects of the context: the purpose of the text, the readers to whom it is addressed, and so on.

In this part of the thesis I will first systematise the kinds of observations made more informally in this introduction, and develop a framework for the analysis of the recontextualisation of the participants of social practices. I will then use this framework in an analysis of three children's texts. These texts
all deal with 'the first day', but they vary contextually. Broadly speaking, the first two stories both seek to reconcile young children with the prospect of having to go to school, but one is written for a mass audience, the other for a more middle class readership. The third story, rather than presenting us with smiling teachers and children whose misgivings soon make place for enthusiasm, shows us, slightly veiled by a fantasy mode, the other side of the coin: here the teacher is authoritarian, the classroom like a prison, and the children are compelled to compete and not allowed to help each other.
Chapter 2: The Recontextualisation of participants

2.2.1 Inclusion and exclusion (system 1)

The knowledge of a social practice that constitutes the field of a given context need not include all the participants who, in reality, take part in that social practice. In texts addressing trainee teachers, for instance, ‘education authorities’ play a significant role (e.g. Cleave et al, 1982), in texts addressing children (e.g. Leete-Hodge, nd; Morgan, 1985) they are never mentioned: the role of ‘education authorities’ is deemed irrelevant in this context, perhaps because it is thought that, to children, ‘educational authority’ should always be fully vested in the person of the teacher.

Inclusion, then, occurs when the knowledge of a social practice that constitutes the field of a given context includes a certain (sociological) participant, exclusion when it does not. And inclusion is realised when a sociological participant is realised by a linguistic participant, exclusion when this is not the case.
2.2.2 Suppression and reduction (system 2)

My definition of exclusion describes the most radical kind of exclusion, the case where neither the participant nor his or her activities are included. Such radical exclusion comes to light only when comparing contextually different texts dealing with the same social practice, as in the example of the inclusion/exclusion of 'education authorities'. In other words, radical exclusion is a category that can be used in comparing texts but not in analysing texts, for the simple reason that radical exclusion leaves no traces in the text. In other cases, however, the exclusion does leave traces: it can be, for instance, that the activity of the participant is included, but the participant him or herself excluded.

This leads to the distinction between suppression and reduction. In both cases the activity is included, but one or more of the participants engaged in or involved with the activity have been excluded. In the case of suppression this exclusion is total, that is, the field radically suppresses the participant or participants, and there is no reference to, no mention of, the participant(s) in the texts that realise that field. In the case of reduction the exclusion is partial. The participants' role in the social practice is not so much obliterated as de-emphasised, pushed into the background.
Reference to the participant or participants in the texts that realise the field is diminished to a greater or lesser degree.

Suppression can be realised in a number of different ways:

(i) **passive agent deletion**
The following text tells us that 'children are admitted', but not who does the admitting. This is made possible by the use of the passive voice, which allows the deletion of the agent, the doer of the action. The action itself is here still encoded as a process and, though a participant has been deleted, the fact that such a deletion has taken place is retrievable. The deletion has left a trace. One can ask: 'admitted...by whom?'

2.2:1 In some areas children are admitted the term in which they are five or even younger, but rising costs and cutbacks in staffing can make this policy hard to maintain

(ii) **nonfinite clauses functioning as participant**
In the following example the infinitival clause 'to maintain this policy' is embedded to function as a (grammatical) participant. This allows the agentive (sociological) participant (which might be, for example, 'for local education authorities') to be deleted. The downranking of the process ('maintain') makes the fact that deletion has
taken place a little less accessible, the trace a little less clear: although 'maintain' is still coded as process, the nominal function of the infinitival clause reduces its process quality, and hence the transparence of its reference to an activity.

2.2:2 To maintain this policy is hard.

(iii) **beneficiary deletion**
It is almost always possible to delete the Beneficiary, the participant for whose benefit an activity is performed. In the following clause, for example, the participant to whom 'he' returns the sheet has been deleted. From the nature of the activity we can infer that a deletion has taken place. The 'trace' is relatively clear.

2.2:3 He returned the sheet.

(iv) **nominalisations and process nouns**
'Cutbacks' and 'staffing' in 2.2:1 refer to activities but function as nominals. The same can be said for 'policy' (cf again example 2.2:1). This allows the participants to be deleted, although they may of course be included in postmodifying prepositional phrases with *by, of, from*, etc. How discernible the trace of the participants' presence is depends on how much the activity has hardened into a thing, the process into a noun. There is a cline which runs from
transparent nominalisations (infinitives, -ing participles such as ‘staffing’), via nouns that have cognate verbs (there is a verb ‘cut back’ and a noun ‘cutback’) to nouns that cannot readily be related to a verb - often, as in the case of ‘policy’, they are the ‘Medium’ (in the sense of Halliday, 1985:144-155) of the process.

(v) adjectivalisations
Processes may also function as adjectives. ‘Rising’, in ‘rising costs’ (example 2.2.1) provides an example which in fact combines adjectivalisation and medio-passivisation (see (vi) below). The downranking of the process again causes the trace of the participants’ presence to be relatively inconspicuous.

(vi) medio-passivisation
In the following example an activity that involves a human participant (‘the teacher opened the door’) has been ‘medio-passivised’, coded as middle voice (cf Halliday, 1985:150-151). This necessitates the deletion of the agentive participant. The context may lead us to infer that ‘the teacher’ was involved, but there can be no certainty - it might, for instance, have been the wind. There is a strong invitation to read the clause as encoding a natural event, rather than a (human) action. The trace is ambiguous.

2.2:4 The door of the playhouse opened and the teacher looked in.
The role of suppression in the construction of different versions of reality, different recontextualisations, has figured prominently in the ‘critical linguistics’ developed by Kress and Hodge (e.g. 1979a, 1979b) and other members of the F:st Anglia school. They took Chomsky’s transformational grammar as their point of departure, but interpreted transformations, not as quasi-mechanical stages in the production of grammatical sentences (‘surface structures’) by individual speakers, or as a formalism of grammatical description, but as resources of language that allow the construction of different, ideologically motivated versions of social reality:

The typical function of transformations is distortion and mystification through the characteristic disjunction between surface form and implicit meanings. Since it is usually a help in reversing transformations to know the context independently, transformations can act as a code, fully interpretable only by initiates, safeguarding their privileged knowledge. But transformations can also create the illusion of such knowledge for both hearer and speaker, masking contradictions or confusions, and imposing an unexamined consensus.

(Kress and Hodge, 1979, p.35)

In most cases it is difficult to know whether suppressed participants are or are not known to the reader, or, indeed, the writer. Example 2.2:1, for instance, makes no reference to the participants involved in the
cutting back of staffing, and, in mentioning 'rising costs', avoids the issue of how and why prices rise. Is this because readers are assumed to know about these processes, so that more detailed reference would be superfluous, overcommunicative? Or is it to withhold knowledge from the reader, knowledge about the how's and why's of cutting back staff and increasing prices? But to pose the question in this way is, perhaps, beside the point. The point is not whether the writers and readers know the details of the economic processes which impinge so much on their practices, or whether their knowledge is 'mystified and distorted' or not. The point is that, in this context, staffing cutbacks and price increases are, literally and figuratively, downranked in importance, mentioned only in passing, referred to only in truncated, incomplete ways. They are to figure here only as a backdrop to the matter at hand, a backdrop that must not be further examined or contested.

2.2.3 Backgrounding and elision (system 3)

In the case of elision an excluded participant is included elsewhere in the same clause or clausecomplex. In example 2.2:4, for instance, the deleted agent of 'The door
of the playhouse opened' is not deleted in the paratactic clause 'and the teacher looked in'.

In the case of backgrounding the deleted participant also occurs elsewhere in the text, but not in the same clause or clause complex. The section of the chapter from which example 2.2:1 was taken, for instance, contains, earlier, the clauses 'one school admits children termly after their fifth birthday' and 'local education authorities vary in their policies'. In other words, we can retrieve, from the text itself, who the excluded participants of the agentless passive 'children are admitted' and the process noun 'policy' are. They are only backgrounded, not suppressed altogether. The degree to which participants are backgrounded can be a significant feature of a field. If, for example, the participant 'education authorities' is frequently deleted in a particular context, then there must be, in that context, some vested interest in minimising the role of that participant, and it will be worthwhile, from a sociological point of view, to attempt to explain this minimisation, this partial effacement.

Although elision is often little more than a relatively neutral cohesive device, it too can, at times, have significance for the way a social practice is represented. The medio-passive voice (cf example 2.2:4 above), for
instance, in which actions are coded as natural, unavoidable events that do not involve human agency, is a common realisation of the exclusion of teachers and other participants with authority over the child in children's stories.²

Backgrounding is realised in the same way as suppression (see section 2.2.3). In the case of elision, some further realisations must be mentioned.

(i) nonfinite clauses
In nonfinite clauses with -ing and -ed participles, and in infinitival clauses with to, the excluded participant can often be retrieved from the same clause or clausecomplex:

2.2:5 Then the children came in, talking and laughing.

2.2:6 'Mary Kate', said Mary Kate, surprised.

2.2:7 She had to put her hands over her ears to shut it out.

(ii) paratactic clauses
In a series of paratactic clauses the subject of all but the first clause may be elided:

2.2:8 She took a card out of a box and fixed it firmly to a corner of the table.
(iii) imperatives

Though, strictly speaking, not retrievable from the same clause or clausecomplex, the subject of imperatives is usually also retrievable from the immediate context - unless, of course, it is directed to the reader or hearer, rather than to a represented participant:

2.2:9 'Come and say goodbye to your Mummy now', said Miss Laurie.

To summarise, in this section we have, with respect to the participants of social practices, dealt with the significant gaps or absences in fields. The discussion was based on three major distinctions: (a) the distinction between complete and partial exclusion, between gaps that are 'filled' elsewhere in the text and gaps that are not; (b) the distinction between excluded participant retrievable at the level of the clause or clausecomplex ('elision'); and (c) the degree to which the suppression of participants leaves 'traces' in the text, that is, the degree to which it is grammatically and semantically possible to include a participant and 'fill the gap'.
2.2.4 Activation and passivation (system 4)

Halliday (1967, 1968, 1985, ch.5) has, in his account of transitivity, outlined the roles represented participants can play with respect to an activity. It cannot be assumed, however, that there is congruency between the participant roles in actual social practices and the grammatical roles which realise them in texts. Roles can be reallocated in recontextualisations. The relations between participants can be rearranged. Here is an example, from the field of television studies:

2.2:10 Children seek out aspects of commercial television as a consolidation and confirmation of their everyday lives (...) The kids use it [television] subversively against the rule-bound culture and institution of the school.

(Curthoys and Docker, 1989, p.68)
2.2:11 Television affects children's sex-role attitudes (...). Furthermore, television has been shown to influence more subtle areas such as racial attitudes and cultural views.

(Tuchman et al., 1978, p. 232)

Leaving aside the participant transformations we have not yet discussed (e.g. objectivations such as 'television' and 'subtle areas', abstractions such as 'aspects of commercial television') and the exclusions (e.g. in 'racial attitudes and cultural views'), the two major (sociological) participants in the examples are 'children' and 'television'. In 2.2:10 'children' and 'the kids' are, grammatically, Actor in relation to the processes of 'seeking out' and 'using' (and also, if one ignores the elisions, of 'consolidating' and 'confirming'), while 'television' ('aspects of commercial television' and 'it') is the Goal of both processes. In 2.2:11 'television' is Actor of 'affect' and 'influence', and 'children' ('children's sex-role attitudes'; 'subtle areas such as racial attitudes and cultural views') Goal. In other words, in one of the recontextualisations (the context of populist 'active audience' theory) the active role is given to 'children', the passive role to 'television', in the other (the context of 'hypodermic needle' mass culture theory) the active role is given to 'television', the passive role to
'children'. Roles are reallocated: Actors become Goals, Goals Actors. But which of the two versions corresponds best to reality, which is the 'reallocation' and which the 'original' allocation, is a problem that cannot, in the end, be solved by text analysis. To recognise this is not a matter of sitting on the fence, of opting for a stance of relativistic objectivity, it merely indicates the limits of what text analysis can do. It can reveal in intricate detail how social practices are represented, and it can relate representations to the contexts in which they are found, but it cannot help us choose which 'reality' to believe in. It can at most give us some of the facts we need to make up our mind.

The involvement of participants in activities can be represented, first of all, as 'active' or 'passive'. 'Activation' occurs when participants are represented as the active, dynamic forces in an activity; 'passivation' when they are represented as 'undergoing' the activity, or as being 'at the receiving end' of it.

Activation can be realised in a number of ways:

(i) participation
Following Hasan (1985, p.37), we can generalise across the different types of processes and say that activation is realised
by the (grammatical) -er role, that is, by a transitivity structure in which the 'activated' participant is Actor in a material process, Behaver in a behavioural process, Senser in a mental process, Sayer in a verbal process, or Assigner in a relational process. Thus, 'Miss Laurie' is 'activated' in:

2.2:12 Miss Laurie gave Mary Kate some wax crayons and a huge sheet of paper.

Unlike Hasan (ibid), however, I do not regard the 'Carrier' role as a realisation of activation, because relational processes do not realise an activity, unless an Assigner is involved. Hasan's 'cline of dynamism' (1985, p.46) will play no role in this part of the theory, as my distinction between 'activities', 'reactions' and 'eligibility criteria' will account for the degrees of dynamism in -er roles.

When 'activation' is realised by 'participation', that is, when sociological participants are realised by grammatical participants, the active role of the participant is most clearly foregrounded (note how, in examples 2.2:10 and 2.2:11 active roles are realised by participation, passive roles in other, more highly transformed ways).
(ii) circumstantialisation
Activation can also be realised by prepositional circumstantials with by or from. Thus 'from the man' in the following example activates 'the man':

2.2:13 They received a pen and a large piece of paper from the man.

Halliday (1985, p.143) does not appear to regard the agentive ('by') circumstantial as a true circumstantial, but in my view it partakes of some of the major characteristics of circumstantials, not only in its form (the prepositional phrase), but also in its 'circumstantiality' - in the fact that it is not indispensable, but optional, an added detail that can be left out. This evidently backgrounds the active role of the activated participant to some degree.

(iii) postmodification and possessivation
Prepositional phrases with by or from can also postmodify a nominalisation or process noun:

2.2:14 They found a present from Aunt Mary in the back porch.

And activation can, finally, also be realised by possessivation, that is, by a possessive pronoun or genitive premodifying a nominalisation or process noun, as with 'their learning' in the following example:
2.2:15 Pupils have never credited teachers for most of their learning.

Here agency is backgrounded still further - changed into the 'possession' of a process which itself has changed into a 'thing'.

2.2.5 **Subjection and beneficialisation**  
(system 5)

Passivation necessitates a further distinction: the passivated participant can be the object of an activity, 'undergo' the activity ('subjection'), or the receiver of an activity ('beneficialisation'). In the following example 'their children' are subjected participants, and the teacher is the beneficialised participant of the exchange enacted by the 'middle-class parents' - it should be noted that I use one term ('Beneficiary') to refer to a 'category of roles', along the lines of Hasan's '-er' and '-ed' rules.'

2.2:16 Middle-class parents commit their children to a teacher's care to keep them from learning what the poor learn on the streets.

There is a cryptogrammatical criterion for considering both these roles 'passivations': both Goals and Beneficiaries can become Subject in passive clauses. But there is, of course, also a cryptogrammatical criterion
for distinguishing them: Beneficiaries can take a preposition (cf Halliday, 1985, p.132 ff). Goals cannot (with the exception of very few cases (e.g. ‘What did John do with the dinner’). There is another important difference between the two roles. Subjected participants are represented as the object of an exchange - think for example of the bride (subjected) given away by the father (activated) to the groom (beneficialised) - or as being at the receiving end of an activity that could also have a non-human object. Beneficialised participants are at the receiving end of an exchange, or of an activity that does not normally have a non-human participant: they are not so much subjected to an activity as partners in an activity.

Like activation, subjection can be realised by participation and possessivation. It cannot, however, be circumstantialised:

(i) participation
Subjection is realised by participation when the passivated participant is Goal in a material process, Phenomenon in a mental process or Carrier in an effective attributive process (cf Halliday, 1985, p.143). ‘Their children’ in 2.2:16 is an example.
(ii) possessivation
Possessivation of a subjected participant takes the form of a prepositional phrase with of postmodifying a nominalisation or process noun, as in 'the warping of the child' in the following example:

2.2:17 A teacher who combines these three powers contributes to the warping of the child much more than the laws which establish his legal or economic minority.

Beneficialisation, finally, is realised either by participation or by circumstantialisation:

(i) participation
The beneficialised participant is Recipient or Client in relation to a material process, or Receiver in relation to a verbal process and does a preposition.

To speak circumstantialisation here does not imply that the Beneficiary is in all respects like a circumstance, merely that it takes on, to some degree, the 'flavour' of a circumstance, that the involvement of the participant with the process has been backgrounded a little (although it may of course be 'foregrounded' in other ways, e.g. by being 'New' in the information structure).

To summarise, we have in this section, distinguished between 'active' and 'passive' participant roles, and between two kinds of passivated role, the role of being subjected
to the activity realised by the process (subjection), and the role of being at the receiving end of the activity (beneficialisation). We have also distinguished between realisations which represent roles in terms of participation, realisations which circumstantialise roles, and realisations which represent participation as possession.
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Figure 2.2: Participant roles

2.2.6 **Personalisation and impersonalisation (system 6)**

Personalisation occurs when participants are represented as human beings, and realised by personal or possessive pronouns (including, of course, personal relative and interrogative pronouns), proper names, or nouns (sometimes adjectives, as, e.g., in ‘maternal care’) whose meaning includes the semantic feature ‘human’.
Impersonalisation occurs when participants are represented by other means, for instance by abstract nouns or by concrete nouns whose meaning does not include the semantic feature 'human'.

2.2.7 Objectivation and abstraction (system 7)

There are two major types of impersonalisation: objectivation and abstraction.

Objectivation occurs when a human participant is referred to by means of reference to a place or thing closely associated with that participant or with an activity of that participant. In other words, objectivation is realised by metonymical reference. The major types of objectivation will be discussed in 2.2.9 below.

Abstraction occurs when a human participant is referred to by means of reference to a quality of that participant. This is realised by an abstract noun denoting the quality, usually formed by means of suffixes like -dom, -ty, -ness, etc. The instances of abstraction in my corpus were almost always nouns denoting mental attributes of states. They frequently added a strongly evaluative dimension to the activity of the participant, as with 'wisdom' in:
2.2:18 School is an activity built on the axiom that learning is the result of teaching, and institutional wisdom continues to accept this axiom.

My use of 'abstraction' clearly involves a narrowing down of the sense of that term. It is therefore necessary to distinguish abstraction in the wider sense (abstraction1) and in the narrower sense (abstraction2) in which I employ it here.

The sense of abstraction1 is closely related to its etymological meaning 'to draw away from', 'to take away from'. Abstraction, in this wider sense, involves the 'drawing away' of part of the meaning from a clause or word. Nominalisation, for instance, the principal kind of abstraction discussed by Martin et al (1988, p.156 ff) in their account of abstraction in junior highschool history textbooks, involves the 'drawing away' of the participants from the process (the transformation I have discussed in 2.2.2 under the heading 'suppression'), and the 'drawing away' of the dynamic aspect of the process, or, in the case of nominalisations like professional, the explicit act of prediction. For reasons to be discussed in more detail in 3.2.4 and 3.2.6 I will refer to this type of abstraction as de-activation.

Generalisation is also a kind of abstraction - one that operates according to some hierarchy of semantic features,
elaborated and realised by the taxonomies inherent in a given discourse. Such hierarchies are culturally and contextually specific, perhaps up to the highest level, that of what Halliday and Hasan (1976, p.274) call 'general nouns' - nouns such as 'man', 'woman', 'thing'.

Abstraction in the narrower sense in which I employ the term here (abstraction2) does not have to operate according to such a hierarchisation of semantic features.

It is finally also possible to 'draw away' the signified from the signifier (cf 2.2:19), or the signifier from the signified (cf 2.2:20), a type of abstraction which I will call metalinguistic abstraction. It is a recontextualisation which draws attention to the way in which reality is semiotically constructed, and which therefore has a somewhat distancing, alienating effect:

2.2:19 Miss Laurie called her name.
2.2:20 Mary Kate didn't like the idea of another Mary.

All four types of abstraction, then, can be characterised in terms of what they 'draw away'. De-activation abstracts away from the participants of material, behavioural, mental, verbal, and effective attributive processes, and from the act of predication in relational processes. Generalisation
abstracts away from particulars, or, one could also say, from the Carriers of attributive clauses whose attribute is a nominal group (clauses such as 'these animals [i.e. herbivores and carnivores] are the consumers of the ecosystem', (cf Martin et al, 1988, p.153) where the kind of food consumed is abstracted away from). Abstraction2 abstracts away from the Carriers of attributive clauses in which the attribute is something other than a nominal group (e.g. from the Carriers of 'uncertain' in 'Uncertainty about the future of professional teaching puts the classroom in jeopardy'). Metalinguistic abstraction abstracts away from the referentiality of the sign. These distinctions in fact correspond closely to the distinctions in the O.E.D. definition of abstraction as 'separation from matter, practice or particulars': 'separation from matter' would correspond to abstraction2 and metalinguistic abstraction, 'separation from practice' to de-activation, and 'separation from particulars' to generalisation.

Figure 2.3: Types of abstraction
2.2.8 Types of objectivation (systems 8 and 9)

The two most common types of objectivation in my corpus were the following:

(i) spatialisation
In spatialisation personalised reference to a participant or set of participants is replaced by reference to the place with which the participant is most closely associated in the given context. This is the case, for instance, with 'some areas' and 'the classroom' in the following examples:

2.2:21 Some areas admit children in September and January, but not at Easter.

2.2:22 I have a word I like to use which is 'the accommodating classroom'.

Spatialisation can also be circumstantialised, as with 'in her area' in:

2.2:23 It is the policy in her area to admit children termly.

'School', the most frequent spatialisation in my corpus, is, of course, not always a spatialisation. It can also function as a process noun. In the first of the following two examples it is a spatialisation, in the second a process noun:
2.2:24 School initiates, too, the myth of unending consumption.

2.2:25 School is just about to begin.

The names of institutions are in fact a special case. Institutions are not really 'things', but social practices objectivated. Hence they can substitute for participants, activities, times, places, and so on. Hence also the special collocations in which they can enter, e.g. with verbs of motion and without deixis ('go to school').

(ii) utterance autonisation
Utterance autonisation occurs when reference to the utterance produced by a participant or set of participants substitutes for reference to the participant or participants themselves. This is the case, for instance, with 'a more recent survey' and 'another list of proposals' in the following examples:

2.2:26 A more recent survey found that the great majority of mothers had visited the school before their child's entry.

2.2:27 Every month I see another list of proposals suggesting the replacement of Latin-American 'classroom practitioners' either by disciplined systems administrators or just by TV.

It is not always easy to distinguish objectivating metonyms of this kind from nominalisations. Perhaps the criterion should
be whether the autonomised utterance functions as the Sayer of a verbal process or not. By that criterion 2.2:28 would be an 'utterance autonomisation', and 2.2:29 - a nominalisation:

2.2:28 This question invites you to compare the Western tradition of high art oil painting with the modern advertising image.

2.2:29 Questions began.

Two further types of objectivation were also common in my corpus:

(iii) instrumentalisation
In instrumentalisation personalised reference to a participant engaged in a certain activity is substituted for by reference to the instrument by means of which the participant carries out that activity, as with 'voices' in:

2.2:30 They were following her down a long corridor full of chattering voices.

(iv) somaticisation
I have coined the term 'somaticisation' to refer to instances in which reference to a participant is replaced by reference to part of the body of the participant. Somaticisation is therefore a synecdoche with a restricted field, a 'pars pro toto' in which the 'pars' must always be a body part, as with 'shoulder' in:
2.2:31 She put her hand on Mary Kate's shoulder.

The noun denoting the body part is almost always premodified by a possessive pronoun or genitive referring to the 'owner' of the body part, as can, indeed, be the case also with other objectivations: a participant can be **semi-objectivated**, as in 2.2:31, or **fully objectivated**, as, for instance, in 2.2:30. I consider 2.2:31 nevertheless an objectivation. The use of somaticisation adds a touch of alienation, of the participant, Mary Kate, not being involved herself. Not Mary Kate, but Mary Kate's **body** is being touched - an unwanted, slightly intimidating intrusion.

More generally, impersonalisation typically has one or more of the following effects: it can background the identity and/or role of participants; it can lend impersonal authority or force to an activity or quality of the participant; it can add positive or negative connotations to an activity or utterance of the participant. When, for example, 'school' is used instead of 'the teacher' or 'Miss Carter' or some other form of personalised reference, the text does not tell the reader or listener who is responsible for the actions, utterances and reactions described. And the objectivation also endows the activities of the teacher with impersonal authority, with a force that is difficult to contest. For this reason
 impersonalisation abound in the language of bureaucracy, a form of the organisation of human interaction which is constituted on the denial of responsibility and governed by impersonal procedures which, once put in place, are wellnigh impermeable to human agency. Abstractions, finally, frequently add connotative meanings: the qualities or states abstracted then serve, in part, to evaluate the activities of the participants, and at the same time lend them an impersonal, quasi-natural force.

To summarise, I have, in the preceding sections, distinguished between (a) personalising and impersonalising reference to participants, that is, between the case in which human participants are referred to by words or phrases which have the semantic feature 'human' as a component of their meaning, and the case in which this is not so: (b) objectivation, in which human participants are referred to by means of reference to places or things with which they or their activities are closely associated, and abstraction, in which human participants are referred to by means of reference to a quality or state attributed to them; (c) a number of different types of objectivation - spatialisation, utterance autonomisation, instrumentalisation and somaticisation; and (d) semi-objectivation, a kind of compromise between personalised and impersonalised reference in which impersonalised reference
is premodified by personalised reference, and full objectivation, in which this is not the case.
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Figure 2.4: Types of participant objectivation

2.2.9 Generification and specification
(system ll)

Generification occurs when participants are represented as classes, specification when participants are represented as specific, identifiable individuals or groups. Generification can therefore be seen as a type of abstraction which ‘draws away’ from specificity – always the first step in generalisation.
The realisation of generification is somewhat problematic (cf Martin, nd, p.65). When participants are represented as a group, the plural without article may be used, as with 'children' in:

2.2:32 Dr. Juan said children often hid their fear of separation.

When participants are represented as individuals both the definite and the indefinite article can be used, as with 'the child' and 'a child' in the following examples:

2.2:33 Allow the child to cling to something familiar during times of stress.

2.2:34 Maybe a child senses that from her mother.

If mass nouns are used for generic reference to a group of participants, the article is always absent - but this form can also be used for specific reference, as with 'staff' in this example:

2.2:35 Staff in both playgroups and nurseries expressed willingness to supply information if asked and regretted that their opinions were not valued more.

However closely related to the use of articles, generification is clearly dependent on a complex of factors, including also tense. Example 2.2:35, for instance, has been
interpreted as specific mainly because of the absence of habitual or universal present tense. In addition generically represented participants cannot have a numerative without the reference changing to specific.

We might finally include also what Martin (nd, p.66) has called 'total reference' - 'every teacher', though strictly speaking specific, is as much a generalisation as 'teachers'.

As noted in 2.1, generification and specification add a particular epistemological flavour to recontextualisation. A comparison of the following two texts brings this out:

2.2:36 The reference is specific since we have in mind specific specimens of the class tiger.

(Quirk et al, 1972, p.147)

2.2:37 Classification is an instrument of control in two directions: control over the flux of experience of physical and social reality (...) and society's control over conceptions of that reality.

(Kress and Hodge, 1979, p.63)

The first of these texts rests on a platonic view of reality, in which the ultimate, underlying reality is one of generalised essences, and in which specific participants are 'specimens' of that generalised essence. The second text departs from 'the flux of
experience', from a specific, concrete world, populated with specific, concrete people, places, things and actions, and sees classification as an operation on this immediate, material reality - an operation which creates a kind of second order reality, a 'conception of reality'.

Sociologists have linked such concepts of reality to social class. For Bourdieu (1986) concrete reference to immediate experience is linked to the 'habitus' of the working class, that is, to the principles behind their appreciation of art, music, literature, their moral and political judgments, and so on. 'Distance, height, the overview of the observer who places himself above the hurly-burly' (p.444), on the other hand, is linked to the 'habitus' of the dominant class, the bourgeoisie, and Bourdieu approvingly quotes Virginia Woolf's dictum that 'general ideas are always generals' ideas'. From this perspective, he says, specific reference is a 'blind, narrow, partial vision' (p.444). In a similar vein, Bernstein (e.g. 1971, p.197) has argued that 'elaborated codes' give access to 'universalistic orders of meaning' while 'restricted codes' give access to 'particularistic orders of meaning', and that access to these codes is class-determined.

The link between, on the one hand, social class and generification and specification as epistemological principles or 'coding
orientations', and, on the other hand, between generification and social control or domination, can be observed in many contexts. In middle-class oriented newspapers, for instance, government agents and experts tend to be referred to specifically, 'ordinary people' generically: the point of identification, the world in which one's specifics exist, is here, not the world of the governed, but the world of the governors, of the 'generals'. In working class oriented newspapers this is not the case: 'ordinary people' are frequently referred to specifically. The following two examples illustrate the difference. They deal with the same topic and the articles from which they are taken appeared on the same day - text 2.2:38 in the Sydney Morning Herald, text 2.2:39 in the Daily Telegraph.

2.2:38 Australia has one of the highest childhood drowning rates in the world, with children under 5 making up a quarter of the toll. This is the grim news from Government studies of Australia's high incidence of drowning. The studies show over 500 people drown in Australia every year, with backyard swimming pools the biggest killers for children under 15. The Minister for Sport and Recreation, Mr. Brown, said the childhood drowning rate was higher than developed countries such as Britain and the US and comparable with many Asian countries. He said children should be encouraged to swim and parents should learn resuscitation techniques.
2.2.39 The tragic drowning of a toddler in a backyard swimming pool has mystified his family. Matthew Harding, two, one of twin boys, had to climb over a one-metre 'child-proof' fence before he fell into the pool. Mrs. Desley Harding found Matthew floating in the pool when she went to call the twins in for tea yesterday. 'I have got no idea how he got in the pool', said Mrs. Harding at her home in Wentworthville South today.
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**Figure 2.5:** Two major types of participant personalisation

2.2.10 **Individualisation and assimilation** *(system 12)*

Individualisation occurs when participants are represented as individuals, assimilation when they are represented as a group.

Assimilation is realised by plurality, as with 'all the children' in:
2.2:40 All the children stopped playing to stare at the lion.

It can also be realised by a mass noun (e.g. 'staff') or noun denoting a group of people, as with 'squads' in:

2.2:41 Mr. Greiner said the specially trained squads from the Department of Education would go to family homes to assist parents and would also organise meetings of parents.

Individualisation is realised by singularity.

Given the great value which is placed on individuality in many spheres of society (and the value placed on conformity in others) it is always of interest to investigate which fields recontextualise which participants as individuals and which as groups. In the introduction to this chapter we already encountered a text in which 'children' were treated as an undifferentiated group (although it should, in fairness, be added that the book from which that text was taken also uses 'case studies' recounting the fate of individual children). In *Offspring*, an ABC radio programme for parents, an explicit plea for individualisation was made by one of the expert panellists, but - experts will be experts, and schools schools - individualisation was, itself, 'assimilated' - the children, despite the emphasis on difference, were represented as groups:
However you manipulate the age of entry into school, you are always going to have the situation where you have children of different kinds of development and with different skills coming into a school programme. And the important thing is to make sure that the programme is adapted to meet the needs of all these children coming in.

Many texts mix the two modes. Texts addressing teachers, for instance, generally assimilate children (and parents), but they alleviate this with case histories. Texts addressing parents tend to individualise children, as in example 2.2:47 below, but they also distance parents from their children, make them see their individual children from the point of view of the teacher or the expert, so to speak, particularly when invoking psychological discourses, as in example 2.2:44:

Your child will become more recognisable as an individual to the teacher if he knows a little about whom he is teaching.

The momentum of the enthusiasm generated by the teacher swept the children into a new world of experience where they felt safe and ready to explore.
2.2.11 Determination and indetermination (systems 14 and 16)

Indetermination occurs when participants are represented as unspecified, 'anonymous' individuals or groups, determination when their identity is, one way or another, specified.

Indetermination is typically realised by indefinite pronouns ('somebody', 'someone', 'some', 'some people') used in nominal function, as in:

2.2:45 Someone had put flowers on the teacher's desk.

In this case indetermination anonymises a participant, asserts that the identity of the participant is, in the given context, irrelevant to the listener or reader (it may, indeed, be unknown to the speaker or writer). The reader or listener merely needs to know that the participant exists and takes part. In 2.2:45, for example, taken from a children's story, introduction to non-teaching personnel (or, perhaps, voluntary workers) is apparently deemed irrelevant. We could call this type of indetermination anonymisation.

Indetermination can also be realised by generalised exophoric reference, as in this quote from a *Snoopy* cartoon:
2.2:46 They won't let you go to school until you're five years old.

In this case indetermination endows participants with a kind of impersonal authority, a sense of unseen, yet powerfully felt coercive force. We could call this type of indetermination power obscurcation.

2.2.12 Differentiation (system 16)

Differentiation explicitly differentiates an individual participant or group of participants from a similar individual or group. It creates the difference between the 'self' and the 'other', or between 'us' and 'them'.

2.2:47 Mummy, did you know there is another Mary?

2.2:48 They played 'higher and higher' with some of the other children.

Differentiation is never undetermined. It always combines with some form of determination, either because the ordinal ('other') premodifies the determination, as in the example above, or because of anaphoric reference, when the ordinal is Head of the nominal group (e.g. 'the others').
As we will see in more detail later, a comparison of middle-class oriented and 'mass audience' oriented children's stories about 'the first day' brings out that differentiation plays a crucial role in the former and does not at all occur in the latter. Middle-class children are encouraged to see themselves as individuals, different from 'the others'. The readers of the 'mass audience' oriented story are encouraged to take pleasure in their ability to conform successfully.

2.2.13 Collectivisation and aggregation
(system 13)

Aggregation quantifies groups of participants, 'treats them as statistics'. With collectivisation this is not the case.

Aggregation is realised by the presence of a definite or indefinite ('exact' or 'inexact', in terms of Halliday, 1985, p.163) quantifier which either functions as the Numerative or as the Head of the nominal group, as with 'most of the children', '50 per cent of all three-year-olds' and '90 per cent of all four-year-olds' in the following examples:

2.2:49 Most of the children had at some time said they did not want to go to school.
2.2:50 There should be places available for 50 per cent of all three-year-olds and 90 per cent of all four-year-olds.

It should be noted that power obscuration (see section 2.2.11 above) can also be aggregated. Example 2.2:46 is an instance of non-aggregated power obscuration. Clauses like 'many believe...', 'some say...' etc. are instances of aggregated power obscuration.

Aggregation plays a crucial role in many contexts. In our society the majority rules, not just in contexts in which formal democratic procedures are used to arrive at decisions, but also in others, through such mechanisms as opinion polls, surveys, marketing research etc. Even legislative reform is now in many instances based on 'what most people consider legitimate'. For this reason aggregation often carries an implicit bias. It is used to regulate practices and to create consensus opinions, although it presents itself as merely recording facts. The following example, for instance, not only records how many mothers 'visit the school before their child's entry', but also, implicitly, endorses that practice, as, indeed, do all the texts emanating from educational authorities in my corpus:
2.2:51 A more recent survey found that the great majority of mothers had visited the school before their child's entry, and most had made some contact with the staff.

Figure 2.6 summarises the distinctions introduced in the preceding four sections:

Figure 2.6: Major types of participant specification
2.2.14 Nomination and categorisation
(systems 21, 22, 23)

Nomination causes participants to be represented in terms of their unique identity, categorisation in terms of functions, identities etc. which they share with others.

Nomination is typically realised by proper nouns which can be formal (surname) or informal (given name).

Occasionally a recontextualisation we might call 'name obscuration' occurs: letters or numbers replace names (e.g. 'Mr. X'), so that nomination can be signified while the name is, at the same time, withheld.

Items other than proper nouns can also be used for nomination, especially when there is, in the context, only one participant who occupies a certain rank, or fulfils a certain function, or has a certain relation to some other participant, as in:

2.2:52 She stood for Mummy to tie a red bow in her hair.

2.2:53 They started out, Auntie Barbara pushing Debbie in her pram.

2.2:54 Magnus walked down the dark stairs. The Unknown Soldier followed him.
In such cases the nominated participant is written, as are names, with the first letter capitalised. The nomination can be used as a vocative, and does not occur with a possessive pronoun, except in contexts of special endearment, which is possible also with names (e.g. 'my Cathy...'). In other languages the possessive pronoun does not necessarily suggest special endearment: in French, for example, soldiers may address officers as 'Mon Capitain', or 'Mon Général'.

Nominations of this kind in fact blur the dividing line between nomination and categorisation. They are particularly common in stories for young children with characters referred to as 'the Little Boy', 'the Giant', 'Rabbit', etc., even in vocatives:

2.2:55 "Turkish Sultan, give me back my diamond button."

Nominations may be titulated, either in the form of a honorification, adding the status of the participant, and realised by standard titles, ranks, etc., as with 'Dr. Juan' in the following example:

2.2:56 Dr. Juan suggests parents take children to the school before the first day,
or in the form of affiliations, adding the personal or kinship relation between the nominated participant and some other participant, as with 'Auntie Barbara' in 2.2:53 above.

Press journalists often use what Bell (1985, p.98) has called 'pseudo titles', such as:

2.2:57 Controversial cancer therapist Milan Brych

As in standard titles, the determiner is absent, but otherwise categorisation and nomination are blurred here, or rather, categorisations are transformed into unique identities, much as in the children's stories quoted above.

The use of surname and given name, with or without titulation, can create further degrees of formality (cf. 'Stephen', 'Stephen Juan', 'Dr. Stephen Juan', 'Dr. Juan').

In some contexts, finally, the borderline between honorification and affiliation becomes blurred (e.g. 'Father Jim', 'Comrade Yerchoy').

'Going to school for the first time' is, as we will see, often represented as, amongst other things, a transition from the world of nomination to the world of categorisation. The story of Mary Kate, for instance (Morgan, 1985), has only nominations - 'Mummy',
'Granny', 'Uncle Jack', 'Jackie' (the dog), 'Dorabella' (a doll), etc. - until Mary Kate enters school. From then on participants are at least introduced in terms of categorisation - 'the headmistress', 'the teacher', 'the other children', etc., and the transition is represented as traumatic, as threatening the child's sense of unique identity. A pamphlet for parents entitled 'Your Child and Success at School' (Luck, 1990) looks at this trauma from the parents' point of view - but here the participants are categorised rather than nominated (although an element of unique identity is created by the 2nd person direct address):

2.2:58 Passing a group of children in uniform gathered in the playground before school starts, as the parent of a pre-schooler you may think, 'All these children appear so similar, yet my child is very special. I know all his ways, his special fears, his wonderful gifts. But will they know how to bring out the best in him?'

We have already seen in examples 2.2:38 and 2.2:39 how a middle-class oriented newspaper makes use of generic reference more often than a working class oriented newspaper. The same examples show that the middle-class oriented newspaper nominates only one participant, a Government minister, whereas the working class oriented newspaper nominates 'ordinary people' throughout.
Although journalists refer to all their writings as 'stories', the latter example is more truly a story. Stories work by making readers or listeners identify with characters, and for this to be possible the characters must be seen to have unique identities, and hence names. Nameless characters in stories fulfil only passing, functional roles. In texts oriented to 'universalistic orders of meaning', to use Bernstein's phrase again, the same participants who in stories are nominated tend to be categorised.

The distinctions made in this section are summarised in figure 2.7:
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**Figure 2.7**: Types of nomination
2.2.15 Association and dissociation (system 17)

Associations are groups formed by participants and/or groups of participants (either generically or specifically referred to) which are never labelled in the text, either by categorisations, or by nominations, although the participants or groups of participants associated in this way are themselves nominated and/or categorised.

Associations can be realised in a number of ways:

(i) parataxis
Additive conjunction (e.g. 'and', 'as well as') coordinates two or more nominal groups, each referring to a participant or group of participants, into a complex nominal group, as with 'Mandy and Mark' in:

2.2:59 Mandy and Mark followed the teacher into a large airy room.

The association between Mandy and Mark is, in the story from which this example is taken, never labelled, for example by a relational identification like 'friends' (we know that they are not siblings). It is constituted by the fact that they enact (e.g. undergo) the same activities: Mandy and Mark are dissociated in terms of their reactions and eligibility criteria such as dress.
(ii) **circumstantialisation**

Association can also be realised by the use of circumstances of accompaniment (cf. Halliday, 1985, p.141), as in 'with the other children' in:

2.2:60  They played 'higher and higher' with the other children.

Associations realised by circumstantialisation are perhaps represented as somewhat looser, somewhat more accidental and fleeting than associations realised by parataxis.

(iii) **pronominal reference in quoted speech**

Personal and possessive pronouns in quoted speech can also realise association, as with 'we' in:

2.2:61  "We'll do something easy today," said the teacher.

(iv) **possessive attributes**

Possessive attributive clauses, with verbs like have, belong, etc., can make an association explicit, still without labelling the group that results from it:

2.2:62  We have a new pupil.

(v) **lexicalisation**

And, finally, the association may also become explicit through lexicalisation, as in:
2.2:63 The essential teacher-child bond may form as a result of this type of introduction.

In 2.2:61 the protagonists of the story from which the example is taken, Mandy and Mark, have not been referred to as associated with their new teacher and classmates before the teacher says "We'll do something easy today".

The association is thus introduced, imposed, we might perhaps say, by the teacher. Hasan (1985, p.88) has referred to this kind of association by means of the terms 'inclusion' and 'exclusion' - for associations go hand in hand with dissociations. The association formed by 2.2:61, for example, the 'school-we', disassociates the earlier association between Mandy and Mark and their families, the 'home-we', and also the association between Mandy and Mark themselves - until the final bell rings they are no longer referred to as 'Mandy and Mark' (or 'they'). Associations are thus formed and disbanded again in the course of the text. They signify impermanent or contingent groupings, or groupings which have not yet fully stabilised.
2.2.16 Functionalisation and identification
(systems 19, 20)

Functionalisation occurs when a participant or set of participants is referred to in terms of an activity, in terms of something the participant does, an occupation, for example, or a role. It can be realised in a number of ways:

(i) By a noun formed from a verb, through suffixes such as -er, -ant, -ian, -ee, e.g. 'interviewer', 'celebrant', 'guardian', 'payee'.

(ii) By a noun formed from another noun which denotes a place or tool closely associated with an activity (which forms, in Halliday's term (1985, p.134ff), the Range of that activity), through suffixes such as -ist, -eer, e.g. 'pianist', 'mountaineer'.

(iii) By the compounding of nouns denoting places or tools closely associated with an activity and highly generalised categorisations such as 'man', 'woman', 'person', 'assistant', etc., as in 'cameraman', 'chairperson', etc.

All these realisations may include a classifier (cf., e.g. 'victim', 'bailiff', 'blacksmith'). In such cases semantic and collocational criteria will have to come into play.
Identification occurs when a participant is defined, not in terms of what he or she does, but in terms of what he or she, more or less permanently and unavoidably, is. I have distinguished three kinds of identification: classification, relational identification and physical identification.

2.2.17 Classification

In the case of classification a participant is referred to in terms of the major categories recognised by a given society for differentiating between classes of people. In our society these include age, gender, provenance, class, wealth, ethnicity, religion, sexual orientation, and so on. The following example combines (collectivised) functionalisation ('a reception class') and classification (the association of 'Asians', 'Chinese' and 'West Indians'):

2.2:62 A reception class of Asians, Chinese and West Indians mounted a freeze of 'Our Portraits' in which the faces were cut out of pale pink card.

Such categories, then, are historically and culturally variable. What in one period or culture is recontextualised as 'doing', as a more or less impermanent role, may in another be recontextualised as 'being', as a more or less fixed identity. Foucault has described
how, in the late 19th century, the discourse of sexology introduced a new classification category, 'sexual orientation'. Participants who previously were 'functionalised ('sodomites') were now, increasingly classified:

Homosexuality appeared as one of the forms of sexuality when it was transposed from the practice of sodomy onto a kind of interior androgyny, a hermaphroditism of the soul. The sodomite had been a temporary aberration; the homosexual was now a species.

(Foucault, 1981, p.42ff)

The distinction between functionalisation and classification is also contextually variable. Sociological role theory goes quite far in blurring the boundaries between the two modes of categorisation:

Every role in society has attached to it a certain identity. As we have seen, some of these identities are trivial and temporary ones, as in some occupations that demand little modification in the being of their practitioners. It is not difficult to change from garbage collector to night watchman. It is considerably more difficult to change from clergyman to officer. It is very, very difficult to change from negro to white. And it is almost impossible to change from man to woman. These differences in the ease of role changing ought not to blind us to the fact that even identities we consider to be our essential selves have been socially assigned.

(Berger, 1966, p.115)
Psychological or psychologising discourses, on the other hand, stress the boundaries strongly, as in this question from interviewer Caroline Jones’ series of radioprogrammes ‘The Search for Meaning’:

So what would you want to say about that split we seem to have made in our habit of thinking between that which we are (our being) and how we value that; and our doing, all our performance, our work? There’s a real split there, isn’t there, in our society?

(Jones, 1989, p.136)

Do we have an identity beneath the many roles we play? Or is our identity the product of the roles we learn to play? Our concern here is not to solve this problem, but to point out that the English language does allow us to make a difference between functionalisation and identification, as a resource that can be used in the recontextualisation of social practices.

Identifications can be, and frequently are, Classifiers in nominal groups, functionalisations only rarely. One can, for example say ‘the Asian teacher’, ‘the homosexual musician’, ‘the woman victim’, but not *‘the teacher Asian’, *‘the musician homosexual’, *‘the victim woman’. Only relational identifications (see 2.2.18 below) occasionally allow functionalisations to become Classifiers, as e.g. in ‘your teacher friend’.
Secondly, classifications and physical identifications cannot be possessivated, except in certain rather derogatory contexts (e.g. "your Asian", "their homosexual"). Relational identifications, on the other hand, are almost always possessivated. But the possessivation does not play the same role as in functionalisations. Possessivated functionalisations signify the activation (as in 'his victim'), subjection (as in 'my attacker') or beneficialisation (as in 'her pianist') of the participant represented by the possessive pronoun (or genitive pre- or postmodifier). Possessivated relational identifications signify the 'belonging together', the 'relationality' of the possessivated and possessing participants (as in 'my daughter' or 'my mother').

On the basis of such criteria a term like 'child' is still primarily an identification, however much sociologists and historians have attempted to recontextualise it as a functionalisation (cf. e.g. Aries, 1973). To functionalise it, 'meta-discursive' statements ('the role of child', 'the concept of childhood') remain, for the moment necessary:

We forget, however, that our present concept of 'childhood' developed only recently in Western Europe and more recently still in the Americas.

(Illich, 1971, p.33)
Two further observations. Firstly, different contexts will select different classification categories — and often develop intricate classificational taxonomies. The texts in my corpus which address teachers, for instance, develop detailed age classifications ('developmental stages') for children, and class and ethnicity classifications for parents, but tend to refer to teachers in terms of functionalisation and appraisement (see 2.2.20). This is not the case in texts addressing children. Secondly, classification tends to be used, in our society, to set apart those who differ from the norm (who are homosexual rather than heterosexual, immigrants rather than Australians, etc.) and those who are subjected to domination. Functionalisation is, in our society, dominant, and, in dominant discourses, dominant participants are referred to only in terms of functionalisation.

2.2.18 Relational identification

Relational identification represents participants in terms of their personal or kinship relation to each other.

It is realised by a closed set of nouns denoting such relations: 'friend', 'father', 'aunt' etc. Typically they are possessivated, either by means of a possessive pronoun ('her
friend’), or by means of a genitive (‘the child’s mother’) or postmodifying prepositional phrase with of (‘a mother of five’).

The role of relational identification is, in our society, less important than that of functionalisation or classification. It has been confined to the private sphere. Its intrusion into the sphere of public activities may be branded as ‘nepotism’ or ‘corruption’ (unless you are a monarch). In other societies, however, it plays a key role. Von Sturmer (1981, p.13) describes how Aborigines, when they first meet, introduce themselves primarily in terms of relational identification. They ‘search for relations whom they share and then establish their relationship on that basis.’ This differs from Western introductions where nomination and functionalisation (‘What do you do?’) are the key to establishing a relationship, and where classification (‘Where are you from?’) comes in only when you display signs of differing from the norm, for instance a foreign accent, or a dark skin. Not so amongst Aborigines:

Mareeba man: ‘Where you from?’
Mickey: ‘I’m Edward River man. Where you from?’
Mareeba man: ‘I’m Lama Lama man...do you know X?’
Mickey: ‘No. Do you know Y?’
Mareeba man: ‘No. Do you know Z?’
Mickey: 'Yes, she's my aunty.'
Mareeba man: 'That old lady's my granny. I must call you daddy.'
Mickey: 'I must call you boy. You give me a cigarette.'

(Von Sturmer, 1981, p.13)

Where blood relations continue to be functionally important in our society, as is the case especially with mothers and children, the relevant terms become polyvalent: 'mother' can be used as a functionalisation ('mothering' is not the act of bringing a child into the world, but the act of giving care to a child; 'fathering' is still only the act of begetting a child), as a nomination ('Mother,...'), and as a relational identification ('my mother'); 'child' can be a classification as well as a relational identification.

We might also note that, by the criteria developed in this section, terms like 'lover' and 'caregiver' (as a synonym for 'parent') can be seen as introducing a measure of functionalisation into the sphere of personal and kinship relations. Projections of the future development of personal and kinship relations in our society such as Alvin Toffler's Futureshock (1970) do indeed at times predict increasing functionalisation, for example professional families bringing up children so that parents can devote themselves to their careers.
2.2.19 Physical identification

Physical identification represents participants in terms of a physical characteristic that uniquely identifies them.

It can be realised by one of a set of nouns denoting physical characteristics ('blonde', 'redhead', 'cripple', etc.)

It can also be realised by adjectives ('bearded', 'tall', etc.) that premodify, or prepositional phrases with with or without that postmodify highly generalised classifications like 'man', 'woman', 'child', etc.

2.2:63 A little girl with a long, fair pigtail came and stood next to Mary Kate.

2.2:64 "What are you doing there?", shouted the man with the large moustache.

The instances of physical identification in my corpus all occurred in stories, sometimes only in the introduction of a character, as in 2.2:63, sometimes throughout the story, as with 'the man with the large moustache', in 2.2:64. They provide participants with a unique identity in the temporary or permanent absence of nomination, and do so by means of a salient detail - we have already noted the importance of the unique identification of characters in stories.
Physical identification, in contrast to nomination, is almost always overdetermined (cf. 2.2.21 below): physical attributes tend to have connotations and these can be used to classify or functionalise participants. Large moustaches, for example, deriving perhaps from the moustaches of Prussian army officers, connote the activities of rigid disciplinarians, not only in armies and schools, but also in other contexts. The borderline between physical identification and classification is therefore not always clearcut: one can think of the way skin colour terms become classifications as well as, and perhaps sometimes at the same time as, physical identifications; or of the way in which the physical identification of women can introduce, obliquely, a classification in terms of ‘sexual attractiveness’.

However, even when used for classification, the category of physical identification remains distinct, because of its obliqueness, its overdetermination.

2.2.20 Appraisement

Occasionally in my corpus a participant is referred to in interpersonal, rather than experiential terms. For these instances I use the term appraisement: a participant is appraised when he or she is referred to in
terms which evaluate him or her — as good or bad, loved or hated, admired or pitied, and so on.

Appraisement is realised by the set of nouns and idioms that denote such appraisal (and only such appraisal), as, for instance ‘the darling’, ‘the bastard’, ‘the wretch’, and as ‘the poor thing’ in:

2.2:65 The poor thing could not reach a nut that someone had thrown him.

Appraising Epithets generally, have a legitimating of delegitimating function.

Although I have found very few appraisements in my corpus, in other contexts, especially certain kinds of conversation, they would evidently play a more extensive role, as might be illustrated with this quote from the (taped and transcribed) autobiography of Miles Davis (Davis, 1990, p.13):

2.2:66 I told the motherfucker as he was going out of the door, "I told you not to go in there, stupid."

It would appear, incidentally, that negative appraisements are more plentiful than positive ones.

Figure 2.8 summarises the distinction introduced in the preceding five sections.
2.2.21 *Single determination and overdetermination (systems 24, 25, 26)*

Overdetermination occurs when a participant is represented as participating, at the same time, in more than one social practice.

We have already come across an example in 2.2:54 where we encountered a character called 'The Unknown Soldier'. Magnus, the hero of the story from which this example was taken, finds The Unknown Soldier (who is 'maybe eighteen years old', but 'looks more like a boy than like a man') on The Unknown Soldier Square, where he sits, rather forlorn, at the foot of a huge abstract
sculpture, a monument dedicated to the Unknown Soldier. As this monument does not look much like a soldier, Magnus assumes that the man-boy must be The Unknown Soldier. The man-boy, after some hesitation, agrees to this. He is glad to get a name because he himself does not know who he is (he is 'unknown'). Magnus and The Unknown Soldier then go to a place 'rather like a school' where The Unknown Soldier fails miserably at answering the questions asked by 'the man with the large moustache'. Thus The Unknown Soldier is connected to at least two practices, warfare and schooling, and comes to symbolise the subjected participant in both these practices, perhaps in all practices that create 'victims' and 'underdogs'.

Magnus' own name is similarly overdetermined, since he is both little, a child, and 'magnus': through his name he transcends the difference between 'what adults (can) do' and 'what children (can) do'.

2.2.22 Inversion, symbolisation, connotation, distillation (System 25)

I have distinguished four major categories of overdetermination:
(1) **Inversion**
Inversion is a form of overdetermination in which a participant is connected to two practices which are, in a sense, each other's opposite.

This is the case, for instance, in the well-known comic strip *The Flintstones*. The activities of the Flintstones are very much those of a 20th century (American) suburban family. The Flintstones themselves, however, are overdetermined: they do the things 20th century families do, but **look like and are nominated as** prehistoric cavedwellers. In other words, they have been transformed from [+ contemporary] to [- contemporary] - while still involved in contemporary activities. Reference thus widens out to prehistoric as well as contemporary practices, perhaps in order that the latter may be viewed as 'natural', as transcending history and culture: overdetermination is one of the ways in which stories can express ideological values (and not only stories, as we will see below).

The 'Magnus' example in 2.2.21 above is also a case of inversion: the participant (Magnus) has been transformed [+ child] to [- child] - while still involved in child-like activities. The effect of this we have already discussed.
(2) Symbolisation
Symbolisation occurs when a 'fictional' participant or set of participants stands for participants or sets of participants in non-fictional social practices. The 'fictional' participant often belongs to a mythical, distant past. This distance allows the participants and the activities in which they engage to refer out to several non-fictional participants and practices.

Will Wright (1975), in a study of Westerns, has shown how the participants and activities in Westerns changed in the early 60ies, towards a pattern which he calls the 'professional plot'. Characteristic for this kind of plot is the replacement of individualised heroes (the lone gunfighter who arrives in town on his horse) by collectivised heroes - the team of fiercely independent men who work for money rather than for love, justice or honour, are technically competent and highly organised, and form a tightly knit elite with a strong code of solidarity within the group. Wright then shows how these 'professional heroes' and their exploits can be linked to a number of social practices and their participants, noting, for instance, how in business the individual entrepreneur has made place for the executive team, how in science the individual genius has made place for the efficient research team, and so on, and how the values of such teams are very similar to
the values of the heroes of the 'professional Western': here, too, one finds high technical competence, work for financial rewards, group solidarity against outsiders, and so on. Thus the 'professional heroes' in Westerns can stand for a variety of participants in actual social practices: doctors, scientists, politicians, business executives, and so on. The township, the 'weak society' for which the 'professional heroes' work, in turn, can stand for such participants as the doctor's patients, the corporation's clients, the politician's electorate, etc. In other words, the participants (and, indeed, the other elements) of the 'professional Western' are overdetermined. They can refer out to a number of participants and practices in society. Bruno Bettelheim (1978) has similarly mapped the participants and activities of fairy tales onto contemporary and actual social practices, especially those of the family.

(3) Connotation
Connotation occurs when a unique determination (nomination or physical identification) stands for a classification or functionalisation. This definition essentially accords with the way Barthes (1967, 1973, 1977) has, inspired by Hjelmslev, defined 'myth' or Connotation.
Connotations are, as Barthes says (1977, p.50) 'discontinuous', 'scattered traits', the knowledge of which is established by popular culture tradition:

A 'historical grammar' of iconographic connotation ought thus to look for its material in painting, theatre, associations of ideas, stock metaphors, etc., that is to say, precisely in 'culture'.

(Barthes, 1977, p.22)

And, in connection with photography (but equally applicable to verbal texts):

To find the code of connotation would be to isolate, inventoriate and structure all the historical elements of the photograph, all the parts of the photographic surface which derive their very discontinuity from a certain knowledge on the reader's part, or, if one prefers, from the reader's cultural situation.

(Barthes, 1977, p.28)

We have already come across an example of connotation when we discussed example 2.2:66, the case of 'the man with the large moustache'. The reader's knowledge of popular culture associates such moustaches with the Prussian military, and then projects into 'the man with the large moustache' all the qualities which the popular culture tradition associates with the Prussian military - rigid disciplinarianism, etc.
Such knowledge is not necessarily conscious. It is a mythical knowledge. The signs are 'not understandable' but 'merely reminiscent of cultural lessons half-learnt' (Berger, 1972, p.140) - from movies especially, in this case, I would say.

(4) **Distillation**
Distillation realises overdetermination through a combination of generalisation and abstraction (see 2.2.7 above). It is perhaps best explained by means of an example. A section of a chapter from Ivan Illich's *Deschooling Society* (1971) establishes, in the course of the text, the following taxonomy:

```
professionals who offer therapy

with captive audience                      without captive audience

school-ministers psychiatrists guidance job lawyers
teachers                                counsellors counsellors
```
Three observations can be made about this taxonomy. Firstly, while 'psychiatrist' and perhaps also 'guidance counsellor' can be seen as true hyponyms of 'therapist', 'schoolteacher', 'minister', 'job counsellor' and 'lawyer' cannot. They may adopt some of the values and manners of therapists, but therapy is not a central aspect of their activities, not a semantic feature high up in the hierarchy. In other words, in the case of 'psychiatrist' and 'guidance counsellor' only peripheral and minor features have been distilled from the sense of the terms and then elevated to the status of pseudo-generalisations. This is borne out by the way Illich formulates the superordinate term: 'professional' is a true generalisation of 'schoolteachers', 'ministers', etc. and Head of the nominal group, 'therapy' features only in the Qualifier of the nominal group. The term cannot, by itself, be used to refer to teachers. In other formulations Illich uses 'therapist' as a circumstance of Role ('the teacher-as-therapist') - again, 'therapist' is a circumstantial rather than a central feature.

The same can be said for 'with captive audience' and 'without captive audience': in relation to 'professional', 'schoolteacher' etc. this is circumstantial and hence an abstraction rather than a generalisation. One cannot say that schoolteachers are a kind of 'with captive audience'.
Thirdly, and most importantly in the present context, the taxonomy is not exhaustive. It is not constructed in order to chart the field of therapy, but in order to delegitimize the activities of teachers by likening them to the activities of ministers and priests. The church is, of course, an institution which, for the readers Illich is addressing here, has already been delegitimated a long time ago. The delegitimation of schools, however, is a more controversial matter. Through overdetermining teachers, through connecting them to both school and church, some of the already achieved delegitimation of the church can be transferred to the school, to teachers and their activities: ‘Children are protected by neither the First, nor the Fifth Amendment when they stand before that secular priest, the teacher’ (Illich, 1971, p.38).

Distillation, then, is a form of overdetermination which connects participants to several social practices by abstracting the same feature from the participants in these several practices.
2.2.23 Anachronism and deviation (system 26)

I finally have distinguished two kinds of inversion: anachronism and deviation.

Of anachronism we have already encountered an example, that of the Flintstones (see 2.2.22), in which the feature [+contemporary] is inverted to [-contemporary]. Science fiction can provide another example. Here the participants may be projected into the future (and onto another planet) but the activities often bear a remarkable resemblance to current social practices.

Anachronism is often used to say things that cannot be said straightforwardly, for instance to offer social and political criticism in circumstances where this is proscribed by official or commercial censorship.

In the case of deviation a participant involved in certain activities is referred to by means of reference to a participant who normally would not be eligible to engage in these activities. In stories about school for young children, for example, reference to children is often replaced by reference to animals, a transformation of the feature [+human] into [-human]:
The teacher wrote the name down in the register: NOIL. Then she finished calling the register. "Betty Small", she said. "Yes", said the little girl. "Noil", said the teacher. "Yes", said the lion. He sat next to the little girl, as good as gold.

This overdetermination fuses 'what children (can) do' and 'what animals (can) do' and so causes the child to be represented as, at the same time, human and animal, 'civilised' and 'uncivilised'. The deviation lies in the transgression of the rule that animals cannot go to school: more naturalistic stories about 'the first day' invariably include the episode of the dog who wants to come to school too, but is not allowed to, and then feels sad and abandoned, while the child does not, or at least not initially, understand why his or her dog may not come to school. When, in a fantasy story like the one quoted above, the animal transgresses the eligibility rule and does go to school, he must necessarily fail. In the case of Noil the lion this does not happen, however, until after Noil has scared off a little boy who teases Betty Small in the playground.

Deviation almost always serves the purpose of legitimation: the failure of the deviant participant confirms the norms. In the case of Noil and Betty Small it justifies the eligibility rule, and so legitimates school
as the necessary transition from a state of being 'at one with the animals' to a state of being 'above the animals'.

Figure 2.9 summarises the distinctions made in the preceding three sections:
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**Figure 2.9:** Types of overdetermination
2.2.24 A note on the relation between participant realisation and lexicogrammar

To conclude this chapter, figure 2.10 shows all the systems discussed together, in a network which also indicates which recontextualisations are either/or choices (square brackets) and which simultaneous choices (curly brackets). As discussed earlier, the network takes as its point of departure a sociological question: what are the ways in which the participants of social practices can be recontextualised. And, at first sight, it might seem to pick corners from various grammatical systems that are, in linguistics, kept separate (transitivity, reference, the nominal group, etc.), although they are, of course, all linguistic systems that serve to realise experiential meanings.

A closer look, however, shows a certain lexicogrammatical consistency in the network. At primary delicacy, the network involves three of the major types of transformation: rearrangement (systems 4-6), deletion (systems 2 and 3), and substitution (systems 7-25) - as discussed in part 1, addition transformations pertain to the recontextualisation of purposes, evaluations and legitimations, rather than to the recontextualisation of participants, activities, reactions and so on. These types of transformation involve distinct lexicogrammatical systems: rearrangement
principally involves transivity, deletion involves voice, and also nominalisation and adjectivalisation.

Most of the network involves substitution. It divides into three parts: systems 11-16 involve constituents of the nominal group other than the Head (cf Halliday, 1985, ch.6; Matthiessen, 1992, ch.3.2): systems 11, 14, 15 and 16 involve the Deictic and the Post-deictic, and hence the system of reference. System 12 involves the system of person, and system 13 moves from the Deictic to the Numerative.

Systems 18-23 primarily involve the Head of the nominal group, in terms of classes of nouns that can fill the slot, including aspects of morphological structure. The Classifier and the Qualifier are also involved insofar as they participate in the designation of the participant.

Systems 7-10 and 24-26 involve various forms of metaphor and metonym.

More globally, the three sections (11-17; 18-23; 7-10 and 24-26 involve, respectively, reference, lexis (the field of nouns referring to human beings), and metaphor.
1. It should perhaps be pointed out explicitly that, throughout this thesis the term 'participant' is used in a sociological sense. It refers, not to the participants in grammatical processes (which can be concrete or abstract, animate or inanimate, and so on), but to human beings engaging in social interaction. However, when social practice is transformed into discourse, sociological participants inevitably become linguistic participants: the transformation from social practices to discourses about social practices is made in and by language. For this reason the transformational terms introduced in the thesis are consistently discussed from two points of view: from the point of view of the sociological significance of the transformation, and from the point of view of how the transformation is grounded in language, in the semiotic system of 'what can be said' and of how 'what can be said' is linguistically realised in texts.

2. Systemic-functional grammarians usually explain passivisations in terms of the textual metafunction: they allow different participants to be thematised (e.g. in example 2.2:4 'the door', rather than 'the teacher' is thematised). My account suggests that there is also an experiential dimension.

3. Halliday would also, I think, analyse 'from' as a circumstance of location, rather than as an agentive. In my account this recontextualisation follows from 'instrumentalisation', a specific kind of activity recontextualisation (see 3.2:3).

4. It might be objected by systemic linguists that this is an ergative term. However as such it does conflate the various process-type specific transitive roles (cf Matthiessen, 1992, p.171 ff)

5. I am well aware of the excruciating ugliness of some of my terms, but insist on the necessity to stress each time that I am talking about the transformation of elements of social practices into discourses, about a process, a 'turning into'. Like Barthes in *Mythologies* (1970, p.130), I have no option but to resort to 'barbarous but unavoidable neologisms'.
Figure 2.10: The recontextualisation of participants
Chapter 3: Association, concept formation and generalisation

This chapter introduces the procedures I have used for analysing the recontextualisation of participants in the texts of my corpus. Table 2.11, an analysis of the following extract from Ivan Illich's *Deschooling Society* (1971, pp.35-36), will be used for the purpose of illustration:

2.3:1 1. Everyone learns how to live outside school.

2. We learn to speak, to think, to love, to feel, to play, to curse, to politick and to work without interference from a teacher.

3. Even children who are under a teacher's care day and night are no exception to the rule.

4. Orphans, idiots and schoolteachers' sons learn most of what they learn outside the 'educational' process planned for them.

5. Teachers have made a poor showing in their attempt at increasing learning among the poor.

6. Poor parents who want their children to go to school are less concerned about what they will learn than about the certificate and money they will earn.
7. And middle-class parents commit their children to a teacher's care to keep them from learning what the poor learn on the streets.

8. Increasingly, educational research demonstrates that children learn most of what teachers pretend to teach them from peer groups, from comics, from chance observations, and above all from mere participation in the ritual of school.

9. Teachers, more often than not, obstruct such learning as goes on in school.

Table 2.11 follows on the next four pages.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARTICIPANTS</th>
<th>ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>CALIBRATION</th>
<th>EXCL</th>
<th>ROLE</th>
<th>GEN</th>
<th>COLL</th>
<th>ASSOC</th>
<th>CAT</th>
<th>OVERD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>everyone</td>
<td>(learns)</td>
<td>children</td>
<td></td>
<td>ACT</td>
<td></td>
<td>AGGR/INDET</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(live)</td>
<td>children</td>
<td>ELIS</td>
<td>ACT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>we all</td>
<td>(learn to speak)</td>
<td>children</td>
<td>PRON</td>
<td>ACT</td>
<td></td>
<td>AGGR/INDET</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(learn to think)</td>
<td>children</td>
<td>ELIS</td>
<td>ACT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(learn to love)</td>
<td>children</td>
<td>ELIS</td>
<td>ACT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(learn to feel)</td>
<td>children</td>
<td>ELIS</td>
<td>ACT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(learn to play)</td>
<td>children</td>
<td>ELIS</td>
<td>ACT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(learn to curse)</td>
<td>children</td>
<td>ELIS</td>
<td>ACT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(learn to politick)</td>
<td>children</td>
<td>ELIS</td>
<td>ACT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(learn to work)</td>
<td>children</td>
<td>ELIS</td>
<td>ACT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(interference)</td>
<td>teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>IND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FUNCT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>children</td>
<td>ELIS</td>
<td>SUBJ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>children...</td>
<td>(‘learn’)</td>
<td>children...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>COLL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FUNCT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>night</td>
<td></td>
<td>night</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>who</td>
<td>((care)</td>
<td>children</td>
<td>PRON</td>
<td>SUBJ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a teacher</td>
<td>(</td>
<td>teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>IND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FUNCT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.11 (a): Analysis of the recontextualisation of participants in text 2.3:1
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARTICIPANTS</th>
<th>ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>CALIBRATION</th>
<th>EXCL</th>
<th>ROLE</th>
<th>GEN</th>
<th>COLL</th>
<th>ASSOC</th>
<th>CAT</th>
<th>OVERD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>orphans</td>
<td>(learn)</td>
<td>orphans</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>COLL</td>
<td></td>
<td>REL ID</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>idiots</td>
<td></td>
<td>idiots</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>COLL</td>
<td>ASSOC</td>
<td>CLASS</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>schoolteachers</td>
<td>(learn)</td>
<td>teacher</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>COLL</td>
<td></td>
<td>FUNCT</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teachers</td>
<td>(educational process)</td>
<td>children.. night</td>
<td>SUPPR</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>poor</td>
<td>(learn)</td>
<td>poor children</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>COLL</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>poor parents..</td>
<td>(are concerned)</td>
<td>poor parents</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>COLL</td>
<td></td>
<td>CLASS</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>school</td>
<td>(want)</td>
<td>poor parents</td>
<td>PRON</td>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>their children</td>
<td>(go to school)</td>
<td>poor children</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>COLL</td>
<td></td>
<td>CLASS</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>their</td>
<td></td>
<td>poor parents</td>
<td>PRON</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>COLL</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>they</td>
<td>(earn)</td>
<td>poor children</td>
<td>PRON</td>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>COLL</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>they</td>
<td>(earn certificate)</td>
<td>poor children</td>
<td>PRON</td>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>COLL</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.11 (b): Analysis of the recontextualisation of participants in text 2.3:1.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARTICIPANTS</th>
<th>ACTIBILITIES</th>
<th>CALIBRATION</th>
<th>EXCL</th>
<th>ROLE</th>
<th>GEN</th>
<th>COLL</th>
<th>ASSOC</th>
<th>CAT</th>
<th>OVER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>middle-class parents</td>
<td>(commit)</td>
<td>middle-class parents</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>COLL</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>their children</td>
<td></td>
<td>middle-class children</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>SUBJ</td>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>COLL</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>their</td>
<td></td>
<td>middle-class parents</td>
<td>PRON</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>COLL</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a teacher</td>
<td>(commit)</td>
<td>teacher</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>BENEF</td>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>IND</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>FUNCT</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(care)</td>
<td>teacher</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>IND</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>FUNCT</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(keep)</td>
<td>middle-class parents</td>
<td>ELIS</td>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>FUNCT</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>their children</td>
<td></td>
<td>middle-class children</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>SUBJ</td>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>COLL</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>CLASS</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(learning)</td>
<td>middle-class children</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>COLL</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>CLASS</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>their</td>
<td></td>
<td>middle-class parents</td>
<td>PRON</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>COLL</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the poor</td>
<td>(learn)</td>
<td>poor children</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>COLL</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>CLASS</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2.11 (c): Analysis of the recontextualisation of participants in text 2.3:1**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARTICIPANTS</th>
<th>ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>CALIBRATION</th>
<th>EXCL</th>
<th>ROLE</th>
<th>GEN</th>
<th>COLL</th>
<th>ASSOC</th>
<th>CAT</th>
<th>OVERD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>educational research</td>
<td>(demonstrates)</td>
<td>educational researchers</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>IND</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>UTT AUT</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>children teachers</td>
<td>(learn)</td>
<td>children</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>SUBJ</td>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>COLL</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>CLASS</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>them</td>
<td>{{pretend to teach}}</td>
<td>teacher</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>COLL</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>FUNCT</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>peer groups comics</td>
<td>{{learn}}</td>
<td>peer group</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>COLL</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>REL ID</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>comics</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>COLL</td>
<td>ASSOC</td>
<td>UTT AUT</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>producers</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>{{observation}}</td>
<td>ELIS</td>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>{{participation}}</td>
<td>ELIS</td>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teachers</td>
<td>(obstruct)</td>
<td>teacher</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>COLL</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>FUNCT</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(learning)</td>
<td>children</td>
<td>BACKG</td>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.11 (d): Analysis of the recontextualisation of participants in text 2.3.1
2.3.1 Tabulation procedures

As a first step in the analysis I have recorded the participants as they have been referred to in the text (column 2 of table 1), using numbering referring to the clausecomplexes in the text (column 1). Where these participants are associated with activities, these activities are recorded in column 3, again, as they have been referred to in the text. They are placed between brackets to indicate that, at this stage, they are not themselves analysed. When one of the activities is associated with more than one participant, this is indicated by means of left-facing curly brackets: 'learn', in sentence 4, for example, is associated with 'orphans', as well as with 'idiots' and with 'schoolteachers' sons' - hence:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4</th>
<th>orphans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>idiots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>schoolteachers' sons</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When one participant is associated with two processes, as for example in certain kinds of causative constructions, this is indicated by means of right-facing curly brackets. In sentence 7 of 2.3.1, for example, 'teacher' is beneficialised in association with the activity of 'committing' and 'activated' in association with the activity of 'caring' - hence:
The procedure also brings out which participants have been suppressed, backgrounded or elided (there will be an entry in column 3, but not in column 2) and which participants are not associated with activities (there will be an entry in column 2, but not in column '3).

The next step in the analysis is the 'calibration', the reduction of all the various ways in which each participant has been referred to one term. This term, entered in column 4, stands for the idea of an untransformed version of the participants, a version from which the transformations, recorded in the subsequent columns, have, so to speak, been subtracted. As language always transforms practice, the term can never be truly neutral and untransformed, particularly not when, as I have done here for the sake of readability, lexical items rather than, say, letters of numbers are chosen. It serves merely as a calibration, a way of facilitating comparison between the different recontextualisations, not only in this text, but in the corpus as a whole. This step also incorporates what Hasan (1984) has called lexical rendering: personal, possessive and relative pronouns are replaced by the (calibrations used for the) lexical items to which they, anaphorically or
cataphorically, refer. The fact that pronominalisation has occurred is recorded in column 5, along with the deletions that have taken place: pronominalisation is thus seen as related to deletion in that it backgrounds, not so much the participants themselves, as the kinds of transformations that lexical content inevitably introduces. Interrogative pronouns do not occur in example 3:1, but when they do, I simply record WHO in column 4 instead of a rewriting of the participant in question.

The remainder of the columns record the transformations that have taken place.

Column 5 (EXCL) records instances of suppression (SUPPR), backgrounding (BACKGR), elision (ELIS) and pronominalisation (PRON).

Column 6 (ROLE) records, for all cases in which participants have been associated with activities, whether they have been activated (ACT), subjected (SUBJ) or beneficialised (BENE).

Column 7 (GEN) records all instances of generic reference (GEN).

Column 8 (COLL) records whether participants have been individualised (IND) or assimilated, and, in the latter case, which kind of assimilation has taken place: aggregation (AGGR) or collectivisation.
(COLL). In addition, cases of indetermination (INDET) and differentiation (DIFF) are recorded in this column.

Column 9 (ASSOC) records any cases of association (ASSOC): square brackets indicate which participants have been associated.

Column 10 (CAT) records the types of categorisation, nomination and impersonalisation which have occurred: spatialisation (SPAT), utterance autonomisation (UTT AUT), instrumentalisation (INSTR), somaticisation (SOMAT), functionalisaton (FUNCT), classification (CLASS), relational identification (REL ID), physical identification (PHYS ID), appraisement (APPR), as well as formalisation (FORM) and informalisation (INFORM) together with honorification (HON) and affiliation (AFF).

Column 11 (OVERD), finally, records instances of overdetermination: anachronism (ANAC), deviation (DEV), symbolisation (SYMB), connotation (CONN) and distillation (DIST).
2.3.2 Extracting information from the tabulation

Four kinds of information can be extracted from the tabulations described in the previous section: (i) quantitative information, information about the incidence of particular transformations in a specific text, and, provided one has a sufficiently large sample of texts with the same context, about the probabilistic weightings of the options in the 'recontextualisation of participants' network that apply to specific fields; (ii) information about the associations formed (and sometimes disbanded) in specific texts, and therefore also in specific fields; (iii) information about the identity relations established in texts and fields; (iv) information about the taxonomical relations established in texts and fields.

The methods by means of which these kinds of information can be extracted from the tabulations are described in the next four sections.

2.3.3 Quantitative tendencies

From our analysis of example 2.3:1 we can construct the following table to show which 'role' options have been selected for the various categories of participants. It should
be noted that, at this stage, I used the form of a table merely to indicate how the results of the analysis can be shown in tabular form: text 2.3:1 is too short and the amount of times the various participants occur in it too low for quantitative results to lead to any definite conclusions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Activated</th>
<th>Subjected</th>
<th>Beneficialised</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>children (in general)</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>poor children</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>middle-class children</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teachers</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>poor parents</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>middle-class parents</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.12: Role distribution among the participants in texts 2.3:1

What kind of interpretations might we make on the basis of such figures? Perhaps (and very tentatively, of course) that the activation of 'parents' and 'teachers' in the table is predictable, but the high incidence of the activation of 'children', and, especially, 'poor children' (with 'middle-class children' more often subjected than activated) specific for a certain kind of radical populist discourse about education, in which children
from underprivileged backgrounds are represented as already empowered, and not in need of education to actively make sense of the world in ways to be valued as equal to or better than those taught in schools.

Similar tables could be constructed on the bases of the other columns of the tabulation. Not all would yield significant results. In the case of example 2.3:1, the way 'utterance autonomisation' is used also shows the populist aspect of the recontextualisation: not only 'educational research', but also 'comics' are autonomised as 'approved', authoritative types of utterance. But in other respects the text does not differ much from 'pro-schooling' expository texts: 'educational authorities' are suppressed ('educational process' and 'planned for them' in sentence 4); 'children' and 'parent' are classified, while 'teachers' are functionalised; and reference is overwhelmingly generic and collective.

2.3.4 Associations

There are two associations in text 2.3:1: that between 'peer groups', 'comics', 'observation' and 'mere participation in the ritual of school' (sentence 8). The former becomes part of a taxonomy by virtue of the superordinate phrase 'children who are under
a teacher's care day and night' (sentence 3), the latter is never encapsulated in a superordinate term or phrase, perhaps to underline the 'non-institutionalised' nature of the mode of learning described here.

As described in section 2.2.15, associations may form and disband again in the course of a text. This does not occur in text 2.3.1 but where it does, it might be charted as follows (the example is hypothetical):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARTICIPANTS</th>
<th>SECTION</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jenny and Johnny</td>
<td>3-10</td>
<td>introduction to the school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All children</td>
<td>10-20</td>
<td>the first 'lesson'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenny, Johnny, their mother, baby brother &amp; dog</td>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>walking home after school</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3.5 Concept formation

Identity relations may be realised at the level of the clause, by means of Token-Value relations, either in ranking or in embedded clauses (appositions, 'defining relative clauses'), or at the level of discourse, by means of identity chains (cf Hasan, 1984). In either case they cause semantically different terms to refer to the same participant, to be used effectively as synonyms, and so build up
a complex of semantic features associated with that participant.' This complex may be encapsulated by a single term, in which case the concept formation is explicit (an instance of technicality, in the sense of Martin, 1986; nd), or it may be realised in a more diffuse way, by the ongoing implicit concept formation in the text as a whole. If we take all the expressions used for identically calibrated participants, insofar as these expressions are used as synonyms (rather than hyponyms or meronyms, cf section 2.3.6 below), and omit repetitions and pronominalisations, we can gain a picture of such implicit concept formation, as in this case from text 2.3:1

everyone (1)
we all (2)
children (3, 6, 7, 8)

Together, these expressions realise, in a dispersed, 'prosodic' way, a definition of 'children' in which children are at once classified (a transformation typically applied to participants represented as 'others') and identified with the readers ('we all' have been children). This urges the reader to look at schooling, not from the point of view of power, but from the point of view of the 'other' who is subjected to power.
2.3.6 Taxonomical relations

Following Martin (1984), we can, finally, inspect the tabulations to see if there are, between the expressions used to refer to the participants, hyponymical and meronymical relations. The former are 'kind of' relations such as obtain, for instance, between 'child' and 'middle-class child' (a middle-class child is a kind of 'child'). The latter are 'part of' relations such as obtain, for instance between 'the class' and 'Johnny' (Johnny is part of the class).

As with identity relations, these relations may be realised at the level of the clause or at the level of discourse. Example 2.3:2, for instance, realises identity at the level of the clause, while 2.3:3 realises hyponymy at the level of the clause:

2.3:2 By definition, children are pupils.

2.3:3 Schoolteachers and ministers are the only professionals who feel entitled to pry into the private affairs of their clients at the same time as they preach to a captive audience.
In text 2.3:1 we can find the following hyponymical relations between expressions used to refer to children:

- children
  - children who are under a teacher’s care day and night
  - orphans
  - idiots
  - schoolteachers’ sons
  - the poor
  - their children (i.e. middle-class children)

The relations obtaining between these expressions can also be represented in the form of a taxonomy.
The category of ‘children who are under a teacher’s care day and night’ is clearly introduced for rhetorical reasons: the children in this category are not distinct in terms of their activities, reactions, etc. They are ‘no exception to the rule’ (sentence 3). They are introduced as a limit-case, a hyperbolic way of describing the fate of all children under schooling. The distinction between ‘poor’ and ‘middle-class’ children, however, is associated with different practices, and with different purposes and legitimations, and will play a role in other texts and other fields also.
NOTES.

1. This crosscuts between lexical cohesion (Halliday and Hasan, 1976, 1987; Martin, 1992) and participant identification (Martin, 1982), showing again that it is not always possible to achieve neat co-classifications of grammatical and semantic distinctions.
Chapter 4: An analysis of two children's stories

2.4.1 Two texts

In this chapter I will discuss the recontextualisation of participants in two children's stories dealing with 'the first day'.

The first, Mark and Mandy, by E. Leete-Hodge (nd), is aimed at a 'mass audience': it is distributed not only via book stores, but also via news agents and via major supermarket chains and department stores such as Coles, where it can be found in racks at

Plate 1: Illustration from Mark and Mandy
the checkout counters, together with women’s magazines, gardening magazines, etc. There is at least one brightly coloured illustration on every page – plate 1 gives an idea of the style of these illustrations.

The heroes of the book, Mark and Mandy, are two five-year-old children, both living in Elm Road (‘Elm Road was exciting, with strange houses, all different, for some were tall, some narrow, others small with pretty gardens in front’, p.1). The children live in flats, but there is nevertheless ‘a large garden at the back where they could play’ (p.1).

The first few chapters sketch an idyllic childhood: ‘fun in the garden’, ‘Smudge arrives’ (i.e. the new dog), ‘helping mother in the house’, ‘a walk in the park’, etc. Gradually the prospect of school is introduced. At Mandy’s fifth birthday most presents have something to do with school: a blackboard and easel, ‘a pen for school’, ‘hankies with her name on it’. As ‘summer is rushing by’, Mark and Mandy play school with the blackboard, using Smudge and their dolls for children, and acting out their fears of strict discipline and punishment: ‘Bad, bad Teddy, go and stand in the corner!’ (p.34). The final chapter (reproduced as 2.4:1 below) deals with ‘the Great Day’.
The second story, *Mary Kate and the School Bus*, by Helen Morgan (1985), tells essentially the same story, but is aimed at a different readership, and set in a different milieu. Published by Penguin, it carries a recommendation by the *Times Literary Supplement* on its back cover, and can only be purchased in the 'good book stores'. It is much more sparsely illustrated (one picture every 5 pages, on average), and the pictures are black and white pen drawings – plate 2 is an example.

Plate 2: Illustration from *Mary Kate and the School Bus*
Mary Kate does not live in a flat, but in a big house, in a leafy suburb. She has no brothers or sisters or friends, although the inevitable dog is of course there: "Mummy had to push Jackie back into the kitchen and shut the door quickly, because he wanted to go with them. They could hear him barking as they went down the garden and through the gate into the wood" (p.23) - note the absence of a street.

In the first chapter Mary Kate, from behind the front window, watches the school bus go by: ‘I shall go on that bus when I go to school, shan’t I, Mummy?’ (p.7). One day, after visiting Granny with her mother, they miss the bus and catch a ride with the school bus. There is some anxiety: ‘she was glad Mummy was with her. She didn’t know any of the children’ (p.11).

The second chapter is devoted to Mary Kate’s fifth birthday. The presents she receives are all school necessities (Mandy at least also got ‘sweets’ and ‘a ball’): new clothes, shoes, pencil case, satchel, etc. Granny arrives and checks whether Mummy has taught Mary Kate to write and recognise her name. Then the day arrives and Mary Kate and Mummy walk to the school: ‘She skipped along the path towards the open gate of the playground, just as Uncle Jack and Uncle Ned, Auntie Mary and Mummy had done, when they were children’ (p.27).
The third chapter is reproduced in 2.4:2 below - it is a good deal longer than the comparable chapter in Mark and Mandy, but if we are to bring out all the similarities and differences, it will have to be dealt with in its entirety.

2.4:1 1. The Great Day at last.

2. The great day came at last.

3. Mark and Mandy were off to school for the first time.

4. They were both very excited, and, to tell the truth, just a little nervous.

5. Would it be easy?

6. What would it be like?

7. Would the teacher be strict?

8. Mandy was wearing a new red dress and white blouse, and felt very smart as she stood for Mummy to tie a red bow in her hair.

9. Mark wore a green shirt and dark trousers.

10. Far too early for they were both so excited they could not wait, they started out, Auntie Barbara pushing Debbie in her pram, and Auntie Margaret holding on to Mandy’s and Mark’s hands.

11. Smudge followed to the door.

12. "You’ll have to wait until we get back," said Mark, and Smudge looked very sad.

13. Where could they be going, and why were they carrying satchels?
14. The school building was tall with a high fence round it, and a big road sign telling drivers to be careful of the children.

15. It looked very big, what would it be like inside?

16. A smiling teacher met them at the door.

17. "Come along, Mandy and Mark," she said, "I’ll show you where to put your coats.

18. And before they knew it, they were following her down a long corridor to a cloakroom full of chattering voices.

19. "Here you are," she said, "Number 23 and 24."

20. They hung up their coats and looked at each other.

21. "Hurry up now, everyone," said the teacher, "school is just about to begin."

22. Suddenly a bell began to ring which made Mandy jump, "ting-a-ling, ting-a-ling" it went and children came running from all directions so as to be in their places on time.

23. Mark and Mandy followed the teacher into a large airy room where she showed them to their seats, next to each other.

24. They had little desks and Mandy could not resist a peep inside, but it was empty.

25. Mark looked round the room.

26. It was light with rows of desks just like his, and pictures on the walls.
27. One showed a big sheep and her lamb.

28. He liked that, but the map did not look very interesting.

29. Someone had put flowers on the teacher's desk, and behind was a huge blackboard, - much bigger than Mandy's birthday present.

30. It was all a bit strange.

31. What would happen next, he wondered.

32. "No talking," said the teacher, and lessons began.

33. First everyone was introduced to one another, and the names ticked off in a big book.

34. "We'll do something easy today," said the teacher who had told them her name was Miss Carter, "we'll look at some pictures and see who can tell me the names of the different animals."

35. Miss Carter held up some large coloured pictures of animals.

36. "Cat," "dog," "horse," shouted the children as they recognised the animals.


38. "Good," said Miss Carter, "now what about this one?" and she held up a picture of a funny looking brown animal in a cage.

39. "A monkey," called the little boy who remembered seeing a monkey cry when he had been taken to the zoo for his holiday treat.
40. The poor thing could not reach a nut that someone had thrown him!

41. "Well done," said Miss Carter for none of the others knew what it was and he looked so pleased.

42. Though it seemed long, it wasn't really, and Mark and Mandy were almost sorry when the final bell rang and it was time to go home.

43. They fetched their coats from numbers 23 and 24, and rushed outside to find their Mummies waiting with Debbie.

44. "It was such fun—we had milk to drink—and I knew a bird," gasped Mandy all in one breath.

45. "Yes, I enjoyed it too," said Mark as they walked home telling of all that had happened on their first day at school.

46. They would always remember it.

2.4:2 1. A name and an elephant.

2. Mary Kate was following Mummy and Mummy was following Miss Chesney.

3. Miss Chesney was the Headmistress.

4. Mummy and Mary Kate had been in her office answering questions while she filled in a form.

5. Now she was taking them to see Mary Kate's classroom and meet her teacher.

6. The classroom had big windows, set high in the wall.
7. Through one of them Mary Kate could see the top of a tree and a patch of sky and through the other she could see the church tower.

8. All round the walls were paintings and drawings and big coloured diagrams and pictures.

9. In one corner was a doll's house and a cot with a doll in it and in another corner was a table piled with books.

10. There was a stove with a huge fireguard round it and, most wonderful of all, there was a little playhouse, with windows and a door and real curtains.

11. Mary Kate wanted to run across the room and peep inside but Miss Chesney was speaking to someone who had just come in.

12. "Ah, there you are, Miss Laurie," she was saying.

13. "We have a new pupil this morning."

14. She put her hand on Mary Kate's shoulder.

15. "This is Mary Kate," she said, "and this is her mother."

16. "Mrs. Williams, this is Miss Laurie."

17. "She will be Mary Kate's teacher."

18. "How do you do," said Mummy and Miss Laurie together, and then Miss Laurie said, "Hallo, Mary Kate."

19. "I'm so glad you've come to join us."

20. "The others will be in soon."
21. "Would you like to have a quick look round before they come, then I'll show you where to put your coat."

22. Off went Mary Kate, to look in the playhouse.

23. Inside were two tiny chairs and a little table, a small set of shelves on a box, painted to look like a dresser, and a bushel box on end, painted to look like a cooker.

24. On the dresser were dolly pots and pans and cups and saucers and plates.

25. Mary Kate just stood there, looking and looking and thinking what marvellous games she could have in the little house, with Teddy and Black Bobo and Dorabella and Og, the Golly.

26. Then she remembered that they were all at home, still tucked in their beds, while she was at school.

27. "Mary Kate," said Miss Laurie's voice.

28. The door of the little house opened and the teacher looked in.

29. "Mummy's going now," she said.

30. "Come and say good-bye to her and I'll show you where to put your things."

31. Mary Kate followed Miss Laurie and Mummy out of the classroom into the cloakroom.

32. There were pegs low down all round the wall and two little low-down washtubasins.
33. Everything was just the right height for Mary Kate.

34. "Good-bye, pet," Mummy said, giving her a quick kiss.

35. "I’ll come and fetch you after school."

36. "This will be your peg," said Miss Laurie, almost before Mary Kate had time to say good-bye to Mummy.

37. "Let me help you with your coat."

38. Mary Kate looked at the peg.

39. It had a picture of a red elephant just above it.

40. "Do you know what this picture is?" asked Miss Laurie, hanging Mary Kate’s coat on the peg and putting her hat on top.

41. "Elephant," said Mary Kate and then she saw that all the pegs had pictures and they were all different.

42. The other pegs had names, too, but Mary Kate’s didn’t.

43. "Good," smiled Miss Laurie.

44. "Now you just remember that your hat and coat are hanging under the red elephant and you won’t lose them."

45. "I’ll print out a name for you in a moment, but I’ll find you a place in the classroom, first."

46. She showed Mary Kate a little table and chair.

47. "You can sit here," she said.
48. "There's a drawer to put your things in and this is so you won't forget where you are."

49. She took a card out of a box and fixed it firmly to a corner of the table with four big drawing pins.

50. It was a picture of a red elephant, just like the one in the cloakroom.

51. "Now I'll just get a card for your name," said Miss Laurie, looking in another box.

52. "Then I'll go and ring the bell and let the others in."

53. "Now, what shall I put on this card?"

54. "What do they call you at home?"

55. "Mary Kate," said Mary Kate, surprised, wondering what else they could call her.

56. "Right," said Miss Laurie.

57. "That's what we'll call you then,"

58. "That way we shan't muddle you up with the other Mary."

59. Mary Kate said nothing.

60. She wasn't sure she liked the idea of another Mary.

61. Miss Laurie went out of the room and a moment later Mary Kate heard the clanging of a bell close by.

62. The noise was so loud she had to put her hands over her ears to shut it out.

63. Then the children came in, talking and laughing and pushing at one another, struggling to hang up their hats and coats.
64. Mary Kate could see them through the open door of the classroom.

65. There seemed to be a great many of them.

66. She hoped they weren't all coming in, but they were.

67. They clattered into the classroom and made their way to their places, all staring at Mary Kate as they passed her.

68. Some carried satchels, some carried books and some had dolls and teddy bears.

69. Mary Kate wished she had brought her Teddy to school with her—or even Og, the Golly.

70. A little girl with a long, fair pigtail came and stood next to Mary Kate.

71. Mary Kate had a feeling she had seen her before, somewhere, but she couldn't think where.

72. "You've come, then," said the little girl.

73. "What's your name?"

74. Mary Kate told her.

75. "I'm Susan," said the little girl.

76. "Susan Bates."

77. She nodded towards another little girl with untidy dark hair falling about her face.

78. "That's Jane."

79. "She lives next door to me."

80. Then Mary Kate knew where she had seen Susan before.
81. She and Jane were two of the children who travelled on the school bus.

82. They had often waved to Mary Kate as she stood at the front gate.

83. A boy in a green jersey came and stood by Susan.

84. "Who's she?" he asked, nodding towards Mary Kate.

85. "Mary Kate," said Susan.

86. "She's new."

87. Mary Kate felt very new indeed as she watched the children go to their places and show one another the things they had brought to school.

88. Then Miss Laurie rapped on her desk for silence and began to call the register.

89. When Miss Laurie said 'MARY TURNER,' Mary Kate stared at the little girl who answered.

90. She had short fair hair, held back with a blue Alice band.

91. Mary Kate didn't think she looked in the least bit like another Mary.

92. She was so busy thinking about it that she didn't hear Miss Laurie call her name.

93. Susan had to nudge her, to make her answer.

94. "You're the last one," said Susan.

95. "Valerie Watson used to be last, but now you are."

96. Mary Kate liked being the last name on the register.
97. It made her feel special.

98. "Susan," called Miss Laurie, "show Mary Kate the doll's house and all the other things."

99. "Perhaps you'd like to play house with her, for a while."

100. So Susan took the doll out of its cot and Mary Kate dressed it and sat it on a chair in the little house, and they played a marvellous game, with Mary Kate being mother and Susan being father and the milkman and the district nurse, who had to come because the baby doll was ill.

101. In the middle of the morning all the children had a little bottle of milk, just as Mummy said they would.

102. Mary Kate bent her straw and Miss Laurie gave her another one.

103. Susan helped her eat the biscuits Granny had given her and then they both went out into the playground to run about till the bell went.

104. After playtime, Miss Laurie gave Mary Kate some wax crayons and a huge sheet of paper and told her to draw a picture to take home to Mummy.

105. She drew the playhouse.

106. When the bell rang again, Mary Kate thought it must be time to go home, but Susan said it wasn't.

107. "We haven't had our dinner yet," she said.

108. "Don't you want any?"

109. Mary Kate did want her dinner.
110. She ate it all and then she had two helpings of apricots and rice.

111. Afterwards, Susan tried to teach her to skip but Mary Kate kept tripping over the rope, so they played 'higher and higher' with some of the other children.

112. In the afternoon Miss Laurie read a story to the class, but Mary Kate didn't hear much of it.

113. She was fast asleep on the floor by the doll's house.

114. When she woke up the children were singing.

115. "This old man," they yelled, "He played one..."

116. Mary Kate knew the song because Granny sang it to her, so she joined in and yelled with the others.

7. Then it really was time to go home.

118. Mary Kate rushed into the cloakroom with Susan and there was Mummy, standing by the door.

119. Mary Kate ran to her and hugged her.

120. "I drew you a picture," she said, "and I cut a blue cat out of sticky paper and I went in the playhouse and I played with the doll and I had two puddings and Susan taught me how to play 'higher and higher'.'

121. "That's Susan, over there, with the long hair."

122. "She's my best friend."

123. "She says I can sit next to her on the school bus, tomorrow."
124. "Can I, Mummy?"
125. "We’ll see," smiled Mummy.
126. "Which is your peg?"
127. "The one with the elephant." Mary Kate told her, but when she looked at the elephant she saw that Miss Laurie had put a card with her name on above it.
128. MARY KATE WILLIAMS, she had written, in big, round, red writing.
129. "That’s right," said Mary Kate, touching the card with her fingertips.
130. "That’s my name."
131. "Mummy, did you know there’s another Mary?"
132. "She’s in my class..."
133. "Is she?" said Mummy, picking Mary Kate’s hat up from the floor.
134. "Never mind."
135. "There’s only one Mary Kate."
136. Mary Kate buttoned her coat up crooked.
137. "Tomorrow I’m going to be father," she said, "and Susan’s going to be mother."
138. "And I’m going to stick my blue cat in a book and write ‘cat’."  
139. "Susan said I could."
2.4.2 *Inclusions and exclusions*

There are many similarities between these two stories. Both deal with the social practice of 'going to school for the first time'. Both are written for young children. Both evidently aim at mentally preparing children for school, at persuading them that school will be a pleasant rather than a frightening experience. And both enlist the parents who are to read these stories to their children for the cause of pro-school propaganda. Nevertheless there are also differences: differences in distribution and hence in children's access to each book, and differences in the social milieu from which the books' young heroes come, differences related to social class. These differences result in different recontextualisations, different representations of what happens during the first day.

The cast of characters in the two stories, for instance, is not quite the same, as shown in the following list (a full analysis of participant recontextualisation in the two stories can be found in appendix 2):
It seems then, first of all, that the ‘mass audience’ story places the first day in the context of the community, the closely-knit group from the neighbourhood, and the street, with its drivers. In this ‘middle class’ story both the nuclear family and the school are isolated from the wider community, decontextualised.

Secondly, while the middle class story legitimates instruction given at home (the child benefits from what Granny has taught her), this is not so in the mass audience story. It is true that the ‘one little boy’ who knows the answer that ‘none of the others knew’ owes his knowledge to the fact that ‘someone’ once took him to the Zoo. But a ‘holiday treat’ is not the same thing as home instruction, and the benefactor remains anonymous, even if the boy does, in a sense, owe his cleverness to a ‘privileged background’.
Thirdly, although it anonymises them, the mass audience story does acknowledge the existence of school employees more humble and less exalted than teachers. The middle class story, on the other hand excludes humble workers, but includes an authority even higher than the teacher, the headmistress.

Fourthly, in Mark and Mandy’s school there is no room for dolls. Playing is over. Serious lessons must begin, and the children in fact worry whether the teacher ‘will be strict’. In Mary Kate’s school dolls are welcome. The middle class school is depicted as less formal and forbidding, and more child-friendly than the school in the mass audience story.

Backgrounding and suppression are used more frequently in *Mark and Mandy* - in relation to the teacher, and in order to lend a certain impersonal formality to her activities. These exclusions cluster around the moment when the children are all sitting in their benches, waiting for the formal group lesson to begin (no row of benches in *Mary Kate*, and no ‘lessons’ - only pleasurable group sessions: reading a story, singing songs). And while in *Mark and Mandy* we never find out who rings the bell (that impersonal, commanding voice), the middle class story lets us know that it is Miss Laurie, the friendly teacher, who rings the bell.
These observations are based on a comparison of just two stories and do not reveal all exclusions. In neither of the stories, for instance, is there any mention of, let alone role for, fathers. They do begin to reveal, however, who, in the context of children’s stories about the first day, the key participants seem to be: children, mothers, teachers and animals (about the latter more will be said below).

2.4.3 **Taxonomies**

In neither of the stories are ‘children’ an undifferentiated group. The stories create distinctions between different kinds of children. In *Mark and Mandy* the crucial distinctions are those between (1) new entrants (‘Mark and Mandy’) and ‘old hands’ who already know the ropes (‘children’); (2) male (‘Mark’) and female (‘Mandy’) new entrants, who dress differently and react to the events according to fairly traditional gender patterns (Mandy, for instance shows her emotions, and, at the end of the day, ‘gasps all in one breath’, while Mark, with manly cool and restraint, says ‘I enjoyed it too’); (3) bright children (the ‘one little boy’ who knows the answer ‘none of the others knew’) and ‘average achievers’, who know the
answers to all the questions that are not especially difficult. These distinctions are represented in the following two taxonomies, the first of which applies before and after 'lessons', the second during 'lessons':

```
\begin{center}
\begin{tikzpicture}
\node (school-children) {school-children};
\node [below of=school-children] {\begin{tabular}{c}
new entrants \\
old hands
\end{tabular}};
\node [below of=new entrants] {male \ female};
\node [right of=new entrants] {\begin{tabular}{c}
low achievers \\
high achievers
\end{tabular}};
\end{tikzpicture}
\end{center}
```

The crucial distinction is of course that between 'new entrants' and 'old hands', and, predictably, it plays a key role in Mary Kate too. But Mary Kate also creates distinctions which do not appear in Mark and Mandy. They are summarised in the following taxonomy - it is telling that, in this context, a separate taxonomy for the world of school and the world outside school is not needed:
Mary Kate, then, distinguishes between (1) old hands who stand out from the crowd, and old hands who remain an anonymous mass; (2) different kinds of old hands (those who carry satchels, those who carry dolls, and those who carry books); (3) differently gendered old hands; girls, who become known by name to the new entrant, or even become friends, and boys, who become individualised, but remain nameless, and with whom no friendship is
established. Mary Kate finally adds distinctions based on an official, public order (e.g. 'the last one on the register') and between children with similar and children with different names ('the other Mary').

A comparison of the two taxonomisations suggests, firstly, that Mary Kate is dependent on school to form alliances, to find a place among her peers. The middle class child cannot fall back on solidarities already established before school began. Mark and Mandy, on the other hand, are not dependent on school for their social relations. They can count on solidarities already established before school began. The other children, to them, remain an anonymous mass. The first day can be a success without establishing relations with 'old hands'.

Secondly, as already noted, gender plays a significant role in Mark and Mandy. Boys and girls are represented as different, along fairly traditional lines, but also as being able to have meaningful and supportive relationships. In Mary Kate, gender is certainly not absent. The difference is made: there are 'little girls' and 'boys'. But the story has a strong female bias. The 'boy in the green jersey' only makes a brief appearance, and he remains faceless, and nameless, and does not establish friendship with the new entrant.
Thirdly, for the middle class child, entering school also means becoming part of a public order, and positively identifying with the resulting new, formal identity ('Mary Kate liked being the last name on the register' and is proud of her surname: 'that's my name'). It is true that, in Mark and Mandy, 'everyone is introduced' and 'the names ticked off', but the children's surname and their place on the 'register' play no further role for the children.

Finally, in the 'mass audience' story, educational achievement plays a significant part from the very beginning. Not so in the middle class school, although the children are divided into 'doll carriers' and 'book carriers' - a hint at different levels of 'development' perhaps. It is in fact rather irritating that Mary Kate is consistently put down by the writer of this story, described as awkward, clumsy and slow (she bends her straw, can't learn to skip, buttons up her coat crooked, etc. etc.), and contented with being second-rate (even 'last'), and 'led' by Susan, the more experienced child.

2.4.4 Active and passive roles

Both stories represent the new entrants more often as active than as passive participants in the activities of 'the first day'. They
are, after all, the stories' little heroes, bravely facing the first day, successfully overcoming their anxieties, and, at the close of the day, enthusiastically telling their mothers how wonderful the first day has been. Table 3 provides the figures, the first column showing the overall degree of activation and passivation, the next three columns showing in relation to which types of processes the various participants play active or passive roles.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ACTIVE</th>
<th>PASSIVE</th>
<th>VERBAL</th>
<th>PROCESS</th>
<th>MATERIAL</th>
<th>PROCESS</th>
<th>KENTAL</th>
<th>PROCESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>activated</td>
<td>passivated</td>
<td>activated</td>
<td>passivated</td>
<td>activated</td>
<td>passivated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>new entrants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark &amp; Mandy</td>
<td>24 (63%)</td>
<td>30 (37%)</td>
<td>3 (27%)</td>
<td>8 (33%)</td>
<td>18 (63%)</td>
<td>12 (40%)</td>
<td>13 (100%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Kate</td>
<td>26 (66%)</td>
<td>20 (24%)</td>
<td>11 (39%)</td>
<td>24 (84%)</td>
<td>49 (65%)</td>
<td>26 (35%)</td>
<td>36 (100%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>brothers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark &amp; Mandy</td>
<td>6 (60%)</td>
<td>6 (40%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>3 (100%)</td>
<td>6 (83%)</td>
<td>1 (16%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Kate</td>
<td>17 (53%)</td>
<td>14 (47%)</td>
<td>7 (47%)</td>
<td>8 (53%)</td>
<td>8 (57%)</td>
<td>6 (43%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark &amp; Mandy</td>
<td>23 (100%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>9 (100%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>14 (100%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Kate</td>
<td>42 (100%)</td>
<td>7 (16%)</td>
<td>13 (75%)</td>
<td>5 (25%)</td>
<td>26 (92%)</td>
<td>2 (78%)</td>
<td>1 (100%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark &amp; Mandy</td>
<td>12 (60%)</td>
<td>18 (40%)</td>
<td>1 (20%)</td>
<td>5 (80%)</td>
<td>7 (54%)</td>
<td>5 (42%)</td>
<td>4 (100%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Kate</td>
<td>20 (100%)</td>
<td>3 (15%)</td>
<td>2 (100%)</td>
<td>2 (0%)</td>
<td>12 (60%)</td>
<td>2 (40%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Kate</td>
<td>21 (84%)</td>
<td>4 (16%)</td>
<td>6 (75%)</td>
<td>2 (25%)</td>
<td>14 (88%)</td>
<td>2 (12%)</td>
<td>1 (100%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>animals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark &amp; Mandy</td>
<td>4 (57%)</td>
<td>6 (63%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>3 (50%)</td>
<td>3 (50%)</td>
<td>1 (20%)</td>
<td>4 (80%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Kate</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>8 (100%)</td>
<td>3 (100%)</td>
<td>2 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>2 (100%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>4 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.12: Activation and passivation in Mark and Mandy and Mary Kate and the School Bus
The table shows that a large proportion of the new entrants' activity is mental activity, an active making sense of the events of the first day. As so often, the relation between the power of participants and the amount of mental processes attributed to them is inversely proportionate. Teachers only act and speak. Children constantly look, listen, think, wonder, doubt, feel, worry, enjoy.

With verbal processes the situation is different. The more power a participant has, the more often is he or she depicted as the active participant in communication. Teachers speak. Children, but for the occasional answer to a question, are spoken to.

In interpreting the figures for material processes, it must be taken into account that many of the activities in which the new entrants play an active role are not interactional: they hang up their coats, walk into the classroom, drink their milk, and so on. The proliferation of such activities can give the impression that the children play a more active role than they in fact do. Table 4.4 concentrates on interactive activities, showing in which relationships the new entrants tend to play an active part, and in which they tend to play a passive part.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Activated</th>
<th></th>
<th>Passed</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mark and Mandy</td>
<td>Mary Kate</td>
<td>Mark and Mandy</td>
<td>Mary Kate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mothers</td>
<td>4 (50%)</td>
<td>10 (53%)</td>
<td>4 (50%)</td>
<td>9 (47%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teachers</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>3 (12%)</td>
<td>15 (100%)</td>
<td>24 (88%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other children</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7 (28%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18 (72%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grandson</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>animals</td>
<td>5 (100%)</td>
<td>9 (100%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dolls</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3 (100%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2.13:** Activation and passivation in interactions: Mark and Mandy and Mary Kate and the School Bus

In their interaction with their mothers the new entrants are as often active as passive. This is because school changes the mother-child relation. Before the children enter school, they are subjected to their mother's authority. Once they have entered school, they gain a new assertiveness towards her. Part of their life now escapes her authority. As a result they now hug her, instead of being hugged by her, they initiate conversation instead of responding to it, and so on. It is interesting to note that the middle-class mother exerts her authority more often by means of language, the mothers of Mark and Mandy by means of action, e.g. fussing over them, taking them by the hand (cf table 2.12).
That the new entrants play a passive part in their interaction with their teacher is not surprising, but we can note that, in Mary Kate, this passivity is slightly diluted. This is partly due to the fact that there is, in Mary Kate, an authority higher still than the teacher, the headmistress, an authority in relation to whom the teacher, therefore, plays a passive role. But it is also because Mary Kate, the middle class child, is much less afraid of the teacher than Mark and Mandy, and sees her as an ally, as someone like Mummy.

As for the interactions with the other children, in Mark and Mandy there are none, and Mark and Mandy themselves do not so much interact as act together, playing, together, the same role in relation to activities. Mary Kate, on the other hand, does interact with the other children, and, in doing so, plays a predominantly passive role. This is so especially in her relation with Susan, who, initially at the instigation of the teacher, shows her the playhouse, teaches her games, and tells her what she can and cannot do (‘Susan said I could’).

School, however, while not giving the new entrants any real power, nevertheless gives them symbolic power, the power of knowledge. This is, in both stories, portrayed through the children’s symbolic interactions with animals. They ‘recognise’ animals, ‘know’
animals, 'stick animals into books'. Thus lack of power in the classroom is compensated for by knowledge power over the lower species. In the case of the monkey, so close to us on the evolutionary ladder, this power is hardest to come by, and only the one clever little boy can achieve it. We can note, however, that, in Mark and Mandy, animals do not entirely become an object of symbolic power. They retain some life of their own - they 'wait', suddenly 'appear', 'cry'.

Frequency tables do not show how role divisions may be represented as changing in the course of a social event. Mark and Mandy, for instance, are comparatively active before the 'lesson' begins. During the lesson their role becomes more passive: what they say or do they only say or do after having been asked or told to say or do it. After school, however, owing to their newfound superiority towards their mother, they become the active participants in the story again.

2.4.5 The individual and the group

In Mark and Mandy, reference to Mary Kate, the new entrant, is individualised 21 times (43%) and assimilated 28 times (57%). Mary Kate is depicted as an individual who enters school, and there, within the public institution,
forms tentative links with others, to then, on going home, become an individual again. Mark and Mandy are portrayed as participants who are already linked to others. They are even ‘excited’ and ‘nervous’ together. School then separates them. Their observations, feelings and thoughts are no longer shared. Activities like answering questions can no longer be done together. At the same time they are fairly unproblematically part of the larger, public group, the class. The other children are not explicitly differentiated as ‘other’ and cause them no particular anxiety. The end of the story reunites them again. They now share a memory together.

The development of the assimilations between the participants in each story can be summarised as follows:

**MARK AND MANDY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Assimilation Process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-10</td>
<td>(the walk to school)</td>
<td>The family group (two mothers, baby sister, dog, Mark and Mandy) is referred to by means of COLLECTIVISATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-33</td>
<td>(introduction to the school)</td>
<td>Mark and Mandy are assimilated by ASSOCIATION and COLLECTIVISATION The other schoolchildren are NOT explicitly DIFFERENTIATED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33-42</td>
<td>(the ‘lesson’)</td>
<td>All children, including Mark and Mandy are assimilated by means of COLLECTIVISATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42-46</td>
<td>(the walk home)</td>
<td>As 1-10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In *Mark and Mandy*, there is no explicit differentiation between the 'self' and the 'others'. The one instance of differentiation is related to educational achievement, by someone other than the heroes. In *Mary Kate*, differentiation between the self and the others is a major theme. Even when Mary Kate eventually joins up with her classmates they remain differentiated ('others'), and the assimilation is an association in which individuality is retained, which, moreover, is circumstantialised ('with the others').
Individuality (and with it an ambiguous mixture of clinging to some 'others' and carefully retaining distance from other 'others') is a key value in the middle class story. Solidarity and belonging are key issues in the mass audience story.

2.4.6 Categorisation and nomination

Table 4.3 displays the types of nomination, categorisation and overdetermination used in recontextualising the key participants in the two stories.

As might be expected in stories, the heroes are informally nominated. But, in contrast to Mark and Mandy, Mary Kate is designated in other ways also. Entering school, in Mary Kate, also means entering a role ('new pupil'), entering a formal name ('Mary Kate Williams') and entering a public registration system ('the register'). Mary Kate has a semiotic lesson to learn: names are context-bound and arbitrary ('that's what we'll call you then'). But she learns to identify with the new identity, the new signs conferred on her ('she liked being the last name on the register'). Mark and Mandy, on the other hand, remain who they were, and do not have to distance themselves from their former selves to this degree.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NEW ENTRANTS</th>
<th>MOTHERS</th>
<th>TEACHERS</th>
<th>CHILDREN</th>
<th>ANIMALS</th>
<th>DOLLS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MARK &amp; MANU</td>
<td>MARY KATE</td>
<td>MARK &amp; MANU</td>
<td>MARY KATE</td>
<td>MARK &amp; MANU</td>
<td>MARY KATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOMINATION</td>
<td>15 (94)</td>
<td>56 (50)</td>
<td>4 (67)</td>
<td>14 (82)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOMINATION</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 (12)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. &amp; MONOMORPHICATION</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 (64)</td>
<td>4 (29)</td>
<td>18 (74)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LISPATION</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 (29)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6 (63)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOMINATION</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2 (28)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. IDENTIFY</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2 (33)</td>
<td>2 (33)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDENTIFY</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOMINATION</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7 (10)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATION</td>
<td>1 (66)</td>
<td>1 (12)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LISPATION</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3 (21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 (19)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.1: Categorisation, nomination and overdeterminism in Mark and Manny and Mary Kate and the School Bus
Listing the different ways in which Mary Kate is referred to illustrates that she (and the reader of the book) must come to terms with a certain degree of heteroglossia. Mary Kate is different things to different people, and in different contexts: to her mother a ‘pet’, to the headmistress a ‘new pupil’, during ‘registration’ the ‘last name’, and so on:

Mary Kate  
(your/her/my) name  
a new pupil  
Mary Kate’s shoulder  
pet  
Mary Kate Williams  
the last one  
the last name on the register

No such complexity exists in the world of Mark and Mandy. They are and remain just Mark and Mandy:

Mark and Mandy  
Mark and Mandy’s hands
Mary Kate’s mother, too, is different things at different times: ‘Mummy’ to Mary Kate, ‘Mrs. Williams’ when she introduces herself to the teacher, ‘her mother’ when the headmistress introduces her to the classroom teacher. The nomination of Mark and Mandy’s mothers emphasises the ties in the ‘Elm Street’ community: Mark’s mother is referred to, not as Mark’s mother, but as (Mandy’s) ‘Auntie’; Mandy’s mother, not as Mandy’s mother, but as (Mark’s) ‘Auntie’.

The ‘mass audience’ story keeps greater distance between the teacher and the new entrants. The teacher remains a nameless functionary until, well into the story, she reveals her name to the class. Instrumentalisation (‘the bell’), the instances of exclusion discussed in 2.4.2, and nominalisations (‘lessons’) and spatialisations (‘school’) further enhance the distance between the teacher and the children. Mary Kate’s teacher reveals her name as soon as she accepts the child and is nominated a great deal more often (76%) than Mark and Mandy’s teacher (29%). In both cases, however, the teacher is the only participant who is functionalised a significant number of times.
As for the other children in the class, the old hands, Mary Kate names and describes some of them. In Mark and Mandy they are merely classified on the broadest level (e.g. 'little boy'), and, in one instance, 'instrumentalised' ('chattering voices'). None of them are given a name, or a more detailed description. Not only the gap between the new entrants and the teacher, also the gap between the new entrants and the old hands is wider in Mark and Mandy.

In Mary Kate animals are classified and semioticised: they are, as already noted, pure objects of knowledge. In Mark and Mandy they are objects of knowledge also, but not exclusively: they are also described ('funny looking brown animal'), named ('Smudge'), and appraised ('the poor thing'). They remain, to some extent, beings to live with, care for, feel for. And they also serve as a symbol for motherly care, right inside the school building: the picture of the 'big sheep and her lamb'.

Dolls, finally, straddle nomination and classification: they are referred to as friends and equals, but also as objects of classificatory power.
2.4.7 The coding of social relations

My interpretations of the differences between the two stories can be summarised as a set of generative principles, or 'structuring structures' (Bourdieu, 1986, p.170) that govern which participants are included or excluded, how roles are allotted to them in interaction, and how they are referred to.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mark and Mandy</th>
<th>Mary Kate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. School is oriented towards 'educational achievement' and formal group activities.</td>
<td>School is oriented towards 'development' through individual or small group play activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Mothers establish no associations with school staff and relate to their children through action.</td>
<td>Mothers establish associations with school staff and relate to their children through speech.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. New entrants rely on the community for meaningful relations with peers;</td>
<td>New entrants are dependent on school for meaningful relations with peers;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. remain at relatively great social distance from teachers;</td>
<td>are socially close to teachers;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. display marked gender differences in dress and behaviour but nevertheless establish meaningful cross-gender relations with peers;</td>
<td>do not display marked gender differences in dress and behaviour and do not establish meaningful cross-gender relations with peers;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. are apprehensive about the teacher. are apprehensive about the other children.

7. have a permanent identity. have different, context-dependent identities.

8. Animals are objects of knowledge but also fellow living beings. Animals are objects of knowledge only.

These principles all concern social relations: social distance (2; 4; 5; 6) and individuality versus conformity (1; 3; 6; 7).

The middle class story represents the child and its mother as socially closer to the world of school, yet, because of the values of individualism, more distant from others generally. The mass audience story represents the child and its family as socially more distant from the world of school but closer to others generally, because of the values of solidarity and conformity: they are closer to the community, closer to other children, and closer also to animals.
These are principles similar in kind to the principles Bourdieu (1986) called ‘habitus’, Bernstein (e.g. 1981) ‘coding orientations’, and Hasan ‘principal components of semantic variation’ (1988; 1990). Bourdieu, for instance, in relation to the appreciation of art, saw distanciation, individual choice, and emphasis on form rather than content as generative principles in ‘bourgeois’ art appreciation, and conformity, necessity, focus on content rather than form and preservation of the links between life and art as the generative principles of ‘working class’ art appreciation (1986, ch.1). Bernstein (1981, p.148) saw ‘the sharp boundary or gap between the unique sensing self and others’ and ‘orientation towards a person rather than a social category or status’ as hallmarks of the elaborated code. Such features of ‘habitus’ or ‘coding orientation’ characterise the values of a social group and at the same time govern the way in which practices such as cooking, dressing, art production and appreciation (Bourdieu, 1986), or mother-child conversation (Hasan, 1988; 1990) are enacted. As we have seen in this chapter, they also govern choices in representation within the same mode of interaction (reading a story aloud to children).
NOTES

1. Halliday does not see verbal processes as agentive: the 'do-probe' does not apply (cf the table in Halliday, 1985, p.155) - one cannot say 'What did John do to Mary?' - 'He said hallo to her'. Ergatatively 'John' would be Medium, rather than Agent. For my purposes, however, the crucial distinction is that between 'activities' and 'reactions', and between active and passive roles with respect to the former. I am happy to dilute the meaning of 'active' and 'passive' to the point where I can legitimately say that if 'John says hallo to Mary' (and Mary does not also say hallo to John), John and only John is activated, plays an active role in the transaction 'greeting', and Mary is only 'being said hallo to', and has the passive role.
Chapter 5: A subversive children’s story

2.5.1 Magnus’ Metro

Magnus’ Metro is a Dutch children’s book by Joke van Leeuwen (1983). It tells the story of Magnus, a little boy who has drawn an imaginary metro line, and who then, on the way to the newsagent to get some stickytape, finds himself entering a door behind which his imaginary metro line becomes reality. At every station he gets out of the train and becomes involved in a new adventure. At the second station he meets The Unknown Soldier, who, as already described, sits at the foot of a large, abstract monument dedicated to The Unknown Soldier, wondering who he is. The Unknown Soldier and Magnus continue the journey together and, at the third station, enter a building very much like a school, where they are held against their will.

Like Mary Kate and the School Bus, the book is distributed as serious literature for children, rather than as a mass market product. Its illustrations, black and white pen drawings, are more similar to those of Mary Kate than to those of Mark and Mandy. But where, in Mary Kate, the ‘first day’ is described as, in the end, a happy experience, in Magnus’ Metro school is portrayed as a kind of prison. Where Mary Kate makes new friends at school, Magnus loses his new friend, The Unknown Soldier. And where Miss
Laurie is friendly and smiling, the 'man with the large moustache' is harsh and authoritarian. Magnus' Metro, rather than a piece of pro-school propaganda, is a subversive text, albeit through the slightly oblique mode of fantasy (the same author, in a more recent book, has again described an oppressive school, this time more directly and realistically; Van Leeuwen, 1988).

Magnus bekijkt het tweede blad:

Plate 3: Illustration from Magnus' Metro
The translation is mine and follows the original as closely as possible. It should be noted that the questions and the riddles are integrated with the illustrations and that the riddles are actual riddles, to be solved by the reader. This mode of integration of text and illustration, and of doing and reading, is of course lost in the following rendition:

2.5:1 1. They got out of the train and climbed the stairs.

2. A long flight of stairs.

3. Gradually it became lighter.

4. The stairs came out in a long corridor.

5. It looked like the corridor of a school.

6. The walls were lined with coat pegs.

7. The corridor veered to the left.

8. And then to the right.

9. And then to the left again.

10. And then to the right again.

11. On and on it went.

12. "It's just like a labyrinth," said Magnus.

13. At last they saw a door with an EXIT sign on it.

14. They opened the door.
15. They saw a kind of classroom.
16. Rows of benches.
17. People were sitting in those benches.
18. Adults.
19. "What are they doing here?" Magnus thought, surprised.
20. A man with a large moustache came towards them.
21. "Sit down there," he said.
22. He pointed at a bench.
23. "We don't want to sit down," said Magnus, "we want to go outside."
24. "Impossible," said the man, "you must answer the questions first."
25. "Only then you can go outside."
26. "If you don't answer the questions you can't go outside."
27. "Which questions?"
   Magnus sat down.
   The Unknown Soldier sat down too.
29. Each in a separate bench.
30. Because the man said they had to.
31. They got a pen and a large sheet of paper.
32. There were many questions on the paper.
33. Magnus picked up the pen.
36. He read the questions.
37. He wrote an answer under every question.
38. What is your name?
40. Why?
41. Because it was my grandfather's name and the name of my grandfather's grandfather.
42. Where do you come from?
43. From home.
44. Why?
45. Because I went to the shop to get some sticky tape.
46. What is the weather like where you come from?
47. I don't know.
48. What are your father and mother called?
49. Mendelt Melk and Wiesje Wip.
50. He returned the sheet.
51. "Good," said the man with the large moustache.
52. He put no less than 15 stamps on the sheet.
53. "Can we go outside now?" asked Magnus.
54. "Not yet," said the man, "there are two more sheets."
55. Magnus got two large sheets.
56. The Unknown Soldier too.

57. He was still busy with the first sheet.

58. "I know so little," he sighed.

59. Magnus looked at the sheets.
    (CF Plate 3)

60. What does this say?

61. How much is $6+3-1+8-5+9-0-3-1+4+2+5-10-5-4+3+5-9-5$?

62. How many strange birds have passed here?

63. Who does not fit in this row?

64. Whose dog is this?

65. Which bit fits?

66. How much is 987654321 - 987654321?

67. It was a lot of work.

68. He had to solve all the riddles.

69. One by one.

70. He solved all of them.

71. Magnus looked at The Unknown Soldier.

72. His head was red.

73. "I know nothing," he moaned.

74. "Wait," said Magnus, "you are bigger than me, but I know more than you."

75. Magnus took the metro map from his pocket.
56. The Unknown Soldier too.
57. He was still busy with the first sheet.
58. "I know so little," he sighed.
59. Magnus looked at the sheets.  
   (CF Plate 3)
60. What does this say?
61. How much is 6+3-1+8-5+9-0-3-1+4+2+5-10-5-4+3+5-9-5?
62. How many strange birds have passed here?
63. Who does not fit in this row?
64. Whose dog is this?
65. Which bit fits?
66. How much is 987654321-987654321?
67. It was a lot of work.
68. He had to solve all the riddles.
69. One by one.
70. He solved all of them.
71. Magnus looked at The Unknown Soldier.
72. His head was red.
73. "I know nothing," he moaned.
74. "Wait," said Magnus, "you are bigger than me, but I know more than you."
75. Magnus took the metro map from his pocket.
76. He wrote the answers of the riddles on that piece of paper.

77. In very small letters.

78. So small that you could hardly read it.

79. Then he crumpled the paper into a little ball.

80. He threw it to The Unknown Soldier.

81. But he missed.

82. The paper fell on the ground.

83. "What are you doing there?" shouted the man with the large moustache.

84. "Oh eh," Magnus stammered, "it's a note...a nut...a nothing."

85. "You are not allowed to help each other," said the man with the large moustache.

86. "You must do it all by yourself."

87. "But he doesn't know anything," said Magnus.

88. "Then he must stay here until he does," grumbled the man.

89. "How can he ever get to know the answers if he doesn't know them?", said Magnus angrily, "I know more than he does."

90. "And I am bigger," The Unknown Soldier whispered.

91. The man with the large moustache walked towards Magnus.

92. His forehead was full of angry wrinkles.
93. "You are naughty," he said, "you must go back to square one."

94. "We don't want to go back to square one," Magnus shouted.

95. "We want to go outside."

96. "You've got no right to want anything," said the man.

97. He picked up Magnus by his collar and trousers.

98. He carried him to the door.

99. Magnus struggled to escape.

100. "Stop," he shouted, "The Unknown Soldier must come with me."

101. "He can't," said the man, "he's got to finish 'is work."

102. "But he belongs to me," said Magnus.

103. "What do you mean?"

104. "Is he your father or your mother or your brother or your sister?"

105. "I found him."

106. "Then he doesn't belong to you."

107. The man strode through the labyrinth.

108. He knew the way exactly.

109. He put Magnus down in front of the metro stairs.

110. Magnus heard him walk away.

111. Then he heard a door slam.
2.5.2 Inclusions and exclusions

The story of Magnus includes the following participants:

children
teacher
ancestors (grandfather & grandfather of grandfather)
father
mother
brother
sister
strange birds
dog

Only two of these are, strictly speaking, characters in the story: the children and the teacher. The others are 'objects of knowledge'. Some of these objects of knowledge figure in Magnus' answers: ancestors, father, mother. Magnus, the boy who knows the answers, knows himself to be connected, not only to his father and his mother, but also to his male ancestors. The Unknown Soldier, on the other hand, has nobody in the world, and is therefore at an educational disadvantage. Other 'objects of knowledge' figure in the questions: the animals.

In both these respects Magnus' Metro is similar to the stories we have discussed in 2.2.4: educational advantage derives from a 'privileged background', and going to school puts an end to equal companionship with
animals and teaches children to regard animals as objects of knowledge, riddles to be solved. But in another respect the participants in Magnus' Metro are very different: they are overwhelmingly male. The friendly school of pro-school propaganda is feminised. The harsh, oppressive school of this subversive story is a masculine world.

There are 22 instances of backgrounding and suppression in the story, and they almost always background or suppress the teacher, sometimes through passive agent deletion ('you are not allowed'), sometimes through nominalisation ('question'), sometimes through the use of passive verb (e.g. 'they got a pen' instead of 'the teacher gave them a pen'). This lends an air of formality and impersonality, and also of inevitability, to the teacher's actions.

2.5.3 Taxonomies

Magnus' Metro suggests that there is no place for solidarity in school. The 'other children' remain nameless. In this Magnus' Metro resembles Mark and Mandy rather than Mary Kate, but we must of course remember that Mark and Mandy's association can resume after the final bell has rung, whereas school irretrievably destroys the relationship between Magnus and The Unknown Soldier.
Secondly, as in *Mark and Mandy*, the distinction between 'knowing' and 'not knowing', between educational achievement and educational failure, is crucial. In contrast to *Mark and Mandy*, however, *Magnus' Metro* spells out the consequences of this distinction: school 'makes the difference' between those who 'may go outside' and continue the journey, and those who may not.

```
schoolchildren
    named    unnamed
    educational    educational
      winners    losers
```

### 2.5.4 Roles

Table 2.15 (next page) shows how active and passive roles are distributed among the participants, table 2.16 (over) how often Magnus and The Unknown Soldier are agiven active cq passive parts in relation to the various other participants.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ACTIVE</th>
<th>PASSIVE</th>
<th>VERBAL</th>
<th>PROCESS</th>
<th>MATERIAL</th>
<th>PROCESS</th>
<th>MENTAL</th>
<th>PROCESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>active</td>
<td>passive</td>
<td>active</td>
<td>passive</td>
<td>active</td>
<td>passive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnus</td>
<td>55 (71%)</td>
<td>23 (29%)</td>
<td>11 (41%)</td>
<td>16 (59%)</td>
<td>30 (81%)</td>
<td>7 (19%)</td>
<td>14 (100%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Unknown Soldier</td>
<td>27 (58%)</td>
<td>19 (42%)</td>
<td>3 (25%)</td>
<td>9 (75%)</td>
<td>16 (76%)</td>
<td>5 (24%)</td>
<td>8 (67%)</td>
<td>4 (33%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other 'children'</td>
<td>3 (75%)</td>
<td>1 (25%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2 (100%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>31 (70%)</td>
<td>13 (30%)</td>
<td>15 (65%)</td>
<td>8 (35%)</td>
<td>15 (79%)</td>
<td>4 (21%)</td>
<td>1 (50%)</td>
<td>1 (50%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.15: Activation and passivation in Magnus' Metro
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>participants are with respect to</th>
<th>ACTIVATED</th>
<th></th>
<th>PASSIVATED</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Magnus</td>
<td>The Unknown Soldier</td>
<td>Magnus</td>
<td>The Unknown Soldier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>12 (34%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>23 (66%)</td>
<td>11 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnus</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>3 (33%)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>6 (67%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown Soldier</td>
<td>6 (67%)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>3 (33%)</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>3 (100%)</td>
<td>3 (100%)</td>
<td>3 (100%)</td>
<td>3 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.16: Activation and passivation in interactions: Magnus’ Metro
Magnus clearly takes a much more active role in relation to the teacher than either Mark and Mandy or Mary Kate: the teacher is more often passivated (30% as opposed to 0% in Mark and Mandy and 14% in Mary Kate). His active role also comes out in the comparatively low number of mental processes attributed to him (23% of all types of process, as against 37% in Mark and Mandy and 38% in Mary Kate), and the comparatively high number of verbal processes in which Magnus plays the active role (41%, as against 27% in Mark and Mandy and 31% in Mary Kate). Magnus speaks out, resists and rebels openly.

The Unknown Soldier, on the other hand, plays a more timid role. When he speaks he 'moans', 'sighs', 'whispers', rather than that he angrily protests or shouts, as does Magnus.

We can, finally, compare the interaction between Magnus and The Unknown Soldier with that between Mark and Mandy on the one hand, and between Susan and Mary Kate on the other hand. Like Susan, Magnus plays an active role in relation to the weaker child (72% activation in Mary Kate, 67% in Magnus' Metro). These figures, however, hide an important difference. Susan is an 'old hand' and her role in relation to Mary Kate is instigated and encouraged by the teacher. She is the teacher's accomplice. Magnus is himself a new entrant, and his role in relation to The Unknown Soldier goes against
the teacher's wishes. Depending on how you see it, this can be called a case of collaboration versus resistance, or a case of allowing children to help each other versus not allowing them to do so. Both Mary Kate and Magnus' Metro differ here from Mark and Mandy, where interaction between children during the 'lesson' is neither encouraged nor punished, but simply doesn't occur.

2.5.5 Associations

As in Mark and Mandy, solidarity between new entrants is major value in Magnus' Metro. Magnus does not brood about his own identity, but is concerned for and supportive of others. However, where Mark and Mandy do everything together (and, during the 'lesson', together with the other children), Magnus' actions become the actions of an 'individual hero' as soon as he and The Unknown Soldier have been placed in separate benches and given the questions. As a result the protagonists are individualised a good deal more often than in Mark and Mandy (72 times, or 78%, as against 82% in Mary Kate and 43% in Mark and Mandy). The two friends are individualised from the moment they are given the questions. But in speaking to the teacher, Magnus continues to refer to them collectively ('we want to go outside') or in terms of association ('h'
must come with me`). And where, in Mark and Mandy, the two friends are reunited, Magnus, at the end of the story, is left with the unhappy knowledge that he has betrayed his friend.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1-34</th>
<th>(entering the school, and receiving the questions)</th>
<th>Magnus and The Unknown Soldier are COLLECTIVISED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>34-94</td>
<td>(Magnus answers questions and attempts to help The Unknown Soldier)</td>
<td>Magnus and The Unknown Soldier are INDIVIDUALISED, except for one instance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94-111</td>
<td>(Magnus is expelled)</td>
<td>Magnus and The Unknown Soldier are INDIVIDUALISED in the teacher's dialogue, but COLLECTIVISED and ASSOCIATED in Magnus' dialogue</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.5.6 Overdetermination

All of the characters in Magnus' Metro are overdetermined. 'Magnus' serves as the name of the hero, a 'little boy' who is also 'large'. The 'other children' are classified as 'adults'. A deviation which erases the boundaries between childhood and adulthood, and thereby adds new themes to the story. Magnus' Metro does not, as Mary Kate, see children as awkward, clumsy subhumans who
cannot move a foot without needing help and guidance, and it can make us reflect on how adults, too, are often patronised and subjected to all kinds of humiliations when they are not in a position of power.

'The Unknown Soldier' combines functionalisation ('soldier'), classification ('unknown') and nomination, because the combined functionalisation and classification is used as a name. This name is overdetermined. A participant (by definition subjected) in army practices, is inserted into the context of practices of schooling. In this way The Unknown Soldier is not just a victim of war, and a failure in school, but a symbol for the victims and losers of society generally.

The 'man with the large moustache', finally, is sometimes physically identified, sometimes broadly classified as 'the man'. We have already noted the authoritarian, military connotations of the moustache (2.2.22). Again: the fact that he is never identified in a more precise way, as 'teacher', for instance, can make him a more general symbol of authoritarian repression.

This story, then, can be read, and has here been read, as referring to the social practice of 'entering school'. But it can, and perhaps should, also be read as referring
to other social practice, for instance entering the workforce. That is the power of overdetermination. Stories which distance themselves to some extent from realistic 'reporting' and from realistic contemporary description of detail, can give us insights that more realistic stories cannot give. The price of overdetermination is the low modality which, alas, in our culture, is given to 'fantasy', and especially fantasy stories for children. We oppose 'fantasy' to 'truth' and so distance ourselves from the truths which may be conveyed through myths, fairytales and similar stories. This, however, is an adult prejudice. For children the distinction does not necessarily apply. As Bettelheim has written:

Plato — who may have understood better what forms the mind of man than do some of our contemporaries who want their children exposed only to "real" people and everyday events — knew what intellectual experiences make for true humanity. He suggested that the future citizens of his ideal republic begin their literary education with the telling of myths, rather than with mere facts or so-called rational teachings. Even Aristotle, master of pure reason, said: "The friend of wisdom is also a friend of myth."

(Bettelheim, 1979, p.35)