3.3.3 **Levels of generalisation**

A list of the (calibrated) recontextualisations of the activities of ‘teaching’ and ‘learning’ (cf. table 3.3) shows that Illich has recontextualised ‘learning’ at different levels of generalisation: he refers to ‘learning’ in general, but also to specific kinds of ‘learning’, such as ‘learning how to speak’, ‘learning from comics’, and so on. ‘Teaching’, on the other hand, is referred to throughout at the highest level of generalisation.

For Table 3.3 (Representational cohesion in text 3.3:1) see next page.

The table also indicates the semantic relations between the different kinds of ‘learning’, following Martin (1984a), and using the following abbreviations:

- **HYP** hyponymy ('kind of' relations)
- **COHYP** cohyponymy (both terms have a 'kind of' relation to some other term)
- **MER** meronymy ('part of' relation)
- **COMER** comeronymy (both terms have a 'part of' relation to some other term)
- **ANT** antonymy
- **SYN** synonymy
- **REP** repetition

This kind of analysis, an adaptation of Martin’s (1984a) ‘lexical cohesion’ analysis which we might call ‘representational
Table 3.3: Representational cohesion in text
3.3.1
cohesion' analysis, can, if repeated occurrences of the same term are eliminated, be used to construct 'concept taxonomies' (Gregory, 1988) - both 'superordination' ('kind of') and 'composition' ('part of') taxonomies (cf. Martin, 1988, pp.152-155). Such taxonomies bring out very clearly the role of generalisation in recontextualisation.

Generalisation can, of course, be realised explicitly, for example through possessive relational attributive clauses (cf. Halliday, 1985, pp.121-122) such as 'learning includes learning from peergroups, learning from comics, and learning from chance observations' (cf. Martin, 1988, pp.152-155 for a discussion of explicit generalisation). It can also be realised more surreptitiously, through alternating references on different levels of generalisation. This is what predominantly happens in Illich's text, although he does suggest the hyponymical relation by means of grammatical parallelism, as, for instance, in lines 1 and 2 of the text:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Everyone</th>
<th>learns how to live</th>
<th>outside school</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We all</td>
<td>learn how to speak,</td>
<td>without interference from a teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to think, to love,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to feel, to play,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to curse, to politicke,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and to work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If, then, we try to make Illich's implicit taxonomising explicit, we should perhaps
begin with the opposition between ‘learning in school’ and ‘learning how to live’, the two types of learning which Illich opposes to each other. It then becomes evident that only the latter, ‘learning how to live’, is made more specific, by a whole list of subordinate kinds of ‘learning how to live’, while the former, ‘learning in school’, is referred to only at what, in the context, become the second highest level of generalisation:

\[\text{learn} \rightarrow \text{learn how to live} \rightarrow \text{learn in school} \]

Later in the text we come across a second classification of ‘learning how to live’, based, not on what is being learnt, but on how it is learnt (where it is learnt, from whom or from which activities, and so on):

\[\text{learn} \rightarrow \text{learn how to live} \rightarrow \text{learn in school} \]

\[\text{learn on the streets} \rightarrow \text{learn from peers} \rightarrow \text{learn from comics} \rightarrow \text{learn from observation} \rightarrow \text{learn from participation in the ritual of school}\]
Like the taxonomies in history textbooks (Martin, 1990, p.11), these taxonomies are adhoc, aimed, not at a single, rigorous classification, but at instantiation and exemplification, and at suggesting an abundance of instances and examples by means of the rhetorical figure of enumeration. Illich's classifications do not create 'technicality' (Martin, 1988, 1989, 1990), and they do not name activity sequences in the way I have described in 3.2.6 above. Illich's text is already at the highest level of generalisation. It takes the details of the social practices of 'teaching' and 'learning' entirely for granted. Perhaps it would be more apt to say that Illich 'de-generalises' one kind of activity ('learning how to live') and one kind of participant ('children'), so as to render these concrete, vivid, and multifaceted, while leaving the other kinds of activity ('teaching' and 'learning in school') and the other kind of participant ('teachers') at the highest level of generalisation, hence dull, distant and uniform, and an empty vessel into which the readers can pour all their negative associations.
3.3.4 Concept formation

Table 3.4 lists the activities calibrated as 'teaching' in table 3.1. It shows that these realisations, even though they all refer to the same activity, and even though they are all at the same level of generalisation, introduce very different meanings. In other words, where Illich deploys generalisation in connection with 'learning how to live' and with 'children', he uses 'concept formation' (cf. 2.3.5) in relation to 'teaching'.

As with generalisation, concept formation can be done explicitly, for example by means of identifying relational clauses (cf. Halliday, 1985, pp.115-128) such as 'teaching is obstructing learning' (cf. Martin et al, 1988, p.150 ff, for a discussion of this in terms of the concept 'technicality'). But it can also be done surreptitiously, and this is the method which Illich predominantly uses. He refers to the activity of teaching by means of ever different terms, continuously redefining it, continuously adding new angles to it - angles which, in reading the text, all blend together into one complex (and nameless) concept. It is the method of what I have called 'concept formation', and what elsewhere has been called 'overlexicalisation' (Fowler et al, 1979, pp.211-212) and 'overwording' (Fairclough, 1989, p.111), a method which
points to areas of intense preoccupation in the experience and the values of the group which generates it, allowing the linguist to identify peculiarities in the ideology of that group.

(Fowler et al., 1979, pp. 211-212)

interference
  care
  'educational' process
  attempt at increasing learning
  care
  pretend to teach
  obstruct learning

Table 4: Concept formation in text 3.3.1

So, where 'learning how to live' is, each time, referred to by the same term, but with the addition of specifics, 'teaching' is, each time, referred to in the most generalised way, but by means of different terms that highlight different aspects, different qualities of the activity. And where generalisation and taxonomising serve as a strategy to make 'learning how to live' vivid, concrete and multifaceted, concept formation serves to delegitimise 'teaching' by means of abstraction ('care'), adding conation ('attempt at', 'pretend to'), distancing (the scare quotation marks of 'educational'), and, above all, by means of inversion ('interference', 'obstruction').
In this discussion I have deliberately used terms like 'strategy', 'gambit', 'move'. Illich's text is a subversive one, a text which seeks to deconstruct the commonsense assumptions about 'teaching' and 'learning' that make up the ideology of schooling. In such texts, language, too, cannot run in wellworn grooves. Perhaps this explains the, for an expository text, unusually activated and concretised style, and the way in which objectivations and abstractions are motivated by field (by the representation of 'teaching' and 'learning') rather than by genre (by the 'language of generalising arguments'). Certain (structuralist, cognitivist) kinds of text analysis have stated the case of the wellworn grooves, of the conventions of genre and schema, other (pragmatist, ethnomethodologist) kinds have stated the case of the strategy and the gambit, of the ever different use of conventions for ever different purposes and in ever different situations. But, as Fairclough has noted:

People do act strategically in certain circumstances and use conventions rather than simply following them; but in other circumstances they do simply follow them, and what one needs is a theory of social action - social practice - which accounts for both the determining effect of conventions, and the strategic activity of individual speakers, without reducing practice to one or the other.

(Fairclough, 1989. p.9)
The circumstances of Illich's book, an attempt at de-legitimising a practice which is only rarely questioned, undoubtedly called for such a strategic use of language.

3.3.5 Sequencing

The relations between the activities and reactions recontextualised in Illich's text can, as we have seen, in many cases be indicated by means of taxonomies and concept formation chains. But not in all cases. Some relate to each other, not in terms of (hyponymical or meronymical) classification, nor in terms of the ongoing process of definition realised by the concept formation chain, but in terms of an order of time, in terms of sequence. However much Illich's text is oriented towards conceptual elaboration and legitimation, rather than towards a detailed account of the activities that make up the social practice of schooling, it is still the 'proairetic code' (Barthes, 1974), the logic of action, which 'brings everything together' (ibid, p.29), which provides the necessary orientation for the reader, and which therefore, in the end, 'determines the readability of the text' (ibid, p.104).

In certain genres, most notably narrative and procedural genres, the order in which
activities appear in the text may mirror quite closely the order in which they would be performed in the social practice (as recontextualised in the text). Literary theorists would say, there is relatively little difference between 'story time' and 'text time' in such texts (cf. e.g. Genette, 1980, pp.33-35). However, even in narrative texts 'achrony' can occur (ibid, p.79 ff) - Genette cites an example in which a spatial rather than a temporal principle governs the sequencing of activities in a section of Proust's *À la Recherche du Temps Perdu*: a series of events is related, not by temporal order, but by the sequence of places where the events occur, a sequence which, as it happens, is also that of the subsequent stops of the train on which the narrator is travelling. Such non-temporal principles for the sequencing of events in texts Genette calls 'syllepses' (ibid, p.85), and he notes that syllepsis can be, not only spatial, but also, for instance, 'thematic' (ibid, p.85). In expository texts thematic syllepsis is clearly the rule rather than the exception. Expository texts disturb the temporal sequence of the activities they include and rearrange them according to the logic of argumentation that structures the text, or, as Barthes has expressed it: 'A rhetorical code is superimposed on the proairetic code: the sequence lists its actions, but the discourse expands by branching out logically' (1974, p.128). It is nevertheless possible to
reconstitute the underlying temporally ordered sequence of activities or episodes, and thus to reveal the foundation of representation on which the expository text rests.

Many texts contain explicit clues that can help the reader reconstitute that underlying temporal order, and this is so even in texts which rearrange that order very considerably. The following clues were most common in my material:

(1) **Temporal conjunction**

This can be realised by conjunctions or conjunctive adjuncts, as with 'then' in 3.3:3:

3.3:3 Then he leapt up at the latch and began to bark.

It can also be realised by hypotactic clausecomplexes in which the subordinated clause is temporally linked to the main clause and contains an activity that precedes (or follows, or is simultaneous with) an activity included in the main clause, as in:

3.3:4 So now, having kissed your child goodbye, you have those precious hours to yourself.

3.3:5 When you arrive at school, you will find several parents waiting with new children.
Pre- or postmodifying elements of nominal groups can, similarly, contain both a time-link with and a (dually objectivated) activity that precedes (or follows, or is simultaneous with), the activity realised by the Head of the nominal group, as with ‘after school’ in:

3.3:6 The value of this after-school conversation is threefold.

Finally, not only conjuncts of time strictly speaking, also conjuncts of order (‘first...’) can play a role.

(2) Circumstances of time
When texts have no conjunctive ‘sequencing in time’, they may still include ‘setting in time’ (the terms are from Gleason, 1968). Circumstances of time like the following can help reconstitute temporal order, providing they can be sequenced with other, similar circumstances of time.

3.3:7 At three o’clock the twins are chattering happily to their mother.

(3) Time identifications
Time identifications are identifying clauses which have either an activity, or, more usually, anaphoric reference to an activity, as Token, and ‘time to...’, ‘time for...’ or some similar expression, complemented by an activity, as Value:
3.3:8 It was a good moment for mothers to hug their child and slip away.

(4) **Tense shift**
Tense shifts also provide clues for reconstituting temporal order:

3.3:9 Others were at an activity table with their child. The (...) teacher (...) had set up activities for every child - puzzles, modelling, construction kits, easels with crayons and a 'kitchen'.

3.3:10 'Good-by, pet,' Mummy said, giving her a quick kiss, 'I'll come and fetch you after school.'

(5) **Phase verbs**
Phase verbs like 'start', 'continue', 'cease', etc., either or not used as part of a hypotactical verbal group (cf. Halliday, 1985, pp.256-258), can also make sequencing explicit:

3.3:11 Start the day with a nourishing breakfast.

(6) **Sequence verbs**
Sequence verbs like 'precede', 'follow', 'coincide with' etc. can connect two or more objectiviated activities - metaphorical substitutes like 'meet', 'greet', 'see', etc. are common in certain genres:
3.3:12  We saw bewilderment greet glib
commands like 'line up' and 'not
more than four at a sandtray'.

Even without such explicit clues, however, temporal sequence can be reconstituted. As Barthes has noted, understanding temporal sequence relies on the 'already done' and the 'already written' (1974, p.204): readers (and analysts) supply the temporal order on the basis of their experience of the social practice itself, or of other texts about them, on the basis of a 'patrimonial hoard of human experience' (ibid, p.204). This is so even when relatively little prior experience can be assumed: books for five-year-old children still will rely on a 'practical reservoir of everyday acts' (ibid, p.204), and take for granted, for example, the knowledge of the 'instrumental actions' (cf. 3.2.6) that make up activities. Texts like Illich's take a good deal more for granted, and perhaps this is their Achilles heel. Generalising may be a grab for power, for the 'language of the General', but it also entails a loss of knowledge about, and a loss of control over what happens down below, among the rank and file, and it leaves texts very much open for interpretation on the level of representation. Narrative texts, by contrast, tend to be very much open for interpretation on the level of 'deeper', more abstract and general meanings.
Some further preliminaries are necessary before we can reconstitute the activity sequences that underlie Illich’s text:

(1) It should be realised that a text may contain more than one activity sequence. The question of the relation between the various activity sequences in a text will be discussed in 3.3.6 and 3.3.8 below.

(2) Of a set of taxonomically related activities only the least generalised ones will be included in the activity sequence.

(3) Two columns will be used. The left column lists the activities, the right column the reactions. Reactions are written next to the activities with which (or with associated elements of which) they are connected, that is, next to their ‘Phenomena’. For a complete analysis (see chapter 1) further columns would be added, to connect times, places, dress, tools, eligibility criteria, purposes and legitimations to specific portions of the activity sequence.

(4) Using tables 2.11 and 3.1 (the analysis of the recontextualisation of the participants, activities and reactions in Illich’s text), both activated and passivated participants are reconnected with the relevant activities and reactions - in their calibrated form. Suppressed participants are indicated by SUPPR.
(5) Activities are connected sequentially, by an arrow, or as 'simultaneous', by a '+' sign, or as 'alternatives', by bifurcating arrows, following flowchart conventions such as used also in Ventola (1987) and Fawcett et al (1988). As the Illich excerpt contains no example of this, the following may serve as an illustration:

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 others' names.

This would be charted as follows, showing two alternative 'courses of action':

```
teacher gives children name badge
  teacher covers up badges
    children guess names
      (teacher calls out names)
```

So, having 'undone' the effects of taxonomisation (including only the least generalised activities) and concept formation (by including only one term for each chain),
we can now list the activities and reactions
from Illich’s text that could enter into
sequential relations:

learn to speak
learn to think
learn to love
learn to feel
learn to play
learn to curse
learn to politick
learn to work
teach
except
want (their children to go to school)
go to school
send to school
be concerned
keep from learning
research
demonstrate
learn on the streets
learn from peer groups
learn from comics
learn from observation
learn from participation in the ritual of
    school
learn in school
observe

From this list two activities need to be
eliminated: the reaction ‘be concerned’,
because it connects with eligibility criteria
rather than activities, and the activity ‘to
keep from learning’, because it realises a
‘purpose’ rather than an activity.
The remaining activities fall into three groups. 'Except' stands on its own, and does not connect sequentially to any other of the activities. 'Research' and 'demonstrate' yield the following short activity sequence:

```
educational researchers research
     ↓
educational researchers demonstrate
```

As will be discussed in 3.3.7, this activity sequence serves to enhance the modality of Illich's recontextualisation, by lending it the backing of reliable, scientific method.

Finally there is the central activity sequence, in which, however, many of the reactions cannot be sequenced, and must be shown as happening simultaneously, or in no particular order:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>REACTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SUPPR. plan to teach</td>
<td>Poor parents want</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>↓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor children go to school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle-class parents send middle-class children to school</td>
<td>Teachers teach (SUPPR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>↓</td>
<td>Children learn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Children learn to speak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Children learn to think</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Children learn to love</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Children learn to feel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Children learn to play</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Children learn to curse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Children learn to politick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Children learn to work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Children learn on the streets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Children learn from peergroups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Children learn from comics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUPPR. Observe</td>
<td>Children learn</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Clearly this is a very truncated representation. The ‘voice of empirics’ (Barthes, 1974, p.21) is weak in this text – just as the voice of taxonomising and concept formation may be weak in others which represent activities and reactions in more detail. The refusal to proceduralise autonomous learning (the activity which the text seeks to legitimise) is striking. Nevertheless, even a text like Illiá’s cannot do without a ‘story’. However generalised and reduced to its barest essentials, and however much ‘prosodically’ realised, dismembered and smeared out over the text, rather than informing its particulate, ‘beginning-middle-end’ structure, this ‘story’ does reveal its own particular inclusions and exclusions, and as such it can be fruitfully compared to other recontextualisations of ‘going to school’.

3.3.6 Embedded recontextualisation

All or part of any taxonomy, concept formation chain or activity sequence may be attributed to someone other than the principal recontextualising agent, the writer(s) or speaker. As a result, texts may contain several recontextualisations of the same activity or episode or practice, some
directly recontextualised, that is, recontextualised by the principal recontextualising agent him- or herself, some indirectly, that is, recontextualised by agents quoted or reported in the text. Indeed, there are texts, for instance certain kinds of journalistic texts, which consist entirely of embedded recontextualisations, of ‘things people said’, and in which the principal recontextualising agent, the journalist, directly recontextualises only the speech activities that project these embedded recontextualisations. This will be indicated in the analysis by means of superscripts, as shown in the box below:

3.3:14 Dr. Juan suggests parents take children to school before the first day to show them where the toilet is, where to leave their belongings and where they’ll be picked up.

Here only the activity of Dr. Juan (the speech act of ‘suggesting’) is directly recontextualised, and the practice of the ‘orientation visit’ is embedded in the practice of providing parental guidance.
The practice of providing expert parental guidance, however, is directly recontextualised. I will use another excerpt from the same article (a 1987 *Sydney Morning Herald* article written by Anne Susskind and entitled ‘The first day: it can be tough on the parents too’) to show this:

3.3:15  (1) The director of Sydney University’s early childhood education programs, Dr Stephen Juan, says it is to be expected that parents and children should be anxious at this time.  
(2) "They should not suppress their anxiety. (3) It’s only natural that the first days of school should be upsetting. (4) After all, you are flirting with a very basic childhood fear, the fear of separation."  
(5) Dr Juan said children often hid their fear of separation.  
(6) "Parents are lulled into thinking everything is all right, (7) only to have the child experience nightmares, go off their food, cry uncontrollably."
As discussed in 3.3.1 (also see Van Leeuwen 1987, 1993), calibrating speech activities which have not been explicitly recontextualised by verbs such as ‘suggest’, ‘caution’, etc., requires defining them on the basis of co-selected lexicogrammatical and discourse-level features. The speech acts in texts 3.3:15, for instance, might be defined as follows:

(i) (EXPLICIT, OBJECTIVE) PREDICTION: line 1
Predictions can generally be defined as co-selecting: Statement; 1st, 2nd or 3rd person; Future; if 1st or 2nd person: verb classified as non-volitional in the given context. In the case of 3.3:15, line 1, the prediction is realised explicitly (by the expression ‘says it is to be expected’) and objectively (‘says it is to be expected’, instead of ‘says he expects’).

(ii) PRESCRIPTION: line 2
Prescriptions are realised by statements with obligation modality.

(iii) (EXPLANATORY) EVALUATION: line 3
Evaluations can generally be defined as coselecting: Statement; 3rd person; specific reference; relational (attributive) clause with an Attribute that has a positive or negative connotation in the given context. In the case of 3.3:15, line 3, a discourse-level feature is also relevant. The evaluation is
explanatory, because it has logical ('Reason' or 'Explanation') conjunction in relation to the preceding speech act. This is rendered as 'grounds adhortation by evaluating...'

(iv) (PERSONALISED, EXPLANATORY)
IDENTIFICATION: line 4
Identifications can generally be defined as coselecting: Statement; 1st, 2nd or 3rd person; specific reference; relational (identifying) clause. Expressions like 'you are flirting with', 'you are dealing with', 'you have here' etc. personalise the identification ('you are flirting with a very basic childhood fear' instead of 'it is a very basic childhood fear'). In the case of 3.3:15, line 4, the identification is explanatory, because of the 'Reason' conjunction with the preceding line. This would be rendered as 'grounds the evaluation by identifying...').

(v) ASSERTION: line 5,6
Assertions are realised by coselecting: Statement; 3rd person; ('nomic') present tense; generic reference; non-relational clause. 3.3:15, line 6 is an INFERENTIAL assertion, because of the 'Result' conjunction with the preceding line. This is rendered as 'makes inference from the assertion by asserting...'

On the basis of these calibrations, the activity sequence would be analysed as follows:
This activity sequence is the recontextualisation of a generic structure, of the structure of the genre of expert parental guidance. It is not, however, the structure of that genre itself, as actually practised in the counselling of parents, nor is it the generic structure of the article, which, at least in the excerpts discussed here, is a loose concatenation of quotes from parents and experts. It is the generic structure of expert parental guidance texts as recontextualised by the quality press. The relation with actual parent counselling is filtered through many intertextual
transformations, not only because academic parental guidance experts may not themselves be practitioners of parent counselling, but also because the text is based on a quite different practice, with its own generic structure, the information gathering telephone interview between the journalist and the academic expert. The obvious traces of this have been removed in the process of recontextualisation, but if we could compare the analysis with an analysis of an actual counselling session, we might be able to explain any differences, among other things, by this factor (cf. Van Dijk, 1987; for a discussion of the relation between news texts and their 'source' texts).

The essential mechanism for embedding recontextualisations is, of course, projection. But there are other ways of embedding recontextualisations, for instance circumstantialisation (cf. 3.3:16) and the pre- or postmodification of participants, a device particularly common in reviews of fictionalised recontextualisation, e.g. plays (3.3:17) or novels (3.3:18)

3.3:16 According to a survey conducted for the Plowden Report, over a third of parents do not see the head before their children start school.

3.3:17 Brian Parker's Theo, a little boy who wears a jumper on his head to hide a rather drastic haircut, is more convincing than his Mr Brennan, the head-teacher.
3.3:18 The parents of Bartje, the hero of Anne de Vries' book, have no time to take him to school.

3.3.7 Recontextualisation and modalisation

When a text contains several recontextualisations of the 'same' activity (or episode, or practice), it may assign different modality values to these recontextualisations, represent some as more likely, or more credible than others, and this, too, is indicated in the analysis, by tagging activities, or other elements of the recontextualised practice, with the relevant modality values, as in the following example, where 'might' realises low probability modality, and 'not unusual' median usuality modality (cf. Halliday, 1985, pp.85-89):

3.3:19 Others bridge the difference and feel more secure if they can take something, for example a favourite car or a small family photo. Alternatively they might arrive home with something from school. Stones from the playground are not unusual.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>REACTION</th>
<th>TOOL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Children take something to school</td>
<td>feel secure</td>
<td>car or family photo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children bring something home</td>
<td>feel secure</td>
<td>stone from the playground</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, modal auxiliaries and their agnate adverbs, adjectives and nouns, and indicators of usuality modality, are not the only ways in which modality may be realised. As Kress and Hodge have noted:

There are a large number of ways of realising modality: non-verbal and verbal, through non-deliberate features (exclamations, ums, ers, etc.) and deliberate, systematic features, which include fillers (sort of), adverbs (probably, quite, better), modal auxiliaries (can, must), and mental process verbs (think, understand, feel), and intonation.

(Kress and Hodge, 1979, p.127)

In this section I would like to draw attention to four ways in which embedded recontextualisations may be modalised: (i) through the credibility assigned to the agent of the embedded recontextualisation; (ii) through the credibility assigned to the embedded recontextualisation itself, as realised by the type of verbalisation or
reaction which projects the embedded recontextualisation; (iii) through the tense of the projecting verb; and (iv) through lexicalised modality.

(1) The credibility of the agent of the embedded recontextualisation
The agent of an embedded recontextualisation may be given positive or negative credibility in a number of ways:

(a) Qualification
Experts, for instance, are given credibility by the inclusion of titles, functions, institutional affiliations, and so on (3.3:20), and, at times, through recontextualising the (methodical and exhaustive) research procedures underpinning their recontextualisation (3.3:21). On the other hand, firsthand experience as a participant of the social practice (3.3:22) may also enhance an agent's credibility.

3.3:20 The director of Sydney University's early childhood education programs, Dr Stephen Juan, says it is to be expected that parents and children should be anxious at this time.

3.3:21 Mark was one of the many children teacher-turned-author Valerie Martin spoke to when writing From Home to School, a book dealing with the first day. "The first day at school can be a happy and a memorable one," Valerie said (etc.).
Her mother, Mrs Erja Immonen, has mixed feelings. She is a little sad because school signals that her children are growing up and leaving her. But she has tried to be very positive. "Children watch your feelings very closely," she says (etc.).

The value of such qualifications is of course context-dependent. In some contexts only professional experience, and not firsthand experience as client in the social practice, counts as valid. In other cases, e.g. sociological research based on interviews with participants, as in Connell’s work on education (e.g. 1982), firsthand experience will count as highly credible. In the mass media, expert credibility is enhanced in particular by frequent media exposure and/or direct access to publication in the mass media (cf. Elliott, 1972 on the recruiting of experts in the BBC), as in the case of Stephen Juan (cf. 3.3:20) who is a regular columnist in the very newspaper which here uses him as expert, as well as a regular performer on radio. Publication in the mass media would, however, diminish credibility in certain kinds of academic circles, e.g. those of narrowly specialised scholarly commentators in fields that do not enjoy attention from the mass media (cf. Bourdieu, 1988).
(b) **Evaluation**

Explicit evaluation of the agent of an embedded recontextualisation can also enhance or decrease credibility:

3.3:23 Many self-styled revolutionaries are victims of school. They see even 'liberation' as the product of an institutional process.

Pictorial illustrations may be pressed in the service of evaluation. The article from which 3.3:22 is quoted, for example, not only features the evaluation 'positive', but also contains a picture of Erja and her two daughters, in which she is seen to tie the shoelaces of one of her daughters while the other ties her own shoelaces. The caption reads: 'If you don't feel positive, it rubs off on the kid.'

(c) **Textual prominence**

Newspaper articles frequently create a contrast between embedded recontextualisations by featuring 'protagonist' and 'antagonist' views. The explicit motivation for this textual schema is a concern for 'balanced reporting': "Around here we give both sides, always", says the city editor to the young reporter (Méncher, 1977, p.52). Still, the scales of balanced reporting may tip one way or another: the different views may be modalised differently, for instance through the amount of space given to each view, or through their
position in the text (Who is given the first say, who the final word, and which view appears in the headline and/or lead paragraph? Which recontextualising agent is featured in the photograph? Who is quoted literally, and whose words are rendered as reported speech?) In the article from which 3.3:20 and 3.3:22 are quoted, for instance, the title includes, not the experts and officials quoted, but only the parent ('it can be tough on parents too'). Of the 16.7 column inches, the mother, Erja Immonen, gets 4, Dr Juan 6.2, and Mr Frank Meany of the Education Department gets 1.5. The mother is made thematic, and featured in the headline, the lead paragraph and the photo which illustrates the article. But the experts are given the final word - and they give, in the end, the teachers' point of view: 'Maybe they're right. After all, teachers are experienced in handling first-day problems and the parent's presence may be distracting.'

This does not exhaust the ways in which the credibility of a recontextualising agent can be enhanced or diminished. Example 3.3:24, for instance, first evaluates the 'fully decorated classroom' as nice and pleasant, to then quote a teacher who holds a different view. The implication is that this teacher's classroom is not nice and pleasant:
Jane’s classroom is bright with pictures and books; in the corridor outside is a colourful display of berries and gourds against an orange drape. The picture on the drawer she is given matches the one on her peg. The environment signals friendliness and welcome; it looks a pleasant place to be in. It is more likely to be so if it is not the first day back after the holidays when everything had to be taken down and packed away. Some teachers come in before the term starts to prepare an attractive setting for the children. Another put the opposite view: surrounded by bare walls she explained: 'I believe in concentrating on getting to know the children first.'

Not only the recontextualising agent, also the recontextualisation itself may be evaluated, as in the following example:

This book makes good first reading for those who intend to be teachers, and it may also be useful for those teachers who have had little experience with young children.

(2) Types of verbalisation and reaction
The meaning of many verbs of saying includes a modality feature: it makes a difference, for instance, whether an expert is said to ‘claim’ or to ‘point out’ that children ‘get anxious when you hurry them too much’, or whether a mother is said to ‘admit’ or merely to ‘say’ that she experiences anxiety. The names of utterance types, similarly, carry
modality values: in our culture 'stories' are not seen as quite as true as, for instance 'documents' or 'testimonies'.

Similar modality values cling to the mental processes which may project embedded recontextualisations. To 'see' carries greater credibility in our culture than to 'hear' ('only hearsay', we say), and the field of cognition verbs is finely graded for modality, from 'know', via 'think' to 'believe' and 'guess'. Affective processes leave the reality of the recontextualisations they project suspended. Thus 'poor children go to school', in the following example, is low in modality, as it is projected by the parents' hopes and desires, rather than recontextualised as actually occurring:

3.3:26 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.

But the modality values of most of these terms vary according to context. In some contexts, e.g. religion, 'belief' and 'knowledge' do not differ in modality, in others, e.g. science, they do. In Old Testament stories (e.g. Genesis 40, 41 and Daniel 2) dreams are seen as prophetic revelations; to psychoanalysts, on the other hand, they manifest wishfulfilment fantasies, while symbolist poets see them as carrying the truth of deeply felt emotions. In
confessional literature, the sense of smell can project recontextualisations of high modality, as in a poem by the Dutch poet J.B. Charles, who returns to his former classroom and 'smells the children who are no longer there' (high modality here translates as a quasi-physical sense of presence). In science smells may be declared untrustworthy, or even illusory, as in this quote from Galileo:

I do not find myself absolutely compelled to apprehend (objects) as necessarily accompanied by such conditions as that they must be white or red, bitter or sweet, sonorous or silent, smelling sweetly or disagreeably... I think that these tastes, smells, colours, etc. with regard to the object in which they appear to reside are nothing more than mere names... I do not believe that there exists anything in external bodies for exciting tastes, smells, sounds, etc., except size, shape, quantity and motion.

(quoted in Mumford, 1934, p.124)

Modality, then, relates, not to an absolute congruence between a recontextualisation and the reality to which it refers, but to social valuations of recontextualisations as more, or less real:

Logicians who talk of modality generally assume it to be a property of propositions, placing it, in Halliday's terms, in the ideational component. Halliday's theory recognises that modality is a matter of the relation of
the participants in a verbal interaction, hence squarely in the domain of the social, and that modal forms are the traces of the activity of speakers acting in a social context.

(Hodge and Kress, p.124)

Different social groups apply different criteria in deciding what counts as real and what does not. Kress and Van Leeuwen (1990), in a study of visual communication, relate this to Habermas’ account of socially determined validity criteria (1984) and to Bernstein’s concept of ‘coding orientation’: modality choices are generated by certain principles for determining what is real or true and what is not, and these principles, in turn, determine and are determined by social factors, by gender, class, age, ethnicity, and by the institutional setting in the context of which the choice is made. In the ‘naturalistic coding orientation’, for instance, the principle is empirical, based on perception, visual perception in particular: the more a representation can be seen as congruent with what can actually be observed, with the naked eye, in a specific, concrete situation, the higher its modality. Kress and Van Leeuwen discuss this in relation to visual communication, but it can be applied also to verbal communication. Newspaper texts adhere to it in their emphasis on the concrete and the specific:
'Every story must say something about people...There must be no abstractions' (Evans, 1972, p.17); and so do texts like And So to School (cf. e.g. example 3.3:24), with their predilection for concrete detail and narrative. In the 'scientific/technological coding orientation', on the other hand, appearances may deceive, and specific, individual differences are considered irrelevant epiphenomena. What matters here is 'what things are like' generally or regularly. In 'abstract coding orientations' (e.g. abstract art), similarly, reality is seen as 'deeper' than the surface, as an 'underlying' reality, an essence which must be brought out by the recontextualising agent, rather than that it is simply there, to be observed without mediation. In the 'sensory coding orientation' truth derives from feelings of pleasure or displeasure. What matters here is not the truth of a representation, but the honesty of the recontextualising agent and the 'deeply felt' -ness of the recontextualisation. Kress and Van Leeuwen have argued that the naturalistic coding orientation is (still) dominant in our society, a lingua franca all agents share, and apply, for instance, when they read newspapers or watch television, even when they apply a different orientation in, for instance, their work. In other words, the relation between the naturalistic coding orientation and the other coding orientations is similar to that between the restricted and
the elaborated code in Bernstein's code theory (e.g. 1971). The other coding orientations apply to specific fields (education, science, 'high' art, psychotherapy, etc.) and form a cultural capital (Bourdieu, 1986) with a restricted distribution.

(3) Tense
As first noted by Kress (1977), tense fundamentally affects modality. After all, 'what was' may no longer be, and 'what will be' may never come into existence, whereas 'what is' is. This also affects the projection of activities and reactions in embedded recontextualisations. Highly credible sources will be quoted in the present tense (we say 'The Bible says...', for instance). The example below, from a BBC publication entitled 'Early Years of School', uses both tense and saying verbs of different modality value:

3.3:27 A recent survey of playgroups in a deprived area suggested that involvement and participation 'is still something of a middle-class concept'. Yet much recent research indicates that almost all parents are concerned about their children's education, and anxious to be involved.

Text 3.3:24 provides another example ('Some teachers come in...', 'Another put the opposite view...').
Lexicalised modality
The credibility of an embedded recontextualisation may also become the subject of explicit discussion by the main recontextualising agent, through attributes, epithets, postmodifying elements, relative clauses and so on, which, with various degree of conceptual fusion, descriptivise the utterance itself as more or less 'believable', 'true', 'credible', and so on:

There is currently a proposal on record which seems at first to make a good deal of sense. It has been proposed by Christopher Jencks of the Center for the Study of Public Policy and is sponsored by the Office of Economic Opportunity. It proposes...(etc.).

Relations between recontextualisations of different social practices within the same text

Texts may not only contain alternative recontextualisations of the one social practice, they may also relate recontextualisations of different social practices to each other. In the course of this chapter I have already indicated several of the ways in which this can happen.

Preparatory practices
A text may involve the recontextualisation of
practices which form, one way or another, a preparation for the practice on which the text is principally focussing, a practice that ensures that the elements of the principal social practice (the participants, their dress, the places where the practice is to take place, the tools needed for it) will fulfil the criteria that make them eligible to be elements of that practice. The eligibility criteria of school dress in 3.3:29, for instance, the kind of clothes to be worn, their colour, the requirement that they be new, necessitate preparatory advice by the school principal and a shopping expedition:

3.3:29 Jane is up early, eager to put on her new grey pinafore dress and red jumper. These are the clothes suggested by her head teacher and purchased from a local chain store.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Head teacher suggests</td>
<td></td>
<td>*HEAD, MEDIAN new, grey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clothes*</td>
<td></td>
<td>pinafore dress and red jumper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(DEL) purchases clothes** from</td>
<td>local chain</td>
<td>**new grey pinafore dress and red jumper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chain store staff</td>
<td>store</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Preparatory practices may of course themselves become focal in a text. In some contexts 'going to school' may be recontextualised as a preparatory practice, as in the Illich text (3.3:1), where
'learning' is recontextualised as preparatory for the all-embracing practice of 'life' ('learning to love', 'learning to politick', etc.). In texts which focus on the preparatory activities of parents (teaching the child to tie its own shoelaces, to cross a road safely, etc.), these preparatory practices similarly become the principal focus of the text.

(2) Remedial and punitive practices
In 3.2.7 I discussed how remedial or punitive practices may be inserted into texts when activities or sequences of activities are inverted. Such practices may of course also become the principal focus of the text, as frequently happens in newspaper articles focussing on deviant behaviour. The following text states the deviant behaviour immediately after the lead, and then focusses on the remedial practice (which is featured also in the headline and the lead paragraph):

3.3:30 HOME VISIT SQUADS TO TEACH PARENTS
A specially trained squad of teachers will go into homes to show parents how to prepare their offspring for formal education. The teach-the-parents scheme will be given a test run next year. Premier Nick Greiner, speaking in Chicago, the first stop of his hectic American tour, said many parents did not have the knowledge to make sure their children were ready for school. He said he had been among thousands of mums and dads who had not known how to carry out their roles as the first teachers in their children's lives.
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. Some mothers and fathers might even take the courses before their children are born. (...) The government is also considering a screening process for parents who would volunteer to have their children assessed to their preparedness for school, as mothers take their tots to baby clinics to check their health.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>LOC.</th>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers*teach parents** Teachers meet parents (preparatory practices)</td>
<td>**home</td>
<td>**home</td>
<td><em>specially trained</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents volunteer (child assessment)</td>
<td></td>
<td>baby clinic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents take children to clinic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LOW before children are born</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(DEL) assesses children (for school readiness)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹This eligibility criterion recontextualises a preparatory practice: 'Education Department trains teachers'
(3) Legitimatory practices

Other practices may be recontextualised for the purpose of legitimating the practice on which the text is principally focusing. This would include practices serving to enhance the modality of a recontextualisation for instance recontextualisations of the research practices of an exper...

3.3:31 A comprehensive study of divorced partners was presented by Dr Constance Ahrons, a psychologist who is an associate professor at the University of Wisconsin at Madison. She released the preliminary findings of her five-year study, the Binuclear Family Project, which has tracked the post-divorce history of 98 pairs of former spouses who have children. Dr Ahrons's findings divided the divorced spouses into four groups, which she nicknamed the 'perfect pals', 'the co-operative colleagues', the 'angry associates' and the 'fiery foes'.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Psychologist studies 98 divorced couples with children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychologist finds four groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychologist names the groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychologist releases findings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Mark and Mandy, the children's book I already discussed in part 2 (text 2.4:1), the practice of visiting a Zoo is introduced for the purpose of legitimating schooling:
Miss Carter held up some large coloured pictures of animals. "Cat," "dog," "horse," shouted the children as they recognised the animals. "Bird," yelled Mandy as she saw a sparrow appear. "Good," said Miss Carter, "now what about this one?" and she held up a picture of a funny looking brown animal in a cage. "A monkey," called one little boy who remembered seeing a monkey cry when he had been taken to the zoo for his holiday treat. The poor thing could not reach a nut that someone had thrown him. "Well done," said Miss Carter for none of the others knew what it was and he looked so pleased.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>PLACE</th>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>TOOL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BOY (DEL) takes boy to Zoo</td>
<td>Zoo</td>
<td>Holiday</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Someone throws nut to monkey*</td>
<td>cage</td>
<td></td>
<td>nut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monkey cannot reach nut</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monkey cries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This story is but one of the ways in which Mark and Andy legitimates schooling as the transition from an animal-like to a truly human state (an old theme: Aristotle in The History of Animals, already wrote that young
children differ little from animals). By going to school, the child will have access to rewards that remain barred from monkeys forever. Thus an evolutionary discourse underpins the legitimation of schooling, as discourses about animals have also underpinned institutions of social differentiation in other societies. As Lévi-Strauss, commenting on Rousseau, has said in his book on totemism:

It is because man originally felt himself identical to all those like him (among which, as Rousseau explicitly says, we must include animals) that he came to acquire the capacity to distinguish himself as he distinguished them - i.e., to use the diversity of species for conceptual support for social differentiation.

(Lévi-Strauss, 1969, p.174)

It is perhaps not accidental that this happens in a 'lesson' which is essentially about language, here conceived of as naming animals, those 'first symbols' (Berger, 1980, p.7). Nor is it accidental that the 'one little boy' who knows the answer 'none of the others knew' does so because of an educational advantage: he has been taken on educative outings. In the chapter 'Your part in the partnership' from Your Child and Success at School, this is recontextualised differently:
When parents help teachers with excursions to museums, mountains or rock-pools, they get to share the learning experience and everyone has fun.

(Luck, 1990, p.56)
Chapter 4: The first day recontextualised for children, parents and teachers

In this final chapter I will present an extended analysis of three longer texts, using the methods introduced in the preceding chapter.

The children’s book *Mary Kate and the School Bus* has already been introduced in Part 2. It is the middle-class oriented story about the only child who ‘didn’t know any of the children’, but nevertheless ‘skipped along the path towards the open playground’ on her first day of school. The text is reproduced again in 3.4.1.

The second text addresses the parents of new entrants rather than the new entrants themselves. Entitled *Your Child and Success at School*, it is published by the Murdoch Press in a magazine-like format of which plate 4 (see over page) gives an impression, and distributed commercially via newsagents.

It contains chapters on ‘Preparing Your Child For School’ (‘the First Five Years’), ‘Choosing the Right School’, ‘The First Exciting Year’, ‘Working Well With Teachers’, ‘Study Methods and Supplementary Education’, ‘Safety And Nutrition’, and ‘Problems And Solutions’ (including ‘advice if you feel in
CHAPTER THREE

The First Exciting Year

PRACTICAL PREPARATIONS

Let us remember the first day of school in detail. Having tried your best to prepare your child mentally and academically for the life as a pupil, the "home" school and the "new" school experience, you now need to plan practically to ensure that the transition is as stress-free as possible. First, make sure that everything is in place before the first day of school.

There are many steps you can take to help your child feel comfortable and secure on the first day of school:

1. **Meeting the Teacher:** Arrange a brief meeting with the teacher before the first day to introduce your child to the new environment. This can help ease any anxiety your child may have about the unknown.

2. **Arrange a Meeting with the Teacher:** Before the first day of school, arrange a meeting with the teacher to discuss any concerns or questions you might have. This can help ensure that your child feels comfortable and supported.

3. **Prepare a Typical Day in School:** Prepare a typical day in school to help your child feel more comfortable. This can include packing a lunch, choosing clothes, and planning a routine.

4. **Establish a Routine:** Establish a routine for your child before school starts to help them feel more comfortable and secure. This can include waking up at a specific time, having breakfast, and packing a bag.

5. **Set Up a Study Space:** Set up a study space at home where your child can study and do homework. This can help them feel more comfortable and secure in their new environment.

6. **Provide Support:** Provide emotional support to your child before school starts. This can include offering words of encouragement, helping them feel more comfortable, and reassuring them of your love.

7. **Encourage Communication:** Encourage your child to communicate their feelings and concerns to you. This can help you understand their needs and help them feel more comfortable and secure.

8. **Prepare for Changes:** Prepare for changes in your child's routine to help them feel more comfortable and secure. This can include changes in their schedule, activities, and friends.

9. **Create a Support System:** Create a support system for your child before school starts to help them feel more comfortable and secure. This can include friends, family, and teachers.

By following these practical preparations, you can ensure that your child feels more comfortable and secure on the first day of school. Remember to be patient, supportive, and understanding as your child adjusts to their new environment.

The early years of school are full of exciting new puzzles, hope and games to explore.
danger of physically abusing your child'). A section from 'The First Exciting Year', entitled 'The First Day', is reproduced in 3.4.2 (each double page spread in the book contains a more or less self-contained section).

The third text addresses teachers. It is taken from a book titled And So To School, a study of continuity from pre-school to infant school, published by the (British) National Foundation for Educational Research, and widely used as a teacher training text, also in Australia. Ostensibly the book is a descriptive study, based on 'participant observation' and discussions with staff in a 'large number of schools'. But case histories and passages summarising different views alternate with lists of do's and dont's for teachers and the book is in fact as much a normative manual of instruction for teachers as a descriptive study. A section from the chapter 'The First Day' is reproduced in 3.4.3.

3.4.1 A Name and an Elephant

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

2. Miss Chesney was the Headmistress.
3. Mummy and Mary Kate had been in her office answering questions while she filled in a form.

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

5. The classroom had big windows, set high in the wall. 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.

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

7. 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.

8. 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.

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

10. 'Ah, there you are, Miss Laurie,' she was saying.

11. 'We have a new pupil this morning.'

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

13. 'This is Mary Kate,' she said, 'and this is her mother.

14. Mrs Williams, this is Miss Laurie.

15. She will be Mary Kate's teacher.'

16. 'How do you do,' said Mummy and Miss Laurie together, and then Miss Laurie said, 'Hallo, Mary Kate.

17. I'm so glad you've come to join us.
18. The others will be in soon.
19. Would you like to have a quick look round before they come, then I'll show you where to put your coat.'
20. Off went Mary Kate, to look in the playhouse.
21. 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.
22. On the dresser were dolly pots and pans and cups and saucers and plates.
23. 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.
24. Then she remembered that they were all at home, still tucked in their beds, while she was at school.
25. 'Mary Kate,' said Miss Laurie's voice.
26. The door of the little house opened and the teacher looked in.
27. 'Mummy's going now,' she said.
28. 'Come and say good-bye to her and I'll show you where to put your things.'
29. Mary Kate followed Miss Laurie and Mummy out of the classroom into the cloakroom.
30. There were pegs low down all round the wall and two little low-down washbasins.
31. Everything was just the right height for Mary Kate.
32. 'Good-bye, pet,' Mummy said, giving her a quick kiss.
33. 'I'll come and fetch you after school.'

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

35. 'Let me help you with your coat.'

36. Mary Kate looked at the peg.

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

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

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

40. The other pegs had names too, but Mary Kate's didn't.

41. 'Good,' smiled Miss Laurie.

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

43. I'll print out a name for you in a moment, but I'll find you a place in the classroom, first.'

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

45. 'You can sit here,' she said.

46. 'There's a drawer to put your things in and this is so you won't forget where you are.'

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

48. It was a picture of a red elephant, just like the one in the cloakroom.
49. ‘Now I’ll just get a card for your name,’ said Miss Laurie, looking in another box.

50. ‘Then I’ll go and ring the bell and let the others in.

51. Now, what shall I put on this card?

52. What do they call you at home?’

53. ‘Mary Kate,’ said Mary Kate, surprised, wondering what else they could call her.

54. ‘Right,’ said Miss Laurie.

55. ‘That’s what we’ll call you, then.

56. That way we shan’t muddle you up with the other Mary.’

57. Mary Kate said nothing.

58. She wasn’t sure she liked the idea of another Mary.

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

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

61. Then the children came in, talking and laughing and pushing at one another, struggling to hang up their hats and coats.

62. Mary Kate could see them through the open door of the classroom.

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

64. She hoped they weren’t all coming in, but they were.

65. They clattered into the classroom and made their way to their places, all staring at Mary Kate as they passed her.
66. Some carried satchels, some carried books and some had dolls and teddy bears.

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

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

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

70. ‘You’ve come, then,’ said the little girl.

71. ‘What’s your name?’

72. Mary Kate told her.

73. ‘I’m Susan,’ said the little girl.

74. ‘Susan Bates.’

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

76. ‘That’s Jane.

77. She lives next door to me.’

78. Then Mary Kate knew where she had seen Susan before.

79. She and Jane were two of the children who travelled on the school bus.

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

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

82. ‘Who’s she?’ he asked, nodding towards Mary Kate.

83. ‘Mary Kate,’ said Susan.

84. ‘She’s new.’
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.

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

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

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

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

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

Susan had to nudge her, to make her answer.

'You’re the last one,' said Susan.

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

Mary Kate liked being the last name on the register.

It made her feel special.

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

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

So Susan took the doll out of its cot and Mary Kate dressed it, with Mary Kate being mother and Susan being father and the milkman and the baker and the district nurse, who had to come because the doll baby was ill.

In the middle of the morning all the children had a little bottle of milk, just as Mummy said they would.
100. Mary Kate bent her straw and Miss Laurie gave her another.

101. 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.

102. 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.

103. She drew the playhouse.

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

105. ‘We haven’t had our dinner yet,’ she said.

106. ‘Don’t you want any?’

107. Mary Kate did want her dinner.

108. She ate it all and then she had two helpings of apricots and rice.

109. 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.

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

111. She was fast asleep on the floor by the doll’s house.

112. When she woke up the children were singing.

113. ‘This old man,’ they yelled, ‘He played one...’

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

115. Then it really was time to go home.
116. Mary Kate rushed into the cloakroom with Susan and there was Mummy, standing by the door.

117. Mary Kate ran to her and hugged her.

118. '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".

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

120. She's my best friend.

121. She says I can sit next to her on the school bus tomorrow.

122. Can I, Mummy?'

123. 'We'll see,' smiled Mummy.

124. 'Which is your peg?'

125. '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.

126. MARY KATE WILLIAMS, she had written, in big, round, red writing.

127. 'That's right,' said Mary Kate, touching the card with her fingertips.

128. 'That's my name'.

129. Mummy, did you know there's another Mary?

130. She's in my class...'

131. 'Is she?' said Mummy, picking Mary Kate's hat up from the floor.

132. 'Never mind.'
133. There’s only one Mary Kate.'

134. Mary Kate buttoned her coat up crooked.

135. 'Tomorrow I’m going to be father,' she said, 'and Susan’s going to be mother.

136. And I’m going to stick my blue cat in a book and write "cat".

137. Susan said I could.'

3.4.2 The First Day

1. Start the day with a nourishing breakfast eaten in a well-protected uniform, because in the excitement, your child may spill things.

2. The family can talk calmly and happily to her about the day ahead.

3. When she is ready with her school-bag complete with lunch box, pencil case, tissues and treasures, set off for school together with plenty of time to spare.

4. When you arrive at school, you may find several parents waiting with new children to go through the enrolment procedure.

5. Some of them may be friends from playgroup or pre-school.

6. Soon it is your turn and the principal greets you and your child warmly before filling in various forms.

7. Questions will cover medical and religious particulars and whatever the school needs to know to ensure teachers can contact parents quickly.
8. With these formalities over, your child will be introduced to her teacher and settled into class.

9. It is important for you to meet the teacher, so you have some idea of the person your child will be spending time with.

10. The teacher can also ask you anything he may need to know.

11. It helps to see yourself as the teacher’s partner who can support his efforts to steer your child through the primary skills of learning how to learn, the social skills of working in a group, and the motor skills and mental skills you may have established at home, which will all be developed further.

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

13. The essential teacher-child bond may form as a result of this type of introduction.

14. Parents often find that, if their child is having temporary difficulties with a teacher, it makes all the difference to have a constructive and informative chat about the situation.

15. This in turn can make all the difference to the child’s progress in school.

16. Your school will probably allow you to stay with your child for a while.

17. Certain independent schools ask parents to spend all the first morning with their child.

18. They also increase the time daily that the child is at school until she has adjusted to the change from home life to school life.
19. It would seem then that it is logistically possible to include mothers in the classroom, so if this is what you want, ask with confidence.

20. Who knows, you may set a precedent at the school if it has not been done before.

21. When I went to observe the first day in my local primary school, teachers were staggering enrolments over several days and some mothers of that day's new pupils were in the classroom.

22. A few sat and looked on while their children joined a group, others were at an activity table with their child.

23. It was a bright and busy atmosphere with a friendly and very efficient teacher who had set up activities for every child - puzzles, modelling, construction kits, easels with crayons and a 'kitchen'.

24. I talked to one mother, the youngest of whose three children had just begun that day.

25. She told me that she felt very sad at 'losing' this last one but she knew the feeling would pass.

26. She now had the opportunity to work on the patchwork quilting which was her favourite hobby.

27. She told me enthusiastically how she would be able to work uninterrupted to achieve a professional quality of workmanship.

28. I asked her how much she had been involved in school activities with the two other, older children.

29. 'In this small town the parents are very involved with the school. That is why we moved from the city.'
30. We teach crafts and help with school plays.
31. We take the children on outings and camps.
32. This teacher welcomes our help with the reading lessons, so that the children can have turns of individual attention.
33. I definitely feel that I am part of my children's education at this school.
34. I'm only sorry that such participation doesn't seem to happen at the senior's.
35. She told me that the parents' and Citizens' Association was very active.
36. It seemed as though I was having a glimpse of an ideal scene in a public primary school.
37. I watched the teacher bring out a massive picture book and engross the children by asking them questions as she read the story and turned the pages with an expert build-up of anticipation.
38. It was a good moment for mothers to hug their children and slip away.
39. I saw no parting tears.
40. 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.
41. So now, having kissed your child goodbye, you have those precious hours to yourself: relish them.
42. Spend them as you planned and trust your child to take up her new independence with confidence and pleasure.
43. Afterwards, when you come to collect her from the school, look at any paintings or models she has made.
44. Carefully pack them up to take home, after talking about them and how she made them.

45. Take her to say goodbye to the teacher, whom you might thank for taking care of your child all day.

46. Your interactions with teachers throughout school life can have a very positive effect on your child's attitudes.

47. After this you go for a quiet walk, somewhere that you can listen to her describing the day without interruption.

48. Some children, in response to the old question, 'How was school?' cannot separate out all of the events, so they reply, 'Oh, it was OK,' and they leave it at that.

49. Yet by being asked specifics such as, 'Did you make a new friend?' or 'What was the very best thing you did today?' your child may find it easy to launch into a vivid description of their day, because they may need a little direction to focus their memories.

50. The value of this after school conversation is threefold:

51. 1. It is an opportunity for your child to express joys and concerns and to share them with you.

52. This maintains the contact between you despite the daily separation.

53. 2. While responding to her stories, you also have a chance to detect any difficulties that you can help with, before they mount up.

54. For example, any perception difficulties, personality clashes or being asked to learn too fast or too slowly for her ability.
55. 3. It trains your child to memorise a
sequence of actions in her life and
helps her to develop her sense of time.

56. By now your child could well be showing
signs of exhaustion after a day of so
much stimulation, so a quiet celebration
of her first day at school might be a
viewing of her favourite video or
something special for afternoon tea (she
will probably be ravenous) or her
favourite meal and dessert.

57. Cleaning and preparing the lunchbox,
school bag and uniform can be
established as a routine now.

58. Leaving nothing for the morning, when
the rest of the family are so busy with
their own concerns, is an excellent
habit to establish.

59. It will become as automatic as cleaning
your teeth.

60. Whatever the routine you establish, try
to start as you mean to continue.

3.4.3 First Day At School

1. ‘Today I’m going to school.’

2. Jane is up early, eager to put on her
new grey pinafore dress and red jumper.

3. These are the clothes suggested by her
head teacher and purchased from a local
chain store.

4. Many infant schools now adopt this
practice.

5. Her mother makes sure Jane has a
substantial breakfast today, and instead
of a leisurely look at the paper gets
herself ready to take Jane to school.
6. On the way they pass the playgroup.

7. It is nearly two months since Jane last went there.

8. In fact, very few children enter school straight from preschool; most of them have had a break of at least two weeks.

9. The walk to school is longer for Jane but the route is familiar to her because, like most of our target children, she has visited the school before: on special occasions when her older brother was a pupil there and more recently when she was invited to see her new class.

10. While most schools arrange for parents and children to visit before entry, a few also invite local day nursery and playgroup staff to bring prospective pupils too.

11. In some cases the head deems a visit to be unnecessary especially where most of the children are transferring from the school’s own nursery class.

12. Jane and her mother have been asked to arrive at school at 9.30 a.m.

13. This means that the rest of the school are already settled and the head is able to greet each new pupil on arrival.

14. First, they are taken to the secretary who checks Jane’s address and telephone number.

15. Jane’s name is then ceremonially entered in the admissions register and she is given a name badge to wear for the morning.

16. This ceremony is designed to help the child feel she now belongs to the school.
17. The head personally escorts Jane and her mother to the classroom, holding Jane’s hand all the way and chatting pleasantly.

18. She introduces her to the teacher who greets Jane warmly and shows her a peg on which to hang her coat.

19. The peg has Jane’s name on it and a picture of a horse to help her identify it.

20. At this point, her mother kisses Jane goodbye and leaves, saying she will be back at 12 o’clock.

21. The teacher talks to Jane softly and unhurriedly, oblivious of the other 15 children present who are busy with tasks.

22. She shows Jane around the classroom, then settles her at a table with a picture to colour.

23. Five minutes later another new entrant arrives.

24. Jane’s induction into school was pleasantly calm, well-organized and trouble-free.

25. It contained four ingredients to make her arrival smooth:

26. Children were admitted one at a time.

27. The existing class was already settled.

28. The atmosphere was calm and quiet.

29. The child was given personal attention, made to feel she mattered and that the teacher had plenty of time for her.

30. Contrast this with Darren’s arrival:

31. It is the first day of term.
32. When the signal is given at 8.50 a.m. the infants line up to go into school.

33. Among them are 40 new entrants and their parents.

34. Inside, the corridors are teeming with children heading for their classrooms.

35. The new arrivals are uncertain where to go.

36. Eventually they find their way to the four reception rooms.

37. Darren, with his mother, father and baby sister enter his classroom.

38. His mother joins the queue to pay his dinner money to the teacher.

39. Darren stands alone surveying the scene.

40. Nine new entrants are gathered on the rug among bricks and construction toys.

41. His mother approaches and he pushes her away.

42. The teacher greets him, and his parents explain how he was used to being away at day nursery.

43. Darren bursts into tears and resists the teacher’s attempts to cuddle him.

44. He kicks and shouts, and eventually his parents leave.

45. He sits on the teacher’s knee while she reads everyone a story.

46. Gradually, his sobs subside and after 25 minutes he joins a group of boys building a tower.

47. There were three ingredients of Darren’s induction which may have contributed to his unease:
48. A large number of new entrants were admitted together.

49. They arrived while the rest of the school were on the move and corridors were congested.

50. The teacher was busy when they entered the classroom and could not give them personal attention till later.

51. But even in calm well-organized situations incidents can occur to upset the new arrival.

52. Rosalie, seeing a brand new slide, eagerly ran to try it out and sustained a nasty fall; after much cuddling and comforting from her mother she recovered her composure and settled down.

53. Eric, on the other hand, screamed so hysterically on his pre-entry visit that everyone feared the worst on his first day.

54. As soon, as his mother left, he made straight for a hollow play-cube and sat hidden inside it till he felt confident enough to come out and joint the group.

55. Our 36 target children responded to their induction into infant school in one of four ways:

56. They settled in from the first with no apparent problems.

57. They showed distress initially but soon recovered.

58. They appeared to settle initially but showed distress later.

59. They showed distress initially and from time to time later.

60. These responses are discussed in this and the next two chapters.
61. Like Jane, most children have set foot inside their new school before entry and some have already been introduced to their new school teacher.

62. But what does the teacher know of the child who is soon to be spending a third of his waking life with her?

63. Two out of three teachers remembered seeing the child before.

64. In one school, the reception teachers went to the nursery unit to see their prospective pupils, but the visit was so brief they failed to remember a single individual.

65. Children who had been seen around the school with their older siblings were more likely to be remembered.

66. Of those who came on a pre-entry visit, only half were specifically remembered by their teacher, the rest fading into obscurity.

67. Perhaps the child is more likely to remember the teacher than the teacher the child.

68. Some reception teachers have no more than a vague idea which preschool new entrants have attended, even when there is a nursery unit attached to their own school.

69. We found that some of our sample schools had absolutely no contact with any preschool provision in their area, nor did they want any.

70. Others made contact either deliberately or incidentally.

71. Incidental contacts occurred, for instance, when minders or playgroup helpers brought their own children to school and perhaps struck up an acquaintance with teacher or head.
72. Deliberate contacts took the form of telephone calls, invitations to visit and informal discussions.

73. These could be initiated by either side but more often were at the instigation of pre-school staff.

74. For example, a nursery school head went each term to local infant schools to discuss briefly the children who were transferring; the matron of a day nursery asked local head teachers if her staff could bring groups of ‘rising fives’ to see their schools; and a playgroup leader, inspired by the project’s study of continuity, decided to invite neighbouring primary school staff to watch her playgroup in session.

75. There are, of course, practical difficulties in exchanging visits between staff.

76. Some head teachers, believing their role to be educators of parents as well as children, gave talks to parents at local playgroups explaining the purpose of play materials and giving hints on how best to help their child.

77. This too has its problems since there are some pre-schools to which a head might not wish to be seen to lend approval.

78. Perhaps links between a school and its own nursery class or unit are the ones which are most easily taken for granted.

79. Yet in some schools these are little more than a myth as far as the reception teacher is concerned.

80. The most likely source of contact is the infant head who calls in from time to time.
81. Depending on its location, the nursery is accessible to infant staff too, but sometimes invisible barriers seem to keep them away.

82. Even that potential meeting place, the school staffroom, may be out-of-bounds to nursery staff, either because break times do not coincide or because of professional self-consciousness.

83. A teacher who is informed about her pupil's pre-school experience at least has a starting point for talking with him and will be able to avoid abortive attempts to question him about his 'play school'.

84. It might be useful to know that he can handle paints and scissors, has had experience of being in a group and sharing an adult's attention.

85. But many reception teachers do not wish to know these things or indeed anything about the child, preferring to regard him as a clean slate.

86. They feel this has the advantage of allowing teacher and child to discover each other for themselves, unbiased by the opinions of others.

87. More than half our sample schools received information about new entrants from the pre-schools and in most cases this was passed on to the reception teacher.

88. But this information was limited and haphazard in availability and content.

89. On the whole, very little was received from the playgroups unless informally by word of mouth.

90. It was not usually asked for, being regarded by some heads as 'suspect'.
91. A few local authority day nurseries made a point of sending a written report on each child, but it was not always clear what became of these.

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

93. Information from nursery education provisions tended to be of a more structured nature, particularly where the county’s official record card for each child began at nursery age and was added to each year.

94. This covered aspects like abilities and skills, language development and temperament.

95. Even these were ignored by those teachers who wanted to form their own impressions of the child first.

96. Parents too had mixed feelings about the passing on of records, fearing that their child could be labelled to his detriment.

97. They had no objections to records on progress and behaviour provided they had access to them.

98. They agreed that teachers should be forewarned about medical problems, but had reservations about divulging details of home background.

99. Every school requested a modicum of information from parents when their child started.

100. First, his birth certificate was checked.
101. Next, the parents completed an admission form with details of the child's name, address, telephone number, emergency contact, major illnesses and impairments.

102. A few were also asked about pre-school experience but not in detail.

103. Admission forms were usually available to the reception teacher if she wanted to see them.

104. It was thus with a minimum of information, if any, that the teacher greets the child on his first day at school and embarks on the delicate task of negotiating the teacher-pupil relationship.

105. Jane's classroom is bright with pictures and books; in the corridor outside is a colourful display of berries and gourds against an orange drape.

106. The picture on the drawer she is given matches the one on her peg.

107. There is a book, pencil and crayons ready for her.

108. The environment signals friendliness and welcome; it looks a pleasant place to be in.

109. It is more likely to be so if it is not the first day back after the holidays when everything had to be taken down and packed away.

110. Some teachers come in before the term starts to prepare an attractive setting for the children.

111. Another put the opposite view; surrounded by bare walls she explained, 'I believe in concentrating on getting to know the children first.'
112. The environment may be intended by adults to convey specific messages, but we do not know how effective they are.

113. One school with an eighty per cent immigration population displayed in the entrance hall a collage of multi-ethnic faces with the caption ‘Infants at Rose Street come from all over the world’.

114. What does this mean to the dark-skinned boy who has come from just down the road?

115. In another school, a reception class of Asians, Chinese and West Indians mounted a frieze of ‘Our Portraits’ in which the faces were cut out of pale pink card.

116. The pictures in the reading scheme were all of white children.

117. But do cultural anomalies like these matter?

118. The coloured five-year-old may already identify with the white world outside his family.

119. Sundar, a Ugandan Asian, resented his teacher because she was the only non-white member of staff.

120. His nursery nurses had all been white and he complained to his mother, ‘Why can’t my teacher be the same as everyone else?’

121. The familiar adults of pre-school have been left behind; teacher and child have to get to know each other.

122. Teachers have their own ways of trying to get the relationship off to a good start.

123. Jane’s teacher took her aside several times and spoke to her face-to-face, using eye contact and facial expressions to establish positive bonds with her.
124. Some teachers use physical contact, taking the child by the hand or putting an arm around him.

125. 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 Penny instead of Penelope.

126. 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 names.

127. Registration can also be used to encourage children to respond to their own names and to learn each other's.

128. The register is marked every session as a record of attendance.

129. It could be the child's first group experience in his new class.

130. Jane's teacher called Christian names only and did not worry if some failed to reply audibly.

131. Other teachers make it into a more formal occasion.

132. The children are expected to sit still and attentive, and to respond with a clear 'Yes, Mrs Brook'.

133. Many children have already made the acquaintance of 'register time' at playgroup of nursery where it often forms part of a conscious attempt to train children in listening and responding.

134. In group situations like this children react with varying degrees of shyness or showing-off.
135. Some appear overwhelmed and self-conscious, remaining silent at first.

136. One teacher feels she should try to draw these children out; another prefers to leave them alone to look on.

137. Some children are bumptious and over-confident; they behave inappropriately in group situations, talking loudly when everyone else is quiet or, like Ian, rushing forward to switch off the school television broadcast because he did not like the noise.

138. But formal group time is a powerful mechanism for social control.

139. Inappropriate behaviour meets not only with rebuke from the teacher but the tacit disapproval of everyone present.

140. Sooner or later even the most unabashed new entrant is obliged to conform.

141. The embarrassment which can be incurred by an individual in group situations is a potent weapon in the hands of a teacher who wants to shame a child in front of his peers.

142. But the skilful teacher can also save the new entrant’s face by showing herself to be on his side: ‘he’s not really crying, that’s just a noise he’s making.’

143. Tone of voice is particularly important, whether the teacher is addressing an individual or the whole class.

144. When another pupil needs a firm reprimand it is not easy to avoid upsetting a sensitive newcomer, and in the early days parents are regaled with tales of naughty children and angry teachers.
145. Some schools are remarkably peaceful, free from the loud signal systems and commanding adult voices which abound in others.

146. Several target children burst into tears when shouted at, or were distressed by sudden strange loud noises.

147. Children vary tremendously in the amount of reassurance they need and teachers vary in their willingness to give it.

148. While some staff believe the child should be encouraged to be as independent as possible, others coax him along with lavish praise, hugs of approval and the occasional Smartie.

149. Some teachers are especially aware of the child's need to find support among his peers, encouraging children to chat among themselves and make friends.

150. By contrast one teacher, overhearing her new pupils talking in Gujarati, tapped them smartly on the heads and told them to speak English.

151. Experienced teachers involve the whole class in supporting the newcomers.

152. Beginners are introduced by name, existing pupils are asked to look after them and sometimes are paired with them for the day.

153. Pairing can be a very successful way of eliminating minor anxieties and distress in new entrants.

154. It works best in classes which are vertically grouped: the new child is introduced to an older classmate who shows him where to go and what to do.

155. From time to time Jane's teacher paused to explain personally to her what was going to happen next.
156. But most of our target children entered school with a number of other beginners and explanations were given to the group or even the whole class.

157. On the first day there is a great deal for the newcomer to take in and the sheer volume of talk coming from the teacher is impressive.

158. Even the most sensitive explanations are fraught with new words peculiar to school: home base, plimsolls, shoe bag, dinner lady.

159. We saw bewilderment greet glib commands like 'line up' and 'not more than four at the sandtray'.

160. We observed baffled expressions at ambiguous questions like 'What do you want to say?' (meaning 'What do you want me to write under your picture?') and 'Where do you think this feather came from?' (eventual answer: 'The gutter'.)

161. One or two teachers took the new entrants on a tour of the school, showing them where everything was and introducing them to key figures on the way: 'This is Mrs Wells who cooks our lovely dinners' and 'This is where we come to see Mrs Neal if we have an accident'.

162. The mysteries of the dark alcove in the corridor and that something called 'The Hall' were revealed.

163. Throughout the trip the teacher answered questions and gave explanations: what the fire extinguisher is for, why the fishtank is bubbling, why the urinal makes such a loud noise.

164. Arrangements for going to the toilet can cause difficulties.
165. In schools where the toilets are a long way from the classrooms, visiting them becomes something of a ceremony.

166. At appointed times the children line up and are escorted to the toilets and back again.

167. This is not only time-consuming but means that the child must go at the required time whether he wants to or not; otherwise he has to be taken specially.

168. He may worry about this and be afraid to ask; if he has an accident he loses face in front of strangers.

169. Fortunate are the children in modern or adapted premises with facilities close at hand; easy access means they can go without having to ask.

170. Some children were perturbed by the unfamiliarity, the smell or the lack of privacy.

171. Not all of them were capable of managing themselves and one embarrassed child emerged with his trousers around his ankles.

172. Another was mystified by the teacher's constant use of the word 'lavatory' instead of toilet or loo.

173. Hand-washing arrangements were also diverse; there was the novelty of pressing taps instead of turning them and the fascination of water running into an open drain under the basins.

174. All these things were carefully explained by teachers who were able to see things through the eyes of a child.

175. The first task Jane was given to do was to draw a picture of her house and colour it in.
176. When she had finished, the teacher would write some words beneath it for her to trace over.

177. Most of our target children’s first tasks were like this.

178. Some teachers had set out a selection of toys and apparatus for the children to choose from when they first arrived, in a similar way to playgroup or nursery.

179. But sooner or later they were introduced to ‘work’, that is, a specific task usually related to literacy or numeracy, which they were expected to complete and have checked.

180. The task was introduced variously with the words: ‘Would you like to?’ or ‘I would like you to’, but either way the child had no option.

181. If a child demurred, two attitudes prevailed: one which said we all have to do things we don’t want to do, the other, that it’s all right this time but in future you will have to do it.

182. Teachers with vertically grouped classes expected new entrants to start work straightaway because if they were allowed to play the older children would want to do the same.

183. Most of the parents said that children of this age should start ‘working’.

184. Most of the target children settled to their work with a will, as if pleased to have something positive and productive to do.

185. They required frequent short bouts of encouragement and approval.

186. In order to get it, new children ignored queues and went straight to the teacher for immediate attention.
187. For the first few days they usually received it.

188. One or two children, having completed part of a task, did not know what to do next and would sit and wait idly as if afraid to move until told.

189. Children responded to work tasks in different ways.

190. Penny burst into tears every time work was mentioned; the teacher resolved this by pretending that everything was an activity to be chosen.

191. Rosalie was bossy and over-confident and frequently sought adult approval by telling tales; the teacher discouraged this by pretending not to hear.

192. Ian was unable to sit still for long and kept fooling around under the table to the annoyance of his companions; the teacher removed him to a place beside her desk.

193. Nadia, who could count to a hundred, was disgusted when told to copy the figures one to five; her teacher resolved the clash by promising her a hundred beads to thread on a string if she could complete her work first.


195. The concept of work brings with it the notion of getting it right and the child learns how to succeed...or fail.

196. Pippa, who had painstakingly coloured a purple teddy, was told scathingly, ‘Bears aren’t purple’. Sunil, unable to hold his pencil ‘properly’, was repeatedly told he was stupid.

197. By contrast, most teachers lavishly praised even the sketchiest efforts: ‘That’s lovely Debbie, you can show all the children.’
198. Failure may be learnt in a more subtle way.

199. Schools vary in the work materials they give to new entrants.

200. Some target children were delighted to be handed an exercise book with plain pages on which to write and draw.

201. Others were given paper at first and only acceded to a book on reaching a certain standard of neatness.

202. There seemed little incentive though for the boy who was given scraps of computer paper long after everyone else had a book.

203. The ability of new entrants to cope with work tasks varied considerably, ranging from those who could scarcely control a pencil to those who were soon drawing small pictures with neatly copied words beneath them.

204. This kind of ability seemed to be related, not only to pre-school experience, but to the availability at home of suitable materials with which to have practised.

205. When tasks were finished, children were usually allowed to choose from a limited selection of activities.

206. The new entrants responded to this in different ways.

207. Celia, who had come straight from home, seemed unable to decide what to do and wandered aimlessly about.

208. Most of the target children had been used to choice at pre-school, but nonetheless reacted with varying degrees of uncertainty and apathy.
209. Melanie sat for 20 minutes beside a construction set and built nothing; Wayne looked absently on at the others; Ruth kept asking if it was dinnertime and Sundar if it was home time.

210. Paul and Jenny decided to get acquainted and the following conversation was overheard:

211. Jenny: I’m bigger than you, I’m four.

212. Paul: I’m four.

213. Jenny: Look I’m bigger than you (moving to compare her height with his)

214. Paul: If you’re four and I’m four, we’re both the same size.

215. When this study was taking place, it was the practice for children in infant schools to be given free milk daily.

216. This came in bottles or cartons holding one-third of a pint.

217. The milk was drunk through a straw.

218. Children who had attended a pre-school had already been accustomed to drinks and biscuits being dispensed with more or less ceremony.

219. Milk or squash was usually drunk from beakers.

220. The reception teacher has to show new entrants how to make a hole in the milk-top and how to use a straw.

221. She has to cope with spills, smashed bottles and leaky containers.

222. Milk time is treated as a specific event in some classes and passes almost unnoticed in others.

223. Here are examples:
224. Milk is available on a table, each bottle labelled with a child's name.

225. Children help themselves and replace the empty bottle in the crate.

226. Drinking time is flexible: any time during the morning.

227. The children go a few at a time to the class 'shop' and buy a bottle of milk with toy money: milk 2p, straw 1p, a mat to stand the bottle on 2p.

228. The whole class are gathered on the rug.

229. The teacher names a colour and children who are wearing it fetch their milk.

230. Drinking time is used for the discussion of news.

231. Target children responded to milk time in different ways.

232. Although it was not compulsory, one or two children built up a dislike of milk which put them off going to school.

233. Some behaved inappropriately, walking about when they were expected to sit down to drink, handing the empty bottle to the teacher or leaving half the milk.

234. Others were very slow and did not know what to do when the straw bent.

235. One child asked for hot milk.

236. Milk time was usually followed by playtime, which is discussed in detail in the next chapter.

237. As the morning drew to an end, teachers employed various closing procedures; clearing up the classroom was popularly followed by a gathering of the children together for a story or discussion.
238. This was sometimes taken as an opportunity to reiterate the morning’s events.

239. It was during this time, when the child was sitting passively, that signs of fatigue became apparent: rubbing eyes, looking glazed, yawning, stretching keeping close to the teacher.

240. This occurred regardless of pre-school experience and was doubtless due to the bombardment of new stimuli.

241. By the time new entrants were putting their coats on, parents were already gathering outside.

242. Children who were staying all day prepared for dinner (see Chapter 10) and the rest were going home.

243. Over-anxious mothers filtered into the classrooms to confront weary teachers and it was then that communication gaps were exposed: the Indian mother who asked if her daughter had learned all she was supposed to received the exasperated reply that the child is only expected to do as she is told; the working mum who was concerned about being late to fetch her son was told that schools are for education, not babysitting.

244. But on the whole it had been a good morning.

245. Jane’s habit of sucking two fingers whenever she was unoccupied had been noticeably absent and most children went off chatting happily.

246. Minor hitches were soon dealt with: it’s the shoebag and not your shoes that must stay in school; your coat hasn’t really been stolen, you’re looking at the wrong peg; the pencil is really yours to keep in your drawer.

247. ‘Goodbye, see you tomorrow.’
248. While some children settled into school with no apparent difficulty, including one child who had also moved house five days earlier, the majority of target children showed signs of bewilderment, fatigue or distress, especially on the first day.

249. Particular sources of difficulty were:

- arriving during noise and bustle or in a hurry
- bewilderment at unfamiliar words and questions
- being bombarded with new information
- sudden loud noises, such as the school’s signal system
- teacher’s tone of voice
- the shock of strange situations away from the classroom, such as assembly, playtime, and dinnertime (see also Chapters 9 and 10)
- unfamiliar toilet arrangements
- undressing for PE
- fear of being last or left behind
- losing face in front of others
- apprehension about work tasks and the possibility of failure
- uncertainty about what to do next
- missing mother, friends, or preschool

250. Distress could be triggered by an accident or by a period of absence.

251. The key to smooth transition seems to lie in avoiding the shock of anything sudden in the way of sights, sounds or experiences, and in introducing everything gradually in an atmosphere of unhurried calm.

252. The following strategies are recommended for use in school:

- a staggered entry with a personal welcome for mother and child
- a calm and unhurried start after the rest of the school is settled
being prepared for the new entrant, having his things ready with his name on
- calling him by name and getting it right
- having a point of contact to begin a conversation with him
- having plenty of time for him, making him feel he matters
- allowing him the opportunity to look on at others from a secluded vantage point
- having foreknowledge of his particular problems
- being supportive of him in front of the other children and sparing him embarrassment
- encouraging other children to be supportive and kind
- pairing him with older children
- giving him lots of reassurance and praise
- explaining things carefully as they occur
- reducing loud commands and signal systems to a minimum
- giving him opportunities to make friends among his classmates
- explaining unfamiliar words and phrases
- showing him around and introducing him to other staff he will meet
- recognizing his need for frequent short bursts of attention
- placing him where he can watch older children in assembly
- letting him watch other children doing PE and getting changed
- make use of other children to help him get dressed or use scissors
- encourage him with a smart new set of work materials
- allow him a mid-morning drink or snack to combat fatigue
- be extra sensitive to his reactions after a period of absence or a disturbance in his homelife
253. The following additional hints are offered to parents:

- give your child a good breakfast and an unhurried start to the day
- have school-type pencils, crayons and scissors at home for him to practise with if he wants to
- don’t be over-anxious and harass the teacher when collecting your child for the first time, see how he is tomorrow
- send him to school as regularly as possible.

3.4.4 The power of the text: activities and reactions

As we move from Mary Kate, the children’s text, to Your Child, the text for the general ‘lay’ reader, and from Your Child to And So To School, the text written for intending specialists of education and situated in the context of tertiary education, there is more and more emphasis on reactions. The following table gives a quantitative summary of the analysis (a complete substitution analysis is included in appendix 3):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Reactions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mary Kate (</td>
<td>ACT + REACT= 238)</td>
<td>81 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your Child (</td>
<td>ACT + REACT= 207)</td>
<td>78 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>And So To School (</td>
<td>ACT + REACT= 858)</td>
<td>72 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.3: Proportion of activities and reactions in Mary Kate, Your Child, and And So To School
The reason for this is that each text supplies reactions for more of the participants: Mary Kate deals only with the reactions of the child, the new entrant; Your Child adds to this the reactions of the mother; And So To School those of the teacher. In addition the reactions of the children become more numerous as we move from Mary Kate to Your Child, and from Your Child to And So To School: the lower a participant’s place in the institutional hierarchy, the greater the concern with his or her reactions to the activities that make up the practice of the institution.

No reactions are supplied for participants who, in the given context, are invested with power. The mothers who read Mary Kate to their children, for instance, have, in that context, the power to send them to school, and a superior knowledge of what is going to happen to them, even of what they are going to feel — and, in accordance with this, the text they read does not disclose what mothers (what they themselves) feel when they leave their children behind in school and give them that ‘quick kiss’. In the business of counselling parents, on the other hand, experts, not McCarthy, have the power — and in the texts from this context we do read about the reactions of mothers as they say goodbye to their children, at the beginning of the ‘First Day’, ‘sad at losing them’.
And _So To School_, finally, the tertiary education text not only attributes reactions to the greatest number of different categories of participants, it also attributes more reactions to each category of participant than any of the other texts. In other words, the higher a context is in the hierarchy of social institutionalisation, the greater is its concern with reactions generally: concern with reactions is directly proportional to the _power_ of the text.

The table below gives the figures:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MARY KATE</th>
<th>YOUR CHILD</th>
<th>AND SO TO SCHOOL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>REACT</td>
<td>ACT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New entrant</td>
<td>79 %</td>
<td>21 %</td>
<td>67 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N=115;77;416)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>100 %</td>
<td>0 %</td>
<td>84 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N=17;86;51)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>98 %</td>
<td>2 %</td>
<td>86 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N=63;21;309)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

_Table 3.4:_ Proportion of activities and reactions for key participants in _Mary Kate, Your Child_ and _And So To School_

Whose activities are included? The following table gives an overview for the major participant categories (percentages below 2% have been omitted):
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MARY KATE (N=258)</th>
<th>YOUR CHILD (N=162)</th>
<th>AND SO TO SCHOOL (N=618)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>new entrant</td>
<td>37 %</td>
<td>32 %</td>
<td>46 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other children</td>
<td>22 %</td>
<td>0 %</td>
<td>2 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mother</td>
<td>7.5 %</td>
<td>44 %</td>
<td>7 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teacher</td>
<td>27.5 %</td>
<td>11 %</td>
<td>37 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>principal</td>
<td>4 %</td>
<td>6 %</td>
<td>5 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>preschool staff</td>
<td>0 %</td>
<td>0 %</td>
<td>4 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.5: Proportion of activities performed by different categories of participant in *Mary Kate, Your Child* and *And So To School*

The table shows that 'First Day' interaction between the children amongst themselves is represented only in the children's text. In texts addressing adults it is treated as irrelevant and minimally represented, or not at all. The table also brings out the incompatibility of the roles of mothers and teachers: all other participants may team up and become a 'we' with respect to certain activities, but mothers and teachers may not. And as the 'First Day' unfolds, for the most part, in the teacher's domain, the mother can only play a bit part, appearing briefly at the beginning and the end of the play, except in the case of *Your Child*, which concentrates on that bit part, and skips over the activities from which the mother is excluded.
3.4.5 Rational subjects and creatures of emotion: types of reaction

What kinds of reaction do our three tests attribute to the different participants of the 'First Day'? Tables 3.6, 3.7 and 3.8 respectively, show this for the 'new entrant', the 'mother' and the 'teacher'. Numbers of instances are very low in some cases, but for the sake of symmetry and easy comparison, I have represented them as percentages anyway.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NEW ENTRANT</th>
<th>MARY KATE (N=32)</th>
<th>YOUR CHILD (N=26)</th>
<th>AND SO TO SCHOOL (N=134)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cognitivation</td>
<td>31 %</td>
<td>23 %</td>
<td>34 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affectivated cognition</td>
<td>3 %</td>
<td>8 %</td>
<td>9 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affectivation</td>
<td>34 %</td>
<td>62 %</td>
<td>52 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptivated cognition</td>
<td>0 %</td>
<td>1 %</td>
<td>0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptivation</td>
<td>31 %</td>
<td>4 %</td>
<td>5 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.6: Types of reaction attributed to 'new entrants' in Mary Kate, Your Child and And So To School
The children's text, then, represents children as cognitive, affective and perceptive in about equal proportions. Mary Kate, the hero of the story, may be preoccupied with her hopes and desires, and with her fears and worries, but this does not prevent her from observing her new environment in detail, and from grappling rationally with the identity crisis occasioned by her discovery that there exists 'another Mary'. In the other two texts, however, the child is represented as reacting predominantly in an emotive way.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MOTHER</th>
<th>MARY KATE  (N=0)</th>
<th>YOUR CHILD  (N=14)</th>
<th>AND SO TO SCHOOL (N=10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cognitivation</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>43 %</td>
<td>30 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affectivated Cognitivation</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>7 %</td>
<td>0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affectivation</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>50 %</td>
<td>60 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptivation</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>0 %</td>
<td>10 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.7: Types of reaction attributed to 'mothers' in Mary Kate, Your Child and And So To School

So mothers, too, are depicted as creatures of emotion, both in Your Child and in And So To School. Comparing Tables 3.6 and 3.7, however, shows that mothers are nevertheless represented as somewhat more rational and somewhat less emotive than children.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEACHER</th>
<th>MARY KATE (N=0)</th>
<th>YOUR CHILD (N=3)</th>
<th>AND SO TO SCHOOL (N=102)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cognitivation</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>67 ‰</td>
<td>58 ‰</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affectivated cognitivation</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>0 ‰</td>
<td>5 ‰</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affectivation</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>33 ‰</td>
<td>29 ‰</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptivation</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>0 ‰</td>
<td>7 ‰</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.8: Types of reaction attributed to 'teachers' in Mary Kate, Your Child and And So To School

In the case of the teachers, then, cognitive mental processes dominate, as though greater power in the institutional hierarchy automatically leads to increases in cognitive and decreases (repression?) in emotive mental activity.

How many of the reactions are effective, recontextualised as caused by the activities of another participant, as in the case where the teacher 'engrosses' the children, or 'bewilders' them with 'ambiguous questions'? The answer is, often where children are concerned, sometimes where mothers are concerned, never where teachers are concerned. Although the new entrant in Mary Kate originates her own reactions (there is only one 'active mental process'), in both Your Child and And So To School 19% of the
child’s reactions are represented as caused by the activities of the teacher. And in Your Child 21% of mothers’ reactions are the result of the activities of others, mostly the teachers. In other words, the less participants are invested with power, the more their reactions are represented as effected by the actions of the social agents who have power over them.

We have seen that children’s reactions are often represented as negative: they ‘dislike’ loud noises, are ‘distressed’, ‘embarrassed’, ‘overwhelmed’, ‘worried’, ‘mystified’, ‘bewildered’ - the list goes on. Here are some figures:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NEW ENTRANT</th>
<th>MARY KATE</th>
<th>YOUR CHILD</th>
<th>AND SO TO SCHOOL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>POS</td>
<td>NEG</td>
<td>POS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitivation</td>
<td>70 %</td>
<td>30 %</td>
<td>83 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N= 10;6;45)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affectivation</td>
<td>54 %</td>
<td>46 %</td>
<td>57 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N= 11;16;89)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptivation</td>
<td>80 %</td>
<td>20 %</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N= 10;0;0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.9: Negative and positive reactions of ‘new entrants’ in Mary Kate, Your Child and And So To School
These figures show that *And So To School* is least confident of children’s cognitive abilities: teachers are taught, it seems, to have few expectations of their future charges in this respect. The child in *Mary Kate*, on the other hand, seems to be able to work at least some things out for herself. Negative reactions are also attributed to other participants, to the mother for instance (43% in *Your Child*, 17% in *And So To School*), and to teachers whose reactions are for 43% negative/affective in *Your Child*, and for 46% in *And So To School*: there is much trauma attached to the ‘First Day’.

Finally, what do the participants predominantly react to? To begin with the cognitive reactions, in *Mary Kate*, the child:
- remembers what she had to leave behind (dolls, tucked in bed);
- thinks about the problem of her identity;
- tries to ‘place’ the children she meets in the classroom.

In other words, the objects of her cognitive activity have nothing to do with the activities organised by the teacher (these occur as phenomena only in lines of dialogue by the teacher, e.g. ‘this is so you won’t forget where you are’), but are represented as the child’s own business.

On the other hand, in *Your Child*, the child:
- learns (e.g. ‘learning how to learn’).
In other words, the child's cognitive activities relate to what her mother hopes will make school worthwhile, proper 'learning'.

In And So To School, finally, the child also learns, but here the learning is not a learning of 'subjects', but a learning of the routines and disciplines of school life: the names of other children, the places where things are kept, the protocols of 'register time'. In the text for teachers, this kind of learning takes precedence over the learning of 'subjectmatter'!

Turning to the cognitive reactions of mothers, in Your Child they:
- know their child;
- can detect its problems;
- know what will help them with their own feelings of loss (e.g. 'that the feeling will pass').

In And So To School, mothers:
- believe that children should 'work' in school.

Here, then, mothers' knowledge of their own children is treated as irrelevant, and remains unrepresented. The teachers' knowledge, however is represented: they are said to 'know' their charges, and also to know things about them - 'information' and 'records' which are 'passed on from preschool'.
Turning now to affective reactions, the child’s affects in Mary Kate center around the same phenomena as her cognitions:
- the question of her identity (she ‘wasn’t sure whether she liked the idea of another Mary’);
- the dolls at home (she ‘wished she had brought her Teddy to school’);
- the other children (she ‘hoped they weren’t all coming in’).

Quite different reactions are attributed to the child in Your Child, where positive affects towards more or less organised school and home activities abound, as well as enthusiasms, pleasures and joys not connected to a specific phenomenon, perhaps to reassure the mother that she can confidently leave her child behind in school and ‘relish those hours by herself’.

In And So To School, finally, practically anything can worry or upset the child: sudden loud noises, assembly, playtime, dinnertime, PE, ‘work’. From the point of view of the teacher, the child is always liable to react ‘wrongly’, although children are also said to ‘like’ the well-decorated classroom and the new materials they are given to work with, and to be ‘fascinated’ by details like ‘water running in an open drain’.

As far as mothers are concerned, in Your Child they feel ‘sad’ at ‘losing their child’, while in And So To School their affective reactions are restricted to their
dealings with teachers and to their suspicions about the 'records' kept in schools. The only affect attributed to teachers, both in *Your Child* and in *And So To School*, is the 'need' for information about their charges - in *And So To School* this also involves their feelings (often negative) about liaising with preschools.

To turn, finally, to perceptions, in *Mary Kate* the child perceives her new physical environment, but not what the teacher says or does. In *And So To School*, on the other hand, the child's perceptions do concentrate on what the teacher says and does, and its attention is in fact fully taken up by the 'bombardment of stimuli' and the 'enormous volume of talk' coming from the teacher.

All this shows, I hope, that different recontextualisations of the same practice can represent the reactions of the same participants in the same episodes in ways that are not only very different from, or even diametrically opposed to each other, but also closely related to the concerns of the recontextualising context (to the desire to reassure mothers, for instance) and to different views of what motivates the behaviour of the different participants.
3.4.6 The silence of Mary Kate and other uses of semioticisation

Mary Kate, the children’s story, often semioticises the activities of ‘going to school for the first time’, representing them, not as ‘done’, but as ‘said’, announced, ordered, verbalised as they are performed, and so on: "Here is a drawer to put your things in"; "Remember that your hat and coat are hanging under the red elephant". In the other two texts this is less often the case:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mary Kate n=226</th>
<th>Your Child n=151</th>
<th>And So To School n=574</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Materialisations</td>
<td>47 %</td>
<td>73.5 %</td>
<td>60 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semioticisations</td>
<td>53 %</td>
<td>26.5 %</td>
<td>40 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.10: Proportion of materialisations and semioticisations in Mary Kate, Your Child, and And So To School

To some extent this is, of course, a matter of genre: Mary Kate is, after all, a story, and many stories use dialogue to dramatise events. However, in this case it is a matter, not so much of dialogue as of monologue - monologues by the teacher and by Susan, the classmate the teacher has selected to look after Mary Kate - and it also leads to a particular version of what happens on the ‘first day’, a version in which the child is
spoken to (spoken at) by the teacher and Susan, but never says anything herself. Mary Kate just ‘looks at the peg’, ‘wished she had brought her Teddy’, and ‘says nothing’, or, on the rare occasions when she does say something, is not quoted verbatim (‘Mary Kate told her’, ‘Mary Kate did want her dinner’). Only at the very end of the story, when Mary Kate is released, and walks home with her mother, does she at last gain a voice. Thus the story is told, to a large extent, in the voice of the teacher, while the child, ostensibly the hero of the story, remains silent.

There is an asymmetry here. In Your Child, the text addressing mothers, we hear the voice of the mother: the text suggests wordings, formulas mothers should use in addressing their children (‘By being asked specifics such as "Did you make a new friend?" or "What was the very best thing you did today?" your child may find it easy to launch into a vivid description of their day’). In And So To School, the text addressing teachers, we hear the voices of teachers addressing their charges (‘introducing them to key figures on the way: "This is Mrs Wells who cooks our lovely dinners", and "This is where we come to see Mrs Neal if we have an accident"). But in the text addressing children, we do not hear the voice of the child, because school has silenced that voice.
Table 3.11: Sayers of the Quotations and Renditions in Mary Kate, Your Child and And So To School

Your Child and And So To School contain considerably fewer Quotations and Renditions than Mary Kate. Semiotic activity is here recontextualised as activity, without any mention of what the activity is about. Teachers 'chat pleasantly' or 'talk softly and unhurriedly'; children write, draw, or sing without us learning what it is they write, draw, or sing. The semiotic activity of children especially is also represented as non-transactive behaviour, as communication with, not only nothing to communicate, but also no one to communicate to, as 'expression' which forms no 'impression', except perhaps in the form of the teacher's praise ('That's lovely, Debbie') or blame.
('Bears aren't purple'). The teachers' communicative activities, even when they don't project content, at least tend more often to have a recipient. They are 'interactionalisations' rather than 'behaviouralisations', 2-participant processes, hence instances of communication, rather than 1-participant processes.

The following two tables show (1) the percentage of semioticisations which do and the percentage of semioticisations which do not project content, and (2) who the Actors are of the 1-participant and 2-participant non-projecting semioticisations, the expressive and interactionalised semioticisations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MARY KATE n=114</th>
<th>YOUR CHILD n=40</th>
<th>AND SO... n=232</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Projecting</td>
<td>84 %</td>
<td>72.5 %</td>
<td>49 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-projecting</td>
<td>16 %</td>
<td>27.5 %</td>
<td>51 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.12: Projecting and non-projecting semioticisations in Mary Kate, Your Child and And So To School
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>EXPRESSIVE SEMIOTICISATIONS</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th><strong>INTERACTIONALISED SEMIOTICISATIONS</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MARY KATE n = 19</td>
<td>YOUR CHILD n = 3</td>
<td>AND SO... n = 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child</td>
<td>37 %</td>
<td>33 %</td>
<td>52.5 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School staff</td>
<td>21 %</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>32.5 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>33 %</td>
<td>2.5 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Susan'</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other children</td>
<td>42 %</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preschool staff</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12.5 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 3.13:** Actors of expressive and interactionalised semioticisations in *Mary Kate, Your Child* and *And So To School*

When, in *And So To School*, children do communicate to their teachers, this is recontextualised, not through quotation or rendition, or field or genre specification, or even expressive or interactionalised semioticisation, but through symptomatisation. In other words, the children are represented as not deliberately communicating, but as involuntarily sobbing, yawning, stretching, rubbing their eyes, showing signs of bewilderment or distress, etc. - symptoms which the teacher can then interpret. This, in *And So To School*, makes up 5% of the semioticisations.
An element of bureaucratic language appears in *And So To School* when the (apparently not very cordial and cooperative) relations between preschools and infant schools are discussed. Here semioticisation is instrumentalised. Teachers 'give talks', preschools staff 'provides sources of contact', 'supply information', 'send written reports' and so on.

3.4.7 **Materialisation: acting versus interacting**

Table 3.14 shows that *Mary Kate* contains more instrumental actions than the other two texts, more emphasis on transactions with the physical world, either by the teacher or the children. There is an interest in objects here, and in places, and in physical actions. We read in detail how the teacher 'looks in a box', 'takes a card out of the box', 'fixes the card firmly to a corner of the table with four big drawing pins' and so on. This kind of detail is, for the most part, skipped over in the other two texts.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mary Kate n=107</th>
<th>Your Child n=110</th>
<th>And So To School n=342</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental</td>
<td>43 %</td>
<td>29 %</td>
<td>26 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioural</td>
<td>36 %</td>
<td>48 %</td>
<td>46 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactional</td>
<td>13 %</td>
<td>16 %</td>
<td>18 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumentalised</td>
<td>8 %</td>
<td>7 %</td>
<td>10 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.14: Types of materialisation in Mary Kate, Your Child and And So To School

Instrumental actions and behaviouralisations are especially connected with the least powerful participants, the children, and also the mothers. Their activities are recontextualised as non-transactive behaviours, or as instrumentalised, that is, as impinging on the physical, but not on the social world. Thus they act in the presence of and for the more powerful participants without interacting with them. Teachers, on the other hand, do engage in interaction: they 'admit', 'enrol', and 'induce' children, and so on, and, indeed, at times these interactions are instrumentalised, as when they 'pair', 'group', 'line up' or 'place' the children, for instance. Needless to say, it is always mothers and children who are the
Goals or Recipients in relation to these interactionalisations and instrumentalisations. The tables below provide some figures, concentrating only on the 3 main groups of participants (for this reason the percentages do not always add up to 100):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BEHAVIOURALISATION</th>
<th>INSTRUMENTAL ACTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MARY KATE n=39</td>
<td>YOUR CHILD n=53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child</td>
<td>56 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>5 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>10 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AND SO... n=157</td>
<td>MARY KATE n=46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child</td>
<td>88 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>6 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>5 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AND SO... n=90</td>
<td>YOUR CHILD n=32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child</td>
<td>39 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>23 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AND SO... n=32</td>
<td>68 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 3.15:** Actors of the behaviouralisations and instrumental actions in Mary Kate, Your Child and And So To School.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INTERACTIONALISATION</th>
<th>INSTRUMENTALISATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MARY KATE n=14</td>
<td>YOUR CHILD n=18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child</td>
<td>43 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>14 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>43 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AND SO... n=63</td>
<td>MARY KATE n=8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child</td>
<td>33 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>6 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>61 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AND SO... n=32</td>
<td>YOUR CHILD n=7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child</td>
<td>17 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>8 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>70 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AND SO... n=32</td>
<td>25 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>57 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 3.16:** Actors of the interactionalisations and instrumentalisations in Mary Kate, Your Child, and And So To School.
In *Mary Kate*, the other children’s (including Susan’s) interaction with Mary Kate is not interactionalised. While the teacher ‘meets’ and ‘greets’ Mary Kate, the other children ‘stare’ at her, ‘nod towards’ her, ‘come and stand next to her’, and so on. They are depicted almost as though they are animals sniffing at each other, rather than humans engaging in social interaction - as less human, therefore also, than the teacher. Thus it is only in her interaction with her mother that Mary Kate can truly ‘interactionalise’. However much this story, on the surface, takes the side of the teacher, and tries to convince its young readers that school will be attractive and pleasant, deep down in the grammar old fears and apprehensions lie buried - and remain buried, even in adult life.

3.4.8 Objectivating and descriptivising the child

It is not surprising, of course, that a children’s story such as *Mary Kate* should focus on action and represent activities as activities, whereas texts like *Your Child* and *And So To School*, texts which blend narrative (the ‘case story’) with the expository (generalising discussion) and the hortatory (advice, suggestions) tend to objectivate and
descriptivise activities and reactions, recontextualising them as things and ‘permanent’ qualities, rather than as transitory actions. Table 3.17 gives a quantitative overview:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MARY KATE n=266</th>
<th>YOUR CHILD n=220</th>
<th>AND SO TO SCHOOL n=857</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Activation</td>
<td>86 %</td>
<td>38 %</td>
<td>43 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De-activation</td>
<td>14 %</td>
<td>62 %</td>
<td>57 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.17: Activation and de-activation in Mary Kate, Your Child and And So To School

However, de-activation is not just a function of genre. It plays a role in representation also: table 3.18 shows clearly that the activities and reactions of the least powerful participant, the child, are most frequently objectivated and descriptivised. Even in Mary Kate this effect can be observed:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Child</th>
<th>ACTIVATION</th>
<th>DE-ACTIVATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MARY KATE</td>
<td>82 %</td>
<td>18 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=125)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOUR CHILD</td>
<td>23 %</td>
<td>77 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=77)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AND SO...</td>
<td>39 %</td>
<td>61 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=428)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARY KATE</td>
<td>93 %</td>
<td>7 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=75)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOUR CHILD</td>
<td>57 %</td>
<td>43 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=35)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AND SO...</td>
<td>47 %</td>
<td>53 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=344)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARY KATE</td>
<td>87 %</td>
<td>13 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=15)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOUR CHILD</td>
<td>52 %</td>
<td>48 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=37)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AND SO...</td>
<td>50 %</td>
<td>50 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=49)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.18: The de-activation of children, teachers and parents in *Mary Kate, Your Child* and *And So To School*

Table 3.19, finally, charts the incidence of the different kinds of de-activation in the three texts, and shows that 'true' objectivation and descriptivisation occur much less often in *Mary Kate* than in the other two texts: most of the de-activations in *Mary Kate* are semi-objectivations,
activities and reactions recontextualised through nonfinite verb forms. In Your Child and And So To School the de-activations are mostly 'true' objectivations, descriptivisations, and displacements ('the day', 'the scene', 'the situation', etc.).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mary Kate n=38</th>
<th>Your Child n=177</th>
<th>And So To School n=540</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Semi-objectivation</td>
<td>68 ½</td>
<td>25 ½</td>
<td>34 ½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objectivation</td>
<td>11 ½</td>
<td>44 ½</td>
<td>36 ½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Descriptivisation</td>
<td>21 ½</td>
<td>16 ½</td>
<td>20 ½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Displacement</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15 ½</td>
<td>10 ½</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.19: Types of de-activation in Mary Kate, Your Child and And So To School

Which are the kinds of activities and reactions that tend to be de-activated? Objectivations, first of all, are of four kinds:

(1) Names for the social practice as a whole (induction, entry, admission) or for episodes of the social practice (the visit, the breakfast, the walk, the arrival, the enrolment, the registration, etc.).
(2) The speech acts of teachers and parents, that is, of the more powerful participants in the interaction, the adults in charge in a given episode (question, conversion, discussion, explanation, direction, rebuke, reprimand, approval, praise, etc.).

(3) The reactions of the children (joy, excitement, dislike, bewilderment, apathy, distress, fatigue, exhaustion, etc.). In And So To School, the de-activation typically goes through two stages: in a 'case story' the reaction is activated ('Penny burst into tears every time work was mentioned') or descriptivised ('he may be afraid to ask'), then, in the summary, it is objectivated ('apprehension about work tasks').

(4) Highly generalised activities of the children (e.g. motor skills, mental skills).

Descriptivisations again focus on the child's reactions, in attributive clauses which either have the child as Carrier ('Rosalie was overconfident') or the Phenomenon to which the child reacts ('the setting looked attractive') or in identifying clauses ('the place signals friendliness') or Epithet-Thing constructions ('an attractive setting') that fulfil the same function.
The use of semi-objectivation is less easily classified, although there is, in *And So To School*, a tendency to use it for turning interactions (or interactive actions) into techniques: by holding hands, using eye contact, etc. The activity is then doubly recontextualised, in a generalised way, which may also recontextualise purpose, and in a more specific way which recontextualises 'means', e.g. 'the teacher resolved this by pretending not to hear'.

Labels (e.g. mechanism, ritual, ceremony, procedure) help create a focus on procedure, on the form of the 'first day', and temporalisations (e.g. register time, milk time, group time) a focus on time: they are much more common than spatialisations such as, e.g., 'group situation' in these texts.

Overall, then, two factors seem to govern the use of de-activation:

(1) The reification of children's reactions. These reactions are made the real object and focus of the 'first day' as recontextualised for and from the point of view of adults. It is as if every single adult activity is motivated by a real fear of how children might react to school, as if indeed their reactions represent the spectre of chaos and loss of control, of a threat against the order of things.
(2) The codification of the 'first day'. The day must go through a well-ordered sequence of stages, known to and named explicitly by teachers and parents. The teachers' and parents' interactions with the child must not only be fitted into these stages but also become objectivated themselves. Where disorder is feared, activations seem slippery and evasive, difficult to get a grip on, in need of the immobilisation, capture and control which objectivation affords in discourse.

3.4.9 Agentialisation and the possibility of control

All three of the texts recontextualise what goes on during the 'first day' as agential, as engendered by human agency. Perhaps this is no wonder. The texts aim to regulate behaviour, aim to make sure that the participants of the 'first day' practice will do what is needed to effect 'smooth transition'. They are concerned with the possibility of control over the practice. To represent the practice as an event outside human control, or to existentialise or naturalise it, would be counterproductive.
Table 3.20: Agentialisation and de-agentialisation in Mary Kate, Your Child, and And So To School

Nevertheless, some de-agentialisations do occur. Mary Kate represents some of the teacher's activities as events: the door opens rather than that the teacher opens the door, for instance, and the bell goes, rather than that the teacher rings the bell. And So To School mostly agentialises the 'problems', 'hitches' and 'difficulties' which occur, but it also has incidents and events occurring, embarrassment being incurred, signs of fatigue appearing, and episodes such as milktme passing almost unnoticed.

3.4.10 Abstraction as the realisation of purpose and legitimisation

Mary Kate, the children's story, contains practically no abstractions. The few that do occur abstract the interactive dimension from
the activities - e.g. 'enter school' is recontextualised as join us in quotations from both Miss Laurie, the teacher, and Susan, the girl the teacher delegates looking after Mary Kate to. In And So To School and Your Child, however, abstraction is more common, as might be expected in texts which go beyond telling a story and also generalise and interpret the events represented.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MARY KATE n=257</th>
<th>YOUR CHILD n=209</th>
<th>AND SO TO SCHOOL n=865</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Concretisation</td>
<td>99 %</td>
<td>75 %</td>
<td>83 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abstraction</td>
<td>1 %</td>
<td>25 %</td>
<td>17 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.21: Concretisation and abstraction in Mary Kate, Your Child and And So To School

The most frequent abstractions in Your Child and And So To School are the following:

(1) The abstraction of time or duration from the represented activities, as, e.g., in the day ahead, the first day, spend time with, spend a third of his life with, group time, playtime, drinking time, etc. Learning to organise time, and learning to think of activities in terms of schedules and time frames is evidently an important part of
school and schooling, and hence a crucial purpose added to recontextualisations of this practice.

(2) The abstraction of the interactional quality or purpose from the represented activities, as, e.g., in be involved with, participate, join, maintain contact, establish bonds, negotiate relationships, etc. Interaction, socialisation into a hierarchically stratified Gesellschaft is another key theme in the practice of schooling, and hence also in recontextualisations of that practice.

(3) The abstraction of the degree of predictability and repetitiveness of the recontextualised activities, episodes, or practice, through terms like ceremony, ritual, procedure, routine, habit, etc. Learning to cope with routines and to form habits, and learning to structure events explicitly, to proceduralise social action, is another key theme of schooling, as well as a key concern of the 'first day', where ordered procedure must contain the threat of chaos represented by the 'untamed' child.

(4) The abstraction of the concept of 'nurture' from the activity of 'teaching'. This occurs especially in And So To School,
through terms like develop, stimulate, etc. Indeed, in the final chapter of *And So To School* the theme is made explicit:

When a seedling is transplanted from one place to another, the transplantation may be a stimulus or a shock. The careful gardener seeks to minimise shock so that the plant is re-established as quickly as possible (...) Children, like plants, are different and respond to change in different ways (...) The findings suggest ways in which such symptoms may be treated and shock minimized or avoided...

(*And So To School*, p.195)

Terms like these suggest a legitimation for the practices of schools and teachers, just as the earlier examples of abstraction suggested what the purposes of these practices might be: the imposition of an order of time and an order of social intercourse on the new entrant.

3.4.11 Overdetermination: inversions and remedies

While *And So To School* introduces 'nurture' as a legitimatory concept, *Your Child* introduces the concepts of building and constructing in relation to the activities of the mother and the teacher, and of exploration in relation to the activities of
the child. These are symbolisations rather than abstractions, concrete images which nevertheless relate the activities to which they refer to other practices. They lack the dimension of containment and control which forms part of the 'nurture' concept, and are more expansive, testifying to the way mothers might hope education will empower their children.

Most overdeterminations, however, are inversions. Inversions occur a great deal, especially in And So To School, a text which is deeply concerned with all the things that can go wrong on the 'first day':

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MARY KATE n=257</th>
<th>YOUR CHILD n=209</th>
<th>AND SO TO SCHOOL n=865</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>single determination</td>
<td>98 %</td>
<td>90 %</td>
<td>64 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inversion</td>
<td>2 %</td>
<td>8 %</td>
<td>36 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>symbolisation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2 %</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.22: Types of overdetermination in Mary Kate, Your Child and And So To School

The difference between Mary Kate and the other two texts is striking. In Mary Kate, the new entrant's behaviour is often inverted, she 'doesn't hear' when she is supposed to respond, 'doesn't remember' when
she is supposed to recognise, and she 'keeps tripping over', 'buttons up her coat crooked', etc. But, with one exception (Susan 'nudges her to make her answer' during register time) no-one does anything to correct her behaviour. In *Your Child*, and, especially, in *And So To School*, inversions are almost always followed by the remedial activities which must ensure that the 'first day' gets on the right track again. If in *Your Child* the child does not, as she is supposed to, 'describe the day' when walking home with mother, the mother will intervene with a strategically worded question, after which the child will 'launch into a vivid description'. In *And So To School* the teacher is held responsible for everything children do wrong, even things that are recontextualised as accidents and mishaps. Always the teacher must 'resolve the problem'. In fact this text inverts not just the behaviour of children, but also that of teachers, and that of mothers. Not only are there children who 'sit idly', 'build nothing', 'look on absently' when they should 'participate' and 'join the group', there are also teachers who 'upset the child' when they should 'show the class to be on his side', 'shout at children' when they should 'give reassurance', ask 'ambiguous questions' when they should provide 'sensitive explanations', and so on. And they are especially blamed for failing to take an interest in the vital information about new entrants which
preschools can provide. Parents, similarly misbehave, by being ‘overanxious’, ‘confronting weary teachers’ with stupid questions, and so on. Parents and teachers, however, must remedy their own behaviour - and the chapter ends with long lists of suggestions as to how they might do this.

3.4.12 Generalisation: labelling episodes and classifying alternative activities

A generalisation analysis of the three texts (cf. Appendix 3) does not capture levels of generalisation in any absolute sense. But, where the text refers to the same activity or set of activities at different levels of generality, generalisation analysis can show us how the text uses generalisation to create implicit taxonomies and to give what would otherwise remain a string of fleeting events the status of a distinct episode. In Mary Kate generalisation is mostly used for the latter purpose: the subordinates in the taxonomies are not cohyponyms, activities which all belong to the same class of activities (e.g. activities which could be generalised as ‘meeting the teacher’), but comeronyms, the parts of a sequence which, as a whole, can be, and is, referred to by means of a generalised label (e.g. as ‘meeting the teacher’: ‘She was taking them... to meet her teacher’). The taxonomies are
(sequentialised) temporal composition taxonomies, and they serve to label episodes.

Episode labels, in *Mary Kate* as in many other *First Day* children's stories, are often introduced by the adult characters, especially the teacher, as they explain to the 'new entrants' what will happen next ('I'll show you where to put your things'). In this way the labels could be said to give both the children in the stories and the young readers of the stories some conceptual grip on the string of individual events. But the writer of *Mary Kate* does not seem to have been overly concerned with labelling episodes. Episodes such as 'the first task', 'milk time', 'playtime', 'storytime', etc. are recounted in some detail, but not labelled. Other episodes are referred to only at more generalised levels, e.g. the 'answering of questions' and the 'filling in of forms' which, as we will see in 3.3.14,
are recontextualised in more detail in *Your Child* and *And So To School*, but here described without the physical detail that characterises *Mary Kate* elsewhere. Sequenced, and headed by one of the terms which, in the story, represents 'the first day' as an activity, this taxonomy includes all the episodes which are recontextualised at more than one level of generality (cf. above for the more specific level below one of its subordinates, 'meeting the teacher'):

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>'Join us'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meet the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cost</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

A comparison with table 3.26 (in 3.4.14) will show just how few of the story's episodes are recontextualised at two levels of generality. If episode labels help to get a conceptual grip on a string of events, then that help is not given to a very great extent, as though the events are to remain as unpredictable and bewildering to the young reader as they are to Mary Kate, the character in the story.
Episode labelling is also common in Your Child, e.g.:

'tafter school conversation''

| describe the day | respond to story |

But the episodes labelled, and the labels themselves, are not the same. Most of the episode labels in Mary Kate involve crucial interactions with the teacher: meeting the teacher, the teacher showing the child her personal peg, her drawer, and her table, etc. In Your Child they involve the aftermath of 'the first day', when the mother regains control over the child, and, in her turn, imposes a schedule on the child’s activities which has the same alternation between play and duty as that of the first day at school:

The first day

| enrolment introduction temporary after school conversation celebrate leave nothing difficulties day for the morning |

|
In *Your Child*, however, generalisation also serves to taxonomise, to create implicit paradigms of the activities which could fill a certain slot in an episode (or a whole episode):

```
celebrate the first day
    view her favourite video
    eat her favourite meal
    or dessert
    eat something special for afternoon tea
```

In other words, in *Your Child* certain activities must always occur (‘in general’), but which specific activities constitute them is open to choice, even if, for mother and child, the choices remain fairly limited: the mother can choose to become involved in such activities as ‘taking the (school) children on outings’, ‘teaching crafts’, etc., the child can choose between her favourite video and favourite dessert. What mother and child do remains, for the most part, determined by the school. Even how to react to it all is not, in the end, open to choice. The mother must learn not to grieve, to react ‘selfishly’: ‘Relish those hours (without your child)!’
Episode labelling in *And So To School* is both more intricate and more systematic, and complete:

'The first day'

Settle the rest of the school
Arrive welcome
Personal medium of information
Request each other
Get to know time
Register newcomer with
Pairing older child

Introduce everything
First task
Work
Milk time
Playtime
Closing procedures

In many cases two levels of *eralisation* are set up:

'get to know each other'

begin a conversation
use physical contact

find out address
use correct child
use child by eye
use way of pronouncing name
use facial expression
use face to face

take child
put arm around

by hand
child
True taxonomies are used a good deal more often than in either of the two other texts: the teacher clearly has more choice than the mother or the child:

The teacher’s choices, however, concern for the most part, not so much the way the first day is scheduled, although there they have choice also (‘some teachers prefer...’ is a typical phrase, never associated with parents or children), but the ways in which to deal with deviancy, with ‘inappropriate behaviour’. And many of the choices are not quite as open as they seem, because they are subtly weighted with positive or negative evaluations before they are given (‘the wise teacher finds out the correct way to pronounce it’), to the point that there is not only a taxonomy of ways of dealing with inappropriate behaviour, but also a ‘shadow taxonomy’ of doing the same in ways of which the writers of And So To School disapprove:
'Subjectmater', finally, knowledge and skills, the stuff some might, naively, think is 'passed on' in the school, is referred to only at the highest level of generality, in both *Your Child* and *And So To School*: 'further develop mental skills', 'steer child through learning how to learn', 'literacy and numeracy tasks'. What matters is the genre of educational activity (order and sequence, procedure, flow, discipline in its various modalities), not the substance, and the psychological aspects of the teacher's task ('taking care', 'developing', 'sensitively treating'), not the instructional aspects. Illich's critique is borne out by these texts:

The teacher-as-custodian acts as a master of ceremonies, who guides his pupils through a drawn-out labyrinthine ritual. He arbitrates the observance of rules and administers the intricate rubrics of initiation to life (...) The teacher-as-therapist feels authorized to delve into the personal life of his pupil in order to help him grow as a person...

(Illich, 1971, p.37)

For Mary Kate, on the other hand, the promise of a very specific and substantial achievement culminates her account of the first day: 'Tomorrow I'll write 'cat'!
3.4.13 Concept formation: manner, purpose, evaluation and legitimation

As discussed in 3.3.4, a recontextualisation may, in relation to some activity or reaction, develop an unusually rich lexis, and this may be done for the sake of concept formation: each new term adds a further semantic feature, a new facet of meaning, to a concept that is nowhere in the text expressed by a single term, but formed gradually, as the text unfolds. Thus Mary Kate refers to the activity 'singing' first through the verb sing, then also through the verb yell, which adds a semantic feature of manner: 'singing' now turns into the rough, heterophonic children's singing considered charming in our society (witness the children's choirs in television commercials). Next it is referred to through the verb join in, and this adds a semantic feature of purpose to the activity: singing now also becomes an activity that serves to imbue children with a sense of community, of belonging to the group. These facets of meaning are never communicated simultaneously, through one term. They become welded together only because, in the context, the verbs that carry them are used to refer to the same activity, and so form a referential chain:
sing

yell

join in

Children's books in fact make relatively little use of concept formation, at least judging by my sample. Such overlexicalisation as does occur is, for the most part, concerned with the very concrete aspect of manner. This adds descriptive vividness and a sense of presence to activities that play a key role in the way the story is told. Two key areas of overlexicalisation in Mary Kate, for example, are Mary Kate's solitary and comparatively 'inactive' activity of watching ('looking', 'seeing', 'staring', 'looking in', 'peeping inside') and the dynamic group activity of running ('clatter into', 'rush into', 'run across', 'run about', etc) first associated with 'the other children' as they enter the classroom and Mary Kate's life, later also with Mary Kate, as she joins other children to play.

Your Child makes more use of concept formation, and it does so, again, in relation to activities that play a key role in the practice of the 'first day', as recontextualised in brochures which seek to regulate the parent's participation in it.
This is evident already in the ways in which the text refers to the practice as a whole. Key aspects of the practice are reiterated (‘first’, ‘begin’), and purposes introduced (‘take up independence’), but there is also an element of evaluation in which the practice acquires both negative connotations (‘loss’ and ‘separation’) and positive connotations (‘independence’):

- separation
- lose child
- first day
- begin
- take up independence
- the day

Later the text seeks to reinterpret the loss by positively evaluating the hours during which the mother could be expected to feel this loss most acutely.

- work uninterrupted
- relish those hours
- have hours to yourself
- work on patchwork quilting
The mother’s interaction with the teacher, representative of the institution which enforces the separation (by law, let us not forget), and hence really the ‘enemy’, must also be endowed with positive evaluation:

- meet the teacher
- support the teacher’s effort
- interact with the teacher

The teacher’s work, meanwhile, is referred to in terms which build up the concept of what Illich would call the ‘teacher as therapist’:

- teacher-child bond
- take care of the child
- spend time with the child

The most heavy overlexicalisation occurs in relation to the child’s reaction to all this. The child is ‘stimulated’, ‘engrossed’, ‘ready to explore’, it ‘feels safe’, and it is filled with ‘enthusiasm’, ‘excitement’, ‘confidence’, ‘pleasure’ and ‘joy’. Telling mother about it, too, is built up into a multi-faceted concept which includes features of purpose (‘describe’, ‘express’, ‘share’) and features of ‘cognitive’ and ‘affective’ manner (‘separate out events’, ‘vivid’):
describe the day
express joys and concerns
share joys and concerns
launch into a vivid description of the day
separate out all the events

A specific aspect of manner, finally, is the form of abstraction which, in 3.2.4, I have called 'labelling', and which concentrates on the predictability and repetitiveness, or degree and kind of rule-governedness of an activity, episode, or practice. In Your Child this happens in relation to new, school-related duties imposed on the child at home, by the parent (but suggested by, among others, publications like Your Child!):
leave nothing for the morning
routine
habit

And So To School regularly uses concept formation for the adduction of purpose. 'Explaining', for instance, serves the purpose of 'eliminating anxieties', 'giving talks' the purpose of 'educating parents', 'displaying a collage of multi-ethnic faces'
the purpose of 'conveying a specific message':

- explain what will happen next
- eliminate minor anxieties and distress

- educate parents
- give a talk

- convey a specific message
- display a collage of multi-ethnic faces

The terms by means of which And So To School refers to the practice of 'going to school for the first time' as a whole are also strongly oriented towards purpose addition. Placing them side by side with the equivalent concept formation chains from Mary Kate and Your Child shows how much they are oriented towards the teacher's interests, rather than, say, those of the child: no 'independence' here for the child, as if that is something only for consumption by mothers:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MARY KATE</th>
<th>YOUR CHILD</th>
<th>AND SO TO SCHOOL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>come</td>
<td>separation</td>
<td>enter school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>induction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>join us</td>
<td>lose child</td>
<td>first day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>go to school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>first day</td>
<td>admit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>smooth transition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>take up independence</td>
<td>start</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the day</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As in Your Child, positive and negative evaluations are commonly added through concept formation. Thus 'contact with preschool' is built up as a positive activity, and its absence as negative:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTACT BETWEEN PRESCHOOL AND INFANT SCHOOL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>links</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exchange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>make contact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>be accessible to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>go to</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO CONTACT BETWEEN PRESCHOOL AND INFANT SCHOOL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>have no contact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>links are a myth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>invisible barriers keep away</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>be out of bounds to</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Terms which, in our society, are loaded with positive connotations ('links', 'exchange',

‘contact’, ‘access’) are contrasted here to negatively loaded terms (‘barriers’, ‘bounds’).

The child’s first task of ‘work’ is also referred to in a number of ways, and positively evaluated in the process:

- first task
- complete numeracy or literacy task
- have something positive and productive to do
- complete work
- start work
- settle to work with a will

The episode in which the teacher begins a conversation with the child is even more heavily overlexicalised, in order to signify the role of the ‘teacher as therapist’, and its legitimation in the discourse of counselling and therapy. The teacher not only ‘settles the child into school’, and ‘begins a conversation’ with him or her, she also ‘gives the child personal attention’, ‘makes the child feel she matters’, ‘has plenty of time for the child’, ‘embarks on the delicate task of negotiating the teacher-pupil
relationship’, ‘gets to know the child’, ‘establishes positive bonds with the child’, and ‘gets the relationship off to a good start’.

As in Your Child, lexical variety is at its greatest where the children’s reactions to the first day are concerned. But here they are less positive. The child is ‘shy’, ‘distressed’, and/or ‘bewildered’, and each of these three themes is elaborated in a number of different ways. Thus children are not only said to be ‘bewildered’, but also ‘show signs of bewilderment’ or ‘baffled expressions’, and they encounter ‘mysteries’, ‘novelties’ and countless ‘unfamiliar’ and ‘new’ places, people and things. Positive reactions, again, would appear to be only for the consumption of mothers!

In conclusion, concept formation fulfils, either separately or concurrently, three distinct purposes in these texts:

(1) It can add one or more semantic features of manner to an activity or reaction, in order to lend descriptive vividness and a sense or presence to key activities or reactions (e.g. to the emotive reactions of children).

(2) It can add one or several purposes to an activity or episode, or to the practice as a whole.
(3) It can positively or negatively, or, at times, ambiguously, evaluate an activity, reaction, episode, or practice. In doing so it can draw on certain fields of discourse, (e.g. the psychology of interpersonal relations) for the legitimation of activities, reactions, episodes, or practices.

Children’s stories seem to use concept formation sparingly, and mostly in order to render key activities or reactions vividly. In other words, they do not use concept formation to add elements such as purpose, evaluation and legitimation to the representation. In children’s stories such elements are added in different ways, more explicitly, or through narrativisation. In the non-narrative texts we have studied, on the other hand, concept formation forms a major tool (and a very implicit, underhand one) for adding purposes, evaluation and legitimations.

3.4.14 Comparative sequencing analysis

Comparing the sequencing analysis of different recontextualisations of the same social practice not only reveals which activities are included and which excluded,
but also how those included are recontextualised differently. Sequencing analyses of the three texts singled out for discussion in this chapter can be found in Appendix III. Here I will lift out some sections for comparison.

Table 3.24 places side by side how each text represents three consecutive episodes, (i) the principal's 'personal welcome' of mother and child, (ii) the official admission 'ceremony', and (iii) the child's first meeting with the teacher. The table shows that the three texts do not represent these episodes in the same amount of detail, and that, even where the amount of detail is more or less equal, each text may single out different activities as constituting a given episode. Mary Kate, for instance, deletes the 'personal welcome' altogether, and represents the ceremony (the 'filling in of forms') only minimally, perhaps because these episodes are deemed to be of no interest to either Mary Kate, the character in the story, or the young reader of the book, concerned as they are with what will happen when Mummy leaves and Mary Kate has to contend with 'the other children' on her own. Your Child, on the other hand, does include the two episodes, but in less detail than And So To School, again, as though it is deemed to be only the school's, and never the mother's, business to know, precisely and exhaustively, what
information about the child is required, which tasks fall to the principal and which to secretary, and so on. **Your Child** in fact leaves out the secretary altogether, and skips over the official admission 'ceremony' rather lightly.

The child's introduction to the teacher is most fully represented in **Mary Kate**. It is here of vital importance for the child to know exactly how each person addresses and acknowledges each other person, and in which order, as this establishes hierarchy and connection in the child's changing social relations. It is noticeable also that Mary Kate's principal and teacher acknowledge the presence of her mother, while the teacher and principal in **And So To School** completely ignore her (cf. 3.4.3, lines 17-20).

Appendix 3 shows how some recontextualisations plot the course of events along a singular track, without detours or alternative routes. This is, by and large, the case in **Mary Kate**, and, indeed, in stories generally: sequence is fully determined by social rules which appear to the characters in the guise of destiny. Other recontextualisations allow the participants choice: from time to time the plotline forks into different pathways which, however, all lead, in the end, to the same destination.
Table 3.24: Sequencing analysis of the 'filling in forms' and 'introduction' episodes in Mary Kate, Your Child and And So To School
This is so in *Your Child* and even more so in *And So To School*. Choice, it seems, increases as power increases: the child has none, the mother a little, the teacher a little more. But inspection of the sequencing analyses in Appendix 3 also shows that this choice often relates to the strategies for dealing with 'inappropriate behaviours' and other eventualities ('if x happens, then do y'), rather than that it constitutes genuine choice. For such strategies merely aim to get the events back on the preordained singular course.

Table 3.25 also provides a second illustration of the way the same episode or set of episodes may be recontextualised differently in different recontextualisations:

(1) The 'after school conversation' between parent and child is represented in considerable detail in *Mary Kate* and *Your Child* (although in the former case it takes place in the cloakroom, and in the latter on the way home, during a 'quiet walk'), but deleted in *And So To School*, where 'overanxious mothers filter into the classroom' asking irrelevant questions that 'exasperate' the teachers, and where it is expected that parents will get to hear negative stories of 'naughty children' and 'angry teachers'. In *Mary Kate* and *Your Child*,
however, the child's stories are positive, even though in *Your Child* they may deal with 'concerns' as well as 'joys'.

(2) In *Mary Kate* it is the child who initiates the 'after school conversation': she runs to her mother and says 'I drew you a picture'. *Your Child*, on the other hand, tells the mother to initiate the interaction ('look at any paintings or models she may have made') and warns her that she may have to drag the story out of her child. However, even in *Mary Kate*, the mother's authority and initiative must, eventually, be reestablished. We read how the child asks permission to sit next to her new friend in the schoolbus, and how the mother then hedges ('We'll see') to let the child know she is still in charge and can stop her from doing what she wants to do any time. *Mary Kate* responds by falling back into childish ineptitude and dependence: we read next how she 'buttons up her coat crooked' and seems incapable of picking up her own hat.

(3) In *And So To School* the teachers are 'exasperated' by the questions of mothers. In *Your Child*, mothers 'thank teachers for taking care of the child'. We must remember that both texts seek to protect the same interests - those of compulsory education. *Your Child* tells mothers what they should do,
MARY KATE
→
CLASSMATE AND CHILD GO TO CLOAKROOM
→
CHILD RUNS TO PARENT
→
CHILD HUGS PARENT
→
CHILD TELLS PARENT THAT SHE DREW PICTURES
→
CHILD TELLS PARENT THAT SHE CUT A CAT OUT OF BLUE PAPER
→
CHILD TELLS PARENT THAT SHE PLAYED IN THE PLAYHOUSE
→
CHILD TELLS PARENT THAT SHE HAD TWO HELPINGS OF PUDDING

YOUR CHILD
→
PARENT LOOKS AT PAINTINGS/MODELS CHILD HAS MADE
→
PARENT TALKS TO CHILD ABOUT PAINTINGS/MODELS
→
PARENT PACKS UP PAINTINGS/MODELS

AND SO TO SCHOOL

→
CHILD PUTS COAT ON
CHILD TELLS PARENT THAT CLASSMATE TAUGHT HER TO PLAY 'HIGHER AND HIGHER'

CHILD POINTS OUT CLASSMATE TO PARENT

CHILD TELLS PARENT THAT CLASSMATE TOLD HER SHE COULD SIT NEXT TO HER ON THE SCHOOLBUS

CHILD ASKS PARENT PERMISSION TO SIT NEXT TO CLASSMATE ON SCHOOLBUS

PARENT HEDGES

PARENT ASKS CHILD TO IDENTIFY PICTURE ON PEG

CHILD IDENTIFIES ANIMAL ON PICTURE
CHILD ACKNOWLEDGES NAME TAG

PARENT PICKS UP CHILD'S HAT

PARENT AFFIRMS CHILD'S UNIQUE IDENTITY

CHILD BUTTONS UP HER COAT CROOKEDLY

CHILD ANNOUNCES THE NEXT DAY'S SCHOOL ACTIVITIES

PARENT TAKES CHILD TO TEACHER

PARENT ENTERS CLASSROOM

PARENT ASKS TEACHER ABOUT CHILD'S EDUCATIONAL PROGRESS

TEACHER ANSWERS THAT CHILD SHOULD DO AS IT'S TOLD
PARENT AND CHILD RETURN HOME, TAKING DRAWING

CHILD SAYS GOODBYE TO TEACHER

PARENT THANKS TEACHER FOR TAKING CARE OF CHILD

PARENT AND CHILD GO FOR A QUIET WALK

PARENT ASKS ABOUT THE DAY

CHILD ANSWERS VAGUELY

PARENT ASKS TEACHER WHETHER SHE CAN COLLECT CHILD AT A LATER TIME

TEACHER ANSWERS THAT SHE IS NOT A BABYSITTER

TEACHER SAYS GOODBYE TO CHILD

CHILD REGALES PARENT WITH TALES OF NAUGHTY CHILDREN AND ANGRY TEACHERS
Table 3.25: Fetching the child from school in *Mary Kate, Your Child* and *And So To School*
And So To School tells teachers what mothers 'really' do. Similarly, Mary Kate helps mothers to tell their child what it should do after school (i.e. tell enthusiastically about the day's events) while Your Child takes a dim view of the child's capacity to actually do so, this for the benefit of mother, and behind the child's back.

(4) In Mary Kate and And So To School, finally, the 'first day' is over with the conclusion of the 'after school conversation'. Your Child, however, brings school into the home, as new routine duties are set up for the child: cleaning and packing the schoolbag, cleaning and making ready the school uniform, etc.

Table 3.26 summarises the sequencing analyses in Appendix 3 by listing the episodes included in each of the three texts. Most striking is the gap in the middle of the list of episodes in Your Child: clearly what goes on in school is treated as something parents do not need to know about. Only the bit parts played by parents at the beginning and end of the schoolday, and in the margins of school life, are represented. It can also be noted that Mary Kate endows the child with a great
deal more initiative than And So To School. The children introduce themselves to each other, and the 'classmate' who shows Mary Kate the ropes does so of her own accord, rather than because she is told to do so by the teacher, as in And So To School. The activities of this classmate, moreover, are represented in detail, while And So To School mentions, and recommends, the concept of pairing, but then pays no further attention to it, depicting, instead, classrooms in which the children are unruly rather than responsible, and in which the teachers must do all the work. It is difficult to see how this can lead to the child 'taking up independence'. The difference in attitude is strikingly expressed in the conversations which children have in the two texts. Here is how Susan and Mary Kate interact:
Mother leaves

Teacher shows child personal peg

Teacher shows child place

Teacher discloses existence of namesake

Other children enter

Classmate introduces herself

Classmate introduces child to other children

Register time

Teacher pairs child with classmate

Child and classmate play in playhouse

Milk time

Drawing

Mother asks permission to stay

Mother sits with child at or near activity table

Teacher reads story

Mother leaves

Teacher shows child place

Register time

Teacher pairs child with classmate OR takes class on tour of school

First work task

Playtime

Children introduce themselves to each other

Milk Time
Table 3.26: Overall comparison of sequencing in Mary Kate, Your Child and And So To School
'You've come then,' said the little girl, 'What's your name?'
Mary Kate told her.
'I'm Susan,' said the little girl, 'Susan Bates.'
'That's Jane. She lives next door to me.'

And here is the conversation from *And So To School*:

Jenny: 'I'm bigger than you. I'm four.'
Paul: 'I'm four.'
Jenny: 'Look, I'm bigger than you.'
Paul: 'If you're four and I'm four, we're both the same size.'

3.4.15 Summary

The analyses in 3.4.4 - 3.4.13 concerned themselves with the substitution analysis of activities and reactions. The main findings can be summarised as follows:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MARY KATE</th>
<th>YOUR CHILD</th>
<th>AND SO TO SCHOOL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>small number of reactions</td>
<td>fairly large number of reactions</td>
<td>large number of reactions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>only the child’s reactions are represented</td>
<td>both the child’s and the mother’s reactions are represented</td>
<td>in addition to the reactions of the mother and the child, the teacher’s are also</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the child’s reactions are represented as cognitive and effective and perceptual; they are not brought about by the actions of adults</td>
<td>the child’s reactions are represented as positive and affective; they are often represented as brought about by the actions of adults</td>
<td>represented as negative, both when they are cognitive (‘bewildered’) and when they are affective; they are often represented as brought about by the actions of adults</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>what the new entrant says is not quoted, but the utterances of other children and adults are almost always quoted.</td>
<td>children’s utterances are never quoted; adults’ utterances are sometimes quoted</td>
<td>children’s utterances are almost never quoted; adults’ utterances are sometimes quoted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the activities of the children are predominantly instrumental or behavioural, those of the teacher interactional</td>
<td>the activities of children and mothers are predominantly instrumental or behavioural, those of the teacher interactional</td>
<td>the activities of children and mothers are predominantly instrumental or behavioural, those of the teacher interactional or instrumentalised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>there is little objectivation and descriptivisation</td>
<td>the children’s reactions and the activities of mothers and teachers are frequently objectivated and descriptivised</td>
<td>the children’s reactions and the activities of teachers are frequently objectivated and descriptivised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>there is very little generalisation</td>
<td>generalisation is used to label episodes and, in a limited way, to create functional similarity between alternative (limited choice for the mother)</td>
<td>generalisation is used to label episodes and to create functional similarity between alternative activities (choices for the teacher)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>there is virtually no use of abstraction</td>
<td>abstraction is used to emphasise the theme of organising time, to realise the legitimatory concepts of 'nurture' and 'interaction', and to stress the repetitive nature of schoolday</td>
<td>abstraction is used to emphasise the theme of organising time, to realise the legitimatory concepts of 'nurture' and 'interaction', and to stress the repetitive nature of the schoolday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>there is a small amount of concept formation to realise descriptive vividness (manner)</td>
<td>there is considerable use of concept formation to realise purpose, evaluation, and the legitimatory concepts of 'nurture' and 'interaction', as well as to lend descriptive vividness to children's reactions</td>
<td>there is considerable use of concept formation to realise purpose, evaluation and the legitimatory concepts of 'nurture' and 'interaction', as well as to lend descriptive vividness to children's reactions and deviant behaviours</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This summary shows very clearly that these texts, which overtly speak of the 'delicate negotiation', the 'teacher-child bond', the 'conversation', etc., in fact manifest very distinct differences in power, both between the key participants, children, mothers and teachers, and between the three text types, which use objectivation, descriptivisation, generalisation and abstraction to such markedly different degrees. These differences, which Halliday has usually linked to the difference between 'spoken and written language' (e.g. 1985b) are not increasingly seen for what they more fundamentally are: differences in power (cf. e.g. Martin, 1985, Martin et al., 1988).
In summarising the sequencing analysis in 3.4.14, I will first list the activities that occur in all three of the texts (note that the ‘breakfast’ and ‘walking to school’ episodes are the subject of the chapter from Mary Kate which precedes the one I have discussed in this chapter):

- breakfast
- walking to school
- arriving
- filling in forms
- meeting the teacher
- mother’s departure
- fetching the child after school
- telling the day’s events
- walking home

These episodes are not all treated in the same amount of detail in all three of the texts. Mary Kate devotes an entire chapter to getting up, having breakfast, and walking to school. In Your Child and And So To School these episodes are treated only briefly. We have seen in the previous section that Mary Kate and Your Child relate the episode of ‘telling the day’s events’ both more extensively and more positively than does And
So To School, where 'parents are regaled with stories of naughty children and angry teachers'. However, the simple list of episodes included in all three of the texts reveals one important thing: While Your Child excludes everything that goes on in school, as though the mothers to whom the text is addressed have no business knowing what goes on after they have left, And So To School does not exclude what goes on in the home. The mother's power stops at the door of the school, the teacher's does not, it seems, stop at the door of the family home.

Comparing the way in which Mary Kate and And So To School recontextualise what goes on between the 'mother's departure' and 'fetching the child after school', we can construct the following list of broad similarities:

- Teacher shows the child her peg
- Teacher shows the child her place
- Register time
- Teacher pairs the child with an older classmate
- Milk time
- Play time
- Story time
The inclusion of ‘showing the child her peg’ is not restricted to these two texts. It functions as a key event, a ritual of initiation in which the child receives a new identity, and it occurs in most ‘first day’ texts. Equally important is ‘register time’, the first ‘group event’, which introduces discipline and formality into the life of the child.

How do the texts differ?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MARY KATE</th>
<th>YOUR CHILD</th>
<th>AND SO TO SCHOOL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mother leaves before the ceremony of the peg</td>
<td>Story time occurs early in the day and mother stays during playtime and storytime</td>
<td>Mother leaves after the ceremony of the peg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children enter en masse and noisily after child enters classroom for the first time</td>
<td>Children are quiet and settled when child enters classroom for the first time</td>
<td>Children are quiet and settled when child enters classroom for the first time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children introduce themselves to each other and are supportive of each other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are no ‘work tasks’ on the first day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The day’s activities include singing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The mother thanks the teacher for taking care of the child</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The child says goodbye to the teacher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The child tells her story on the way home</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A ‘quiet celebration’ and ‘preparing for the next day’ are included</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The differences charted here can be explained by the different purposes of the texts, and by the different readers to which they are addressed. The rearrangement of the activities in Your Child perhaps serves to reassure the mother: she can stay a little longer, yet does not have to witness her child receive a new identity (‘peg’) or be subjected to the formal discipline of ‘register ti?’, which might be less reassuring. Your Child, aimed at mothers, and And So To School, aimed at teachers, differ in their representation of the relation between mothers and teachers. And so on. But one thing must not be forgotten. All three of these text types ultimately emanate from, and serve the interests of, compulsory education: the publishers of children’s books engage the services of expert advisers in producing ‘first day’ books, or commission teachers or ex-teachers to write them; Your Child, though published commercially, is written by an ‘author, counsellor and teacher’, and indeed many of the articles in the press and items on radio and television which address parents use educationalists as their source of information. The same institution in the end produces these different versions of the same social practice for the different participants involved in it, in order to procure their trouble free participation. Of course, there are other texts, and I have discussed some of them in this thesis, the children’s story Magnus’ Metro and Illich’s
Deschooling Society, but they are few in number and, in their different ways, too marginal to effectively tackle commonsense discourses such as the ones discussed in this part of the thesis, commonsense discourses which seem so uncontroversial, so practical, so concerned with the child’s wellbeing, and which are yet so thoroughly ideological in the way they help hold up the edifice of compulsory state education and hold at bay the doubts which might from time to time arise in the minds of children and parents alike.

NOTES

1. From information supplied by the publishers and writers of the children’s books in my corpus I was able to ascertain that ‘first day’ books are usually commissioned from ex-primary teachers, or use first-hand observation in schools and advice from primary school principals. Some publishers of children’s books have ex-primary teachers on their editorial staff. Only one writer mentioned that she had consulted with parents, although several mentioned that they were themselves parents.