Asta Cekaite*

Subversive compliance and embodiment in remedial interchanges

<https://doi.org/10.1515/text-2020-2078>

Abstract: This study examines normativity of affect and the affective embeddedness of normativity, instantiated as verbal and embodied stances taken by the participants in adult-child remedial interchanges. The data are based on one year of video fieldwork in a first-grade class at a Swedish primary school. An ethnographically informed analysis of talk and multimodal action is adopted. The findings show that the children's affective and normative transgressions provided discursive spaces for adult moral instructions and socialization. However, the children's compliant responses were resistant and subversive. They were designed as embodied double-voiced acts that indexed incongruent affective and moral stances. The findings further revealed several ways of configuring embodied double-voiced responses. The children juxtaposed multiple modalities and exploited the expectations of what constitutes appropriate temporal duration, timing, and shape of nonverbal responses. They (i) combined up-scaled verbal and embodied hyperbolic rhetoric when the teachers' talk required but minimal responses, and (ii) configured antithetical affect displays, e.g., crying and smiling, or overlaid bodily displays of moral emotion (sadness, seriousness, and smiling) with aligning but exaggerated gestures and movements. Subversive, embodied double-voiced responses simultaneously acquiesced with and deflected the responsibility and effectively derailed a successful closure of remedial interchange.

Keywords: emotions-in-interaction, affective stance, remedial interchange, disciplining, compliance, subversiveness

1 Introduction

Emotions as an intrinsic and accountable part of social interaction were acknowledged already by Aristoteles, who pointed out that emotions persuasively establish a position because they effectively communicate and encourage the

*Corresponding author: Asta Cekaite, Department of Child Studies, Linköping University, 58183, Linköping, Sweden, E-mail: asta.cekaite@liu.se

Open Access. © 2020 Asta Cekaite, published by De Gruyter. This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

audience to see one's point of view. The person who displays emotion is strongly committed to it as a stance that involves a cluster of rights, duties, and moral obligations. Various theorists of human sociality (e.g., Bourdieu 1977; Levinas 1998; Merleau-Ponty 1962) have argued that normativity and moral accountability constitute the ultimate condition of social life, pointing out the interrelatedness between our normative and affective engagements in the world (Baerveldt and Voestermans 2005).

Whereas the interactional organization of affect in social interaction, i.e., affective stances, has been a growing focus of interactional research, the moral valence of affect and its normatively organizing functions in social life has received less attention from interactional perspectives (but see Stevanovic and Peräkylä 2013). The present study examines normativity of affect and the affective embeddedness of normativity, instantiated as verbal and embodied stances taken by the participants in adult-child remedial interchanges (Goffman 1971) in a primary classroom in Sweden. Remedial interchanges following an infraction of social order present a social situation when one party makes amends and, in doing so, has to show proper regard for remedial actions. Here, moral conduct and affect are put at stake in that they are relevant to the re-establishment of moral equilibrium and social order after a normative transgression has been committed. In adult-child encounters, affective and normative transgressions provide discursive spaces for the characterization and negotiation of various normative expectations, as well as instructions regarding their interactional realization (Cekaite 2012; Cekaite and Ekström 2019; Sterponi 2014). The present study specifically examines an unsuccessful remedial interchange that demonstrates the children's resistance to the teachers' attempts to establish the formers' moral accountability. It adopts a theoretical perspective according to which interactional practices provide a multifaceted matrix within which children develop ways of being in the world and learn to use language and embodied resources as tools for accomplishing social actions and organizing relations (Goodwin and Cekaite 2018). By exploring the interactional – verbal and embodied – design of the teachers' instructional attempts to inculcate moral values, and the children's resistant-compliance, the present study will empirically demonstrate the interrelatedness of affective and moral stances, and affective normativity of social life.

In the following sections, I will describe the earlier research on affect and morality in social interaction, outline method and design of the study, and present analysis and discuss the results.

2 Literature review

2.1 Affective and moral stances

Learning to calibrate affective and moral stances within the realm of social and moral order constitutes an integral part of socialization processes. Stance-taking in social interaction is accomplished “dialogically through overt communicative means (language, gesture, and other symbolic forms), through which social actors simultaneously evaluate objects, position subjects (themselves and others), and align with other subjects, with respect to any salient dimension of the sociocultural field” (Du Bois 2007: 163, cf. Goodwin and Goodwin 2000; Du Bois and Kärkkäinen 2012). Affective stance displays “mood, attitude, feeling, and disposition, as well as degrees of emotional intensity vis-à-vis some focus of concern” (Ochs 1996: 410). It is not limited to linguistic means but is located within embodied sequences of action, where lexical and prosodic means are coordinated with participants’ facial expressions, body posture, gaze and gestures (Goodwin et al. 2012). Stances are not only responsive to the prior interactional act, they also serve as powerful means of constraining what will be said (Ochs 1996) and done next, thereby creating possibilities for securing a desirable response. Social actors use body techniques as ways of composing bodily actions (cf., “body gloss”, Goffman 1971: 128) and, by acting towards others in a way that is acceptable by virtue of commonly sustained rules and resources, orient to and reproduce a moral order. In this way, the public and socially meaningful embodied acts facilitate the coordination of a social situation, and social organization (Crossley 1995).

2.2 Moral and affective socialization in adult-child interactions: Reproaches and disciplining in educational settings

Understanding the emotional import of social actions requires attention to local socioculturally valid expectations and ideologies of moral personhood, including notions of everyday morality, ethics, and empathy (Keane 2016). Linguistic anthropology and language socialization perspectives convincingly show that affective stances constitute socioculturally specific modes of participation and are shaped in social interactions. As demonstrated by classroom socialization studies, educational settings teach – through various discursive strategies – culturally situated moral, and affective norms and action patterns. Disciplining practices in classrooms in various cultural contexts can have different interactional

organization, and socialize specific kinds of moral responsibility. Discursive structures for moral work (including remedial interchanges, reproaches, conflict mediation, and resolution) are closely related to normative expectations concerning the appropriateness of affective stances (Cekaite 2012, 2017; Danby and Theobald 2012), and they can simultaneously provide discursive templates for moral and affective socialization. For instance, remedial interchanges (following a breach of social order) constitute a social ritual that re-establishes the equilibrium of moral order when a normative transgression has been committed. A successful remedial interchange requires actions that attest the culpable person's "expression of a credible commitment to change" (Goffman 1971: 108) and through participation s/he can be socialized into appropriate remedial actions (on various forms of "remedial action" see Goffman 1971: 95-187), i.e., acknowledgement of culpable behavior, usually configured as an embodied display of remorse.

Everyday morality in educational settings is usually monitored by teachers. They can categorize students into particular institutional identities according to respectful and polite vs. disrespectful behavior, and hold them accountable for acting in affectively acceptable ("respectful") ways (Howard 2009). Teacher reproaches can comprise ascriptions of negative affect (anger), used to aggravate the disciplining (Evaldsson and Melander 2017). As demonstrated by a language socialization study of a Chinese heritage language classroom in the US (He 2000), the teachers used implicit and explicit resources to deal with the students' problematic conduct. The teachers offered an implicit description of a current situation as a problem, but then used imperative directives, explicitly commanding the students to modify their behavior in the future. The teachers' commands were upgraded with negative affect and conditional warnings that morally appealed to the students to change their behavior as their actions could have negative consequences for the teachers, and for the entire group.

Similarly, Lo (2009) shows that Korean heritage language teachers located negative affect in the moral evaluation of children's (mis)behavior. In reproaching the students for inappropriate conduct, the teachers used presumptive negative questions ("You did do that, didn't you?"), and metapragmatic descriptions and narratives that stated the serious consequences of inappropriate behavior. The students were to modify their behavior in order to protect the teacher's feelings and face (e.g., Ahn 2016 on similar practices in a Korean primary school). Lo also shows that the students were able to resist the teacher's reproaches by code-switching, using abrupt and annoyed tone, and talking back with "double-voiced" utterances (Bakhtin 1981). Double-voicedness is linked to the notion of "hybrid construction", i.e., when a word contains two utterances or speech manners, i.e., "two semantic and axiological belief systems" (Bakhtin 1981: 304–305; on double-voicedness in prosody, see Guntner 1997).

Yet another normative and affective socialization strategy, documented in an ethnography conducted in Russian classrooms, relied on shaming and teachers' negative assessment by invoking the judgement of a collective gaze: the teachers required the children to manage their emotions by telling them that "all children are looking at you" (Moore 2014). In a Swedish context, institutional moral discourse across different educational settings and age groups is characterized by teacher questions that invoke and seek children's perspectives, alignment, and discursive displays of accountability (Björk-Willén 2018; Cekaite 2012, 2019; Holm Kvist 2018). Rather than explicit reproaches and shaming (cf. studies from Russian or Korean preschools on characteristic teacher practices, Ahn 2016; Moore 2014), social relations can be re-established through teacher-guided remedial interchanges that require children's active discursive participation, perspective-taking and embodied reconciliatory acts of remorse (e.g., hugs, Björk-Willén 2018; Burdelski 2013).

3 Data and methods

3.1 Data collection, setting, and participants

The present study is part of a larger project on affective and moral socialization of children in educational settings in Sweden (see Cekaite 2012, 2019). The data are based on one year of fieldwork in a first-grade class (for seven-year-olds) at a mainstream Swedish primary school in a low socio-economic suburb. The study was subjected to ethical vetting by a regional committee for research ethics. Written and oral information was provided to the staff and the parents, and consent forms were signed by those adults who wished to participate (for the parents, this consent also included their children). To prevent the participants from being recognized, the names used are pseudonyms, and sketches used for illustrative purposes are anonymized.

Throughout my time at the school, I took field notes, video-recorded classroom lessons and children's recesses and lunches (70 h), collected documents, and had many informal conversations with the teachers and the children. The classroom reflected a great deal of cultural diversity: the majority of children were of immigrant background (families from Iraq, Kurdistan, Bosnia, Syria, and Somalia). The language of the classroom was Swedish. The daily classroom life entailed various conflicts between the children, and between the students and the teachers. Disciplining, reproaches and moral instructions were recurrently initiated by the teachers who in this way aimed to implement the institutional norms and constrain what the school considered to be inappropriate or physically or socially harmful behavior.

3.2 Analytical approach

The present study adopts an interaction-analytical approach involving an ethnographically informed analysis of talk and action (Goodwin and Cekaite 2018). The analytical procedure is also informed by a multimodal interactional approach to human interaction and sense-making, according to which participation in face-to-face encounters in social interaction is accomplished in dynamically evolving participation frameworks where participants organize their actions within an emergent social situation (Goodwin and Goodwin 2000; Goodwin 2018). Multiple senses and resources, laminated within particular contextual configurations, contribute to intersubjective meaning-making. In addition to the meaning potentials of various modalities, the temporal features of verbal and nonverbal interactional moves are considered (Mondada 2018). In all, detailed analysis of video recordings examines how the teachers and the children use language-mediated practices in conjunction with body positionings, gestures, gaze, and facial expressions.

Video data was logged and morally and affectively poignant situations were identified and transcribed. In what follows, I have chosen to discuss one extended trajectory of a remedial interchange, characterized by the child's resistance, where the teacher's instructional efforts become public and explicitly apparent. Such analysis allows the detailing of a broad range of discursive moves and the discussion of how they affect the development and outcome of the remedial interchange.

4 Analysis

An examination of the disciplining practices in the Swedish primary classroom shows that the children's moral transgressions usually occasioned remedial interchanges – requests for apologies, reproaches, disciplining, moral instructions – that became discursive sites for the children's moral socialization. They were clearly related to normativity of affect. The teachers held the children accountable for the moral transgression, and required that the students demonstrate their alertness to the moral domain and an awareness of oneself as a morally adequate and responsible actor. This was done by the teachers' question formats that required the children to acknowledge their understanding of the normative infraction and accept moral accountability. The children had to demonstrate their readiness to modify their behavior by producing minimal, low-key affective responses. The remedial interchanges also provided rich opportunities for the children's resistance. The children subverted the teachers' moral messages and expectations by designing what can be called resistant-compliant responses, i.e., “double-voiced”, “hybrid constructions” (Bakhtin 1981). Such resistant-compliant moves effectively extended and derailed the remedial trajectory, resulting

in the teachers' use of multiple and increasingly explicit strategies, related to i) spelling out the general norms of conduct, and ii) explicating how the morally accountable emotion (e.g., authentic feeling of remorse) had to be manifested.

Below I will demonstrate in detail how an extended remedial trajectory is interactionally achieved, and show how affective and moral stances, and embodied and discursive strategies on the part of both the teachers and the children play a key role in invoking, socializing, and resisting moral accountability.

4.1 Telling-off, accusations, and outright resistance

In the remedial interchanges, the teachers aimed to hold the children responsible for behaving in a way that inflicted harm upon others. The remedial interchanges served as a training ground for instilling in the children an understanding of the physical, emotional, and moral impact of his or her actions on the others. In cases where the teachers witnessed what in the school was considered to be physically dangerous conduct, they immediately reacted by interrupting this 'misconduct', and, in concurrent moral discourse used telling-off, accusations, reproaches, and instructions. Such telling-off and directives were to be listened to and complied with, and they presented (in a linguistic form) a general rule.

Just prior to Extract 1, several children, including the seven-year-old boy Hamid, start playing with scissors, pretending to cut each other's hair. According to school regulations, misuse of scissors is considered to be very dangerous and the students are prohibited from using scissors for other than educational purposes. Here, the teachers repeatedly tell the children to put away the scissors and go and sit at their desks, but they, including Hamid, dispute these directives.

- (1) 1. Teacher: Jo men då **sätter** du dig på din plats!
*Well, but in that case **sit** at your desk!*
 ((angry voice))
2. Hamid: ((reluctantly sits at his desk))
3. Hamid: Om jag ska **va** jag ska inte sitta på min (.)
 4. min plats.
*If I'll **be** I'll not sit at my(.) my desk.*
 ((sitting at his desk, defiant voice))
5. Teacher: FAST (.) DET ÄR **JÄTTEFÄRLIGT** ATT KLIPPA
 6. MED SAXAR PÅ NÅN!
*BUT (.) IT'S **EXTREMELY DANGEROUS** TO CUT
 WITH SCISSORS ON SOMEBODY!*
 ((looks at Hamid in close F-formation))

7. Hamid: °Ne: j jag [klippar inte°=
°No I don't cut°=
8. Teacher: [JO! DU KAN **SKADA** NÅN. HAMID!
BUT YOU CAN **HURT** SOMEBODY HAMID!
((points, looks at him))

Figure 1: Hamid looks down

9. Hamid: °Jag vet°. ((Figure 1))
°I know°. ((looks down,
serious facial expression))

In response to Hamid's reluctant compliance to put away the scissors and sit at his desk (lines 2–4), the teacher, in an agitated voice, states the negative consequences of his (allegedly) dangerous actions, 'fast det är jättefarligt att klippa med saxar på nån' 'but it's extremely dangerous to cut with scissors on somebody' (lines 5–6). By gazing attentively at Hamid and his classmate Steve (in F-formation, Kendon 1990), she configures an embodied participation framework of moral accountability, where the target child and the adult are in close proximity of each other. Hamid, who is reluctantly sitting at his desk, *sotto voce* objects the teacher's blame ascription 'nej jag klippar inte' 'no I don't cut', refusing to accept responsibility for cutting (line 7). The embodied features of his turn index a nonassertive objection, resisting the teacher's accusation. However, the teacher, probably hearing only his negation 'no I', in overlap, aggravates her accusation 'JO! DU KAN SKADA NÅN' 'but you can hurt somebody' (line 8). The turn-initial negation 'jo' shows that the teacher interprets Hamid's talk as an outright act of resistance and her aggravated accusations (articulating negative consequences of the boy's alleged misconduct), suggest that she views Hamid as a student who does not fully realize or acknowledge the dangerous character of his actions. Hamid (line 9) with a subdued bodily stance (he

looks down at his hands on the desk there they can be seen) finally confirms his understanding ('jag vet' 'I know'), and publicly acknowledges breach of rules. However, the teacher continues the remedial – instructional – exchange.

As demonstrated, the child's outright resistance, designed with turn-initial objections, is immediately responded to by the teacher. The teacher uses upgraded admonishments and articulation of social rules of conduct in an attempt to clarify why a particular kind of behavior constitutes a normative transgression. Her telling-off explicates the norms and behavioral expectations and the child's noncompliance (his refusal to acknowledge the infraction of norm) results in the teacher's aggravated moral instructions (lines 1, 5, 8).

4.2 Moral instruction and accountability in question-answer sequences

Remedial interchanges operate within the domain of accountability and moral instruction, and the teachers socialized the children by using discursive strategies that ascribed accountability and engaged the children's participation and compliant contributions to moral discourse. The teachers used questions (hypothetical and polar), comparisons and mundane moral syllogisms to invite the students' acknowledgement or articulation of the serious consequences of untoward actions, working to instill in the children an understanding of the physical, emotional, and moral impact of their actions on the others. The discursive strategies used by the teacher pointed to the serious outcomes and affective consequences of bad behavior (alluding to causal relation between untoward acts and negative emotions) and requested that the child actively engages and participates in moral thinking by considering and delving into how one should reason and act. The teacher's persistent moral instruction clearly positioned the child as not fully acknowledging the severity of his transgression, and worked as a discursive site for moral and emotional socialization into expressing embodied subdued understanding of one's culpability. Importantly, a smooth development of such remedial interchanges operated on an assumption that the child is a morally cooperating subject who listens and seriously accepts the telling-off; if compliant responses were not forthcoming, the teachers' moral instructions intensified.

In Extract 2 (continuation of the same remedial trajectory as Extract 1), the teacher uses the hypothetical question 'Om saxen kommer i nåns öga! Vad tror du händer då?' '*If the scissors get into somebody's eyes! What do you think will happen then?*'. Such a hypothetical situation presents an implicit instructional scenario about the negative results of normative infraction.

- (2) 10. Teacher: Om saxen kommer i nåns öga!

11. Vad **tror** du **händer** då?
*If the **scissors** get into somebody's **eyes**!*
*What do you **think** will happen then?*
((gesture towards her eye))
12. John: Man blir [död.
 One becomes dead.
13. Hamid: [Man blir död.
 One becomes dead.
14. Teacher: *((silences John with a gesture, looking at Hamid))*
15. Teacher: Nej. Man **dör** inte. Vad **händer** då?
16. Det [är kanske nåt som är **värre**.
*No. You don't **die**. What **happens** then?*
*Maybe it's something **worse**.*

Figure 2: Hamid covers his eye

17. Hamid: [Man kan inte se. Man kan inte se. ((Figure 2))
One can't see. One can't see.
((covers his eye, smiley voice, moving playfully))

The teacher presents a hypothetical morally charged situation 'If – what happens then?' ('*If the scissors get into somebody's eyes! What do you think will happen then?*', lines 10–11). Interestingly, John's and Hamid's responses are serious but exaggerated, i.e., 'man blir död' '*one becomes dead*' (lines 12–

13). They both, in a nearly choral fashion, use an extreme case formulation to refer to severe and tragic consequences. However, the teacher bluntly, with a turn-initial negation, corrects their responses and repeats her question *‘What happens then? It may be something worse’*. Hamid then responds with an embodied demonstration *‘man kan inte se’* *‘One can’t see’* (line 17).

The teacher’s questions do not spell out the social norms of conduct, but rather, as implicit discursive socialization devices, position the child as an active moral agent who has to take part in this moral instruction by compliantly aligning with, reflecting and acknowledging the explanation why this is a transgression in the first place (cf. the studies of Korean classroom discourse, Ahn 2016; Lo 2009; that show that teachers use prohibitive imperatives, demanding children’s normatively appropriate conduct). The smooth flow of the remedial exchange and appropriate participation in a moral instructional exchange require that the children acknowledge the teacher’s moral agenda and actively engage in the co-construction of the moral ‘message’ (see also Cekaite 2012, 2019). Demonstrably, the student’s correct, but affectively ambiguous answer (line 17) – he enacts a negative outcome of playing with scissors, covering his eye, but uses smiley voice – shows that this is not the case.

4.3 Children’s embodied double-voiced responses: Crafting resistant compliance as embodied hyperbole

The teacher used numerous and varied questions throughout this socializing moral encounter (Extracts 1–2). As demonstrated, a remedial interchange that was conducted as a question-based discursive strategy relied on an assumption that the child accepts the teacher’s normative version: a smooth resolution of a remedial interchange depended on the respondent accepting responsibility for transgression. Importantly, the children’s verbal or embodied responses, involving affective displays of sadness and remorse, served to attest their acceptance of culpability and also authenticity of their remedial actions (see also Björk-Willén 2018 on children’s apologies in a Swedish preschool). In that these affective expressions were normatively expected during the re-establishment of moral equilibrium, the affective valorization of the children’s responses became a target for moral inspection of adult authority, and emotions – remorse, anger, empathy, sorrow – gained moral value and were monitored by the teachers.

The children, however, did not always comply with the teacher's disciplinary efforts, and exploited the teacher's questions as opportunities for veiled noncompliance, or resistant compliance. They exercised their resistant agency without engaging in explicit confrontation. As will be demonstrated, Hamid, instead of bluntly refusing blame ascription, crafts his responses as double-voiced acts of resistant compliance. Importantly, this double-voicedness (or hybrid constructions, Bakhtin 1981: 304) was affective and embodied. Several ways of configuring embodied double-voicedness were discerned. The children combined up-scaled verbal and hyperbolic nonverbal responses when the teacher's talk required but minimal responses. In addition, the children combined contrasting, antithetical affect, e.g., crying and smiling, or used embodied hyperbole (exaggerated gestures and movements). In that such responses did not explicitly defy the teacher's moral instructions, resistant-compliant moves were efficient in derailing a successful resolution of remedial exchange. Below, I will describe several typical designs of the children's double-voiced, resistant-compliant responses.

In Extract 3 (continuation of the same remedial trajectory), the teacher extends the remedial interchange by posing questions that contain personal examples and refer to the target child as protagonist in a morally charged situation. In that personal examples strongly commit the respondent, they constitute rhetorically powerful discursive resources aimed at steering and securing the child's institutionally relevant responses, and implicating the child's culpability in committing the normatively transgressive action. In these ways, the teacher is able to point out the general rules and norms for the child to follow, and link them to the child's experiential world.

- (3) 17. Hamid: [Man kan inte se. Man kan inte se.
One can't see. One can't see.
 ((covers his eye, smiley voice, moving playfully))

Figure 3: Teacher removes Hamid's hand

18. Teacher: Du. ((Figure 3))
Listen. ((removes Hamid's hand from his face))
19. Tycker du det är **bra** att nån inte kan **se**?
*Do you think it's **good** if someone can't see?*

Figure 4: Large headshakes

20. Hamid: ((large headshakes)) ((Figure 4))
21. John: hahaha ((hiding his mouth behind his palm))
22. Teacher: Du (.) Hamid!
Listen (.) Hamid! ((touches him quickly))
23. Teacher: Då ska du inte **leka** med saxar!
*Then don't **play** with scissors!*

Figure 5: Continuous nods

24. Hamid: OK. ((Figure 5)) ((*continuous large nods, disengages from teacher's gaze*))
25. Teacher: Dom **har** vi när vi **klipper**.
We use them for cutting.
26. Hamid: ((*continues large nods*))
27. Teacher: **DU** blir **ledsen** om nån gör dumma saker mot **dig**.
YOU get **sad** when others do mean things to you.
((*angry voice*))
28. Hamid: A.
Yes. ((covers his face mock 'crying', smiles behind his palm))
29. Teacher: A. **TROR** DU ATT dom blir **ledsna** när **du** gör dumma
30. **saker**.
Yes. DO YOU THINK they get sad when you do mean things? ((gazes at Hamid, suddenly removes his hand from his face))
31. Hamid: ((*large nods*))
32. John: ((*smiles*))
33. Teacher: Då **behöver** du tänka **också**.
In that case you need to think too.
34. Another student approaches the teacher.

Hamid's response (line 17) publicly displays a subversive stance: verbally, he produces a factually 'correct' response to the teacher's morally valorized question. However, the teacher removes Hamid's hand from his face, correcting his bodily conduct and uses a polar question that poses a challenge: 'tycker du att det är bra att man inte kan se?' 'do you think it's good if someone can't see?' (lines 18-19). Despite Hamid's aligning verbal response, the teacher interprets the response as an embodied expression of a resistant affective stance. The double-voicedness and the hybridity of the child's action capitalize on the affective discrepancy between the verbal and embodied features: serious propositional turn content and smiley voice (mixing of "two styles"; "two ... axiological belief systems", Bakhtin 1981: 305). Such double-voicedness of the child's responses is achieved by using embodied resources that can be conceptualized as embodied hyperbolic rhetoric, or bodily hyperbole. Whereas hyperbole in talk refers to exaggeration that emphasizes something and works as an intensifier that, for instance, relays speakers' exaggerated emotions, here, it is the child's bodily actions that carry an exaggerated shape and duration and intensify his display of eagerness and alignment with the teacher.

It can be suggested that the child's resistance gradually builds up (it becomes more visible and elaborate) as the teacher uses different strategies to account for her disciplining and thus attempts to teach the child appropriate conduct and instill the sense of moral accountability. Thus, in line 20, Hamid's nonverbal response yet again aligns with the teacher on a propositional level: his head shakes confirm that he does not think that it is good to lose one's eyesight. Simultaneously, the double-voiced character of the child's response is indicated by the shape of his head shakes – they take a markedly exaggerated shape. The ambiguity of moral and affective stance is achieved by using embodied hyperbole in responses where a subdued stance is expected.

In line 23, the teacher's prohibitive conclusion '*then don't play with scissors*' ties back to and is causally related to Hamid's alleged normative transgression (playing with scissors). The teacher's prohibition is markedly aggravated: through voice quality, facial expression, and prosody, the teacher adopts an angry affective stance and emphasizes the limits for the child's future conduct. The instruction '*we use them for cutting*' explains a general rule and concludes the personalized moral syllogism. Hamid yet again aligns with the teacher: he nods but uses embodied hyperbolic rhetoric. His nods are large, temporally extended, and are combined with affectively disjunctive smiley facial expression (line 27). Continuous nodding (throughout the teacher's instruction '*we use them for cutting*') not only flouts the seriousness of his response, but also allows him to withdraw from an attentive body-spatial framework initiated by the teacher.

The child's double-voiced responses occasion the teacher's use of questions, involving personal examples (line 27), or, what is here called moral syllogisms, that aim at socializing empathy and perspective-taking by narratively positioning the protagonist in precarious, affectively charged situations. Hamid's own emotional experiences and his individual perspective are fitted in a logic structure, thus exemplifying negative emotional consequences of untoward behavior and the relational character of emotions. The moral syllogism holds him accountable for his actions towards others.

The teacher intensifies her attempts by repeatedly issuing person-focused questions or descriptions (in response to Hamid's repeated double-voiced acts), that are eagerly responded to by Hamid, who publicly enacts his compliance and concurrent collusive resistance (see similar design in lines 20, 24, 26, 28, 31). The teacher upgrades and formulates her moral instruction by using a syllogism '*du blir ledsen om nån gör dumma saker mot dig*' '*you get sad when others do mean things to you*' and asks Hamid a hypothetical question which has a moralizing potential '*tror du att dom blir ledsna när du gör dumma saker*' '*do you think they get sad when you do mean things?*'. This

question ties back to the teacher's statement about Hamid's emotional reactions and holds him accountable, committing him to act in accordance with his own and the others' feelings and conduct. Here, negative emotion ascriptions highlight affect as a relational and causal act. The teacher uses affect as a resource for socialization by soliciting the child's own commitment to act in accord with moral expectations and the child's affective stance (serious, remorseful) has to attest change in his moral portrait and vouch for his conduct in the future.

4.4 Teacher's intensification of moral instruction: Pointing out inappropriateness of double-voiced affective stance

The remedial interchange was extended and was increasingly more explicit, although it was characterized by the absence of the target child's objections (but see initial part of the exchange, Extract 1). Rather, the more the child engaged in double-voiced responses, the more the teacher intensified and extended the remedial interchange, shifting from referring to general rules and norms (Extracts 1, 3) and direct, harmful consequences of transgression (Extract 2), to explicitly commenting and criticizing the child's inappropriate bodily conduct, and, more specifically, his double-voiced affective stances. Throughout the remedial trajectory, the teacher changed the subject of moral instructions from socialization about general norms of conduct (including demands of accounts for the social norms' significance) to how to visibly display – or embody – understanding of these norms to others.

- (4) Teacher stops instructing another student who goes back to his desk, and she re-initiates the remedial interchange.
50. Teacher: *((moves closer to Hamid, F-formation))*
51. Hamid: *((mock 'attentive' face, does not look at teacher))*
52. Teacher: >Förstär du Hamid?<
>Do you understand, Hamid?<
53. Hamid: A.
Yeah. ((smiling, Figure 6))
54. Teacher: A men du le:r.
Yeah but you smi:le.
55. Hamid: Jag vet.

Figure 6: Hamid is smiling

I know.

56. Teacher: A. (0.2) Det känns lite **konstigt** för mig.
 Yeah. (0.2) *It feels a bit **strange** to me.*

The teacher resumes disciplinary instructions with a polar Yes/No question 'Do you understand?' (line 52). The cognitive state of 'understanding' is related to appropriate emotional expression on the face of the child, which is again double-voiced by Hamid, who, despite his verbal ratification 'A' 'Yeah', is smiling (line 53). The teacher's statement 'a men du ler' 'yeah but you smile' focalizes and accuses Hamid of an inappropriate affective stance and he makes a concession ('jag vet' 'I know'). The teacher then proceeds with moral instruction by articulating her personal meta-evaluation of the affective, and moral, stance, taken by Hamid ('det känns lite konstigt för mig' 'it feels a bit strange to me', line 56).

The very fact that Hamid repeatedly and eagerly answers the teacher's questions by using embodied hyperbole is inappropriate. A normatively expected – serious and respectful – response to a moral instruction such as this one would be a minimal acknowledgement from the target person. The child, however, adopts a contrite, resistant-compliant, pose instead. Throughout the remedial interchange, he produces multiple multimodally double-voiced responses. The child denotatively agrees with the teacher's description but simultaneously makes his recalcitrance collusively noticeable to his peer through embodied hyperbolic rhetoric design. In that the child does not produce an outright aggravated objection, the teacher, a moral authority, does not have an easily attainable target of criticism. Significant features characterizing the remedial interchange are the intensive F-formation and close spatial proximity established and sustained by the teacher

through body positioning, various types of touch and gaze that together position the child's body in a social space of attentive participation (Cekaite 2012). However, such F-formation allows the teacher to control the child's bodily position, but not his affective stance, or collusive glances towards his peer John, an overhearing audience. It is the child's subversive responses that lead to the teacher's explicit articulation of her expectations towards Hamid (lines 52 'do you understand Hamid'; line 54 'Yeah but you smile'): the teacher resorts to using explicit strategies where she topicalizes and criticizes Hamid's inappropriate affective stance.

4.5 Derailing of remedial interchange through a subversive topic shift

As noted earlier, the extended trajectory was related to the target child's numerous and varied, double-voiced compliant-resistant responses. In addition, the child initiated sudden topic shifts. Such topic shifts were introduced by using a disjunctive adjacency pair that combined contradictory pragmatic meanings. The topic shifts were introduced in an affectively neutral and non-confrontational way, and provided entertaining and collusive interactional resources for derailing the teacher's moral instruction (see Extract 5, continuation of the same remedial trajectory).

(5)

57. Hamid: Men **vänta**. Kan jag gå **hem** snälla: ! ((Figure 6))
 But **wait**. May I go **home please**! ((smiling))
58. [(5)]

Figure 6: Hamid is smiling

59. John: [((smiles))
 60. Teacher: ((looks at Hamid, serious face))
 61. Hamid: Skratta inte.
Don't laugh. ((points at John))
 62. Hamid: Vad är det som (.) är **roligt** för honom.
*What is it that (.) he **thinks** is funny?*
((to John, teacher))
 63. Teacher: °Jag vet inte(.).°
°I don't know (.). °((looks at John,
holds firm grip on Hamid's arm))
 64. [(9)
 65. Hamid: [((laughs silently, gazes away from teacher))
 66. Teacher: [((gazes at Hamid, 'serious' face))
 67. John: [((smiling))
 68. Hamid: Men sluta skratta. Han gör att vi skrattar.
But stop laughing. He makes us laugh.
 69. Teacher: ((looks at students silently for some
time, then leaves))

Despite the teacher's persistent attempts to solicit the child's 'authentic' affective participation in this remedial interchange, Hamid derails the situation by shifting the topic: he issues a polite request asking the teacher for permission to go home ('Kan jag gå hem snälla' 'May I go home please?', line 57). The sequential position, the smiling stance, and the propositional content of his request contribute to an abrupt change of topic. His turn constitutes a first pair part rather than a response to the teacher's moralizing evaluation 'Det känns lite konstigt för mig' 'It feels a bit strange to me' (line 56) and derails the teacher's moral instruction. By asking permission to leave, Hamid plays with the institutionally prescribed rights and responsibilities of teachers versus students in that it is the teachers who have the right to end the school day.

Interestingly, it is Hamid's continuous smiling that the teacher is able to pick out as a point of her implicit criticism (Extract 4, line 54), and while Hamid makes a concession that he is smiling (Extract 4, line 55), he also claims that his smile is not intentional (Extract 5, lines 61, 62, 68) and he allocates blame to his peer John. Hamid invokes the idea that smiling may be something that you "can't help" doing, as he says that John is "making him" smile (line 68).

The teacher, however, does not seem to be convinced by Hamid's argument, in that she does not shift her attention to John, and keeps her gaze directed at Hamid. Hamid's deflection of blame, while he continues smiling, constitutes an efficient double-voiced resistant move.

He does not engage in outright resistance and avoids displaying a remorseful attitude that could bring the remedial interchange to an expected closure. Despite the teacher's intense gazing and numerous extended pauses, the children keep collusively smiling, laughing and deflecting blame (lines 65, 67, 68). No apology or normatively appropriate display of remorse are offered by the children and the situation is terminated by the teacher who withdraws and leaves.

5 Discussion and conclusion

The present study has examined recurrent discursive features and affective and moral stances that characterize teacher-child remedial interchanges in a Swedish primary classroom. It shows in interactional detail the mutual association between the affective dimension of everyday normative engagements, and normative dimensions of affective engagements in the world (Baerveldt and Voestermans 2005). This association between affect and normativity is realized through the discursive organization of remedial interchanges where appropriate participation in remedial encounters depends on interactionally congruent – emotional and moral – discursive design. As demonstrated, a successful resolution of remedial interchange requires the moral target's affectively valorized acknowledgement of blame, and, embodied displays of serious attitude, authentic remorse, sadness, or empathy. The affective attunement of moral stances provides a foundation for participants' reestablishment of moral equilibrium and social order.

5.1 Discursive organization of remedial interchanges and instructions for moral accountability

Remedial interchanges and associated moral instruction can be accomplished in different discursive ways (cf. Ahn 2016; Howard 2009). In Swedish primary educational settings, they were structured through teacher questions that placed responsibility and gave the children possibilities to contribute to the formulation of moral messages, rather than explicitly commanding them to adhere to the authority's prohibitives (e.g., Cekaite 2012, 2019; Holm Kvist 2018). Congruent with the civic values and social competences, defined by the Swedish National Curriculum, the teacher's questions formed moral instructions that outlined serious consequences of bad behavior, thus socializing children into how they should reason about the consequences of their actions and modify their future conduct accordingly. The teacher's questions (polar or hypothetical wh- questions, personalized moral syllogisms) served as discursive socialization devices that did

not spell out the social norm. Rather, through logic of deduction, these questions invoked the relevance of social norm and the children's personal accountability. These discursive strategies firmly guided the children towards taking on a required moral position. The children's participation was inextricably linked to their public displays of morally and emotionally adequate and congruent responses, i.e., a remorseful affective and moral stance.

As demonstrated, the teacher's disciplining moral instructional approach was multifold: the child's affective stances were interpreted as a moral stance towards blame allocation, and towards an interlocutor. The child was expected to acknowledge wrongdoing by agreeing with the teacher's version of events and to show his authentic remorse by displaying a repentant and serious, i.e., remorseful, attitude. The responses had to show embodied agreement with the accusation. The child was expected to take in the moral instruction silently, respond with brief confirmations and use minimal response tokens to answer the teacher's questions. The child's responses were evaluated as a publicly visible and accountable expression of his inner feelings, and of his cognitive and moral understandings. In all, a successful resolution required the children's aligning, compliant responses. However, the question-answer-based interactional organization provided the children with ample opportunities to flout and collusively subvert the remedial interchange.

5.2 Multimodal double-voiced responses: Embodied hyperbole and hybrid/antithetical stances

The remedial interchange in focus was unsuccessful and was characterized by the child's intricately configured responses that flouted the teacher's moral agenda. Intriguingly, there was a notable absence of the target child's outright objections. Instead, the extended remedial trajectory was occasioned by the target child's resistant-compliant responses. Importantly, these double-voiced or hybrid constructions (Bakhtin 1981: 304) were affective and embodied. The present study thereby contributes to the widening of Bakhtinian concepts (initially used in literary work) to include basic but elaborate forms of embodied and verbal features of social interaction.

Repeatedly, despite the discursive expectation to align with the teacher's version of events and her interpretation of the child's actions, he collusively resisted the teacher characterizations, by answering with embodied, publicly visible, double-voiced and therefore, subversive, affective and moral stances. The child's affective and moral stances, indexical of remorse, were assembled as ambiguous acts that acquiesced with and simultaneously deflected the child's

culpability, effectively derailing the normative and interactional structure and a successful closure of the remedial interchange.

In all, the analysis revealed several ways of configuring the so-called embodied double-voiced responses. The child exploited the expectations of what constitutes appropriate temporal duration, timing, and shape of nonverbal responses and the juxtaposition of multiple modalities. He (i) combined up-scaled verbal and embodied hyperbolic rhetoric when the teachers' talk required but minimal responses, and (ii) configured antithetical affect displays, e.g., crying and smiling, or overlaid bodily displays of moral emotion (sadness, seriousness, and smiling) with aligning but exaggerated gestures and movements. The target child's bodily actions exploited embodied hyperbolic rhetoric: the exaggerated shape and duration of his actions intensified the display of eagerness and alignment with the teacher when contrite and subdued stance was expected.

5.3 Upgrading moral instruction

Notably, during this remedial trajectory, the teacher changed the subject of moral instructions from socialization about general norms of conduct (including demands of accounts for the social norms' significance) into how to visibly display affective stance of remorse and understanding of norms of moral accountability to others. The more the resistance, the more the teacher used insistent and direct disciplining socialization strategies (a process that can be described as a "complementary schismogenesis", Bateson 1972). The subject of instructions and socialization shifted from general rules of conduct and harmful consequences of transgression to criticism of inappropriate affective stances. In this way, behavioral and moral norms came into the open in order to become public knowledge.

In the light of the present analysis of an unsuccessful remedial trajectory, the embodied affective features of interpersonal moral acts are shown to carry significant implications for socialization into accountability. As demonstrated, norms become norms "not by virtue of their reflective articulation, but precisely because of their affective nature" (Baerveldt and Voestermans 2005: 450). The teacher used affect as a resource for control by soliciting the children's own orientation and commitment to act in accord with moral expectations here-and-now and in the future. Such examination of social interaction in recurrent social practices in a Swedish classroom contributes to a deeper understanding of how children and teachers interpret and modify emotional and moral experience and actions, while relying on and building a moral framework for interpreting and assessing each other's conduct. The findings underscore that culturally specific patterns of affective and moral socialization involve a complex interplay between language and

corporeality. Accordingly, moral accountabilities of social actors are affectively valorized and embodied: being and becoming a socially and morally recognizable persona means becoming an emotionally ‘adequate’ embodied actor.

The present study contributes to and extends the prior research on classroom moral socialization by highlighting how affective stances and normative understandings are linked together in ritualized embodied performances and language use. The examination of the multimodal interactional organization of a remedial interchange allowed to elaborate the understanding of intersubjectivity and moral accountability as embodied.

Transcription key

:	prolonged syllable
(.)	micropause, i.e. shorter than (0.5)
(2)	numbers in single parentheses represent pauses in seconds
AMP	relatively high amplitude
(tack)	unsure transcription
(())	further comments of the transcriber
?	denotes rising terminal intonation
.	indicates falling terminal intonation
smile	sounds marked by emphatic stress are in bold
hahah	indicates laughter
kommer	indicates talk in Swedish
come	translation to English

Acknowledgments: Financial support from Swedish Research Council is gratefully acknowledged; project ‘Communicating emotions, embodying morality’ DNR 742-2013-7626 with Asta Cekaite as Principal Investigator.

References

- Ahn, Junehui. 2016. “Don’t cry, you’re not a baby!”: Emotion, role and hierarchy in Korean language socialisation practice. *Children & Society* 30(1). 12–24.
- Baerveldt, Cor & Paul Voestermans. 2005. Culture, emotion and the normative structure of reality. *Theory Psychology* 15(4). 449–473.
- Bakhtin, Mikhail. 1981. *The dialogic imagination*. Austin: University of Texas.
- Bateson, Gregory. 1972. *Steps to an ecology of mind*. Hawai: Chandler Publishing Company.
- Björk-Willén, Polly. 2018. Apologies in children’s interactions. *Research on Children and Social Interaction* 2(2). 177–194.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. 1977. *Outline of a theory of practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Burdelski, Matthew. 2013. “I’m sorry, flower”. Socializing apology, relationships, and empathy in Japan. *Pragmatics and Society* 4(1). 54–81.

- Cekaite, Asta. 2012. Affective stances in teacher-novice student interactions: Language, embodiment, and willingness to learn. *Language in Society* 41(5). 641–670.
- Cekaite, Asta. 2017. Emotional stances and interactional competence: learning to disagree in a second language. In Gabrielle Kasper & Matthew Prior (eds.), *Talking emotion in multilingual settings*, 133–154. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Cekaite, Asta. 2019. Triadic conflict mediation and perspective taking in a Swedish preschool. *Linguistics and Education*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2019.100753>.
- Cekaite, Asta & Anna Ekström. 2019. Emotion socialization in teacher-child interactions: Teacher responses to children's negative emotions. *Frontiers in Psychology* 10. 1–19.
- Crossley, Nick. 1995. Body techniques, agency and intercorporeality: On Goffman's Relations in Public. *Sociology* 29(1). 133–149.
- Danby, Susan & Maryanne Theobald (eds.). 2012. *Disputes in everyday life: Social and moral orders of children and young people*. New York: Emerald.
- Du Bois, John. 2007. The stance triangle. In Robert Englebreton (ed.), *Stance in discourse: Subjectivity in interaction*, 13–182. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Du Bois, John & Elise Kärrkäinen. 2012. Taking a stance on emotion: Affect, sequence, and intersubjectivity in dialogic interaction. *Text & Talk* 32(4). 433–451.
- Evaldsson, Ann-Carita & Helen Melander. 2017. Managing disruptive student conduct: Negative emotions and accountability in reproach-response sequences. *Linguistics and Education* 37. 73–86.
- Goffman, Erving. 1971. *Relations in public*. New York: Basic Books Inc.
- Goodwin, Charles. 2017. *Co-operative action*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Goodwin, Marjorie H. & Charles Goodwin. 2000. Emotion within situated activity. In Nancy Budvig, Ina Uzgiris & Jim Wertsch (eds.), *Communication: An arena of development*, 33–54. Stamford CT: Ablex Publishing.
- Goodwin, Marjorie H., Asta Cekaite & Charles Goodwin. 2012. Emotion as stance. In Anssi Peräkylä & Marja-Leena Sorjonen (eds.), *Emotion in interaction*, 16–41. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Goodwin, Marjorie H. & Asta Cekaite. (2018). *Embodied family choreography. Practices of control, care and creativity*. New York: Routledge.
- Guntner, Susanne. 1997. The contextualization of affect in reported dialogues. In Susanne Neimeier & Rene Dirven (eds.), *The language of emotions*, 245–275. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- He, Agnes. 2000. The grammatical organization of teacher's directives: Implications for socialization of Chinese American children. *Linguistics and Education* 11(2). 119–140.
- Holm Kvist, Malva. 2018. Children's crying in play conflicts - a locus for moral and emotion socialisation. *Research on Children and Social Interaction* 2(2). 153–176.
- Howard, Katherine. 2009. "When meeting 'Khun' teacher, each time we should pay respect": Standardizing respect in a northern thai classroom. *Linguistics and Education* 20(3). 254–272.
- Keane, Webb. 2016. *Ethical life: its natural and social histories*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Kendon, Adam. 1990. Spatial organization in social encounters: The F-formation system. In Adam Kendon (ed.), *Conducting social interaction*, 209–238. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Levinas, Emanuel. 1998. *Entre nous: Thinking-of-the-other*. New York: Columbia University Press.

- Lo, Adriane. 2009. Lessons about respect and affect in a Korean American heritage language school. *Linguistics and Education* 20(3). 217–234.
- Merleau-Ponty, Maurice. 1962. *The phenomenology of perception*. New York: Humanities.
- Mondada, Lorenza. 2018. Multiple temporalities of language and body in interaction: Challenges for transcribing multimodality. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 51(1). 85–106.
- Moore, Ekaterina. 2014. “You are children but you can always say...” Hypothetical direct reported speech and child-parent relationships in a Heritage language classroom. *Text & Talk* 34(2). 591–621.
- Ochs, Elinor. 1996. Linguistic resources for socializing humanity. In John Gumperz & Stephen Levinson (eds.), *Rethinking linguistic relativity*, 407–437. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Sterponi, Laura. 2014. Caught red-handed: How Italian parents engage children in moral discourse and action. In Cecilia Waynryb & Holly Recchia (eds.), *Talking about right and wrong: Parent-child conversations as context for moral development*, 122–142. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Stevanovic, Melisa & Anssi Peräkylä. 2013. Three orders in the organization of human action. *Language in Society* 43(2). 185–207.

Bionote

Asta Cekaite

Asta Cekaite is Professor in Child Studies, Linköping University, Sweden. Her research involves an interdisciplinary approach to language, culture, and social interaction. Specific research foci include social perspectives on emotion and moral socialization. Empirical fields cover adult-child and children's peer group interactions in educational settings, and family social interactions (in Sweden, the U.S., and Japan). Her recent publications examine emotion, language, interpersonal touch and embodiment, and bodily techniques in socialization (*Research on Language and Social Interaction*, *Language in Society*, *Journal of Pragmatics*, *Language Sciences*, *Linguistics and Education*, *Multilingua*). She has co-authored a monograph with Marjorie H. Goodwin titled *Embodied Family Choreography: Practices of Control, Care and Creativity* (Routledge, 2018) and with Lorenza Mondada is a co-editor of *Touch in Social Interaction: Touch, Language and Body* (Routledge, 2021).