Signing and Singing

Tina Kullenberg

Signing and Singing

Children in Teaching Dialogues

Abstract

The dissertation examines children's dialogical sense-making in task-oriented teaching activities, the aim of which is to explore children's values and ideas in musical learning, in order to investigate how musical knowledge is constructed collaboratively through different levels of dialogicality. Hence, the study addresses the organizational resources and values at stake when children take part in pedagogical dialogues.

The four children studied are allocated the pre-given task of instructing each other, without the presence of adults, to sing songs in dyads (two and two). Five singing activities are video-documented, transcribed and analysed in depth through dialogical activity analysis, and group interviews with the children in pairs are also conducted, transcribed and analysed.

A sociocultural perspective on learning and communication with an approach based on dialogue theory forms the analytical point of departure for the study, where constitutive relations between the mediating acts of the participants and the resources in use – in the shape of discourses, cultural tools, representations, interaction orders, activity frames and values – are focused upon, and where teaching and learning are viewed as primarily communicative activities, and where learning as a purely individual process is dismissed.

The practice of musical teaching is seen to be an embodied and materialized practice, even though the young practitioners taking part in the study displayed different knowledge ideals, as well as different educational strategies, throughout the instructional phases of activity. In other words, they emphasized that there was a distinction between *learning the songs* and *knowing the songs*. The participants also used signing and singing with the help of artefacts, words and their bodies in a number of multi-functional, multi-semiotic and subtle ways. Moreover, the children organized their activities as traditional classroom teaching in several ways, and displayed skills in schooling as practitioners of a social practice. Accordingly, they established a school-specific task culture that took the form of a *communicative activity type*, where their orientation to *double dialogicality*, that is, the dialogue of the culturally established dimension on the one hand, and the interpersonal, local context on the other, is of significance.

Contents

Acknowledgements

Before I start to account for the present study, I sincerely want to thank all people that actually stand behind this work. Without the children in this study and their schoolteacher, nothing of significance could have been said. I wish to express my deepest gratitude for your cooperation and patience throughout the research process. Moreover, my thesis profoundly relies on all of you who have supported me with academic skills. My next thanks goes to my university in Gothenburg and, especially, the research school in educational science, CUL, and our leader Jesper Boesen. This school has generously served me with comprehensive knowledge and so much inspiration from numerous impressive scholars within the field.

Next, the team behind me is excellent. Together you showed me the way into interesting and useful knowledge. Claes Ericsson, I know you can sail on the sea, but I can see that you are able to navigate brilliantly as a supervisor too. You have been firm when I needed that but also sensitive when it was appropriate. In addition, I have appreciated your willingness to always answer questions and mails both quickly and informatively. Niklas Pramling, my other supervisor: You always have interesting things to say. It has been a pleasure to look on my drafts with your glasses. Now, how can I thank you, Per Linell, who has generously been there for me during this intellectual journey, with all your specialist-knowledge and wise, inspiring thoughts to share. At HSM, I would like to thank Anders Carlsson for his great support in practical concerns. My critical friends here, the PhD

students, have challenged my drafts constantly, problematizing many things. As Vygotsky said:

> The swimmer's path, like the writer's creativity, is the resultant of two forces, the swimmer's own effort and the deviating force of the current. (Vygotsky, 1925/1971, p. 16)

So, thanks for doing this, you have been my "deviating force of the current", pushing me to sharpen my arguments even more. A note on some more persons is needed. Göran Folkestad and Karin Johansson in Malmö, the University of Lund, who helped me initially with my empirical ideas: Thanks for your creative ideas at the start. I would also like to thank my opponents at the seminars during this research education: Cecilia Hultberg, Helen Melander and Marléne Johansson. You gave me important keys to what to be aware of in my drafts. Cecilia Wallerstedt, and Monica Lindgren, you have also contributed a lot with clarifying reflections on my questions and drafts during this extended process.

The current work is also based on contributions from those of you who have shared knowledge with me on the way, before becoming a PhD student. Many of you have been important guides to my personal development, especially the teachers who encouraged me from start, making me believe in what I am capable of doing. In my early music teacher education, Ann-Krestin Vernersson, now Professor, showed how art and creativity could be taught in untraditional and exciting ways. Bertil Hallin was important as well. Inga-Britt Niemand, who educated me in piano teaching: You not only taught me how to teach piano-playing methodically. With all your enthusiastic dialogues with me, you were also an important person for arousing my initial interest in pedagogical thinking. Later, I had the honour to meet and learn from interesting scholars/teachers: Hans-Edvard Roos, Per-Olof Olofsson, Anders Nelson, Gunnar Heiling and Jonas Aspelin in my second academic period, studying sociology and pedagogy. In the later phase of my intellectual development, Roger Säljö, Øivind Varkøy, Cecilia Ferm and the philosopher Jan Bengtsson, who so sadly passed away from us, have been important guides to me. You all clearly helped me to build a ground for my academic identity, as necessary for this task. I hope you can see the influences from you in this study. Furthermore, my dear friends who have been around me in these intense times: as you know, I need you. Thank you so much for your selfless friendship.

Sarah, my dear daughter, now the time has come for *you* to study social science hard. It is my time to return your consistent support. You have been outstanding, wanting me to work more with books than cooking, expecting me to go in for my intellectual development and buying deep books for me written by famous female thinkers who have contributed to changing the world. How many daughters give their mum such enormous support!? Moreover, I appreciate your illustrations in this book.

Mattias, my dear son, perhaps you want me to say something funny now again. But only you can. Right now I can only think of how great you are, and so on. Now we can put other things than books and 'hard facts' on the dinner table… Your computers, for example, or what about a lot of sweets!

Introduction

This chapter will describe what particular pedagogical and musical issues I shall address in this study. First, the readers will meet some decisive experiences of my professional background, that is, my experiences as a music teacher in compulsory Swedish schools (section 1.1). Then I continue to outline educational research that has contributed to the research questions posed, also pointing to some trends within the research field (section 1.2). Given that backdrop I further describe the aim of the thesis. Finally, in 1.3, the structure of the thesis is given an account. This serves as an overview of what follows in the present work.

1.1 BACKGROUND

First of all, I shall make a scene-setting note on my own classroom life with young pupils, as a newly certificated teacher in the 1990s. My first class teaching was with relatively young children, some of them were enrolled in the preschool (i.e. 5–6 years of age). Convinced by the educational idea of being well equipped with a detailed, pre-given pedagogical plan, I used to write down a detailed lesson plan and place it in my pocket. Then I entered the school. To put practical things in proper order before the lessons was an important part of this planning procedure. Further, it was not easy to keep the musical instruments, furniture, tools, plans and things in such order, and at the same time take control of the enormous power of expressivity in a group of curious

young children, immediately eager to express wills in all directions. I cannot say it was worth all my preparatory efforts, and that was perhaps the worst thing to realize. I left the lessons too frequently in a disappointed mood, facing the fact that our classroom activities were mostly fun, and useful as well, but not in the way I had initially expected. It was not so easy to transfer the note in my pocket to the music pedagogical realities, as they occurred. For a while, I lost my enthusiasm in the teaching profession. At the same time, the Swedish national curricula changed radically for all school subjects. The instructions in the middle of the 1990s were to have specific learning goals in mind. The methods were up to the teachers to find out. The learning abilities in the long run were what mattered now, and the curriculum was not so regulated any more. I felt free to do whatsoever in order to accomplish music-specific skills. To allow me to feel free was not only stimulating in the creative sense. Something very transformative also happened to my entire attitude to teaching.

Why should we teachers feel discouraged even when our pupils actually learn a lot of relevance and seem to enjoy their lessons in addition? Musical development is a complex process, and the routes often vary in the learning individuals. So, at this point I started to share the children's enjoyment in our intense, playful lessons, no matter exactly in what order the skills were achieved (if they were achieved exactly in the ways that I had expected or not). I now also learned to rely on our dialogical dynamics, that is, to teach in conjunction with the emerging group flow, to a much larger extent than before. Looking back at teaching young people aged from 5 to 16, I can identify that the most successful and playful pedagogical ideas are created in the social situations *with* them, not exclusively *before* them. Practically, the pupils then informed me about the abiding concerns of how to launch the most successful classroom ideas – the music pedagogical methods in practice. But of course, I was the one who had the professional idea about the way to take, and what skills have to be finally achieved. As far as I can remember, I did not receive general complaints of what we achieved in relation to developmental levels in music the pupils reached, and in accordance with the outlined national learning criteria. The convention of detailed pre-planned efforts in teaching seemed to be overestimated, at least in a school subject like music. But to use an improvisational teaching style is not uncomplicated, either to the teachers or to their pupils. Issues such as risk-taking, trust, perspective-taking, losing social control, having the courage to act out musicality, and sharing divergent opinions deliberately were actualized in the classrooms throughout these years.

Now it should be more explicable to the reader why didactical and pedagogical aspects are not only about planning and knowledge achievement in its most linear and restricted sense. Rather, they are one of several parts of the work as a teacher. As hinted, my chief interest became more about how communication facilitates or restricts learning, and what social premises can be related to pedagogic creativity. Further, as my teacher experiences have indicated, my general interest in education also concerns the perspective of the pupils. What makes sense to them, and how and when can teachers see pupils as partners – as resources for both teaching and learning, are examples of recurrent thoughts from my period as a music teacher. These experiences constituted the very outset of my intellectual journey in the educational world. They clearly contributed to my prolonged learning trajectory that has now finally ended up in a research format – a PhD thesis delivered. It is an intricate but exciting moment, setting off with the attempt to share my new knowledge.

The present study concerns how children, aged 9 and 10, teach each other to sing songs. Here I examine how the young participants face both pedagogical and communicative challenges when working with a particular song in pairs without any adult in attendance. With such an opportunity, I am also eager to get an idea of what knowledge ideals and pedagogical strategies actually make sense to them from moment to moment. In the children's eyes, what needs to be solved, explicated and realized when facing musical challenges, and what remains implicit? Also of relevance to this thesis is to discover how children express themselves when teaching and learning in such collaborative encounters.

School music has changed considerably since the 1990s, and *peer work* is now an important part of music lessons in Swedish elementary schools (Skolverket, 2005). Pupils are placed in groups with assignments that have to be dealt with collaboratively during a relatively short span of time. Usually the assignments are complex; for example, playing a piece of music on instruments in an ensemble or, even more complicated, composing music together (Ericsson & Lindgren, 2010). Such work requires skills in both music and communication. The teaching shift described has to do with a new interest in young people's preferences and experiences from their lives outside school. Music in school is now "more affected by the musical life of society and young people's musical ideas, interests and needs" (Skolverket, 2005, p. 13, my translation). Moreover, Skolverket (ibid., p. 121) states that in the early school period (that means, the ages 6 to 12) singing songs is the

activity that Swedish music lessons mainly centre on, in contrast to older children aged 13–15 years who have to focus on musical instruments instead of so much singing.

Given this change and the fact that the topic requires more research, I want to contribute with empirically based knowledge about precisely this: what children's musical ideas, interests and needs look like, and how they approach singing in learning situations. At the same time, the present thesis will shed light on socially constructed knowledge; how ideas and interests can be put into action *dialogically* and situationally. Hopefully this research will be fruitful for both didactical and theoretical reasons, in the first instance, by gaining more knowledge of how to organize peer work with young people's perspectives in mind. In the second, gaining insight into dialogic learning and what constitutes musical learning in children's singing activities.

1.2 THE AIM OF THE STUDY AND THE RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The academic concerns about children's musicality have been directed to their individual musical abilities, talents and achievements. Musicality traditionally reflected the myth that only some children are musical and possess musical creativity (Burnard, 2012; McPherson, Davidson & Faulkner, 2012; Sundin, 1978, p. 25 f.). Here musicality is defined as something that belongs exclusively to a small proportion of children, consequently implying that the rest of the children are more or less non-musical. I shall come back to this issue throughout the thesis, as several conducted tests of musicality appear to legitimate such a take on this issue. When constructing operational measurement-procedures of musical, or non-musical, behaviours in test situations, the children's musicality is assumed to be inferable and, hence, verified scientifically. In such an experimental plot there are also presumptions about the children's further development. The traditional tests further undertake predictions of later success in, for example school music activities (Sundin, 1978, p. 26). Sundin wrote about a research culture with a focus on achievements, often generating questions of quantitative type, such as how well the child sings (assessed in quantitave scales), or how much s/he is able to reproduce on the spot. He called for quite another focus; a research interest in how children experience music in terms of how they actually relate to it (cf. Ferm Thorgersen, 2009; Pramling Samuelsson & Pramling, 2009; Wallerstedt, 2013). That also means examining what they really do with the music, rather than merely

observing what they do *wrong* in their music performances, according to Western adult norms of music. For example, questions such as what musical aspects young people pay attention to, and how they construct attitudes and norms in music are apposite examples of music educational issues to deal with here. Phrasing it differently, I am interested in the shift from looking at musical learning *outcomes* to musical learning *processes;* in recognizing what is happening behind 'the scene' before the music has finally been embodied and learned (cf. Hellsten, 2013, and Heiling, 2007, who advocates a view of arts education that allows for the latter focus). Such a shift also concerns *teaching processes* in music: "the manner in which instrumental teachers [in music] carry out their teaching becomes a determining factor where learning and educational outcome are concerned, which subsequently makes it an interesting arena for research" (Nerland, 2007, p. 399, with reference to Kennel).

Sundin was concerned about the 'achievement focus' in 1978. So, it is clearly not a recent statement. One might therefore ask if there is still good reason to emphasize his view of children's attitudes to music in these late-modern days. The answer is both yes and no. On the one hand, there is now new knowledge and awareness of the child perspective, seeing children as actors with agency in the own right (James, Jenks & Prout, 1998; Sommer, 2005). In the music educational practice we now face two contrasting versions. The convention of an adult-led teaching style, focusing on order and teacher instructions in front of the group of young pupils still exists (Young, 2009). In contrast, Young also identifies a child led approach appraising such pedagogical ideas as play and free choices offered to the pupils. Nowadays she also identifies a new step towards a dialogical stance. Recently education has been described as a dialogue, leading to the promotion of peer-based work. She claims that the way children work with each other is now something to explore. My thesis also takes this latter view as its point of departure, by exploring the nature of peer collaboration in paired work (cf. Vass, Littleton, Miell & Jones, 2008, who acknowledge peer collaboration as an important resource for learning in creative school subject matters).

On the other hand, however, a number of scholars in music education accentuate the problems of the current one-sided instrumental discourse, focusing on the usefulness of musical skills (Bamford, 2009; Lindgren, 2006; Pio, 2009; Pio & Varkøy, 2012; Varkøy, 2003, 2009; Young, 2009). Nilsson problematizes the goal-oriented pedagogical request "to make the right thing" (Nilsson, 2013, p. 139, my translation) in the music educational practice. This is consistent with international research on music education, distinguishing

between what music is in people's lives as existential music experience vs. what music is in people's lives primarily by virtue of technical skills (McPherson, Davidson & Faulkner, 2012; Welch & McPherson, 2012). This kind of instrumentality often means considering knowledge development in music in terms of other, more generic abilities such as creativity, critical thinking, self-esteem, memory, teamwork, literacy or numeracy. In Young's (2009) view, this results in pressure to formalize and accelerate children's education. Bamford (2009) suggests that there is education *in* arts and education *with* arts. She welcomes both approaches in her comprehensive study. The instrumental trend in both educational research and practice does not characterize only arts education. It is a consequence of an educational discourse embracing ideals of teaching and learning such as effectiveness, emphasizing individual autonomy and individualisation, usefulness, measurement, administration and goal-rationality (Aspelin, 2012, 2014; Aspelin & Persson, 2011; Bergqvist, 2010, 2012; Biesta, 2009a; Liedman, 2011; Lindgren, 2006, 2013; Pring, 2004; Skolverket, 2009; Varkøy, 2003). So, the new public language of learning is basically an individualistic concept. It refers to what people, as *individuals* do, "even if it is couched in such notions as collaborative or cooperative learning. That stands in stark contrast to the concept of 'education' which always implies a relationship" (Biesta, 2009a, p. 38f.). I am here studying Swedish children and what makes it interesting is the fact that Sweden accentuates self-regulative working ideals in learning, even more than most other Nordic countries:

> Individualisation can be seen as continuity in the pedagogical ideas – at the same time the meaning of individualisation changes along with other changes in school and society. While in Sweden and Norway the appearance of self-regulatory individualised ways of working in the end of the twentieth century is quite strong, it is not so obvious in the other [Nordic] countries. (Carlgren, Klette, Myrdal, Schnack & Simola, 2006, p. 301)

In all perspectives, there is something subordinated in the shadow of the points at stake. One of the missing points in the late-modern educational trend might be that both human art experiences and existential knowledge often develop beyond standardized measurements. Moreover, long-term objectives in formalized learning are in risk to be overlooked in the narrow-minded pursuit of curriculum-based short-time objectives to check off in report cards, certificates and the like. Such reasoning hence lends itself to reductionist interpretations.

Recalling Sundin (1978) and his search for a less achievement focused research on children's musicality; there is now a new reason for his concern. Whereas playful music pedagogy is now widespread, the influences of a considerably less playful idea of teaching are also salient. According to Pio and Varkøy (2012), this influential idea has emerged from the technical rationality of our time in which the issue of music experiences as existential experiences is increasingly threatened. In Sweden there are reports of how music educators are again addressing purely technical and formal aspects of music, in decontextualized ways along similar lines that Sundin attributed to traditional music education (i.e. not viewing music and musical learning in its wide contextual and experiential complexity). Kempe and West (2001) point to how Swedish music teachers primarily narrow down music into small musical units as particular printed scores and technical instrumental aspects, without allowing for music listening experiences or dialogues about the pupils' experiences of music. Ericsson and Lindgren (2010) claim that current music education in elementary Swedish schools is permeated with a "task culture" in order to keep the pupils busy with prescribed assignments. That implies that the realized learning is not only about music, or musical creativity, but about how to participate in formalized school activities in general. As the butter on the bread, the pupils' music work is evaluated upon this institutional premise. Hence, the crucial teacher assessments are based on somewhat decontextualized premises too – it is not merely the music abilities that count, rather it is how they are operationalized in the classrooms. In my earlier study (Kullenberg, 2008), the adolescent students in elementary school did not indulge enthusiastically in what they call music in the classroom, even when popular music was on the agenda. There was no room for that, they said. School music is not real music, while out-of-school music was clearly attractive to them. This is in conjunction with other findings that refer to Swedish school music (Ericsson, 2007; Skolverket, 2005).

With the background of what has been said here in mind, I am eager to know more about how children value and organize musical knowledge 'in action' outside a school situation, and without a guiding adult in their immediate vicinity. Perhaps it might then be possible to understand something new about children's meaning making: to generate new knowledge of how children orient to musical learning and teaching. Further, due to the existing focus on individual achievements mentioned above, it is also of interest to explore another approach in order to generate more original knowledge. Norms and knowledge ideals that young people co-construct in social ways become

relevant. In the present thesis I accordingly step away from the concern in strictly individual-based knowledge building, trying to avoid epistemological points of departures such as the traditional solitary knower, or to conceive of creativity as based on self-dependency.

Moreover, we do not know much about how children participate as instructors in learning and teaching activities, both in general and more specifically within the field of music education. Here 'teaching activities' refer to social encounters in cultural practices. They are close to Mercer's concept "guided construction of knowledge" (Mercer, 1995), indicating that teaching is based on social and dialogical constructions. They can be situated in various contexts, bringing life to particular ways of reasoning and thinking (i.e. discourses, cf. Bergqvist, 2001a, b, 2010, 2012; Ericsson & Lindgren, 2010; Lindgren, 2006, 2013; Nerland, 2004, 2007; Säljö, 2000, 2005). The encounters take place between an instructor (or instructors) and an apprentice (or apprentices) and where the participants involved share an agreed purpose: to deal with the apprentice's specific learning outcome. That means an *intended* and contracted learning outcome, with the instructor as the pedagogical leader. Given this definition, teaching can be an activity outside conventional institutions, as in the case of my research design in which these criteria exist. However, it is too early to say anything about the participants' nature of instruction in more detail. The final results will tell us that. As far as theory is concerned, I shall come back to the notion of teaching, discourses and dialogues.

The aim of the present study is to contribute knowledge about children's perspectives as they are expressed in pedagogical dialogues with each other. Their musical skills and learning will then be analytically related to the situational development through communicative interactions of different kinds. In this thesis, I take the chance to explore *how children organize learning together*. The learning activity is at the same time a social practice centring on teaching. More precisely, the purpose is to explore how some children make sense when instructing each other in a song task. The children teach each other songs in dyads (two by two) as a pre-given task, without the presence of an adult in the ongoing activity. I intend to study how this activity is organized dialogically, on the basis of the video-documented social interactions and the nature of the given task. It is hoped that such a study will be of interest both to educators of young people in general (researchers as well as elementary school-teachers) and to the research field of music education. If we know more about children's ways of expressing themselves in instructional and musical issues, we might

get some clues about how to come a little bit closer to an understanding that makes sense also in institutional learning situations. Both educationalists on the floor, working in schools, and in the field of educational research might profit from new knowledge of this kind. Further, this work can be seen as an attempt to contribute a sociocultural activity approach to analysing dialogues. It deals with pedagogical communication in a somewhat novel way; identifying both micro- and meso-levels in pedagogical activities.

My research questions centre on the following:

- How do the children go about teaching and learning to sing songs in their social interactions?
- What role does culture play in their joint task?

1.3 GUIDANCE FOR READERS

As help for the reader to overview the structure of the thesis, some guiding words are needed. The chapter that follows this introductory section is *Chapter 2*, which addresses earlier research on children's musicality in relation to pedagogical issues. Here I point to central traditions within the existing field. The chapter further provides a summary. *Chapter 3* also addresses earlier research but focuses on educational science in its broader conception: research on teaching as an educational practice, and on discourses of schooling. The chapter ends up with a summary to briefly clarify the most significant threads in the discussion. After the background facts have been presented, we will deal with theory in *Chapter 4*. At the very outset, in section 4.1, the theoretical principles and concepts in a sociocultural perspective on learning are explored. I then move on to outline the principles of dialogism (paragraph 4.2), that is, a meta-theoretical framework explicating the basic tenets of a dialogical outlook on communication, learning and being. Analytically speaking, those basic ideas can be formulated as more precise analytical concepts. I describe the ones that are of relevance to my empirical work (see paragraph 4.3).

Chapter 5 deals with details of the design and the research methods. This chapter is divided into two parts. Section 5.1 deals with the research design and section 5.2 takes up methodological implications of the described design. *Chapter 6,* an activity analysis, serves the function of highlighting the participants' ways of organizing their communicative music activities. Here

their main conversational topics at stake, and the types of sequences estab-
lished, are discussed. *Chapter 7* presents other aspects of my empirical data.
Here I probe deeper into classical sociocultural questions as, for example, the
role of semiotic mediation and cultural tools of different kinds in teaching
and learning. Both result chapters (6 and 7) are based on detailed in-depth
analyses of data, designed to uncover dialogic learning and teaching issues
on the micro- and meso-levels. *Chapter 8* contains an integrative discussion
of the findings. Here, the empirical results are related to what has been de-
lineated on theory (chapter 4) and earlier research (chapters 2 and 3). In this
chapter I also provide concluding remarks in a summary (section 8.4.1) and
suggest didactical, theoretical and methodological implications of the thesis,
pointing to openings for further research (section 8.4.2). Finally, there is one
more chapter that provides a Swedish summary of the thesis: *Chapter 9*.

Research on children and music education

In this chapter I discuss earlier research of relevance to my present study. It is an account of investigations within the field of children's musicality; how children learn and develop musically. Studies on children's singing will be approached, methodologically and theoretically. In the following sections, my ambition is to delineate recurrent field-specific issues by highlighting the debate on the most contentious issues throughout music educational history on young people's musicality. As several music scholars have indicated: it is all about which perspective on music and musical learning, and on the ontology of human beings, that implicitly or explicitly guides the production of music educational research (Alerby & Ferm Thorgersen, 2005; Olsson, 1993; Pio & Varkøy, 2012; Varkøy, 2003, 2009; Wallerstedt, 2010).

It has been found that scholars within the confines of adult educational learning consider human learning from three main perspectives (Parker, 2005, p. 17). Those three epistemological points of departure are notable even in the field of younger individuals' learning in music and might add to our understanding of the progression in music research. Therefore it may be a good idea to start with a brief look at how Parker (p. 17) poses it. On the first level of analysis what constitutes learning is the brain and biology. On the second level, learning arises from the learner's particular circumstantial factors such as gender, age, developmental stage, experience and context. On the third learning is a result of the effects of the social/cultural context on learners. I will relate the designated three units of analyses (the epistemological levels

as Parker describes them) to the music educational correlates. The chapter ends with concluding remarks on the topic (see section 2.3).

2.1 FOCUSING ON THE INDIVIDUAL

Notably, what constitutes learning on Parker's (2005) first level of analysis does not only entail the brain and biology. Such human learning also addresses a somewhat delimited analytical unit: the individual. Learning then arises within the individual, as a consequence of his/her biological status, and the research accordingly centres on individual learning issues. In the next section we will see how the reasoning goes in music educational matters.

2.1.1 Focusing on the brain

The first assumption described by Parker (2005, pp. 17–21) is human learning as a cognitive process; a cognitive perspective. For her that means an assumption that is based on the idea of learning as a function of the brain. The biological basis for learning is considered, including the impact of subtle neurological states at the bio-chemical and neurological levels. In biological terms, the end point of successful learning (the expected *change*) would be a change in the "wiring" of the brain. Within the psychological field of music and music education, neuro-scientific research is the most rapidly growing branch, mapped out in the last two decades by Peretz and Zatorre (Hargreaves, McDonald & Miell, 2012).

According to Peretz, Brattico, Järvenpää & Tervaniemi (2009) some people are born with an *amusic brain*, that is, with anatomical anomalies associated with abnormal grey and white matter in the auditory cortex and the inferior frontal cortex within the brain. To suffer from such a musical disorder means to face a lifelong deficit in music perception: a brain-related deficit that cannot be explained by hearing loss, brain damage, intellectual deficiencies or lack of exposure. However, as Hargreaves et al. (2012) assume, there is still a long way ahead for music scholars before getting to grips with real-life musical behaviour (i.e. to reach understanding of how neurological phenomena translate analytically into musical actions and experiences in persons' lives).

Bjørkvold (1998) here applies a neurological outlook to children's music and singing. With reference to the neurologist Damasio, he urges the reader to consider "secondary emotions" (in short, deepened emotions) with the help of musical experiences. Such deepened emotions need developed

cognitions – an extended biological network located in the brain, more precisely the prefrontal and somatosensory cortices. Cognitive memories, engendered from the flow of music, are essential for developing this network – the Intranet. There is a need to move from the emphasis on Internet to Intranet, from software to humanware, and from the digital to the spontaneous in human beings, he argues. Human brains, constituting Intranets, are pre-eminently stronger, faster and richer than digital Internets. In addition, our mental intranets build the personal identity. Bjørkvold regards singing as a universal ability. He then integrates the neurological presumption with an existential philosophy of musicality and being:

> Human beings can sing, in all the keys of human diversity. [---] Like meaning is created from the beginning, when a child is born into the world: Sing your song! It is a question of access to your own life with your own voice – as an opportunity and a challenge to each and every one of us. Only in this way does the world come into being. (Bjørkvold, 1998, p. 10, my translation)

Here I should add that Bjørkvold views singing, and singing ability, in a metaphorical way too. To use your voice in an aesthetic fashion is a profoundly creative act: to engage expressively in singing, playing, learning, dancing, reading, seeking or creating something personally in life.

There is a burgeoning interest in a neurological outlook within the international and national music educational field, but I have to leave the details on this and proceed with another depiction of biological premises for musical learning: the cognitivist tradition that has dominated pedagogic investigation until some decades ago (Davidson & Scripp, 1989; Fiske, 1992). When starting to do my initial research on earlier studies of relevance to my present study, it did not take me long to realize the massive impact of the experimental, cognitivist approach on music psychology – an extended branch in music educational research. That kind of approach implies ideas from cognitive psychology. Here, musical learning is viewed as a function of the brain. As in all branches, there are overlaps in several studies too. There are studies on the crucial role of cognition in learning, allowing for contextual variables as well. However, for the sake of analytical clarity, I shall describe the typical gist of each of these perspectives.

In the 1980s there was still a lack of consensus among researchers and educators on what musical development might be (Davidson & Scripp, 1989).

Davidson and Scripp describe how the research in this field still typically prefers experimental designs, modelling development in single modalities outside musical instruction. At one extreme, experimental studies of music perception may present a small number of tones with minimal musical content or context. The authors stress the common ground between education and psychology in their ambition to contribute a new understanding of skill development in the rehearsal studio or the classroom. For a group of teachers applying the cognitive-developmental view, learning is reflected in the student's ability to solve increasingly complex problems independently. This cognitive view stresses the notion of a development like a cognitive growth, relatively independent of outer influences: "development appears as largely *self-constructed*" (Davidson & Scripp, 1989, p. 66, emphasis added). The authors argue for such an understanding but underline that a cognitive approach does not exclude investigations into musical skills as they unfold in educational activities. Methodologically they do not want to separate music events and teaching situations from learning but, as a theoretical approach, they clearly do.

From other music educational scholars too, much attention has been directed to music in relation to children's minds and their mental cognitions. Consider titles such as "Exposure to music and cognitive performance: tests of children and adults" (Schellenberg, Nakata, Hunter & Tamato, 2007), "Children's inaccurate singing: Selected contributing factors" (Szabo, 2001) and "Children's Mental Musical Organizations as Highlighted by Their Singing Errors" (Brand, 2000). The reasoning here proceeds in a relatively linear and causal direction in the ambition to map the way "backwards" from the musical output to the musical input in detail. In order to do this, there is a methodological call for making inferences from the participants' overt behaviours. Recalling Schellenberg et al. (2007), the children from Japan and the adult group from Canada were tested in a laboratory, isolated from the interpersonal dynamics in a classroom setting. The purpose was to identify cognitive effects of exposure to different kinds of music. One of the findings was that such an exposure contributes to a higher score in performance on cognitive tests, that is, the intelligence measured after different kinds of classical music pieces. Another result is that the cognitive effects of the specific music listening generalize across cultures and age groups.

2.1.2 Focusing on musical behaviour

Another experimental music researcher in the cognitivist tradition, Flowers (1984), also look for effects. This time it is the effect of children's music education that is examined in experiments aiming to determine the effect of instruction on music vocabulary and class music activities. The pupils were recruited from the third and fourth grades in the elementary school (8–10 years old). In experiment 1 her subjects were instructed to listen to short piano selections and describe whatever they heard. In experiment 2 some specific musical elements were directed intentionally: dynamics, articulation and tempo. Contrasted piano selections were presented to the subjects in this experimental phase. After listening to the examples the children were asked to write down their descriptions of the music played. Their written responses, the test answers, were analysed statistically. In both experiment situations, most children seemed to make a limited number of responses, Flowers concludes. She also reflects on the fact that their manner of responding to "what you hear" represented an either-or choice for most of the children; for example, if they referred to articulation then other types of description were generally omitted. However, in the present study, it should not be assumed that failure to describe an element necessarily constituted lack of awareness, she adds.

Flowers and Dunne-Sousa (1990) report how the development of singing ability has been an important aspect of school music instruction since its inception, yielding decades of measurements, developmental theories, and curricular models in areas thought to relate to vocal ability. Pitch-related tasks and its relation to singing abilities have been examined in detail. The authors focus on children in preschool. Here and in elementary music classes, echo singing is a common activity. It is used for a variety of purposes when it is an issue to teach a new song. The teachers narrow down the song phrase by phrase, in manageable units, in order to provide a vocal model that the child immediately emulates. Another pedagogical purpose of this imitative technique is to assess a child's ability to match pitches and approximate melodic contours. Many method texts advocate echo procedures as a component of early music classes, according to Flowers and Dunne-Sousa.

The purpose of the study by Flowers and Dunne-Sousa was to assess young children's abilities to echo short pitch in relation to the maintenance of a tonal centre. These scholars also considered age differences determining the quality of the song performances in these aspects. The 3–5-year-old

children were tested individually when singing songs and echoing short pitch patterns. It was found that the tested children echoed melodic contours more accurately than single pitches or tonal intervals. Moreover, there was a low correlation between the demonstrated ability to echo pitches or contours and maintenance of a tonal centre in singing. Not being able to keep the tonal centre means musically that the children modulate into a number of tonal centres instead of orienting to the actual one of the current song. The low correlation mentioned implies that it was possible for some of the singers to echo pitches accurately but not to maintain the tonal centre, or the other way around.

Brand (2000) is concerned with children's singing errors, arguing that such research presents a new way of looking at children's musical understanding (cf. Szabo, 2001, who is looking for children's singing inaccuracies). Her underlying theoretical assumption amounts to stating that inaccurate musical behaviours in the test-situations fundamentally reflect inner mental structures or, more precisely, "mental musical organizations" (also termed "mental models" in the text). She reasons that the listener, when listening to a song, hears a stream of auditory stimuli. Since a song does not exist as a tangible entity, it has to be constructed in the listeners' minds.

Though such psychological entities cannot be observed directly, they can be traced in the expressed, observable behaviour. Hence, a careful examination of the children's overt behaviours is seen as the golden way to gain knowledge about how the participants really apprehend and hear music. The overt behaviours she elaborated on are how the children talked about what they had heard and sung, how the played the song on xylophone bars and a drum, and how they chose to represent the music visually with written words, drawings or standard musical notation. The result shows several singing errors, musical mistakes and inaccuracies in the children's singing. They were not a consequence of factors such as age or the ability to play instruments. Rather, the errors reveal the embedded common patterns in mental musical organizations, she concludes, and recommends music teachers and researchers to pay careful attention to the children's intuitive, mental and musical understandings – as they emerge from their musical expressions.

Davidson and Scripp (1989) draw on a cognitive-developmental model of music education (see above in section 2.1.1). When discussing the issue of how to learn a song as a child, their developmental model states that young children construct and understand music differently in comparison to adults. This is the case from age 2 up to the age 8. The child's singing develops in a learning trajectory over time that centres on the childish use

of stable melodic structures, "contour schemes". When growing up they learn to expand the contour schemes and develop through this long-term process. They become increasingly sophisticated in learning and inventing songs, and by the age of 7 or 8 they can invent or sing familiar songs with adult-like tonal stability, flexibility and nuance. As with other musical skills referred to in their book, the song-singing skills drop off around the age of 8 if there is no more training.

Sundin (1963, 1995) who has investigated children's singing and their innovative singing abilities discusses his different experimental variables and how they are related to each other. The children's intelligence is at stake here since their intelligence is measured in the "Draw a Man Test" of Goodenough, generating an intelligence quotient for each child. Comparing singing ability (i.e. reproduction), creativity (i.e. production) and the intelligence/cognitive development, Sundin asks: "Is the singing productivity an expression of a generic creative imagination and relatively independent of the child's musical talent and environment? It seems so" (Sundin, 1995, p. 115, my translation).

As Parker (2005) points out, in research practice the overlaps between the outlined analytical levels are ubiquitous. For example, in the level of analyses above we can recognize how variables from level two interfere: circumstances that influence the learning outcome, such as age, experience, context and developmental stage. However, the focus is still on the pursuit of isolated mental conditions and perceptions, even if sometimes considered in relation to effects from exposure to, for example, music or educational instruction.

2.1.3 Focusing on the natural child

Davidson and Scripp (1989) describe underlying assumptions about musical development until the 1980s, reporting some common stances by music teachers. I have already discussed the cognitive-developmental view that they themselves favour. For other music teachers, learning to sing is a matter of nurturing the expressions of curiosity displayed by the naturally creative child, that is, *the maturational view*. However, both the cognitive-developmental view and the maturational one elaborate on biological abilities given by nature, at least initially, although their emphasis on musical training and teaching differs. Let us stick to Bjørkvold (1991) and his text on the musicality in children.

Bjørkvold (ibid.) writes about the "muse" (Sw. *musa*) within human beings, especially in children – and in their singing. Human beings are born

into muses, sharing musical expressions already as unborn babies within their mothers' wombs. Children's natural learning in their first years is an integrated spontaneous interplay between body and soul, fantasy and reason, the inner world and the outer world. But a learning paradox happens when they have to leave the culture of children and enter the culture of school. Suddenly the child stops to learn curiously and spontaneously. Bjørkvold saw this gap as a process of disconnection: from the ecology of learning, in the child culture, to the learning break in the encounter with the school system. Spontaneous play, peer talk, the children's way of learning, and use of bodily expression as well, are now relegated to the short breaks between working passes. Consequently, the child is at risk of developing a disoriented emotional state when being deprived of the natural spontaneity integrated with the bodily expressions. Hence, the child culture is opposed to the confined school culture. A teacher who embodies the muse inside is a deciding factor in developing children's musical abilities in the classroom. Music teachers should have insights into more things than musical knowledge. They should have respect for the children's own life-styles and abilities. They should also work for the musical intelligence in school with their creative spontaneity, musical energy, improvisation ability, fable-making ability, naive curiosity, playfulness, personal warmth, vital and intense language use, a fiery kernel, wisdom, and the ability to build trust and enthusiasm. In other words, they must use the musical entry keys to a true muse.

In a sense, Sundin (1963, 2007) also emphasizes the naturally creative and musical child. He discerns different functions and meanings in creating child songs and had the possibility to develop in-depth reasoning about the social and contextual meanings in the observed singing activities. However, he took another route, instead pointing out empirical results going beyond the influences of age, parental interest in music, general intelligence and even singing ability. In the experimental part of his study, the outcome of creative ability shows no significant evidence of such relationships. These relationships can be placed under Parker's second analytical heading: the influences of relatively static conditions outside the particular learning phenomenon studied (here, musical creativity as Sundin's research object).

Given that, Sundin defines musical creativity as an expression of a general creative attitude, relatively independent of the child's general musical and intellectual aptitude. He discusses the children's ability to work hard in order to make the world meaningful, including the world of music. In his reasoning, children cannot make much meaning out of creativity studies conducted in

non-natural settings with highly specific tasks. Such tasks might be conceived of as restricting the young actors' own imagination and also their musical choices. Such a methodological implication also raises the question of the focus on process or product. When looking too closely at the musical products, the process of sense making in learning is ignored. Sundin problematizes the traditional dichotomy between process and product.

2.2 FOCUSING ON THE SOCIAL CONTEXT

In contrast to the maturational view – the idea of universally inherent, natural musical abilities – a sociocultural perspective instead put relational issues to the fore when considering human development. It underlines the crucial role of the social context, as imbued in constitutive dimensions of cultural conventions, tools and sense making social interactions. We will come back to this in the theory sections (chapter 4). Such a perspective is roughly in conjunction with Parker's (2005, p. 17) account of the third level: to hold a social, cultural or contextual perspective based on the view of learning as a result of contextual "effects". However, according to the sociocultural perspective I subscribe to, the term "effect" is not in common parlance because it directs the word meaning to a strict causal relation associated with the mechanical transfer idea of simplified learning, going from one instance to another. This is not resonant with a dialectic perspective in which there is dynamic, creative tension between the learner(s) and the situated, cultural contexts. As stated by Burnard (2012) and Frith (2012), musical creativity might be seen as socially constructed, connected to social practices. Burnard claims that individuals and institutions exist in structural relations to each other. Hence, the concept of musical creativity has to be conceived beyond the common individualistic notion. It is a social concept, according to her.

Recalling Flowers (1984) and her intention to map children's musical perceptions from written test answers, another study has been carried out recently on similar lines (i.e. differentiated musical listening) and with children of similar ages (Wallerstedt, Pramling & Säljö, 2013). However, the theoretical and methodological approach is different. Here the sociocultural perspective on learning and development, emphasizing listening to music as a meaning making social activity, is evident. Moreover, listening is a kind of cultural learning through which we become acquainted with musical communication in its many varied forms, the authors claim (cf. Wallerstedt, 2010). Such an approach implies music listening beyond a passive registration of sound

stimuli. In addition, Wallerstedt et al. demonstrate how the children are scaffolded within the zone of proximal development, guided by a music teacher as interviewer. In and through this communicative learning trajectory, the children increased their ability to structure music linguistically and bodily (cf. Kullenberg, 2014a). Wallerstedt et al. (2013) do not search for isolated mental abilities in test situations, rather how musical listening, as understanding, is overtly expressed in learning processes. Another study in which Wallerstedt is involved also concerns the role of scaffolded learning and describes how a playful communicative framing can be realized within a musical task for six-year-old children (Lagerlöf, Wallerstedt & Pramling, 2013).

Barrett (2005) tells us about the path-breaking shift in "the change of location" in the research environments on this topic, which means, investigations into children's experience and understanding of music. As in the case of the empirical choice made in the present study, other scholars have started to move beyond the boundaries of the experimental laboratory and the music classroom as well, in order to study the children's engagement with music in a range of settings. According to Barrett, this change reflects the increased influence of sociocultural theory on the study of children's development. It also implies the view that development may be conceptualized as a process of socialization into existing systems of meaning and cultural practice. According to her, children are active social agents capable of "internalizing" (or appropriating) cultural meanings through interaction with knowledgeable others. She queries the notion of the 'eternal child', resonant with Vygotsky's genetic approach. Like him, she rejects the idea of a child whose development may be explained through reference to universal laws that hold across time and culture. Instead, she proposes the notion of the "historical" child. In order to gain adequate understanding of the development, we have to study the child's participation in the sociocultural practices of her/his life-world, Barrett argues.

Mars (2012), cf. Mars, Saether and Folkestad (2014), also frames her study socioculturally when she examines how young people from Gambia and Sweden learn to play and sing songs in cross-cultural collaboration with each other. She finds that their modes in teaching and learning were highly influenced by their different cultures, as experienced in their earlier musical training. Accordingly, they used teaching and learning strategies and solved musical challenges with various mediating tools. However, the Swedish youths showed a preference for written tools whilst the participants from Gambia preferred to trade on oral methods to a more significant extent, for example,

with call and response singing or playing by ear in front of their partner. To them, continuous repetition was the key, not stopping when they faced challenges and using clarifying meta-talk as the Swedish participants did. In her thesis, Lagergren (2012) addresses contextually conditioned differences in children's composing strategies, located in different school systems: municipal schools of art and primary school. Her point of departure is also a sociocultural perspective on learning. The results point to a distinct relation between the children's musical creativity (i.e. the composing activities in small student groups) and the forms of musical schooling.

Chen-Hafteck (1999) discusses the text-melody relationship in children's song learning and singing. She reviews past music education on this issue, pointing to the importance of understanding how words and melodies are related in their song acquisition. Earlier researchers have claimed that words and tunes should be taught separately because of the too distracting function of learning words together with tunes (melodic patterns). However, Chen-Hafteck insists that these findings are inconsistent and refers to other findings that suggest that words and melody are integrated in people's memories. The author highlights various cultural contexts and their influence on cognitive processes, comparing Cantonese-speaking children with English children. She concludes that separating words and melodies may be more efficient for some children but not for others. Her result is interesting with a sociocultural approach. It points to the significance of relating singing skills to a wider context: to cultural meanings and learning traditions. Further, her result can be related to "the cultural transmission view" outlined by Davidson and Scripp (1989). They allude to the current notion of the increasingly socialized child and how the child receives conventional valued skills and knowledge presented by the culture.

Mizener (1993) is interested in singing accuracy in young people, including the assessment of pitch making and melodic accuracy. In her study she aimed at mapping relations between singing attitudes and classroom singing activities, choir participation, gender, degree of singing skills and also other musical aspects. She investigated over 500 elementary pupils in school music, from the third to the sixth grade. Most pupils indicated a positive attitude to singing in general, but less than half were interested in choral singing. Her most surprising result is said to be that the children's singing skills have little influence on their attitude to singing. Of relevance for classroom education in music are her reports on their attitude to learning songs with clapping hands or not. The students in this study did not like clapping the rhythm of the

words in the song during the learning process. Mizener recommends teachers to use drums and other rhythm instruments instead of the disliked clapping. In the upper grades they also disliked using songbooks, and so did the boys in general. They preferred singing to records and tapes (cf. Borgström Källén, 2014). I interpret her findings to mean that the students' preferences were not restricted to traditional classroom activities but they wanted to connect with social practices outside school, such as listening to music in a more informal fashion (cf. Borgström Källén, 2014; Ericsson, 2007; Ferm Thorgersen, 2009; Folkestad, 2006, 2007; Green, 2001, 2008; Söderman & Folkestad, 2004).

2.2.1 Focusing on language

When coming to the study of communication, the key to a sociocultural study is the recognition of communication as a contextualized practice, concerned with the production of meanings, according to Barrett (2005). Other socioculturally informed research projects on young people's musical understanding and expressions point to the need for analysing verbal conversations in music activities (Pramling, 2009; Wallerstedt, 2013). Wallerstedt (2013) contests the common assumption that musical knowledge is something "beyond words", a language in itself, and can only be communicated by tones. She demonstrates how her subjects use an invented verbal concept when appropriating musical knowledge collaboratively. Along similar lines, Pramling (2009) and Pramling Samuelsson, Asplund Carlsson, Olsson, Pramling & Wallerstedt (2009, 2011) underline the crucial pedagogical role of meta-communication as a means of sharing and developing musical experience and knowledge. This is very important due to the nature of music, which is not tangible but needs to be fixed representationally in order to facilitate the musical understanding of what phenomenon is being heard. Another way of speaking about and reflecting upon such fixations is to demonstrate music visually. Pramling and colleagues discuss the function of audio-visual representation in children's classroom use: to demonstrate experienced music with tools that are both aural and visual (cf. Dahlbäck, 2011).

The view held by Sundin (1995) is an example of a position regarding the idea of comprehending musical knowledge in children as separate from verbal language use and language skills. He attributes the problems that he sees in Swedish schools and the Swedish society to the contemporary conditions that have started to create passive consumers of things and products, as substitutes for an inner security within people. With this book he intends to show how

that general problem affects the children's field of music. His theoretic orientation is a developmental psychology that also embraces environmental and societal frames. He uses the concepts "creating", "creativity" and "production" interchangeably. The opposite is "reproduction" according to him, operationalized in his studies as the ability to reproduce songs (also described in 1963 and 2007). Another statement is about the relation between verbal language use and tonal use in childish singing. Our cultural language "demusicalizes" (Sw. *avmusikaliseras*) when we learn more about verbal conceptualizing and when the formal language in thinking develops. The expressive aspect of language is seen as foreshadowed, implying a tendency to focus on what has been said in words, not how it has been said. This is considered as a threat to the children's musical abilities: "The language learning also implies that one learns not to hear differences in tempo, pitch, timbre etcetera, that is, the attention paid to them decreases" (Sundin, 1995, p. 79, my translation). 8–9 aged school children start to look at reality in a more differentiated way. They learn to read, write and count and, learn several new concepts. The children's thinking in this age is characterized of a practical outlook on the world, less expressive and spontaneous and, more technical oriented (Sundin, ibid., p. 116 f.). He also discusses musical creativity in school: "Creativity does not need to totally disappear in school. The extent to which it shows up in school work seems to be largely a function of inspiring teachers' efforts and adult expectations in general" (Sundin, 1995, p. 117, my translation). Holmberg (2014) has examined young children in three Swedish preschools during teacher-led music activities. She found that singing was the most frequent music activity and that the joint singing was clearly reproductive in its educational way of dealing with the pupil's song performances.

Olsson (1997) searched for social psychological theories in the music educational field, that is, attention to aspects of language use in music teaching. So did the editors, Hargreaves and North (1997), in this book: *The Social Psychology of Music*. More recently attention has been paid to language use and social interaction. For example, Catteral (2002) suggests that improved social interaction and academic achievement are related to activities in the arts. In music making, it was found that the participating children had the ability to give each other crucial creative inspiration in their social interactions (Nilsson, 2002). Mizener (2008) addresses another side of social interaction and singing: the role of nonverbal communication in song teaching. Bodily gestures are informative and pedagogically useful according to some of the empirical studies she refers to. Linge (2013) also claims that creative

learning in music is facilitated by multimodality in and through sign-systems of different kinds (cf. A. Falthin, 2011; Ideland, 2011; Sandberg Jurström, 2009). As Nerland (2004) writes, engaging in music means a practice influenced by bodily dimensions: to discipline the body due to the musical conventions and musical instruments (cf. Vernersson, 2013). Another song-teaching condition discussed by Mizener (ibid.) is using bodily means when training singing accuracy. Kinaesthetic activities may be helpful for targeting pitches accurately, for example, moving the voice to higher and lower pitch levels with higher and lower physical actions, following the melodic contour with the body or with hand signs, and doing breathing exercises in order to improve the singing. With reference to Szabo, she describes results indicating that kinaesthetic activities that reinforce a visual model were the most helpful ones when learning to sing melodies. In similar lines, Bygdéus (2012, p. 97) found that choir leaders with singing children facilitated the musical learning on the basis of hand- and arm gestures. The flow of music was thus accompanied by visualizing, mediating means, according to Bygdéus' reasoning. However, the overall scholarly results of using hand signs according to the method of solfége are mixed and, consequently, an area open to further study, Mizener (ibid.) concludes.

Another way to phrase the music educational questions discussed in this chapter is to talk in terms of the internal vs. external meaning of music, and inherent meanings vs. communicated meanings. The concepts are still relevant in this educational debate (Green, 1988; Olsson, 1993; Wallerstedt, 2010). The perpetual music educational debate of inner vs. outer music experiences lives on too, and so does the role of the musical language vs. the verbal language.

2.3 SUMMARY

Music educational perspectives have been discussed and compared. In particular, I have delineated some research trends of relevance to my study. To sum up, the contentious issues within the music educational field concern ontological, epistemological and methodological dimensions. I have structured the chapter according to three main themes, focusing on distinct aspects of enquiry throughout the debate.

First I discussed the consequences of addressing solitary individuals and their brains in research of music. Such orientation is cognitive or neurological in its one-sided pursuit of mental outcomes, notable in the 'musical

behaviour', as displayed in experimental situations. One of the problems indicated is the methodological one: how to analytically infer inherent musicality from overt behaviours in test situations. In this first category 'the natural child' also has a place. This refers to conceiving the child as naturally talented in music. The educational implication is then to pedagogically encourage the talent inside the young person to take form. Everybody can sing and learn music if they really get the chance to express oneself musically is another implication of such reasoning.

More recently, there has been a significant move to address social contexts in music educational matters that concern young people. Now it is more common to view musical learning as situated, related to its context-specific premises. This research shift also includes the new interest in the role of communication. Hence, issues focusing on language use and discourse are now even more highlighted. Ontologically speaking, this further implies a shift from an individual-centred and cognitive perspective to a more dialogical and cultural perspective. However, although there is a clear move towards dialogicality, all studies of social contexts and musical knowledge building are not completely dialogical in its most philosophical sense. There is more to do.

Research on teaching and schooling

Issues of existing research in the field of teaching are reported in this chapter. Here I have elected established bodies of knowledge that are of importance to have in mind when considering the outcome of the present study. The school discourses in focus describe salient features in classroom communication and other school-based rhetoric. The first section (3.1) gives an account of dialogic teaching and the second part (3.2) reports on other types of school issues (i.e. school discourses). The main points in each section are summed up in section 3.3.

3.1 DIALOGIC TEACHING

Increasingly, educational science calls attention to the role of dialogue, communication and social relations in teaching (Alexander, 2008; Aspelin, 2005, 2006, 2010, 2012, 2013, 2014; Aspelin & Persson, 2011; Biesta, 2005, 2009b; Bingham & Sidorkin, 2004; Bergqvist, 2010; Lilja, 2013; Littleton & Howe, 2010; Littleton & Mercer, 2013; Lyle, 2008; Nerland, 2004, 2007; Säljö, 2000, 2005; Schwarz, Dreyfus & Hershkowitz, 2009; Sawyer, 2004, 2006; Wells, 2007; Wennergren, 2007). Alexander (2008) favours and defines *dialogic teaching,* influencing both education programmes in several school subjects and scholars within the sociocultural field (cf. Hardman & Delafield, 2010). He describes current classroom discourse as interactive whole-class teaching that tends to focus on the organizational aspects of pedagogy, but what

matters most to him is the quality of the pedagogical communication; the dynamics and contents of talk. He emphasizes that learning is not one-way linear communication. Dialogic teaching is his alternative idea for minimizing the traditional use of rote; recitation and instructional teacher talk at the price of vivid discussions and dialogues in the classrooms.

This brings us to Sawyer (2004) who, in a similar vein (like Alexander, also influenced by Bakhtin), points to problems implied by some common ideas about teaching in classrooms. He opts for creative teaching and links it to the issue of creative communication. Teaching has often been thought of as a creative performance, related to contemporary reform efforts toward scripted instruction. He describes the paradox in the outcome of these efforts. Instead of emphasizing the aspect of teacher creativity, as was the intention initially, the reforms have become associated with the denial of teacher creativity. Scripted teaching, the dominance of the written language in classrooms, is problematic from a dialogical point of view, because of its nature. It is mostly pre-planned like actors in a theatre play, Sawyer argues. Teachers stand "on the stage" in front of the classroom "audience". The lectures and student exchanges are like "scripts" for the performance. Teachers should "rehearse" their presentations, and the teacher/performer must work hard to hold the attention of the audience, with timing, stage presence, and enthusiasm. In this way, teaching as a performance metaphor encourages teachers to think of themselves as actors on a stage, enacting a performance for their students. Sawyer suggests that creative teaching is better conceived of as *improvisational performance*, a kind of disciplined improvisation. The device of improvisational performance highlights the collaborative and emergent nature of classroom practice, and how it helps us to understand why teaching is a creative art. Rogoff (1998) and Baker-Sennett and Matusov (1997) have also argued for the importance of improvisational teaching, due to its possibility of enabling co-constructed knowledge from the perspectives of the students. Briefly, they reason as follows: with schooling that is too controlled by teachers, the students' experiences and knowledge cannot be expressed and developed fully (cf. Biesta, 2011).

Like Alexander, Sawyer sees the potential for teaching that transcends traditional communication bound up with, for example, recitation from scripts, or strict instructional talk (cf. Jorgensen, 2008, p. 216). Hence, they both suggest that other communication forms are important alternatives. In the flow of *group creativity* both structure and improvisation are always present (Sawyer, 2006). That means, improvisations contain elements of structure and structured performance contains improvisational elements. Especially

in music and theatre, the performers are not mere interpreters. Rather, they are creative artists, according to Sawyer (ibid.). In improvisation groups such as musical and theatre ensembles, the creativity happens in the moment of the encounter. Collaboration here means that the group creativity cannot be associated with any one person. Instead, the interactional dynamics of all group members contributes to collaborative performance. The interpersonal, relational being in achieving knowledge is also considered by Gergen (2009), who claims that achievements should not be described as isolated entities, for example, as points on a scale as in individual tests. Student achievements are not tied to individual actions. Säljö (1998, 2000, 2005) and Schoultz et al. (2001a), among others, reason along similar lines.

von Wright (2000), drawing on Mead in her thesis about social inter-action in teaching, holds that minds are neither confined to the individual, nor to the location of the brain (p. 205). Fruitful reflexivity, that is, reflex-ivity that facilitates learning, bringing new light to the socially constituted consciousness, can only arise when students are challenged with the social, interpersonal dynamics in pedagogic encounters. In order to work as such learning potential, the habitual orders also have to be disrupted. von Wright stresses the role of perspective taking in learning and teaching. Biesta (2011) partly adopts a similar approach, emphatically stressing the problem with pre-planned, instrumental communication in teaching children (more pre-cisely, the article discusses teaching the subject philosophy in school). He bases his thought-provoking idea on an ideal pedagogy that does not orient towards the improvement of knowledge in linear directions: to rationally equip the learning subjects with a range of useful skills. On the contrary, ped-agogical moments of interruptions allow for hesitation, and orientation to-wards *not-knowing* is instead underlined. In such interrupted moments, there is educational potential for inventing a unique response, and for inventing the involved subjects uniquely in and through this response (cf. Biesta, 2005, 2009b). In "Beyond Individualised Teaching" (Aspelin, 2014), relational (i.e. interpersonal) processes between the teacher and the student in education are conceived of as inevitably unpredictable. They are characterized by elements of surprise, as a condition of genuine dialogue (cf. Asplund, 1987, who argues from a social psychological perspective that genuine communication is al-ways built on some uncertainty). Hence, interpersonal educational dialogues are also about risk-taking, as I shall come back to later.

Another dialogical perspective on educational creativity is provided in Herbert's (2010) notion of the other and alterity. Other people's voices and

stances challenge learning in a productive but psychologically complicated way, according to Herbert. If the social climate between the teachers and the students in the learning situations is deliberate, and the persons involved can respond with an open attitude to new challenges and new ideas by the other, pedagogical creativity can be achieved successfully (cf. Hellman, 2014). In order to facilitate such open-minded responses, the teacher has to work on a social climate that permits risk-taking and trust. She points to ethical implications of accentuating multiplicity, as in multi-cultural pedagogy (cf. Säfström, 2005). The importance of building trust is a recurrent topic in Hattie's (2009) comprehensive study, based on a huge amount of empirical school data. He argues strongly for a social situation in school in which the participants can feel safe enough to learn productively in the classroom. To be aware of trust and the fragility of social bonds in educational relationships is also something that Aspelin (1999a, 1999b, 2005, 2006) stresses (cf. Evensen, 2014; Lilja, 2013; Nordström-Lytz, 2013; Zittoun, 2014). With his social psychological orientation, he applies that 'in between-view' in educational matters, more precisely in theorizing teaching (cf. Aspelin, 2010, 2012, 2013, 2014). He identifies communicative structures in the classroom with a social psychological and micro-sociological focus, with influences from Scheff, Goffman and Mead in his first works (1999a, 1999b). Interaction sequences in classroom episodes are scrutinized in detail, and the emotional dimension in teacher-student-based social bonds is considered. Emotions are conceived of as interpersonally constituted and, hence, are not analysed as individual phenomena. When the classroom actors present themselves, they use both verbal and nonverbal acts. Nonverbal signs constitute the meta-message in the conversations. They have to do with the actors' way of speaking: the pitch, the voice volume, tempo, prosody, and their gestures (bodily positions, movements, gazes etcetera) (cf. Kress, Jewitt, Ogborn & Tsatsarelis, 2001, p. 60).

An understanding of social order cannot emanate from analyses outside the local social context in focus, for example, general causal facts about social institutions or social structures. Social life is dialectic by nature and has to be studied in ways that make this visible. The social interplay between teachers and students in school life is unpredictable and risky at the micro-level of social bonds; emotions are at stake beneath the surface, Aspelin (1999a, 1999b, 2006) argues. In these writings, he especially considers the fragile social situations in the perspective of the students, who need to feel trust in their relation to their teachers, and the other way around. *Pride* and *shame* can be analysed as a coupled concept. These temporary emotions can be observed

in facial expressions. Smiles say something about social psychologically relevant communication, and are also crucial for how people value themselves in relation to others. We constantly evaluate our identities in this relational way. In educational activities, such emotions play an important role in knowledge development and therefore have to be recognized in educational science, Aspelin claims. To be an active and productive actor in school means to use social courage – to be deeply intersubjective with the other persons. But the modern, "self-dependent" ideals that emphasize autonomy and rationality have contributed to the lack of classroom studies that discuss this fundamental interpersonal sociality. How emotions and emotive identities are shaped in interpersonal, educational communication is seldom an issue due to this societal discourse of modernity (cf. Aspelin, 2014).

Accountable knowing in classrooms has to include the notion of responsiveness to the perspectives of others and rhetorical flexibility in situated argumentation, Åberg, Mäkitalo and Säljö (2010) argue, informed by a sociocultural perspective on learning and communication. They discuss their empirical data consisting of transcribed social interaction between students (Grade 9 in elementary school) who were involved in a panel debate as a project work assignment in school. Their basic interest reported is how students learn to argue in such school activities. Bergqvist (2010) notices another trend than the student-centred communication in late modern Swedish classroom communication. There is little evidence of student commitment and genuine dialogue in the classrooms; instead the cemented functions of schooling such as teacher control and other traditional interaction patterns make themselves felt (see also Cazden, 1988; Tharp & Gallimore, 1990). Bergqvist too draws on a sociocultural perspective, regarding teaching and learning as communicative practices in school. She argues that these communicative practices are construed in and through the natural classroom setting, and that a number of them are accomplished by linguistic activities through talk and texts. Therefore it should be a crucial issue for the educationalist to study communication and schooling in detail.

Any discussions of a dialogic approach in teaching and learning that exist owe a debt to other socioculturalist thinkers: Vygotsky and Bruner (Lyle, 2008). Lyle (2008) reports an increasing body of educational research that supports the idea that talk (and communication) is the key to children's learning. The underlying idea is that culture, not biology, shapes human life and human minds (cf. Bruner, 1990; Valsiner & van der Veer, 2000). With Vygotsky, Lyle highlights the social construction of the children, that is, the

children's active contribution to his or her learning. The research has now shifted significantly away from the abstract, individual child to the contextualized, social child. Because of the impact of Bakhtin, there is also a growing, re-emerging interest in Bakhtin's dialogical approach that Lyle opts for in this text: a dialogic pedagogy. In line with these sociocultural thinkers, she considers the educational implications of traditional, teacher-centred practices that predominate in research and in school practice. Accordingly, dialogic practice is contrasted with monologic practice in classroom interaction. In dialogic practice, the pupils participate enthusiastically, raising the quality of pedagogical interaction (a participatory discourse) (cf. Kullenberg, 2014a, 2014b). It is high time that scientific recognition is accorded to dialogic meaning making along with Bakhtin, Vygotsky and Bruner (see also Dysthe, 1996, and Wells, 2007, who also urges educators to develop a dialogic stance, consistent with Lyle's approach).

Theories of education concern the interface between the nature of human culture and human consciousness (Bruner, 1996). Bruner's central question is: How does the culture support or constrain the realization of individual abilities? As a culture-psychologist, he orients to the perspective of culturalism, a perspective that views the human consciousness as rooted in cultural dimensions. Culturalism has two theoretical tasks. On the macro-level culture is seen as a system of values, rights, exchanges, duties, possibilities and power. On the individual level, the micro-level, it examines how the demands of the cultural system influence the actor within the system. With the latter level in mind, it focuses on how people construct meanings and realities which make them willing to adapt and cooperate with the institutional structures. However, education is, in the end, an issue of individual embodiment and not only a general preparation for a particular cultural life-style, according to him.

When coming down to this micro-level, educational and intellectual skills should not be discussed without recognizing emotions, sense making and embodiment. A knowledge interest in cognitive development does not, and should not, exclude an interest in emotive aspects of education as a cultural system, Bruner underlines. A culture-psychological approach does not necessarily reduce the subjective and emotive in his reasoning, particularly when we are dealing with the role of school in the construction of "the self". Here, the emotions are salient features of the education, he claims. Emotions are "there" as something we, as culture-psychological scholars, have to deal with (Connery, 2010; John-Steiner, Connery & Marjanovic-Shane, 2010; M. Johansson, 2002, 2011, Smagorinsky, 2011, 2013; Vygotsky 1925/1971, cf.

Linell, 2010b). That does not mean it is unproblematic to theorize about culturally constructed emotions. His argument resonates with Vygotsky's (1925/1971 and 1930/2004, cf. Valsiner & van der Veer, 2000) view on subjectivity and feelings in symbolic learning and other cultural activities.

It is also consonant with a lecture in which Vygotsky (1994) discussed "The Problem of the Environment", in which he points to the role of environment in child development. Even when the environment remains little changed, it is a fact that the child changes in the process of development. The influence of environment on the psychological development of children, and on their conscious personalities, is made up of their emotional experiences: *perezhivanija*. The emotional experiences arising from any situation or from any aspect of her/his environment determine what kind of influences this situation or this environment will have on the child. According to Vygotsky, environmental factors have therefore to be seen as refracted through the prism of the child's emotional experience. Psychological (and educational) research operates through the unit of emotional experience in this sense, he claims. Important in the school context is to realize that children possess various levels of awareness. This means that the same event will have a completely different meaning for them: "The crux of the matter is that whatever the situation itself, its influence depends not only on the nature of the situation itself, but also on the extent of the child's understanding and awareness of the situation" (Vygotsky, 1994, p. 343).

There is one problem that is always with us when dealing with teaching and learning, one that is so pervasive, so constant and so much part of the fabric of living that we fail to notice it, or perhaps even to discover it – as in the proverb "the fish will be the last to discover water" (Bruner, 1996, p. 45). Bruner refers to the issue of how human beings achieve a meeting of minds, as when teachers ask themselves "How do I reach the children?" Or when children ask, "What's she trying to get at?" This is a classic philosophical problem of Other Minds, but its relevance to education has mostly been overlooked until very recently, according to him, in 1996. In a similar vein, Bengtsson (2004) points to the philosophical question of intersubjectivity in teaching, focusing here on the definition of the concept intersubjectivity in educational settings.

According to Bruner (1996, p. 20), passing on knowledge involves a subcommunity in interaction. Here intersubjectivity, to understand the minds of others, is crucial, whether through language, gesture or other means. But as hinted above, our Western pedagogical tradition hardly does justice to

the importance of intersubjectivity. Indeed, it often clings to a preference for explicitness that seems to ignore it:

> So teaching is fitted into a mould in which a single, presumably omniscient teacher explicitly tells or shows presumably unknowing learners something they presumably know nothing about. Even when we tamper with this model, as with "question periods" and the like, we still remain loyal to its unspoken precepts. *I believe that one of the most important gifts that a cultural psychology can give to education is a reformulation of this impoverished conception.* (Bruner, 1996, p. 20f., emphasis added)

Bruner continues to delineate a radical scene of the future. Without reducing the teacher's role, or her or his authority, the omniscient teacher will disappear from the classrooms in the future, just as the omniscient narrator has disappeared from modern fiction. However, teaching poetry requires a different approach from that required for teaching mathematics; there is obviously no single formula that follows from the cultural-psychological approach to interactive, intersubjective pedagogy. The approach advocated by Bruner and the others who care about an "intersubjective pedagogy" or other social psychological dimensions in teaching are in conjunction with this study. In this study emotive attitudes and embodied aspects of constructing teaching and learning are discussed in relation to the concern of how musical skills develop in and through the young participants' dialogues.

When discussing multiplicity in teaching and learning from a sociocultural stance, Bakhtinian notions are also of relevance. We can see how Wertsch (1998) is influenced by Bakhtin's multi-aspectual and multi-voiced perspective here (cf. Linell, 2010b). The idea of multiple goals of action refers to the agency of actors capable of doing mediated actions with multiple purposes:

> Furthermore, these multiple purposes, or goals, of mediated action cannot be adequately interpreted if we assume it is organized around a single, neatly identifiable goal. Instead, multiple goals, often in interaction and sometimes in conflict, are typically involved. (Wertsch, 1998, p. 32)

I shall come back to the theoretical notion of mediation in section 4.1.1. Using tools and methods does not often imply only one motive or one goal. Translated to the empirical world of pedagogic co-actions, I relate this insight to the sense making learners. When they utter something or do practical

(dialogical) things, it is possible that they orient to several meaning-systems simultaneously. With the thinkers mentioned, it seems important not to reduce their actions to a narrow understanding of human action. What is feasible then to study empirically in the corpus of data is another question – a methodologically informed one.

3.2 DISCOURSES ON SCHOOLING

To be in school, and to learn in school, is to be socialized into the knowledge values according to the typical institutional setting. The participants are "talked into being", with Heritage's (1984) words. Children are trained to reason in certain ways in school, and to value their education (the teaching and the learning) according to these normative ideas of practising institutional knowledge development (cf. Bunting & Lindström, 2013). This is of relevance to the present study due to the fact that the participating children, as will be seen, show that they share social values of how to teach, learn and talk. In this section I shall review some findings from previous research on young people's educational discourses.

When opting for a discursive approach to classroom activities such as schoolwork and institutional-specific learning conventions, Bergqvist and Säljö (2004) draw on a dialogical outlook in order to analyse the notion of schooling, that is, the recognition of teaching and learning as accomplished in and through talk. In school, people talk, write, use linguistic categories and perform communicatively by other means (cf. Bergqvist, 1990, 2001a, 2001b, 2010). If one takes this view, knowledge cannot be understood as something accumulated or discovered by the solitary individual. Rather, knowledge is jointly construed through participation in communicative practices. This does not mean that classroom dialogues are symmetric from the view of power. Rather, asymmetries are salient features in such a context. Bergqvist and Säljö bring the issue of the new forms of discipline to the fore. They argue that schooling can be understood as continuous production/reproduction of interactional patterns within discourse communities.

Communication in school, in Sweden – as in many, if not all, countries – is still strongly oriented towards *written language* (Säljö, 2000, 2005). School is characterized by the fact that it is a language-based activity form. Here the main activities are reading, writing and talking (Säljö, 2000). To some extent the participants in the classroom talk about the world around rather than the world they are a part of, according to Säljö. One crucial educational role for

school is to prepare students for what Säljö term "text-based realities", as they will show up in several forms and dimensions in their future life. But there is also a risk that equating the concept of knowledge with text-based knowledge will disqualify students who are not skilled in literacy practices. The social practice in school is a decontextualized learning practice. For example, Säljö shows how we are expected to handle information from texts when doing school-specific exercises with the ambition to learn intended aspects of mathematics. Even if the exercises tell the students something about shocking criminal things of high concern to them, they are expected to sit down and work patiently with disciplined focus on all the mathematical exercises that have been set. Students are normally not allowed to dwell upon the moral issues, or to react emotionally and communicatively against any content that is not directly linked to the exercises. As Säljö puts it, the exercise must be conceived of as "a closed world in itself" (Säljö, 2000, p. 213, my translation). Content and form are separated in a new way in this kind of institutionalized socialization.

In the article "Conceptual Knowledge in Talk and Text", Schoultz, Säljö and Wyndhamn (2001a) discuss the role of conceptual knowledge in school. They demystify conceptual knowledge in school education and, hence, contest the cognitive research tradition in the field where conceptual knowledge is seen as something abstract that lies "beneath" or "behind" human performances in concrete social practices. Instead, Schoultz et al. regard conceptual knowledge as part of situated action. This reasoning implies quite a different concern about the students and their displayed skills in terms of low or high performance. If one takes this perspective, performance and reasoning in the classroom are best understood as situated and relative to circumstances. In their analysis, Schoultz et al. show how speech interaction is a way for the young students to solve specific text-based tasks communicatively. What they refer to as low performance is reconsidered to be a communicative problem due to the nature of discursive tools present and the situated setting in which the child finds him- or herself, not a purely cognitive (intellectual) problem that is transparent and can be taken for granted in the test situations. Accordingly, talk and text imply different constraints and meaning affordances that must be considered by the teachers in educational situations, and in their assessment of their students' outcomes.

Mehan (1979) too provides an approach on classroom discourse that is oriented to the social dimension of formal knowledge construction (an ethnomethodological approach). Viewing teaching and learning in the classroom with an interactional perspective implies that knowledge is a social

construction (i.e. a public property – not a private, internal state within the individual knower). Various classroom arrangements impose constraints on interaction and on children, who have to operate within those constraints. Knowledge does not exist in its pure, isolated form. His findings also imply that academic skills are at stake for the young students, not only the learning content in the specific school subject as such (cf. Bergqvist, 1990, 2001a, 2001b, 2010). These skills concern the issue of how to talk and behave in the formal school context and also what discourses to learn in order to please the teacher in the overall system. In the study referred to here, Mehan states that *evaluations* seem to be one of the features that distinguish conversations that take place in classrooms and other educational settings from those that occur in everyday situations (cf. Bernstein, 1990). Teacher evaluations used to comment on a reply to an earlier question posed by the teacher. This constitutes a typical sequential organization of "known information questions", as opposed to "information-seeking questions", where the intention is to really have a factual answer, not to prompt someone to answer something aptly in a precise and normative direction. Teachers are sometimes not aware of how the child's display of knowledge is constrained by the organization of discourse and the structure of the task.

Studying practices in music education, Ericsson and Lindgren (2010) view each educational context as a discursive practice. They are interested in looking at the multiplicity in the interwoven discourses as displayed in the institutional practices. In search of strategies of governance in music classrooms, they found six main governance strategies in accordance with practical and ideological music educational dilemmas. They even examine the "task culture" of school and point to its counterproductive effect when attempts are made to generate creativity in music making. Moreover, today's students are obliged to make efficient use of time and keep themselves busy with productive activities (Biesta, 2009a; Bergqvist, 2010, 2012; Bergqvist & Säljö, 2004). Time and productivity are frequently discussed topics in the conversations studied in contemporary classrooms. Students are given such questions as: "Could you think about how you can use time more efficiently?" and "How can you be better at remembering what you have to do?" (Bergqvist, 2010, p. 143). Through such guiding questions the students are socialized to be very well aware of issues of time and efficient productivity in their schoolwork, here at the secondary level at a Swedish comprehensive school.

Traditional teaching in Sweden has gone through what must be considered a radical reorganization (Bergqvist & Säljö, 2004). Teaching traditionally

in front of the entire class has been considerably reduced, and the most prominent element is now a combination of individual work and work in student groups (cf. Carlgren et al., 2006). Lessons during which students sit listening and waiting have been replaced by more self-regulatory studies. The educational tradition in the Swedish comprehensive school system has been oriented to child-centred approaches, representing a strategy in which the working methods rather than the specific contents are emphasized (the learning content in, for example, a school subject). "Learning by doing", the progressivism phrase we have taken from Dewey concerning the ideal of the active, curious child who is able to learn by himself/herself and not only after prompts from teachers, still lives on among teachers today. But now this ideal is conflated with the radicalized ideas I have mentioned above about individual responsibility and the crucial role of meta-awareness as meta-reasoning (Bergqvist & Säljö, 2004). The child is viewed as a more or less self-regulated being, driven by personal needs. The students also have to be able to participate in social activities such as group work and meta-communication with the teacher or the classmates, facilitating meta-awareness (cf. Bruner, 1996; Pramling, 2006; Säljö, 2005). Further, Bergqvist and Säljö (2004) outline the increasing emphasis on democratic modes of communicating. But even these have their roots in earlier conceptual threads from the reformative Swedish school discourse. Social competence and democratic rhetoric are, however, not enough according to the guidelines for the late-modern curriculum from the National Agency of Education. Bergqvist and Säljö describe how students must also develop realistic conceptions both of their own competencies and of those of their peers.

The regulative role of conversational forms and patterns is arguably a core issue for Arts Education. Ways of interacting communicatively do not only regulate cognitive comprehension, emotive processes or practical behaviour but also have aesthetical implications. Gee (2012) discusses school discourses and their implications for creativity when telling public stories in the classroom. He exemplifies with two seven-year-old children representing different cultures and, consequently, meeting different challenges in their school lives. Leona is an African-American child, participating in sharing-time stories in the classroom. In this activity the children were meant to acquire the kinds of explicit language used in literate-style talk and writing. The children were not able to read or write yet. Moreover, they were encouraged to "talk about one important thing" and to be completely explicit in their language, relying as little as possible on the ability of their audience to

draw inferences. In these types of classroom activities, sharing times could be seen as an early essayist (prosaic) literacy training for children who could not necessarily write or read yet, Gee argues, and names this school discourse "the essay literacy discourse". He describes how Leona's language use is clearly rooted in her home community, but her way of telling a story in front of the class is also an invitation to the other children to participate with her in sense making, and they readily accept this invitation. However, the teacher does not, as Gee points out. Moreover, Leona's teacher responded with judgements that Leona was "not talking about one important thing" or just "rambling on" (p. 144).

The teacher's listening goes through her school-based ears, to use Gee's parlance. Important to notice here is the fact that Leona's literate style is emphasized as important in another part of the curriculum, that is, in other school practices. So the teacher's ears were not only school-based but more precisely school-subject based, or school-practice based. Some stories are obviously not evaluated as successful sharing-time stories. Leona used sound effects and glee as communicative resources in a highly interactive and creative style, including the use of figurative language and poetics. She was telling a story in a social language that went against the grain of a social language by which sharing time was intended to guide children into high literature. This intended pedagogical aim was not explicitly communicated to the students.

In the study referred to, the story telling of another girl, an Anglo-American middle-class girl called Mindy, also was analysed. The teacher considered Mindy's sharing-time to be appropriate and successful. Gee examined the circumstances that enabled such a success in the classroom. How did Mindy use her words in order to perform appropriately? When Gee scrutinized her oral report in front of the class, it was clear that Mindy and her teacher managed to be in sync. That is, Mindy was able to follow the teacher's scaffolding (for example, rephrasing instructions as questions, and regulating the dialogue with pauses as signals), being guided into the 'right' way to talk. The teacher enacted the role of being a greater expert. She also used echo questions to underline what she found interesting and was impressed by, and Mindy continued without missing a beat. However, Mindy made an interesting 'mistake': she was corrected by the teacher when trying to interact with the audience (the other students) with the aid of tools of central significance to the whole story. Instead of describing in words the prime theme of her story, about making candles, she *showed* the candles, relying on the fact that the whole class could actually see what she was talking about. She was

further engaged in talking about the colouring of the candles, and that lent itself logically to the visual presentation of the candles in this social context.

With help of her teacher, Mindy developed a lexically explicit, coherent and school-based account of a complex activity. The student was most of all engaged in learning to be 'in sync' with the resources of school-based social practices, Gee argues. The teacher provided a clear and elaborate set of guidelines for how she wanted Mindy to talk about making candles: "Tell the kids how you do it from the very start. Pretend we don't know a thing about candles" (p. 145). Typical was also the teaching technique of adding more and more descriptive and lexically explicit detail around a single topic. When comparing the discourses of Mindy and Leona, Gee asks himself why Leona's literary stories, banning fantasy, are not recruited within other school-based practices where 'creativity' and 'literariness' in language are being encouraged. Her sort of story, with its rich ties to the historical base of literature and its many creative and literary features, is rarely encouraged and recruited in school, according to him. He suggests some answers. One answer could be to ask what counts as 'high literature' and not as everyday poetics. After all, Leona's language has many features that could be easily recruited for an apprenticeship into classical poetry or 'high literature' too, but what counts in school is how students adapt to the prosaic discourse, at least in story telling.

Moving to the notion of institutional music educational socialization, Barrett (2006) studies conditions in schooling that enable children to be creative or not. In her view, creative work provides a means for children to make sense of their experience of the world, to control and organize it, and to communicate this understanding to themselves and others. When considering invented song making in this light, there are a number of implications for early childhood practice and music education. The most conspicuous aspect to her seems to be the conventionality in existing institutional music educational practices with young people. The music development that is supported through these practices tends to enculturate the child into the conventions of adult music making. There is little opportunity for viewing music as a creative rather than a re-creative practice exists, she argues.

Before leaving my account of discursive trends in late-modern educational school systems, I shall turn my attention to the late modern discourse that instrumentally accentuates knowledge efficiency and measurement at the price of other learning qualities, so emphatically discussed in the Western world (Aspelin, 2012; Aspelin & Persson, 2011; Bergqvist, 2010, 2012; Biesta, 2005, 2009a; Liedman, 2011; Pring, 2004; Varkøy, 2003, 2012). Briefly,

according to the authors referred to, the social, dialogical dimensions are easily reduced into the matter of social interaction with a strictly purposive connotation to equip students with useful knowledge skills, often with an emphasis on intellectual skills (see also Biesta, 2009b). Educationalists now orient to school-tasks that translates into efficiency and assessment of student achievements. To put it in Bergqvist's (2012) words, we now face a "bureaucratisation of schoolwork" that emphasizes a typical late-modern way to govern students and their academic results, that is, through the individuals' autonomy, interests and needs. In current Swedish school music on the elementary level, aesthetic knowledge, as music knowledge, is legitimized and construed in the interest of two normative main tendencies, Lindgren (2013) reports. There exists one romantic ideal of the free, unrestrained and creative child, in need of pleasureable, undemanding aesthetic activities. However, this idea is contrasted by the other knowledge norm that draws on the neo-liberalist discourse of our time: "our current neo-liberalists ideologies of the individual's own development and freedom under control, and mapping, of pupils' needs" (Lindgren, 2013, p. 17, my translation). The latter approach can be compared with Olsson (2014, p. 132). He states that Swedish higher music education adopts neo-liberal management-theories as the point of departure.

As Biesta (2009a) outlines, educational values are premised on the neo-liberalist agenda in the current "educational measurement culture". The effects of this trend have considerably narrowed the discussions of education that especially orient to issues of evaluation and measurement, seeing education primarily as relations of (instrumental) exchange. Thereby it tends to emphasize narrowly techno-centrically usefulness and individual responsibilities, for example, turning education from a right into a duty in the public discussion. In a similar vein, Aspelin and Persson (2011) identify the knowledge school as a contemporary Swedish discourse, accentuating efficiency in knowledge production. They are critical of such a development. It overlooks the existential, ontological fact that human relations stand in the educational centre. They are critical of the other existing discourse too – the caring school discourse. The problem here is that it focuses too much on the students' identity formation; who you are becomes more important than what you will become. Their theoretical solution is to talk about a third alternative, the social psychological discourse on *relational pedagogy*.

In practice, this liberal discourse is not as liberal as it seems. An example of relevance to aesthetic pedagogy is when the pupil Sara wanted to plan

drawing as her "self-chosen activity" in the schoolwork (Bergqvist, 2001a). She wanted to note that in her planning book. Then she was told to write down other things in the book; drawing was not a legitimate activity in her case. Instead she was told by the teacher to draw if she wants when she has been good and ambitious enough in *other* school subjects. Clearly, this school-subject in art was not valued as the main skill to achieve in the reflective, planning style, and Sara's freedom to make own choices was in practice clearly confined.

In contrast to the everyday language, an institutional language use is challenging because it actualizes a terminology – an institutional discourse – that has to be appropriated. It is in need of reflection and conscious learning in that sense (Bergqvist, 1990, p. 101; Säljö, 2005, p. 157). The meaning of the terms is thematized as a central part of the institutional activity. This form of language use is also of a distinct nature, a more abstract and scientific conceptualization compared to the everyday talk. The latter is bound up with more spontaneous and, thus, more transparent style of talking. This implies that this type of communication is practised less reflectively. We do not need to think of exactly how we express ourselves here; the situation allows us to be understood by the other(s) anyhow, Säljö (2005) argues.

Social order in pedagogic discourse and institutional talk go together, according to Bernstein's (1990) classical, sociological work about the structuring of pedagogic discourse. I shall note some words of relevance to my current study, lingering on his chapter 5: "The social construction of pedagogic discourse" (p. 165). It is a matter of some interest that the sociology of education has rarely turned its attention to the analysis of the intrinsic features constituting and distinguishing the specialized form of communication realized by the pedagogic discourse of education, according to him. Instead, these theories see pedagogic discourse as a medium for other voices: class, gender, and race. The discourses of education are here analysed for their power to reproduce dominant/dominated relations *external* to the discourse. Pedagogic discourse (henceforth: PD) comprises the rules of specialized communication through which pedagogic subjects are selectively created. He defines PD as the rule that embeds a discourse of competence (skills of various kinds) into a discourse of social order in such a way that the latter always dominates the former. Further, what can be seen in PD as the key to pedagogic practice is continuous evaluation. Hence, the pedagogic code deals with evaluation rules as a main feature. Bernstein also recognizes how "thinkable practices" and "unthinkable practices" operate in and through the

PD – the forms of institutional regulation:

> We know that in general those who *reproduce* legitimate knowledge insti-
> tutionalize the 'thinkable' whilst those who *produce* legitimate knowledge
> institutionalize the 'unthinkable' and that we find these are two strongly
> classified groups within the legitimate fields of the production and repro-
> duction of education. (Bernstein, 1990, p. 187f.)

3.3 SUMMARY

There is an increasing trend towards dialogic teaching, according to Lyle
(2008). She also reports on the growing interest in Bakhtin and his dia-
logue-philosophy among educational researchers. I am one of them, drawing
on Linell's interpretations of Bakhtin and dialogicality. What makes Bakhtin
radical and interesting in contrast to more traditional beliefs about teaching
and learning in educational systems? In chapter 3.1, I mentioned several
authors who argue for dialogic teaching, for example, Lyle, Sawyer and
Alexander, who draw on Bakhtin-influences that lead them to seek alter-
native reasoning, both new attitudes and concepts for creative dialogues in
classrooms. The emphasis on the problems with traditional, teacher-centred
classroom dialogues is one thing they have in common. Lyle (ibid.) makes
a distinction between a monologist (one-directed) practice and a dialogist
practice that is more student-centred. Sawyer (2004) defines creative and dia-
logic teaching as a *disciplined improvisation* responsive to the students rather
than a pre-planned, scripted play like a theatre play in which the rehearsed
teacher enters the stage and talks non-improvisational with a listening
audience (the students in the classroom). Alexander (2008) tries to find com-
municative ways that transcend recitation and strictly instructional teacher
talk. In a similar vein, Bruner (1996) problematizes the traditional teacher
role and calls for an intersubjective pedagogy from a sociocultural perspective
(with Lyle, Sawyer and Alexander). He guesses that the omniscient teacher
will disappear from the classrooms in the future, just as the omniscient nar-
rator has disappeared from modern fiction (cf. Bergqvist, 2010, who reports
on the lack of traditional teacher control). Other educational thinkers, such
as Biesta (2009b, 2011) and Herbert (2010), stress the dialogical dynamics
of unexpected openings in pedagogically interesting ways. Moreover, some
scholars consider dialogicality in educational and interpersonal relations in
terms of trust and other socially constructed emotions (Aspelin, 1999a, b,

2005, 2012; Biesta, 2005; Evensen, 2014; Lilja, 2013; Nordström-Lytz, 2013; Zittoun, 2014). So does Bruner (1996), who calls for a cultural-historical perspective that does not exclude the construction of the emotional identity in the analysis of educational relations.

Chapter 3.2 has dwelt upon empirical research on school discourses (i.e. main features of pedagogic communication in classroom research and the like). To be in school, and learn in school, is to be talked into being: to be socialized into the knowledge values according to the typical institutional setting. Teaching and learning are accomplished in and through talk to a high extent. In school, people talk, write, use linguistic categories and perform communicatively by other means (Bergqvist, 1990, 2001a, 2001b, 2010; Bergqvist & Säljö, 2004). If one takes this view, knowledge cannot be understood as something accumulated or discovered by the solitary individual (cf. Aspelin, 2012, 2014; Biesta, 2005, 2009a; Mcbeth, 2011; Mehan, 1979; Säljö, 2000, 2005, 2011a; Schoultz et al., 2001a). Knowledge may then be seen as something jointly construed through participation in communicative practices. Such a dialogical ontology stands in sharp contrast to the late liberal idea of the self-regulated, autonomous individual who is strictly accountable for her or his achievements in school.

The social practice in school is a decontextualized learning practice. For example, the student has to handle – to appropriate – text-based realities (Säljö, 2000, 2005). Here there is a risk that the concept of knowledge will be reduced if it is evaluated as being equated with text-based knowledge (i.e. knowledge based on written language), thereby leaving behind, or disqualifying as suggested above, students who are not skilled in literacy practices. Furthermore, in contrast to everyday language, an institutional language use is challenging because it actualizes an abstract terminology that has to be appropriated. That is also what school is about: learning to master the specific institutional concepts themselves, Säljö tells us (cf. Bergqvist, 1990). Moreover, to be taught by someone, more precisely in school, is to be evaluated constantly (Biesta, 2009a, 2009b, 2011; Bernstein, 1990; Mehan, 1979). That is what mainly distinguishes schooling discourses from everyday talk.

I have also discussed how late-modern school practices are interlinked with creativity and musical knowledge building. The new type of efficiency in Western schools accentuates student skills in planning and evaluating complex school tasks, forcing students to build meta-awareness and to engage in meta-communication. Morever, it typically creates students who are productive and organised in relation to time and other framing conditions

(Bergqvist, 2001b, Bergqvist & Säljö, 2004; Bruner, 1996; Pramling, 2006). As Ericsson & Lindgren (2010) put it, Swedish music pupils in the elementary school are expected to develop musical creativity in a "task culture", imbued in prescribed and rigid procedures and regulations. The authors discuss the pedagogical problem in this conventional practice (cf. Barrett, 2006). In a similar way, Gee (2012) is concerned about how creativity in young people's schooling is premised by communicative (discursive) patterns. He found that Leona's, an Afro-Americans' creative ways of story telling in the classroom was viewed as a failure due to the teacher and her norms in the investigated school activity – the "sharing time". She was told that she was "not talking about one important thing" (p. 144), and so on. Leona's poetic text production clearly goes against the grain of the social language to which the activity is intended to apprentice children. The knowledge norm identified was the essay literacy-style; to talk in a linear, reportive way without interaction with the audience as a resource (the classmates in front of the story teller) and without illustrating means, figurative language etc. Gee finds this guided knowledge construction problematic in an ethical sense (i.e. discriminating the social language of Afro-Americans, tied to an oral culture, in contrast to Anglo-Americans' language culture), but also due to the pedagogic discourse in fostering fantasy and creativity.

Theorizing learning and communication

In this chapter dialogical perspectives on learning and communication will be discussed. The sections below present differentiated aspects of sociocultural approaches in the present thesis. These are my perspectivating research tools through which I scrutinize my data in the present study.

4.1 A SOCIOCULTURAL PERSPECTIVE ON LEARNING

The sociocultural perspective constitutes a wider set of epistemological assumptions that are pertinent to the issue of learning and teaching (although it should not be understood as a simple didactical model of teaching, rather as an analytical tool for approaching knowledge construction in social practices). In this chapter I shall describe some more aspects of relevance to learning. In this perspective there is a call for bringing the social processes of institutional teaching and learning analytically together (Bruner, 1996; Mercer, 1995). This is opposite to the current educational field, according to Mercer (1995). In keeping with his framework of sociocultural psychology with regard to learning, he argues that it would be more appropriate to conceive of teaching as a *guided construction of knowledge.* Knowledge is not only about individual mental possession. It is also joint possession because it can readily be shared. Children use language to formulate ideas and to evaluate them. The favoured approach to analyse institutional learning is then to examine how talk is used to shape representations of reality and interpretations of experience. That is,

to analyse language as real-life events; talk between teachers and learners. With Littleton as a co-author (Mercer & Littleton, 2007; Littleton & Mercer, 2013), Mercer emphasizes the pedagogical importance of thinking together. As Gee (2012, p. 89) writes, "social cognition" is beginning to come together with work on sociocultural approaches to language and literacy, and a goal for the future is an integrated view of mind, body, and society (cf. Linell, 2010b, 2014). The present thesis underlines such a point of departure.

That leads us to the analytical level of relevance to the present thesis. Here I explore how children develop co-constructed meanings, knowledge and reasoning in situ, through a wide repertoire of communicative and cultural resources. In order to study the micro-situations in detail, with the purpose of gaining knowledge about interactional learning in cultural practices, I adopt *the micro-genetic level of development* (Calais, 2008; Linell, 2009, p. 253; Valsiner, 1997; Wallerstedt, Pramling & Säljö, 2013; Wertsch, 1990, p. 65). According to Wertsch (ibid.) and Linell (2009) micro-genesis entails the level of social interaction – the moment-to-moment in the single situation. It is not merely the micro-level that is involved, however. Micro-genetic designs emerged during post-Piagetian studies because the significance of scrutinizing the close connections between micro-level changes (e.g. children's problem-solving) and macro-level changes on the societal level (Calais, 2008). A sociocultural perspective does not overlook the macro-dimension embedded in social life even if it here focuses on interpersonal processes in communication.

4.1.1 Mediation and appropriation in social practices

Wertsch (1991) has theorized a sociocultural approach with an emphasis on the dialogical and social dimensions of human learning. As stated above, a basic premise of this tradition is that human knowledge is developed in dialogue with others, that is, interpersonally, and in dialogue with cultural knowledge, embedded in societal norms, artefacts and conventions. Dialogical means such as language and other cultural representations are therefore conceived of as crucial for the individual's learning processes. In other words, the idea of semiotic mediation – the constitutive use of culturally shaped symbolic representations – is intimately related to learning in sociocultural/culture psychological and dialogical epistemology (Linell 2009, 2011a, 2014; Säljö 1998, 2000, 2005, 2011a; Valsiner, 1997, 2000; Vygotsky, 1930–1934/1978; Vygotsky & Luria, 1994; Wells, 2007; Wertsch, 1998). The notion of semiotic mediation implies the idea that human knowledge is construed

in and through cultural tools such as speech and other sign-systems within specific social practices and discourses. Semiotics is also often built into the material environment, for example, in inscriptions as artefacts (cultural tools). Hence, artefacts might be both conceptual and material (Cole, 1996; Säljö, 2005; Wells, 2007). This perspective on language implies the rejection of a view of language as a mirror, strictly representing the outside reality in any straightforward manner. Further, the sociocultural approach presented rejects the idea accompanied by the latter view of language: to consider learning as the transfer of knowledge (a purely mental act of taking in messages from the outside to the inside and stored in the receiving brain of the learner) (Linell, 2009, 2014; Säljö, 2000, 2005, 2011a, b, cf. Biesta, 2009b; Reddy, 1979; Rommetveit, 2008).

In contrast, if one takes a sociocultural perspective, knowledge is not seen as only residing and developing solely in the individual's mind, but also between people and in cultural fields – in *social practices* with particular aims, discourses and cultural tools (Säljö, 1998, 2000, 2005, 2011a). Appropriating knowledge is conditioned by interactional co-ordination of perspectives, learning collaboratively to accomplish the current situation in which the interlocutors indulge in. With such reasoning, mental processing has to be conceived of as a social, relative phenomenon (not as autonomous inner states), contingent on interactional and contextual conditions. Interactional contexts afford creative meaning-potentialities but also constraint and regulation by its distinct nature and (social) function. Meaning-potentials are not neutral in their inherent values. According to Säljö, there is no unmediated, objective truth of knowledge. Knowledge and its values belong to situational contexts of meaning and have to be regarded as relative to those contextual and cultural framings. As mentioned above, *situated learning* is an underlying point of departure in this study, a concept often applied in sociocultural reasoning (cf. Lave & Wenger, 1991).

We use sociocultural resources when we interact with each other and our cultural community. Semiotic resources (e.g. in spoken language) signal symbolic meanings that support and build knowledge in subtle and differentiated ways. They also mediate interpersonal action; to negotiate goals and means, and to regulate other nonverbal expressions, that is, to manage the interpersonal relationships involved (Säljö, 2000; Wells, 1999). Such a notion further urges us to an integrative approach to communication, in which both verbal and nonverbal communication, and other complex interrelations in language use are acknowledged (cf. Linell, 2009, 2010b, 2014).

Moving to the theme of knowing and learning, the current semiotic work has to be interpreted by the learners. This is interesting because again we can see how the relativity is tightly interlaced with knowledge. As Säljö (2011a) points out, there are no univocal thinking-forms and pathways for understanding reality (cf. Bakhtin, 1986; Linell 2009, 2014; Wertsch, 1998). Rather, he suggests that learning is about taking over perspectives in social interaction. There is a communicative value in understanding new conceptual systems in contexts. Learning has to do with interpretation, and interpretation leans on culturally inherent guidelines for what counts as valid knowledge criteria. Conceptual knowledge that encompasses verbalized socially shared knowledge then clearly contributes to the individuals' co-construction of the reality. So, "Knowledge is no neutral picture of reality but argument, and argument requires communication" (Säljö, 2011a, p. 81, my translation).

In accordance with this epistemological perspective, is there a further link from personal experiences and collective knowledge? One crucial key to making complex, advanced learning possible is externalization; to make experienced knowledge collective, thereby enabling further knowledge building in another social reality (Säljö, 2005). *Externalization* of knowledge thereby allows us to recontextualize dimensions of knowledge, creating new learning opportunities for the individual and the social community. More precisely, it is the cultural tools in use that enable the process of externalization. To put it in Säljö's words:

> Hence, the cultural tools exist in the public room, and they are used in different practices; they are audible, can be sensed, observed and even smelled. [---] With Donald's (1991) concept and, in a sociocultural tradition, the tools are conceived of as externalizations of human knowledge and insights. The human being simply has the ability to 'lay out' traces of their insights in the surrounding world by creating artefacts, by linguistic categories and, by developing a number of communicative patterns or activities that are institutionalized. (Säljö, 2005, p. 50f., my translation)

Central to the sociocultural perspective is the concept *mediation*. Individuals do not stand in an immediate relation to their reality. Instead, the surrounding worlds are mediated by cultural tools such as language and other representational sign-systems. We live in a mediated reality, Vygotsky (1934/1986) claimed. That ontological assumption has to be pursued into learning issues

too, according to sociocultural reasoning. The notion of mediation leaves us with the question *how* we build knowledge, not only where. Tools make specific seeing and doing possible (Säljö, 1998, 2000, 2005; Vygotsky & Luria, 1994; Wertsch, 1998). Cultural tools are therefore interrelated with perception and cognition. But the current study underlines that the mental cognitive aspects are interspersed with other social actions and feelings due to a person's earlier life experiences and the cultural activity that is involved in the accomplished learning (Linell, 2009, 2014; Säljö, 2011a; Vygotsky, 1925/1971, 1994, 1930/2004; Wells, 1999, 2007). A theoretical ambition is to articulate a non-dualistic (epistemological) stance, trying to avoid the reductionist view of separating mind and body, and the inner self versus the environment 'out there' (the individual versus the social). When we use cultural tools and artefacts we do mediated actions, Wertsch (1998) suggests.

Moreover, learning can be construed as a process of *appropriation* (Säljö, 2000, 2005, 2011a; Wertsch, 1998). Säljö emphasizes how appropriation is enacted socially in human interaction. The learning process is typically mastered step-by-step:

> The idea that mastering abilities and tools goes in the direction from external aid to be mastered in a self-dependent manner by the individual can thus be seen as appropriation of cultural ways of expression and knowledge. During the learning process the external aid decreases until it is totally absent. (Säljö, 2000, p. 125, my translation)

Further, Linell (2009) describes the characteristics of artefact-based appropriation in the following way:

> When artifacts are being *actually used and made sense of*, they become artifacts-in-use, rather than just artifacts 'as such' […] Artifacts are *appropriated* by users in different ways in different contexts. When they are appropriated, they are typically assigned local and situated meaning. Appropriation implies making artifacts into something that users 'own' and integrate with their activities. (Linell, 2009, p. 347, italics in original)

With Wertsch (1998) Linell also acknowledges how Bakhtin paid attention to the appropriation of voices within the dialogical self. Again, discourses and linguistic means are cultural tools that can be appropriated as well as the materialized artefacts mentioned above. Linell (ibid.) mentions Bartlett as

the forerunner of the concept of appropriation in cultural psychology (i.e. a dialogical, sociocultural perspective on learning and development). Wertsch (ibid.,p. 53) explains that although the processes of appropriating cultural tools are thoroughly intertwined, this need not always be the case. In line with Linell, Wertsch also emphasizes the meaning of the word *appropriation* as the process of taking something that belongs to others and making it one's own. So, if the user of a cultural tool (the mediational mean) does not really enact his agency fully because of a personal feeling of resistance to it, the appropriation will not be successful. Hence, appropriation requires a motivated use of the tool employed in the learning situation.

This notion is of relevance to the idea of artefact-based learning. Artefacts materialize ideas of production (i.e. cultural, collective knowledge inbuilt in the making of such tools). But they have to be analysed primarily due to the *user's* meaning making (i.e. the user's appropriation of them), Säljö (2005, p. 231 f.) underlines. Let us take the example of the knife as a well-known artefact. For example, in Miller's (2011, p. 214) eyes, interpreting Vygotsky, a knife is not a sharp bit of matter associated with the idea of cutting. Instead he argues that an artefact has no independent existence in relation to the user of the knife. It is "dead as a doornail" until it is brought to life as a knife in the act of cutting. If we think of an artifact as something separate from the human agent, we construct an empty abstraction, according to this reasoning. Vygotsky (1925/1971) too uses the example of the knife to illustrate the user-dependence in the meaning making with tools. The focus of his present thesis is art, and here Vygotsky directs his 'knife example' to the functioning of music in our lives:

> Like a knife, or any other tool, art in itself is neither good nor bad. More precisely, it has tremendous potential for either good or evil. It all depends on what use we make of, or what task we assign to, this tool. To repeat a trite example: a knife in the hands of a surgeon has a value completely different from that of the same knife in the hands of a child. (Vygotsky, 1925/1971, p. 254)

Vygotsky continues his reasoning about music as an art form. Thinking that dance music directly makes us willing to dance and that a piece of traditional military music evokes a special behaviour in the listener is futile. Music pieces are more than that. Such a view overlooks how musical expressions really work, he claims.

4.1.2 Signing with cultural tools

In the present study I analyse how especially three types of cultural tools are related in the participants' practice, and how they are linked to their teaching. Artefacts, discursive tools and visual tools are considered in their functional multiplicity. These tools are conceived of as mediating thinking tools, contributing to learning and teaching in differentiated and integrated ways. The thesis explores how young musical actors teach and learn with such cultural and semiotic resources.

Discursive tools (Säljö, 2000) are verbal resources that facilitate the mediation of abstractions beyond the local context. Through word meanings learners can imagine earlier experiences and another context than the one here-and-now. Metaphors are interesting examples of discursive tools. Pramling (2006) sees verbal metaphors as a constitutive tool of language, ubiquitous in people's talk. He investigates how children qualify their answers verbally and how they use figurative language in learning to represent. This approach is made in communicative rather than cognitive terms, according to his socio-cultural framework. It is found that reasoning 'as if' or by analogy is frequent in the empirical data analyses. Metaphorical reasoning serves an important function when confronted with novel or conceptually demanding knowledge (p. 96). Trying to make sense of something unknown requires that we construe what we address in terms of something better known, that is, metaphorically. Eventually the metaphors will be locked into concepts, becoming 'naturalized' in how they are understood. They become simply 'the way to say it' in a social practice or in a wider culture. They are no longer understood as metaphors but as saying what it means in a more 'direct' sense. The metaphor simply comes to say how *it is*. The now familiar figurative words are no longer two-dimensional but have become one-dimensional: a transformation from the 'as if'-mode of thinking to a set understanding of how 'it is' in itself. Pramling addresses the importance of developing meta-communicative knowing and meta-awareness in educational learning (cf. Pramling, 2009). Such knowledge paves the way to thinking anew, that is, to reconsidering things.

Scaffolding is also related to the discursive tools in social interaction. Scaffolding means to structure learning dialogues communicatively, so called communicative underpinnings (Säljö, 2000, p. 123). The premises are basically that there is verbal guidance from a leader, such as a teacher, parent or another knowing instructor, and intense, clarifying communicative work between the interlocutors involved. Performance by novices is often scaffolded by others

(Linell, 2014, p. 52). Practically, scaffolding could consist of breaking up the current problem-solving for the learner, in order to help with the reasoning; providing explicit cues to how to interpret and attend to the task at hand. To scaffold is to guide the apprentice in micro-situations with supporting co-actions and co-thinking, according to Säljö (2000). The term scaffolding was introduced in a paper by Wood, Bruner and Ross (1976) where they describe the nature of the tutorial process between a guiding adult and a child; the means whereby a more skillful adult or 'expert' assists someone who is less knowledgeable due to the particular skills in focus. The tutor's pedagogical function is to direct and control the problem-solving by reducing degrees of freedom in the task to manageable limits. Bruner (2006) conducted a study in which 3-, 4-, and 5 year-olds were tutored in the task of constructing a pyramid from complex, interlocking blocks. The tutor guided the young participants in maintaining directions in the problem-solving, marking out critical learning features, controlling frustration, and demonstrating solutions when the learner could recognize them. The significance of the finding for instruction in general is considered. The demonstration phase often involves the tutor's idealization of the act to be performed. For example, the tutor imitates an ideal form of solution to be tried out, expecting the learner to imitate it and present it in a more appropriate form.

In social interaction it is not only talk that constitutes mediated resources. Conversationalists also use bodily gestures in their communication (Linell, 2009, 2010b, 2014; Säljö, 2005). Mutual gaze, for example, is a strong communicative resource in establishing dyadic contact (Linell, 2014, p. 69), and both gestural and discursive actions are salient features in instructive practices (Goodwin, 2000; Lymer, Ivarsson & Lindwall, 2009). Vygotskij (1934/1999, p. 444) considers how the spoken dialogue presupposes a visual perception of the other interlocutor: to interpret his mimics and gestures, and, in addition an aural perception of the intonation in the spoken language. In this study I emphasize these aspects of interpersonal communication too. It is not only about *what* is being said in the dialogue – it is also a question of *how* the messages are designed by multiple means:

> All conversations are expressions of mediation, and people are, so to say, constantly mediating resources to each other in interaction. An intended glance, a questioning intonation, or a description of an event, mediate the world to the interlocutor in a particular way, and make learning possible. (Säljö, 2005, p. 37, my translation)

As illustrated above, meaning making has to do with all kinds of mediation in action. When describing the person's mind as culturally and socially embedded, it is also important to realize how this insight of sociocultural embeddedness could be combined with that of *embodiment* (Linell, 2009, p. 114, cf. Linell, 2010b). This is the point where the concept and phenomenon of the 'voice' come in: utterances are always carried by the individual voice. The embodied voice is a thoroughly dialogical medium, according to Linell. In addition, he emphasizes the dialogical and interactional functions of mutual gaze, seeing one another's face and eyes. With reference to Lévinas, he recognizes the human understanding that is due to this dialogical aspect: "You cannot begin to understand that you are somebody (who can think) until you have been approached and greeted as somebody by the other" (2009, p. 116). But there are other pedagogical resources to conceive of than interpersonal communication and situated cultural dimensions. The notion of tool-dependency in human learning is a main assumption in the sociocultural perspective (Säljö, 1998, 2000, 2005, 2011a, 2011b; Vygotsky, 1930–1934/1978, 1934/1986; Wells, 2007; Wertsch, 1998).

This leads us to another study by Vygotsky and his co-worker (Vygotsky & Luria, 1994). It concerns children's signing and learning, and bring to attention the issue of the children's practical actions. Important to have in mind when reading this are the intellectual trends of that time within the field of child research. Vygotsky and Luria were engaged in path-breaking theoretical argumentations. They emphasized the analytical importance of regarding the use of tools in structural and genetic relation to the development of signs and sign making in practical actions. *Speech* was, at the most, traditionally viewed as an element accompanying practical intellectual operations just as harmony assists the melody in a piece of music (here "harmony" should be understood as the musical construction of chords). That means ignoring the constitutional aspect of speech in the activities performed. Symbolic action was treated as a factor that had no ties with the organization of the child's practical activity. The outcome of their observations shows that the child not only acts tacitly with the purpose of achieving a goal. At the same time s/he also speaks, seemingly spontaneously. A corollary to these results was two basic conclusions: 1) The child not only speaks about what he is doing, but that for him speech and action are in this case one and the same complex psychological function, directed toward the solution of the given problem. A child's speech is an inalienable and internally necessary part of the operation. 2) The more complex the action demanded by the situation and the less direct its solution, the greater the

importance of speech in the activity as a whole. These observations led them to the conclusion that the child does a practical task with the help of not only eyes and hands, but also speech. Speech, practical action and perception are analytically integrated. That also means that natural mental functions such as attention and memory are transformed into more conscious, voluntary attention and memory forms in the learner's symbolic use of signs as mediating tools.

According to Vygotsky and Luria (ibid.), learning and acting mean being guided by *auxiliary signs* (signs serving as helping, subsidiary tools for problem-solving and action). Words directed toward the solution of the problem pertain not only to objects belonging to the external world. They also work in the other direction, that is, inwards in the virtue of functioning as a guiding tool connected to the child's own actions and intentions. Hence, with the aid of speech and symbolic activities, the child proves able to master his/her own behaviour, relating to him/herself as to another being. The development of the child's higher forms of practical activity and the complex unity of speech is the product of a deeply rooted process of development in which the subject's individual history is closely linked to his/her social history. If speech was at that time usually identified either as a system of reactions (the behaviourist perspective) or as a means leading to the comprehension of the subject's inner world (the subjectivist perspective), Vygotsky and Luria regard speech in a third way: as a system of auxiliary symbols, helping the children to reconstruct their conscious actions.

When speech is turned inward and is used as a means of self-regulation or self-control, natural (spontaneous) mental functions such as attention and memory are transformed into voluntary attention, and voluntary remembering as well, according to Vygotsky who points to the role of word meaning in relation to consciousness (Miller, 2011). Hence, signs such as the spoken or written word can be seen as cultural communication- and thinking tools that facilitate mental functioning (cf. P. Falthin, 2011). In a study of children's astronomical reasoning with a visualizing globe (Schoultz et al., 2001b), the authors acknowledge the significance of tool-dependent activity in the interview situation within the design of the research project. The globe was used as a shared physical object of attention during the interaction with the researchers, allowing the children to answer their question about, for example, gravitation, with this central artefact as a thinking tool, also serving as a communicative resource.

It is unthinkable to exclude mediating tools of a visual nature from analyses of learning in our days, according to Säljö (2005, p. 160). Pictures have a

new, important status in our technological media society. Written texts and pictures live side-by-side, constituting different kinds of visual representations as supplementary resources for human talk and learning. As tools we need both. We talk and write about pictures, and we use pictures when trying to clarify what we state verbally, he claims. Text can also be used as a thinking tool, supporting remembering in interpersonal dialogues (Linell, 2011b; Mäkitalo, 2011; Säljö, 2011b). Through the written words, people are able to re-actualize their experiences and talk about them together, even as resources for future actions (Mäkitalo, 2011). At first glance it may appear that dialogism focuses mainly on talk and dialogue between mutually co-present individuals (Linell, 2009, p. 244). However, Linell (2009) points to how dialogistic thinkers, including Bakhtin, actually focused on written texts. Here texts are regarded as utterances that readers respond to. Texts in this perspective are seen as text practices or text events rather than as static structures. He further describes two dialogical (dialogistic) ways of analysing written, artefact-based texts. One of them is relevant to this thesis. That is to study the life of texts within a series of communication situations: how texts are conceived, tried out, formulated, written and edited. Moreover, with the dialogical framework applied in this study, the notion of dynamic polyvocality (several voices simultaneously) is central too. In texts and single utterances as well, other voices are reverberated. In that sense intertextuality, how texts are linked to other contexts and other voices is stressed. When using a text as a thinking tool, for example when reading it out loud and arguing with him/her/self, indulging in self-dialogue, at least two voices interact (the reader's and the inherent message(s) of the text). There may be others' 'voices' present too, either manifest or masked, explicitly quoted or implicitly invoked, according to Linell.

Although language tools are not purely physical objects, they have inherent material features and material consequences when used (Säljö, 2005). They also have a history rooted in culture. Given this, words and signs are created in human communities. Such tools allow us to communicate knowledge and experiences to each other. In practice, physical tools and language tools are used in integrated ways. Signs and symbols are often embedded in the material as, for instance, pictures and text as representations on the computer screen or printed scores in music books for the musician. Also, Hultberg (2000, 2007) and Nerland (2004) point at how cultural tools as written symbols often regulate the individual's musical actions.

The different kinds of cultural resources here build upon each other, and constitute an *inscription*: interlinked physical artefacts and discursive

tools. To separate them analytically is to emphasize a dualistic reasoning that splits language and thinking on one side and artefacts in social practices on the other (cf. Ivarsson, 2004). Säljö underlines how inscriptions work as mediating tools in more than one direction. Sometimes inscriptions do not enable quick and easy understanding and learning. Rather, as complicated abstractions they can also function in the opposite direction, being challenging to the learner who needs to put in a lot of hard work in order to learn from this type of symbolic cultural tool.

This study addresses musical learning. When considering the role of music theoretically, Vygotsky's notion of music and art provide a sociocultural idea of how to approach the role of culture and dialogue in aesthetic learning. In *Psychology of Art* (1925/1971), Vygotsky regarded art as one of the vital functions of society; an important scientific research object in studies encompassing human psychology and human knowledge. Vygotsky searched for an alternative in theorizing aesthetics – a third way beyond "aesthetics from above" and "aesthetics from below" (p. 9f.). He described the idealist "aesthetics from above" position as a (Kantian) philosophy, deriving its laws and evidence from metaphysical premises only. However, neither was "aesthetics from below" free from problematic aspects. Here we face the risk resorting to what we today term naive empiricism: an explanatory base that is somewhat blind to underlying explanations in its limited search for obvious (superficial) local inter-relations in human behaviour on which to base their analytical results. In Vygotsky's words, aesthetics from below "was thus incapable of lifting itself even slightly above this combination of primordial and fundamentally meaningless facts" (Vygotsky, 1925/1971, p. 10). Thus, it became ever more obvious to him that both existing aesthetic perspectives were in the throes of a deep crisis at that time.

Vygotsky introduced his new psychology, the third way, as an attempt to formulate a monistic (i.e. anti-dualistic) explanation of the nature of the mind (cf. Veresov, 1998). That means an attempt to overcome the dualistic idea of separating bodily reactions and the inner world of the individual – a version of the Cartesian dualism that separates body and mind (Veresov, 1998). Vygotsky was also occupied with another dualistic problem, trying to overcome the analytical clash between the individual and society – the culture. As Kozulin (1990) argues, Vygotsky's psychological theory of aesthetics has an early cultural-historical perspective. He considers it easy to see how this early writing relates to the later works of Vygotsky. The ideas of aesthetic experiences from 1925 (1971) clearly correspond to his later theory of "psychological tools",

according to Kozulin. Here Vygotsky elaborates on how cognitive functions can be transformed into cultural ones by materialized tools (i.e. the role of mediational means). In *Psychology of Art*, Vygotsky views the artistic work (e.g. the music piece or the written poetry) as a mediator that has a transforming function for the human body, that is, both the emotive and cognitive embodiment. Veresov (1998, p. 70) admits the crucial role of culture in the book. That is why most of it was dedicated to the analysis of the structure of different artistic texts rather than to the mechanism of the aesthetic reaction as such.

Vygotsky considered music as a public affair, placed in a social context in our culture. The educational significance is relevant to these notions. Evaluating music and art critically in society means undertaking the role of organizing the effects of art. The really important purpose is not to interpret and explain a work of art, nor to prepare the listener, reader or spectator for the perception of a work of art. He proposed "Only half of the task of criticism is aesthetic; the other half is pedagogical and public" (Vygotsky, 1925/1971, p. 254). This can be phrased as a matter of organizing the somewhat chaotic and unexpected unconscious forces in the aesthetic emotions of man into the attitudes of consciousness. That allows the person who experiences music and art to counteract, that is, to cooperate with those emotional impulses that have been generated by the work of art. An educational implication of this line of argument is that it is in the meeting between the emotional unconsciousness and the willful conscious actions we can construct artistic meaning and useful knowledge of art forms as well. Art is the social within us. In its materialized forms, projected outside us, then fixed in external objects, it should also be seen as a tool of society, Vygotsky claimed. The relevance of these statements to the present study has to do with the (social) construction of artistic meanings. The children construct expressive embodied acts in their aesthetic dialogues, drawing from cultural values, and creating something of cultural value. Arguably, and in line with Vygotsky, these should not be conceived of as purely distributed cognitions. Rather, cognitions are imbued in emotional dimensions, both conscious and unconscious, and intimately interrelated to the culture and the particular interpersonal situations.

In "Imagination and Creativity in Childhood" (Vygotsky, 1930/2004), Vygotsky addressed the distinction between productive knowledge building and the reproductive process of knowledge building. To build knowledge productively implies the necessity of leaning on reproductive activities as, for instance, the ability of memorizing and re-creating cultural elements in a new conditional setting. To re-situate in this sense is an important creative

act, typical of children when playing together. They handle worldly orders in reproductive ways but the productive acts are characterized by the completely new situations and meanings assigned in their playing activity. Hence, it is quite obvious how the productive (creative) elements are conflated with the reproductive ones and thus have to be seen as interrelated in learning. There are also similarities to the references made above about the amusement found in playing with concepts and words. When living through established knowledge together, the children discover new conceptual versions to elaborate on. At the same time, they relate it to their reality. Creativity refers to any human act that generates something new, according to Vygotsky. It even passes for creating a thing or concept in the outer world or for constructing a new intellectual or emotional state, invisible to other people's consciousness. Recalling the reproductional state mentioned earlier, he claims that you are reproducing if you make a strict depiction of something. Another example is when someone is acting according to a given pattern of some kind. That means reproducing experienced events from life, a form of imitation.

One crucial premise for the creating activity of the imagination is the richness and plurality in the person's earlier experiences (cf. Vygotsky, 1994). In this sense, imagination and fantasy has a very important function in a person's experiences. It becomes a means of expanding the personal experiencing and thereby a way of profiting from social and historical experience beyond the immediate sphere of living. An educational implication of this reasoning is his point about encouraging children to broaden their experiences systematically.

4.2 DIALOGICALITY

The present study is designed with a meta-theoretical framework, embracing a distinct dialogue philosophical outlook on human communication. The fact that I intend to place the already dialogical phenomenon communication in such an explicitly dialogical framework may seem paradoxical to the reader, but all research on communication does not share precisely the same ontological assumptions that will be introduced in this section. It is rather the opposite traditionally, as Ragnar Rommetveit puts it:

> In a monologically based and information technology-inspired communication theory, the relationship between the subjective and collective meaningful has been lying like a taboo topic in a no man's land between

the narrowest individual psychological theory and abstract system theory. Pioneers in the development of a dialogical paradigm are broad-minded theorists who ventured out on explorer lift missions in this borderland, wholly free from established prejudices about the boundaries between the subjective, intersubjective and collective meaningful. They advocate the dialogical paradigm: the individual as a co-owner of the language as a collectively constituted resource; Joint authorship of linguistically mediated meaning and distribution of epistemic responsibility; dialogically based communication science: "A moral science?" (Rommetveit, 2008, p. 90, italics omitted, my translation)

Rommetveit points to the ethical aspects of a dialogical-theoretical outlook, as we can see in his words cited above (cf. Linell, 2014, p. 69, and Aspelin, 2005, who discuss the possibility to derive an applied ethics from dialogical assumptions of self-other-interdependence). He sees the dialogical alternative as a comprehensive basis for the cognitivist, individualist and monologist theory on language, thought and communication. I shall come back to the more precise meaning of the concept of monologism. Rommetveit tells us that Mikhail Bakhtin, Valentin Volosinov, Lev Vygotsky, Martin Buber, Hans-Georg Gadamer, William James and George Herbert Mead have paved the way for the dialogical paradigm in this field. Later thinkers with this orientation are Jerome Bruner and James Wertsch, and I shall refer to them throughout my thesis, together with Vygotsky and some Swedish names in this tradition. He also names our Swedish social psychologist Johan Asplund. In this work I lean a lot on a dialogical thinker whom Rommetveit recommends us to read: Per Linell. The sociocultural tradition that I draw on in the present work is resonant with his theory. So, now I shall turn to Linell, and especially his work on this theme from 2009.

Linell (2009), a sociocultural thinker within the field of linguistics, urges us to rethink language, mind, and world dialogically. He describes the cultural and semiotic nature of human communication in depth. I allude to his title in the comprehensive book referred to: *Rethinking Language, Mind, and World Dialogically: Interactional and Contextual Theories of Human Sense-Making.* As Valsiner argues in the introduction, Linell's synthesis of a systematic perspective on dialogical science is at the forefront of culture psychology. Linell presents a thought-provoking (and heuristic) alternative to mainstream theories in linguistics, psychology and social science, articulating the concept of *dialogism* in contrast to the more traditional view: *monologism* (cf. Linell,

2003). However, the latter term (monologism) is almost never used by the monologists themselves. The follow-up question is given. What then, is the difference between the two stances mentioned, dialogism versus monologism? The following text in this section will explicate this issue, with Linell's work in mind. I shall start by looking at the most general assumptions of the dialogism outlined.

> What then *is* monologism? The brief answer is this: the constituent theories of monologism are the information processing model of cognition, the transfer model of communication (communication as the transfer of messages from senders to recipients), and the code model of language (language consists of static signs, i.e. stable combinations of expressions and fixed meanings). We might add to this a theory of contexts as external to language, language use, thinking and communication (rather than relevant contexts seen as integrating aspects of these semiotic means and activities). (Linell, 2009, p. 36, italics in original)

The ontology of monologism assumes that communicative acts are accomplished of the individuals in their capacity as senders and speakers. The individuals are analytically stripped of their inherent sociality. Their cognitions and behaviours are seen as produced by autonomous rational individuals rather than socioculturally embedded (other-oriented) persons. Correspondingly, there is no active role assigned to recipients. Typically, the monologist individualism is regarded in universalistic terms rather than in culture-interdependent terms. That is, to conceive of the individuals as basically alike in the biological sense, being generally dependent on their biologically given endowments. Instead, dialogism stresses the impact of variations between sociocultural traditions, and also of differences between persons due to their different biographical trajectories and experiences. Monologism is part of a major tradition in Western philosophy and science. Linell articulates the reductionism within such a perspective. If individuals are not treated as rational individual and autonomous subjects, they are treated as observable objects (cf. the rationalist and empiricist traditions also described in Winch, 1998). Linell suggests that one way of answering the question of what monologism really is to examine several theoretical traditions.

Basically, human sense making is an important issue with his overall dialogue philosophical stance: "One might say that dialogical theories bring meaning and sense making back into human sciences, particularly

psychology and linguistics" (Linell, 2009, p. 31) (cf. Jovchelovitch, 2007). His point is that sense making (and knowledge-building) is constituted by *the double dialogicality* (see also Linell, 1998, 2003, 2011a, 2014). It is dialogically construed in and through multiple contexts and discourses on various levels, including both local and global contingencies. That means, both the interdependencies of social interaction in situ and the situation-transcending ones. There is, in other words, a need to analytically combine the tradition of interactionism with sociohistorical / social constructionism. When doing so, social interaction is linked to cultural traditions and sociocultural practices. Human beings draw from sociocultural resources in interpersonal dialogues and from culturally sedimented dimensions as well. As Linell describes it: "Double dialogicality thus refers to the fact that any interaction is both situated and situation-transcending. One may term this distinction 'situation vs. tradition' " (Linell, 2014, p. 33).

According to the ontology (and epistemology) of dialogism, "the world is constituted not only (or even mainly) of elements and categories (as in Cartesian epistemology) but also of essential (constitutive) dimensions" (Linell, 2003, p. 227). That means a focus on tensions, contradictions, interdependencies and potentialities in social existence, rather than trying to reduce the complexity of human life. Influenced by Bakhtin (cf. Linell, 2010b), Linell does not underestimate the non-consensual aspects of communicative meaning making. Rather, he finds the multi-voiced, multi-faceted, and conflictual inherent in, and constitutive of, learning and development. He proposes that sense making should be regarded as action-based, interactional and contextual in nature. Central to dialogical theories are hence *activities* rather than underlying systems or structures: "Meanings must be determined in the making" (Linell, 2014, p. 4). Moreover, one fundamental thesis of dialogism is that sense making is always dependent on explicit or implicit *semiotic* resources (talk, text, nonverbal resources) and *contextual* resources in interplay (Linell, 2014, p. 20).

Yet there are some other basic principles that have to be considered. The notion of *other-orientation* is a key concept, implying the presence of the other in individual thinking, communication and feeling. Other-oriententation is inbuilt even in solo thinking; there is building on other's language and ideas as expressed in, for example, actions, talk and text. Hence, consciousness has a socio-dialogical base. Social apperception and recognition are important for understanding. With Bakhtin (1986) he assigns a responsive feature of the phenomenon of understanding. That implicates a close relationship between

understanding and responding; trying to understand something, in particular an utterance, may involve preparing a response to it. Moreover, the idea of semiotic mediation – the communicative construction of signs – is also crucial in this dialogical outlook. See chapter 4.1.1 in which I elaborate on semiotic mediation based on the sociocultural perspective.

Moreover, other-orientedness is a key concept in dialogism, Linell (1998, 2003, 2009, 2011a) proposes (Sw. *annan-orientering*, see 2011a, p. 127f.). In talk-in-interaction, one individual responds to another, addresses the other and anticipates possible next actions from him or her. Even in solo thinking, there tends to be some kind of other-orientedness. We experience our own acting and thinking *as if* someone might be listening to us and evaluating us accordingly. Consciousness has a socio-dialogical basis that involves reflecting on one's own position. Sometimes we experience consensus together with others, sometimes alterity; to realize that others understand you and the world in divergent ways (Levinás, 1969). Such insights also constitute learning (cf. Säfström, 2005; Todd, 2008). Social apperception and recognition are important for human understanding: without being recognized as a person who can actually think it is hardly possible to believe in one's own understanding. The present study explores educational dialogues. Here, social recognition is seen as a communicative, and social psychological, phenomenon that has to be considered analytically. *Responsive understanding* is linked to this (see Bakhtin, 1986; Linell, 1998, 2009; Mäkitalo, 2011; Wells, 2007, p. 255). Linell's words imply a close relationship between understanding and responding. Preparing a response involves taking a perspective and perspective-setting, i.e. interpretative understanding. To take the other's perspective is thus central in responsive communication. In learning and teaching it is crucial too (see chapter 3.1 on "Dialogic teaching").

Trust and distrust are relational concepts, inherent in dialogicality. Communication has to build on many aspects of trust, according to Linell (2009, 2014). To rely on the other is a social phenomenon of the other-orientation described above. In educational discourse trust might be a risky undertaking (Evensen, 2014). Evensen points at the social relation between pupils and teachers in school: how pupils gradually come to realize that the teacher is not only a friendly coach, in fact also a judge. That implicates the evaluative dimension in educational practice. I shall come back to this aspect in chapter 4.2. The gradual transition of realizing the teacher functions, from the pupil perspective, invites an issue of trust, according to Evensen. Zittoun (2014) also relates trust and distrust to the dialogical (social) dimension.

She maintains that learning is about risk taking and demands a leap of faith on the part of teachers and learners (cf. Aspelin, 1999a, 1999b, 2005, 2006; Lilja, 2013). Hence, epistemic trust in educational situations is linked to interpersonal (relational) trust, she argues.

Trust and intersubjectivity (sharedness) are linked together because we often take the shared background knowledge about the world and specific topics for granted. Despite the ubiquity of trust (and distrust) in human communication, it is seldom theorized in linguistic pragmatics, and Linell (2009) suggests that it has to do with the fact that it usually remains implicit in the spoken discourse. The conversationalists take it as a given, taken-for-granted premise. But if it no longer can be taken for granted in the situation, then it will be taken up explicitly. Further, intersubjectivity has to do with dialogical sense making in intricate, situated ways. "Meanings are made in situated discourse. They are brought to life in situations" (Linell, 2009, p. 222). I shall pay attention to the participants' joint sense making instead of drawing on an underlying assumption of individual sense making; a monological statement that I step away from here. In this thesis, sense making is a social affair between the persons orienting towards each other, and through culturally embedded knowledge and values.

4.3 ANALYTICAL CONCEPTS

In this section I shall proceed from the account of dialogicality as a meta-theoretical framework. Some concepts will be used in the activity-analysis of the children in action (chapter 6). So, I shall refer back to these lines when discussing my interactional data.

4.3.1 Discourse

Discourse is a common and somewhat vague term for language use in context (Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2011). Discourse as situated language use in talk or text also refers implicitly to discursive organizations, according to Linell (2010a). Such discourses make up *communicative activity types* (see section 4.3.2) in the social spheres where people co-exist and interact with each other, for special purposes. Following Linell then, the term *discourse* is used in a rather substantive sense: "a (piece of) discourse is a stretch of concrete, situated and connected verbal, especially spoken, actions" (Linell, 1998, p. 6, cf. Gee, 2012). Such a discourse includes paralinguistic signals (nonverbal

signs) and embedding contexts, according to him. Linell (2009, p. 199) also describes *discourse types,* which are linked to *communicative genres*: ways of talking about certain kinds of topics in certain kinds of situations (see 4.3.4).

The kind of disourse analysis undertaken in this study should not be confused with the postmodern approach in the most radical social constructivist view; the most far-reaching relativist perspective on knowledge construction. Instead, Linell (2011a, p. 122 and 167) addresses an activity-based empirical analysis that entails the notion of discourse, as hinted above. Here, the spoken words within an interactional and conversational context are scrutinized in order to state something about the interlocutors' dialogical sense making: the specific talk-culture(s) at stake.

4.3.2 Communicative activity types – CATs

Examples of where people meet for special purposes are classroom lessons, job interviews, psychotherapy sessions, football games and dinner parties. Levinson (1992) mentions teaching as a typical activity type with specific premises. These activities might be seen as larger social patterns of actions and interactions – activities in which the participants are subjected to habits, routines, norms and rules, framed by culture-specific conventions, values and purposes (Linell 1998, 2009, 2010a, 2011a). As a consequence, talk, text use and other semiotic activities take on activity-specific forms. Contextual resources of a communicative activity and social situation type (beyond the local, interactional one) imply both constraints and affordances. In other words, they provide for a basis for the participants' situated sense making. In this study, sense making and knowledge formation are profoundly intertwined phenomena. So, in that sense, social learning is based on this overarching contextual framing too.

The data collected for this thesis can be seen both at a micro-level and at a macro-level: particular lessons as occasions of music education with particular participants – the overall school as a system with its educational practices. In terms of micro- and macro-sociological analyses, the concept of communicative activity type (henceforth: CAT) serves as a bridging meso-concept (Linell, 2010a). It provides a link between situated micro-processes and societal macro-structures. Further, it links the interactional order with the institutional order, thus giving substance to considerations of "organizations in discourses" and, in reverse, "discourses in organizations". This is of importance for not only my activity analysis of the examined children's

interactional patterns but also for the final conclusions in this thesis: the discussion about schooling and aesthetic communication. In accounting for these notions, my ambition is to cover precisely the double contextuality in their communicative sessions, considering implicit trans-situational sense making resources for the teaching and learning accomplished jointly and situationally. It is not feasible to claim that I know for sure the hidden (implicit) social facts beyond the overt interaction, for example, asserting that the children actually have their own concrete school-lives in mind when they are building teaching situations as a research-conducted task. But it can be argued as plausible to analytically relate their expressions for learning and teaching with earlier research on educational features in modern school discourses.

A CAT analysis is concerned both with the overall organization of an encounter and its embedded discourse. A CAT is a social situation type in which participants are engaged in a specific activity. A central task for the analyst is to figure out what the particular *situation definition* looks like. Another way to put it is that all this concerns how the participants view the interactional contract they are actually involved in: what expectations and interpretations guide them? What is at stake in the situation? What underlying rights and obligations do they have to follow? What is the socially accepted behaviour?

Accordingly, Linell lists some properties of a prototypical CAT (2010a, p. 42f.):

i) it is related to a social *situation* and *encounter*, whose nature is recognised by participants and often has a conventional name (i.e there is a folk concept tied to it, e.g. "job interview");

ii) it is framed by specific expectations and purposes;

iii) although there are often different and sequentially ordered sub-activities (=phases), each instantiation is temporally contiguous within the situation, and involves (at least partly) the same primary participants;

iv) some are linked to, and administered by, institutions, specific profession(al)s and societal organizations.

Linell continues to delineate three main dimensions within CATs. These contain overlapping and interdependent features. Hence, they have to be understood dynamically as interlocking ideas to describe such activity type

structures. These dimensions are *the framing dimensions, the internal inter-actional organizations and accomplishments*, and *the sociocultural ecology* (see Linell, 2011a, p. 159: the corresponding terms in Swedish are "avgränsning, iscensättande och omgivning"). Linell proposes that the first dimension, *the framing*, demarcates the specific CAT, including the situation definition in terms of purposes and tasks, activity roles, scenes, times and medium – the specific activity language. Roughly, framing dimensions are basically pre-given, either as physical resources or as culturally determined premises (as, for example, musical instruments in a music classroom or the use of tonality systems when dealing with the musical language as part of the subject-matter). Again, we have to keep in mind that these resources become relevant only when, or if, the participants make them relevant; if they choose to invoke them in the actual interaction when orienting to them in the joint activities that they have undertaken.

The second category above, *the internal interactional organizations and accomplishments*, tells us about dialogical things that are necessarily "brought about" in situ, thus incorporated into the participants' interactions. Examples are the particular phase structure (as organized by the interlocutors), topics, agenda, core communicative projects, turn organization, question designs, participant positioning, feedback and other interactional patterns, degree of (in)formality and the role of artefacts. Before moving to the next category, a note on *communicative formality* is needed. Linell (2011a) proposes a defini-tion: "formality in a communicative activity is primarily that some distinct actions *have to* be accomplished, and in addition in a specific form, no matter if the particular case actually needs it or not" (p. 406, italics in original). The third category, *the sociocultural ecology*, concerns larger surroundings that are also crucial for a dialogical understanding of CATs. The sociocultural history is one such wide environmental framing. Other aspects mentioned are rela-tions to larger societal organizations and societal sectors, and to neighboring CATs within the societal institutions or communities of practice.

4.3.3 Communicative projects – CPs

Within a CAT the conversationalists are dealing with smaller communicative tasks, *communicative projects* (henceforth: CPs). Those sequences are also context-interdependent, embedded in, for example, the context of an activity type. The project of getting something said and understood linguistically is always done in the service of an overarching project, Linell (2010a) underlines.

They are often related to a situational problem-solving. A CP is dialogical too, involving an implicit or overt co-action between two or more parties, with actions that are responsive and addressed to other participants. Typically, the parties in the dialogues enact their contributions in different ways; for example, they contribute more or less, yet they usually make mutually complementary contributions.

Moreover, CPs have to be conceived of as relatively open-ended, dynamic movements with various formats. Linell (2010a) accounts for the notion of local CPs, "in which participants accomplish a communicative task over a limited sequence" (p. 39). A very local CP might consist of repairing an occasional mishearing or misunderstanding, or asking a question and getting an answer. But there are also larger CPs, which can emerge when, for example, the participants are carrying out an extensive, complex task, embracing a whole encounter (like a medical consultation) or series of encounters. When people engage in an educational, goal-oriented learning task collaboratively, they are facing a large CP within a CAT, in which the CAT is marked out by the education as its whole. A corollary of this reasoning is the idea of CPs as varied in their extensions (sizes) and hierarchically organized

4.3.4. Communicative genres – CGs

The notion of CAT is also closely related to that of *"communicative genres"* (henceforth: CGs) (cf. Luckmann, 2002). Linell (2011a) suggests that CAT and CG are closely related concepts, but they may be linked to situation type and discourse type respectively. CG shares some affinity with the Bakhtinian idea of speech genre (Linell 2009, p. 198). That is, utterances cannot be fully understood without recognizing them in their larger wholes, the genres of language use in action. The act of uttering something is linked to more extensive discursive units; we do not only orient to each other's previous or next coming (anticipated) utterances, we also orient to the conventions associated with the activity-related discourse types (CGs). For Bakhtin such social norms and conventions in speech and other verbal activities guide the speaker/writer into specific ways of using the language. That does not mean that the personal voice is eliminated. Rather, the person's intended verbal expressions are mediated by these genre-based language norms and other cultural, ideological norms as well. CG is, however, a more inclusive concept than speech genre, since it can apply to other communicative means than language. Nonetheless, the most basic unit of a CG is an utterance.

In the following, the structures of institutional communicative practices are brought out. Some aspects are of significance and I shall set out with a note on formality in communicative practices, following Linell (2011a, p. 53 and p. 406). He outlines a definition of communicative formality in which the type of acts is in focus. In the formal style, in contrast to the informal, some pre-given acts have to be performed even if they are not the most appropriate ones in the specific (micro)situation. Very often, the acts have to be managed in rigid order or in a particular linguistic form. Informality is about the opposite practice, followed when adjusting the accomplishment of the CPs to the particular, occasioned circumstance and its audience. This brings us to the issue of agenda-bound interactions that abound in institutional interactions, permeated by functional routines and tasks that have developed over generations. Hence, agenda-bound activity types are typically oriented to a task-oriented, transactional conversational style. The former – transactional interaction – is closely associated with formality.

4.3.5 Topics and division of communicative labour

What roles do *topics* have in communicative activities? Human utterances are 'about' something; in everyday language we may call this "content" (Linell, 2009, p. 245, cf. Zandén, 2010). Linell (1998) describes some concepts that are useful for my purpose when analysing topicality. In a topical episode, conversationalists talk about a specific content, a topic. In institutional topic progressions, the dialogues may be imbued in *activity-sustained coherence* (in contrast to topic-sustained). Activity-sustained coherence is a constituent feature of a framing activity type that works to hold together the talk episode. Linell's example is a professional-lay interaction where gathering personal data about a client is on the agenda, as part of the main activity. Other examples might be opening and closing sequences of telephone calls. Here the episode clearly leans on the activity procedure rather than the joint interest in a particular subject to dwell upon. Linell concludes that, though topic organization is common, it is not a universal property of discourse. The extent and the ways of organizing topical, procedural and other episodes in discourse are hence activity-specific. Some activities admit more topic-sustained coherence, like penetrating interactive discussions in academic seminars or a café-encounter with topical foci on the weather, politics or news from the media (my examples). They do not build on procedures and practical, routinized issues so intensely as in formal, institutional arrangements.

Monotopical vs. polytopical episodes also have to be mentioned here. If the conversationalists have specific goals for their interaction or specific topics on the agenda (i.e. more or less pre-planned CPs), they may try to stay within homogeneous topic spaces. This leads to a mono-topical conversation and is especially common in some institutional activity types, according to Linell. In polytopical episodes the participants are not trying to avoid abrupt topical shifts. Rather, the episodes are topically heterogeneous. On the other hand, polytopical CATs can treat several different topics sequentially, like the agenda items of a formal meeting.

Asymmetric features are common in institutional interactions. Parties do not contribute the same things to their coordinated projects. Rather, there is a *division of communicative labour*, Linell points out (2009, p. 213f.). It might be the case that one party will dominate the interaction by taking more initiatives in the dialogue and by trying to steer and control the others' responses. However, they make meaning together and work in a complementary manner within their positions and role structures. This is not to deny the fact that people with less power in society sometimes also have weaker communicative power and, hence, are assigned to the less dominant position in the talk situation (cf. Linell 2011a, p. 347). In an educational, instructional or reporting role, the person will take on a dominant position when posing questions to the other(s), or when monopolizing the floor. The respondent party may counter with short answers and interjections, as questions or protests, but does not dominate the scene.

Finally, the principle of *act-activity interdependence* is also worth noticing under this heading. This is a principle following from the assumption of part-whole relations in sense making:

> It points to the dynamics of interaction in terms of the constituent acts as being issued in the service of more extensive goals, as being part of larger communicative undertakings (activities), and these communicative activities, the larger wholes, as being built on and realized through the constituent acts… (Linell, 2009, p. 187)

Design and methodology

Under this heading the methods used will be presented. In addition, the methodological implications that need explaining to make underlying assumptions visible are described. One of my overarching aims is to make the relation between the theoretical perspective and the methodological one coherent. Hence, the reader will meet lines of argumentation that are relevant to both theory and methodology. But first some words about the overall design.

5.1 THE DESIGN OF THE STUDY

In the study I investigate how four children, aged 9–10, worked together at the task of teaching each other to sing a song. They were asked to teach a song to another child of the same age. The song chosen by 'the teacher' was unknown to the partner. The children worked in dyadic relations (pairs) in an accentuated dialogical learning situation embracing communicative challenges of several kinds. In line with my overall reasoning in the current thesis, these learning situations were multimodal in nature. Five sessions were recorded on video. Three of the four participants were both in the role of teachers (instructors) and 'pupils': they were engaged in two sessions altogether. One of the participants preferred to take on the pupil-role only, in one recording. The songs in focus were the Swedish songs "Dagny" (a pop song, not generally well known to children), "Myggan Hubert" (a song for children), and "Kom Julia vi gå" (a folk song). All three songs were based on traditional Western tonality.

At their disposal, the children had a music instrument (piano), computer, paper and pens, sheets of paper and other surrounding artefacts. They were introduced to some of them by me before they set off with the song task. The introductory procedures took place in the same setting as the video recorded session. I briefly pointed at the artefacts available, without giving precise instructions how to use them. Rather, I emphasized their freedom to use them according to their imagination and intentions. I told them explicitly that I was eager to know what they really could find out with them. I also told them to use any other things or tools in the room that I had not mentioned if they wished to, explaining that it was impossible for me to know in advance what they would be able to discover in the situation. More precisely, the only material resources (tools) that I actually offered explicitly were a piano, a computer with access to the software program "Microsoft Word", empty sheets of paper of different sizes, coloured pens and a large piece of staff paper with five red lines at intervals. I had a preliminary meeting with the children in my own home. At the beginning of the empirical work I considered holding the video-recorded learning sessions in the music room at school, but one child came up with the idea of being in my home, and the other children agreed. Accordingly, the video recorded learning situations were located in one of my rooms at home.

As I have described above, a fundamental instructional concern was the participants' freedom of choosing from several alternatives. That means that I was also concerned with their own choices of artefacts because I was interested in their use of cultural tools; how they communicated in and through them and produced musical meanings of different kinds. I told them explicitly that I looked forward to hearing their own decisions and innovations regarding this issue. Actually, that is the point in the whole study. The teaching episodes of 30 – 40 minutes duration were recorded by video cameras, without the presence of adults. Before the music session we met together taking advantage of the opportunity to prepare for the task, discuss or clarify questions and arrangements, and express our expectations and intentions. We should not forget that one social aim was even to enhance the feeling of being relaxed and comfortable with each other. Here, there are clearly ethical aspects, but the meeting might also be seen as a research strategy for creating an empowered and deliberated situation, viewed in the perspective of the children as creative actors. When we met up to clarify the procedures, I tried to show them trust, joking that almost anything was allowed in the room provided for the video recordings, short of actual physical damage to

CHAPTER 5

the property. Concerning the social interaction expected I tried to convince the children of their situational liberty. One example of how I conveyed this was not to instruct the child who acted as a 'pupil' to politely follow the child who acted as a teacher. My intention was to see the events unfolding in the light of the flow of social dynamics between the children studied, as it happened in situ. Phrasing it differently, if I really wanted to study the more or less spontaneous social interaction of the children, I had to frame the study in ways that admit such conditions.

After the music activities the two children involved were asked to share spontaneous, somewhat unstructured reflections with me on their musical and educational performance. These conversations were video-recorded so that I could relate it to my own analysis of what I noticed from the videos, opening up an interpretative field of tension. Methodologically speaking, it is of importance for the validity to get some clues of participants' 'own' reasoning; what they themselves paid attention to in retrospective. That is, to anchor my analytical interpretations of the children's meanings, or intentions, with what they themselves actually told me right after their tasks. In addition there is here an ethical concern: to let the children's voices be heard. However, my main method in this study was the in-depth analysis of the participants' video-documented learning tasks.

5.1.1 Video-documentations

As described above, the young participants carried out the music activity with no adults present. I put a video camera on a bookcase in a fixed position and pressed the start button before I left the room. The children were told to call on me when they decided to finish the task, that is, when they felt that the task was completed, and so they did.

The design in terms of duration of the ongoing musical and communicative performance was completely determined by the children themselves. They were asked to continue as long as they felt the situation to be meaningful in relation to the instructions given (described above). An implication of this is that they also had to decide when the actual song was to be learnt by the other child. In order to do so, they had to make decisions on the basis of their musical knowledge, or musical ideas. Little deviation was seen regarding the time duration of the participants' singing activities. They all chose roughly the same time at their disposal, in order to accomplish their session (between 30 and 40 minutes).

5.1.2 Transcriptions and translations

Basically, detailed transcripts from talk-in-interaction serve to illuminate the multi-faceted interactive dynamics of turn taking as it is presented in the specific type of communication studied. The corollary of claiming that talk amounts to action is to analyse the dialogue as social action. A detailed mapping of the participants' communicative activities is the backbone of a fine-grained analysis of the outcome of the study: to narrow down the empirical facts to a demonstrable level of semiotic action (in the first stage of the analytical process). This is appropriate to the research question and the unit of analysis applied: to study mediated action as it unfolds dialogically in situ. In such transcripts the parties' ongoing sense making and monitoring of their relationships surface, indicating the kind of social activity occurring between the interlocutors. Obtaining a systematic detailed description of the interactional practice means searching for a transparent picture of the events. This does not mean, however, that a transcript fully represents the complex social reality studied. However, it is an attempt to come as close as possible in that sense. In my transcriptions there are also references to non-linguistic social acts. Discourse analysis (and discursive psychology) in general share the analytical commitment to studying discourse as texts and talk in social practice (Potter, 2011). The focus here is not on language as an abstract entity such as a set of grammatical rules or a system of differences. Rather, the language is the medium for interaction, Potter continues. An analysis of discourse then becomes an analysis of what people do interactively together, to put it in his own words.

In my first step in the current empirical work, however, I am applying transcription conventions from the CA and EM traditions. They are useful when doing the groundwork I referred to earlier, the base for further meta-analysis. The system of transcription was developed of Gail Jefferson. It evolved side by side with interaction analysis, and it highlights features of the delivery of talk (overlap, delay, emphasis, volume and so on) that have been found to be present in interaction. They are features of talk treated as relevant in one way or another by the parties to the interaction. Jefferson's system is winning ground as the standard according to the research literature. Reasons for using it are primarily its attempt to capture talk as participants hear it. Although this kind of transcription can initially appear complex and hard to read, the system is intended to build intuitively on familiar ideas, for example, underlining for emphasis.

I have used Schegloff's (2014) recommendations (home page on the Internet: http://www.sscnet.ucla.edu/soc/faculty/schegloff/), first developed by Gail Jefferson. Some of the symbols adduced derive from Linell (2009). They are reasonably compatible with each other. I shall also present some transcription conventions of my own, motivated by my ambition to analyse multi-semiotics in the empirical data. Tentatively I denote some facial expressions with smileys ("emoticons", Nilsen & Mäkitalo, 2008).

Following the recommendations of Linell (2011a, pp. 145–149), I denote what is spoken as it sounds to a great extent, imitating the interlocutors' actual pronunciations, without paying attention to grammatical rules. For instance, when they say "nånting" (Eng. *somethin'*) I do not denote it "någoting" (Eng. *something*). Consequently, "det" (Eng. *it*) is spelt "de" and "vad" (Eng. *what*) is denoted "va", and so on. An exception from this principle is when singing words are denoted. Here I write out the words as they are spelled in the written song lyrics. One reason for this is that they sing or read it with the written articulations. Moreover, when denoting how the interlocutors work with spoken song lyrics, inverted commas (") are used for the sake of clarity to the reader. At the same time it reflects how the children talk when they are reproducing the lyrics verbatim.

In the next section, I provide examples to illustrate what can be seen when using a detailed transcription convention as a tool for analysing talk and semiotics in learning dialogues. The excerpt below is a conversation between Paul (P), the instructor, and Michael (M), his apprentice, taken from my data in the present study. First, the reader will meet a version in which only the spoken words, the verbal utterances, are displayed (Version 1). Thereafter, the same lines are again demonstrated but with a number of transcription symbols attached, paying attention to not only uttered word meanings (Version 2). In these sequences below Paul (the instructor) and Michael (the apprentice) are trying to improve a piece of music – to phrase musically:

```
Version 1:


223 P:      ska vi ta den sista på versen
            will we take the last one on the verse


224 M:      vi försöker
            let's try
```

```
225 P:      mm "Jag har en liten hobby som ingen annan har"
            mm "I have a little hobby that no one else has"


226 M:      "Jag har en liten hobby som ingen annan har"
            "I have a little hobby that no one else has"


227 P:      nu gör du de igen "som ingen annan har"
            now y'do it again "that no one else has"


228 M:      ja vet "som ingen annan har"
            I know "that no one else has"
```

As we can see, there is no hint here of how Paul and Michael communicate with facial expressions (i.e. their emotive attitudes), or how they really work with the song as a whole: with tempi, emphases and non-linguistic signing. Nor is it possible to view how tonality (the singing) was related to the talk. What we *can* see in these lines is what has been said and done verbally. For example, we understand that Michael imitates Paul's song recitation (225–226) according to Paul's initiative (223–224). It is also clear that they reach a consensus on the problematic music aspect at stake (227–228), that is, to end the phrase appropriately. In other the words, the unfolding conversational topic is told, and the spoken utterances, but how do they actually design their messages, and what does the *musical* theme imply in their communication? In contrast to the excerpt above, the following lines display such facts to the analyst:

```
Version 2:


223 P:      ska vi ta den sista: på versen
            will we take the last one: on the verse


224 M:      vi försöker ☺
            let's try ☺


225 P:      mm (.)"Jag har en liten hobby som ingen annan har"
            mm (.) "I have a little hobby that no one else has"


226 M:      "Jag har en liten hobby som ingen annan har"
            ((takterar med hö hand))
```

```
                "I have a little hobby that no one else has"
                ((musical conduct with the right hand))


227 P:          NU GÖR DU DE IGEN ☺ "som ingen >annan har<"
                ((demonstrerar även med handgester))
                NOW Y'DO IT AGAIN  ☺ "as nobody >else has<"
                ((demonstrates with hand gestures too))


228 M:          ja vet "som <ingen annan har>"
                I know "as    <nobody else has>"
```

Now we get another picture. At first, lines 225 and 226 display the singing mode (denoted as the underlining mark). Further, it now becomes clear how they mark out the musical challenge by additional means, such as putting the beat in the body as help for singing (226), hand gestures in order to educationally clarify musical tempo (227), and contrasting tempi when articulating critical songtext words quickly or slowly (227, 228). Before Paul started to sing, line 225, we can also note how he prefers to take a micro-pause between his minimal response ("mm") and the singing phrase, that is, between talking mode and singing mode. If we move on to the interlocutors' dialogical expressiveness, the smiles are salient. Michael's first response to Paul's initiative is met with a smile, contributing to the cooperating words "let's try" (224). After a critical remark, it is Paul who now smiles at his partner (227). The first line (223) indicates a question: "will we take the last one?" The symbol ꞉ here denotes a rising intonation contour, typical of a question design. Explicitly denoted in this utterance of Paul is also his emphasized pronunciation at "the last one", indicating a pedagogical focus on the specific part of the song: the last part, the verse. Drawing all these communicative details together, the last picture of version 2 seems to supply a more appropriate basis for my in-depth study that seeks to comprehend the subtle interrelations of different communication forms (i.e. the interplay between expressing musical language, verbal language, bodily language and other dialogical features in action).

When denoting facial displays as ☺ and ☹, I seek to approach symbolic communication in its dialogical complexity, moving away from a reductionist stance. That means to acknowledge the emotive dimension (i.e. social psychological aspects) in pedagogical interaction. However, it does not mean to conceive of facial signing and other bodily expressions as pure representations of actual emotional states within the psyche of the individual. Rather, they

are analysed as co-constructed gestures in interaction, integrated with other communicative expressions, with other words as "visible acts of meaning" (Bavelas & Chovil, 2000). Such visible acts of meaning are not just physical actions (like just arms waving in the air) but also symbols in the simplest sense of the term: something that stands for something else, Bavelas and Chovil (2000) suggest (cf. Chovil, 1991; McNeill, 1992). For example, to look at the clock in front of people might be a communicative nonverbal act in the particular social situation, not only an informative act. It is found that "In the literature, the complex network of 'emotion in dialogic interaction' is mostly addressed by reducing the complex and isolating individual aspects which are analysed from a specific, for instance, psychological perspective" (Weigand, 2004, p. ix). In a similar vein, Sorjonen & Peräkylä (2012) argue that although emotions in most cases are manifested and recognized when people interact with each other, they have usually been studied *outside* real interactions, in experimental settings, for example. In the last decades, emotions and emotional stance have been intensely discussed in many fields, for example, linguistics, communication theory, social psychology and sociology. However, in CA research to date (i.e. conversation analysis), studies focusing directly on specific affects and emotions are scanty, Sorjonen and Peräkylä write. In educational science there is also a need of more research on the role of emotions (Aspelin, 1999a, b, 2006; Smagorinsky, 2013). Further, a moral aspect has been discussed. Analysing individuals' social interaction without the recognition of existing emotive signs is said to be somewhat incompatible with societies that foster an ideal of humanism. Daneš (2004) here refers to the problematic trend that he terms "anti-emotionalism".

When discussing transcriptional issues we also need to consider the role of translations, from transcriptions in the original language (here Swedish) to the target language (here English). As translation theorists underline, to produce faithful translations does not necessarily has to do with equivalence in the word meaning. With other words, it is possible to be faithful even though the translated text looks referentially false, not representing strict literal meaning (Eco, 2001). According to Eco, one of the reasons is that translations are not only connected with linguistic competence but rather narrative, psychological and intertextual competencies, based on context-dependent interpretations. Eco (ibid.) also discusses a distinction of relevance for the present study: the distinction between denotation and connotation of words. A good translation is not concerned with the *denotation* but with the *connotation* of the words, he suggests. One example of a translational challenge in

this study concerning the connotation of a particular word, demonstrates the context-dependency at stake and, at the same time, points at an ethical issue. As the children's dialogical situations unfold, the interjection "oh shit" was uttered in the original source language (Swedish). The problem is that "shit" is said to be a more rude utterance in England, in comparison to the Swedish language use, and I do not want to portray my young participants as unneccesary rude or impolite, for ethical reasons. In cooperation with the proofreaders I therefore decided to change the expression "oh shit" to "oh heck" (even if "shit" is a more English word than a Swedish due to its origin). Hence, in my transcriptional work it is appropriate to consider the differing cultural contexts.

It is inevitable not to do constant translation-based decisions in relation to each transcription fragment and the production of the participants' situated utterances. Some of the choices concern the excerpt presentations to an English reader: how to translate the children's subtle pronunciations in talk from Swedish to English. As an attempt to be clear in my account of the transcription extracts I chose to work with two lines for each original utterance (or set of utterances/lines). The first one represents the original language (Swedish) and the second one contains the translated words in English (cf. Melander, 2009). Moreover, the second English line is denoted with a distinct design in order to facilitate readability for the reader. One more note is needed on this issue. I also had to do a decision of how to articulate and pronounce the words in the translated (English) language. Here I got help from my proofreader who is familiar with how children in England express themselves verbally. However, the attempts to mark out English translations of emphases in Swedish spoken words (i.e. the Swedish pronunciations) are somewhat speculative by nature. But if I had decided to totally leave out such tentative emphases, stretches and other talk features of prosodic relevance, the reader would not get a picture at all of how the Swedish children produced their spoken words with subtle vocal means. Now the reader might at least have a clue how their interactional utterances were expressed; how they could have been expressed if the children talked in English.

5.1.3 Transcription conventions

Here is the transcription key needed in order to understand how I apply the symbols denoted in the transcriptions of the children's dialogues. The first set of symbols presented below is taken from Linell (2009).

bold   is used to highlight the phenomenon attended to in the analyses; note that this does not

index any physical or other property in the data themselves (unlike the codes below);

UPPERCASE (often with underlying of the syllabic nucleus) is used when words are spoken in a louder volume and/or with emphatic stress;

[(left brackets) on two adjacent lines, the one bracket placed right above the other, marks beginnings of simultaneous (overlapping) talk by two speakers;

] (right brackets) on two adjacent lines, the one bracket placed right above the other, marks the end-points of simultaneous (overlapping) talk by two speakers;

° ° denotes speech in a low volume (relative to the surrounding);
* * denotes laughter in the speaker´s voice while pronouncing the words enclosed;
> < denotes accelerated (compressed or rushed) tempo relative to the surrounding talk;
< > denotes slower tempo than in the surrounding talk;
.h= in-breath;
= indicates that utterances are latched onto each other without any interjacent pause whatsoever;
(.) denotes micro-pause
(0.7) marks timed pause (here: 0.7 seconds);
(xxx) denotes undecipherable talk.

(Linell, 2009, p. 465f.)

Next, the symbols below are recommended by Schegloff, and are also applied in my transcriptional work.

:: Colons are used to indicate the prolongation or stretching of the sound just preceding them. The more colons, the longer the stretching. On the other hand, graphically stretching a word on the page by inserting

blank spaces between letters does <u>not</u> necessarily indicate how it was pronounced; it is used to allow alignment with overlapping talk.

<u>**word**</u>   Underlining is used to indicate some form of stress or emphasis, either by increased loudness or higher pitch. The more underlining, the greater the emphasis. Therefore, underlining is sometimes placed under the first letter or two of a word, rather than under the letters that are actually louder. Especially loud talk may be indicated by upper case; again the louder the sound, the more letters in upper case. And in extreme cases, upper case may be underlined.

<u>_</u>:   <u>:</u>   Combinations of underlining and colons are used to indicate intonation contours, as follows: If the letter(s) preceding a colon is underlined, then there is an "inflected" <u>falling</u> intonation contour (you can hear the pitch turn downward on the vowel). If a colon is itself underlined, then there is an inflected <u>rising</u> intonation contour (i.e., you can hear the pitch turn upward on the vowel).

hh   Hearable aspiration (breathing) is shown where it occurs in the talk by the letter "h" – the more h's, the more aspiration. The aspiration may represent breathing, laughter, etc.

<   The "less than" symbol by itself indicates that the talk immediately following is "jump-started," i.e., sounds like it starts with a rush.

(( ))   Double parentheses are used to mark transcriber's description of events, rather than representations of them. Thus ((cough)), ((sniff)), ((telephone rings)), ((footsteps)), ((whispered)), ((pause)) and the like.

(   )   Empty parentheses indicate that something is being said, but it could not be heard. If the empty parentheses are where speakers are identified, it indicates that the speaker could not be identified either.

(Schegloff's (2014) home page on the Internet: http://www.sscnet.ucla.edu/soc/faculty/schegloff/)

Some more notes on how I refer to my transcript excerpts are needed:

<u>Underlining more than one word or syllable</u> denotes tonal singing;
☺ represents a happy smile
☹ represents a sad or disappointed expression

Although the participants do take turns, I have structured their turns into a system in which a minimal response like "mm" is noted on its own line in my transcriptions. But this should not be seen as a full-fledged turn. So, in this study, I refer to *lines* and their numbers, not to the number of turns. The symbol " (inverted commas) is used to denote how the children recite the lyrics of the songs, when the spoken or singing lyrics start and stop. Their ways of pronouncing words change when talking in this style, as mentioned earlier.

5.1.4 The participants in the study

Under this heading I shall describe the selection of the four children participating. I was guided here by the ambition to find children who really wanted to participate in this musical and pedagogical enterprise. At the same time, I had the idea of looking for children between nine and eleven years of age, based on my experiences as a music teacher throughout the years. I had found that children in this age group cooperated with adult leaders with ease and curiosity in contrast to how they generally act later, for example as teenagers. At least that was my experience and my practical starting point; one of the things that I took into consideration. As James et al. (1998) point out; the selection of young people should not be based on the traditional developmental stage thinking based on biological assumptions. Without saying that biology has nothing to do with my choice of ages, my line of argument is concerned with the practical issues related to my experience as a teacher, working with children of different ages. There is also the dimension of cultural socialization, for example, how they learn to enact specific skills progressively in the school system and the conventions behind being socialized by the parents due to the societal traditions. Another of my research ambitions was to include children that like to sing and do musical things but whose experience of formal schooling in music is limited. I reasoned that this selection might enhance the creative communicative challenge as such.

With these criteria in mind, I asked a music teacher in a Swedish primary

school to bring up the research idea with her classes in the third and fourth grades. She asked them to tell her if they were interested in participating and then sent over the list of candidates and their telephone numbers to me by e-mail. Through contacts I obtained deeper information on the children listed and decided strategically to choose the participants described below, after discussing the project with their parents. My plan was to start with the four children selected, because they seemed to get along well with each other. Thus, they seemed to have the potential for carrying out the highly interpersonal task required.

Each child and one of her/his parents met me at home to sign an agreement and discuss the project. We also discussed the child's choice of songs, the overall premises and the partner they wished to have in the research settings (the task performed) and which role they wanted to enact: the teacher or the apprentice ('pupil'). Both 'the teacher' and 'the pupil' are learners, but with different roles and obligations. Some weeks after the discussions, I invited all four children to an introductional meeting, designed in a playful style. By the end of the meeting, they were amusing themselves with the SingStar game on the TV and having snacks and ice cream to eat. My aim was simply to have fun together and to get to know each other better because of our need to co-operate and set the frame of the project. If they experienced a somewhat relaxed informal situation, they might even look forward to taking part and getting something out of it. I left them alone partly because I wanted them to start realizing that my role in this project was primarily to document the sessions planned and not to interfere in their music activities. I expected them to build up a social culture of their own later (in the constellations of pairs). It was my intention not to enact the role of a teacher-like leader, if possible. The outcome of their engagement with their video-recorded task in terms of the chosen duration of the activity, for example, indicates that they actually had the motivation and curiosity to accomplish their performances. They had an active, creative approach to the situations throughout the project.

The participants were as follows: Michael, ten years old, likes listening to pop music and is interested in some sports. He could be described as social, humouristic, verbal and curious in the encounter with me. Amy, nine years old, likes to sing at home, with friends and in school. She tells me that she likes the teacher-role very much and is influenced by her parents who are both professional teachers. Amy is interested in music and sports. She could be described as ambitious and verbal in our dialogues. Paul, ten years old, plays

the trumpet and has done that for about two years, taught by a professional trumpet teacher at the municipal 'culture school' (a music school outside the elementary school). He has even experience of participating in the orchestra at the school mentioned. Paul likes to reflect a lot about his experiences when we talk together. He is interested in how to learn new things. Diana, nine years old, dreams of becoming a music teacher and to have the opportunity to sing a lot. She takes part in gymnastics on a regular basis outside school. She can be described as a calm, verbal and enthusiastic girl in our dialogues. Diana likes to talk about personal feelings with me: about music and her involvement in the project.

Finally, it must be clarified that this is not a study focusing on individual personalities. Contrary to such an approach I here follow the dialogical line in theory and methodology – an approach that rather yields a focus on interactional (co-constructional) phenomena instead. In the present thesis I do not either analyse pre-given, fixed social categories as genus, class and ethnicity. That would be another treatise. I study only four children and their communicative cooperation in depth, and the overall design has the character of a case study in that sense.

5.1.5 Ethical considerations

Ethical issues permeate several aspects of the research project. They inform the construction of the design, the data collection, the dissemination of the results and, in my case, also how to do translations of the young participants' talk: from the original Swedish to the English target language. I shall come back to the latter. The project has been framed according to the ethical guidelines of the Swedish Research Council for the Humanities-Social Science (Vetenskapsrådet, 2004, 2011). The need for informed consent and protection are salient issues in their recommendations.

However, in practice, the strategy of consent that involves children amounts to complex aspects of power relations. Being subject to these may lead to submissive compliance in reality, based on the asymmetry inherent in the relation between adult – child and researcher – participant (James et al.1998). The particular challenge in child research should not be overlooked. With James et al. (1998, p. 187) I chose to face the demands inbuilt in doing research with young people engaged in dyadic working constellations (peer learning in pairs). The authors above claim that, notwithstanding the professional codes of conduct to which any researcher should

adhere, researching children does raise a number of particular problems that require consideration. Morrow and Richards (1996) point to the inadequacy of focusing exclusively on the central issues of informed consent and overall protection.

When trying to overcome this vexed problem I have emphasized the participants' right to interfere actively during the research process. That means that I told the children and their parents that they could withdraw from the study at any time. Another issue brought up with them was to assure that they would be allowed to read my written interpretations in the end phase of the work, thereby actively involving them and their parents in the empirically grounded statements as formulated by me. My intention was to do research *with* them, not *upon* them (see Cohen et al., 2011; Dockett, Einarsdóttir & Perry, 2009), something also the authors referred to above see as highly recommended from an ethical perspective. This does not mean that I would rethink my analytical results in accordance with the participants' opinions. The idea was to let the children be part of the design work in the study, make them into active participants, or, co-researchers in that sense. They contributed by declaring their preferences and ideas about how to organize the project practically. One example of this is that they chose the setting in which the video-documented activities took place.

Another ethical aspect has to do with the detailed analysis of the participants' actions. I chose to report on the dialogues and music performances in detail and in depth, but at the start of the project I assured both the children and their parents that I would not evaluate their music performance normatively or describe their musical level explicitly, at least not out of context. Instead, I focused my attention on situational descriptions of the dialogic learning that took place, connected to the semiotic means applied in the local semiotic space in which their actions were taking place. I find this dialogical aspect important too because of the epistemological and ontological nature of my analytical results. Practising a dialogical framing also implies stepping away from individualistic stands belonging to the monological tradition (cf. Linell, 2009, 2014; Rommetveit, 2008). Hence, the children's communicative actions are not regarded as individual. The unit of analysis is dialogical, imbued with the social interactions as a premising analytical condition, implying that utterances and other actions are responsive, social actions.

Furthermore, the choice of doing task-centered rather than talk-centred (James et al., 1998) research was not incidental. A task-centred method is of ethical interest, according to James et al. When I engaged the children

in a task, although a talk oriented one, they were given an activity space for expressivity *in situ*, that is, in a context that allows for making sense of their conduct because of the inherent situational coherence. The children here were allowed to talk in an integrated way, to be more precise, within the music pedagogical task. With Linell's (1998) words, we are talking about a goal-oriented *communicative practice* (cf. Säljö, 1997, 2000). Following James et al. (1998), it calls for problematizing the conditional issue of designing the activities examined. The nature of childhood admits several methodological possibilities, in line with ethically adequate principles. One of them is to conceive of the young persons as skilled practitioners. As long as they can follow the pragmatic idea of the ongoing research and have space enough to express themselves on their own premises, in accordance with their abilities and motivations, they are great resources as research subjects. Needless to say, the basic approach of the authors is to conceive of children as 'subjects' and 'actors'. However, if we put them in situations that do not facilitate their special abilities and interests and, furthermore, base these situations exclusively on the communicative rules of the adult world, then the ethical dilemma is a fact: "It behoves us to make use of these different abilities rather than asking children to participate unpractised in interviews or submit them unasked to our observational and surveilling gaze" (James et al., p. 189).

As a part of the research design, I used unstructured interviews. James et al. (ibid.) emphasize the point of the researcher actually listening to children's voices. Thus, an ethical reason informed the choice of arranging a talking situation to supplement the video-recorded documentations. One may have objections to this for other methodological reasons but, as I discussed above, working with children obliges us to take other aspects into consideration. For example, I chose to talk with them in a small group (the pair) in the immediate situation instead of talking only with one child at a time. This is in line with the child researchers' recommendation concerning the interpersonal power aspect. As a pair they had more expressive power than single actors with me in the role as interviewer. Moreover, this research element was closely connected to the activities performed, and we even used the same locality to facilitate the situational coherence. In the participants' activities, there were also opportunities to interact with tools. This can be compared to the study of Schoultz et al. (2001b). The researchers' participating children had a globe as a communicative thinking tool when reasoning about astronomical facts together with the researcher. Obviously, as discussed in a previous chapter, there were interesting research outcomes. Besides this, however, I can see an

ethical aspect of doing research with tools. The children now had a concrete object to turn their attention to, instead of focusing on the words of the interviewer only, and the asymmetric interpersonal relation unfolding. The globe as a thinking tool involved them and their responsive actions. So did all the tools that were used as resources for the participants' task oriented activities in my study.

5.2 METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS

In this section my aim is to delineate some of the ways in which methodology bears witness to underlying ontological and epistemological assumptions about the world and children's position in it. The meta-perspective applied in the present study accentuates a dialogue-philosophical view. In the light of this specific sociocultural framing, the reader should be able to interpret and value the forthcoming outcomes and discussions. Making conceptual understandings explicit when considering the consequences of the implications is one of the cornerstones for doing qualitative research in these fields.

The study was designed with the intention to investigate how young people work with peer learning and teaching aiming to do vocal training in singing. Furthermore, my aim was to explore the given conditions for musical expressivity and meaning making. Hence, the contextual framing and the semiotics in dialogical use are important aspects, in accordance with my point of departure. In order to analyse these interrelated aspects, I was looking for methods that facilitate the study of differentiated dialogical expressions. Some aspects have to be taken into account when outlining the specific methodological challenges in this study. I shall now account for this in detail.

5.2.1 Face-to-face interactions – using video

C. Heath (2004) claims that studying how the participant themselves orient to each other's actions, make sense of each other's communicative contributions, and produce their own conduct is the key to making an analysis of sense making in social interaction. He also draws attention to the dynamics in the reflexivity produced in conversational interaction with the participants examined. When relating it to methodological foundations, he suggests that:

> The intelligibility of the scene, the character of the event, the 'objective order of social facts' is ongoing accomplished in and through the practical and concerted actions of the participants themselves; there is 'no time out' from the moment-by-moment production of the 'objective order of social facts'. The reflexive character of practical action is therefore a central concern and direct analytic attention to the methodological foundations of practical actions and activities and the achieved character of ordinary events. (Heath, 2004, p. 270)

One methodological positioning has to be outlined explicitly in this discussion. Crucial for the pedagogical implications inferred from the empirical corpus of data is the notion of discourse analysis as a route to step away from the idea that using talk and texts is a pathway to underlying cognition (cf. Ericsson & Lindgren 2010; Lindwall, 2008; Lindwall & Lymer, 2011; Linell 1998, 2009, 2011a; Potter, 2004; Säljö, 1997). Instead, the analyses undertaken here dismiss cognitive reduction and I treat cognitive phenomena analytically as parts of social practices.

Further, Heath notices that one of the most impressive developments in sociology over the past couple of decades has been the burgeoning body of empirical research concerned with talk in interaction. Ethnomethodology and Conversational Analysis have made a profound contribution to our understanding of interactional meanings and functions. It has been found that audio-visual recordings provide useful resources with which to subject *in situ* practical actions and activities to detailed analysis. With the increasing interest in the visual material as well as vocal aspects of human activity, the use of video has become increasingly common (see also Goodwin, 1994; Heath & Luff, 2000; Hindmarsh & Heath, 2003). Heritage (2004) argues along the same lines, drawing on conversational analysis as a method of analysing interactional data. Exploiting the opportunities provided through video implies the possibility of capturing aspects of the audible and visual elements of situational human conduct. Like Heath, he is eager to develop a sociology that takes the visual, material as well as vocal aspects seriously, as a topic for investigation and analysis. Such studies will not replace the extraordinarily rich body of work concerned with talk in interaction but further enhance our understanding of nonverbal behaviour. With my study I am also not intending to reduce the role of verbal communications in dialogues but rather to illuminate the differing representational sign-systems brought to the surface by the expressivity of the children as

their joint learning activity unfolds, That is, I shall unpack significant communicative aspects of the organization of their language use accomplished in its multiplicity.

Jewitt (2006, p. 32ff.) shares some of her instructive experiences from conducting research within the field of multimodal data collection from classrooms. She underlines that a multimodal approach to learning, as is the case in my highly multimodal field in this study, needs a method of data collection that enables a focus on several modes of representations. Video offers a reliable method for recording interaction despite the speed and complexity of recording gesture, body posture, speech and other modes stringed together in its complexity.

Linell (1998) points to the face-to-face interaction as a fruitful base for doing investigations within the framework of the dialogical perspective, without excluding other forms of dialogue. More specifically, he states that the face-to-face interaction is the canonical type of talk. The definition of the concept of dialogue used is based on interaction between co-present individuals through symbolic means. This implies a theoretical conception disregarding the normative approach based on a model of an ideal dialogue. He also proposes a refutation of the view that dialogues are entirely based on conditions of symmetry and cooperation.

The video camera used in this study was in a fixed position, placed on a bookcase, and during the recording of the planned activities. That provides a consistent view of the stream of action (Heath, Hindmarsh & Luff, 2010). The authors referred to outline certain activities and settings that lend themselves to using a fixed position and a single viewpoint. The common assumption that fixed cameras affects the conduct of participants and, thus, undermines the quality of data, is also discussed. Here the reasoning is that such a reactivity issue is often exaggerated. As I have described already, some of the children in my study explicitly commented on that. They were surprised that they had forgotten the presence of the camera so quickly, and this is in line with the report of Heath et al. (ibid.). However, I have to admit that I did not adopt the long-standing tradition in social psychology studies: to record facial expressions and emotive gestures using multiple cameras. For practical reasons, I could not solve this challenge in the traditional way to capture close-ups of the faces in action. The participants were moving around in a small area, not only placed in fixed positions like, for instance, when having dinner conversations around a table. Then at least one adult assistant would have been needed to help me record the actors in a non-fixed manner. One of my

methodological points in this study is to step away from adult participation during the activities performed.

5.2.2 Bodies and talk in multimodal interaction

In linguistics, language has nearly always been portrayed as something abstract and impersonal – formal structures existing over and above individuals (Linell, 2009, p. 114). But language lives among real people and their interactions with one another. Human utterances are always embodied, enacted bodily by individuals and carried by their personal voices. Consequently, Linell emphasizes the quality of the voice when producing utterances; the prosody, accents, rhythm etc. are all involved in dialogical sense making. He also considers *mutual gaze* as a significant embodied resource in establishing dyadic contact (Linell, 2014, p. 69).

As Goodwin claims in "Action and Embodiment within Situated Human Interaction" (2000), talk contains multiple sign systems in use, gaining their power as social action. Through talk, particular actions of other kinds are being invoked, giving rise to the more precise social actions. He recognizes the human body as a semiotic resource used in and through social interaction (cf. C. Heath, 1986, 2004; Linell, 2010b; Lymer, Ivarsson & Lindwall, 2009). The interactive bodies are able to represent different communicative aspects from the verbal talk. Bodily gestures, as well as talk, may be construed, indexed or treated as irrelevant or relevant entities in the participants' surround. This fits in with Melander and Sahlström's (2010, 2011) work with learning in social interaction. In addition, Goodwin considers the environmentally materialized semiotic structure in its interactional context, as a resource in the participants' embedded activity.

Melander (2009, 2012) has studied children's knowing and learning through embodied social interaction. She outlines how the young participants actually use both their talk and bodies as well as the material world throughout their dialogical learning trajectories (the development of knowing through time in the interactions). Moreover, she probes into the empirical fact that the children she had studied were building (public) epistemic stances through a wide repertoire of embodied resources (Melander, 2012). Epistemic stances are knowledge claims referred to by the participants within the discourse analysed. They involve bodily gestures as face work, hand gestures and other bodily postures in front of the other person addressed. Aspelin (1999a, b, 2006), too, has examined bodily postures and face work within

video-documented learning dialogues. He linked the embodiment observed to emotions as communicative acts within the verbal interactional framing in the secondary school classrooms.

5.2.3 Orienting to social activities

There is another route to be mentioned which is linked to a sociocultural and dialogical stance with reference to Linell (1998, 2003, 2009, 2011a, 2014). "Many theoreticians have underscored the importance of *praxis* – the sociocultural practices consisting of situation-transcending traditions – and yet most theories of language have failed to provide it with a proper treatment" (Linell, 2003, p. 226). Sociocultural implications are also of relevance for methodological reasoning. Also, Säljö (2005, p. 66) underlines the need of analysing *activities* in sociocultural learning studies: how individuals act in these, what experiences they will meet and, consequently, how they build sense making within these situated activities.

According to Linell (2009), *"double dialogicality"* is seen as a distinctive hallmark for full-blown dialogism, examining the local (situational) context and the situation-transcending sociocultural practices as well, implying social norms and conventions to follow. This could be done if we recognize the overarching *communicative activity type* (the CAT), which relates the local interactional order with the institutional order, or the order that frames the situation definition by the members studied. Then a meso-level, a level between micro and macro is actualized (see the theory section 4.3.2 on a more detailed description of this). In this thesis, I adopt a new analytical method on conversation as social practice, based on a sociocultural activity approach (Linell, 2011a). Central here is the concepts of double dialogicality and communicative activity types mentioned above, that is, the significance of cultural premises in talking (and learning). With Linell's words:

> Conversations, or phases of conversations, have to be analysed as (parts of more comprehensive) *social practices. Practices are culturally determined, more or less routinized patterns for how to organize our company and solve different specific types of tasks.* (Linell, 2011a, p. 75, italics in original, my translation).

Moreover, Linell (ibid., p. 75) points at the unreflected nature of such communicative sociocultural practices. That means the joint situation-definitions

in societal tasks and activities are implicitly inherent. Hence, there is often no need for the interlocutors to define their conventional sense making explicitly (as in established institutions). He also recognizes the bodily element in sense making human activities. People use their bodies when participating in activities and, the mental part ("the mind") has a bodily substrate as well, according to him. It is then notable how body and social interaction on the micro-level, and the sociocultural practices on the meso-level are interlinked in Linell's methodological and theoretical notions (cf. Linell, 2009, 2010a).

Adopting the view of the double dialogicality implies also paying attention to "the double contextuality" (Heritage, 1984; Linell, 1998, 2009). The concept highlights dialogue contributions as both context-shaped and context-renewing, being both conditioned by the actual talk context and conditioning new context for the future dialogue. Thus, contributions to dialogue are both occasioned by prior co-texts and occasion a new local content, creating a new structure of relevance to the next actions. Such linked actions also encompass the situational premises embedded in cultural conventions, traditions and social norms. But the actors are not totally determined by the societal structures either. They can co-construct new meanings and opportunities for future change too.

Heritage (1984) considers social and institutional orders in social interactions. There are also social and institutional orders *in* interaction. The social worlds of the corporation and the classroom, of medicine, law, etc., are evoked in talk, that is, "talked into being". He states that it is fundamentally through interaction that context is built, invoked, and managed. It is through interaction that institutional imperatives originating from outside the interaction are evidenced and made real and enforceable for the participants. Speakers often orient to institutional tasks and contexts through their selection of descriptive terms, and many studies have dealt with the context-sensitivity of descriptions. They show that speakers select descriptive terms that are fitted to the institutional setting, or their role within it. A dramatically clear illustration is the way that speakers refer to themselves as "we", not "I" – speaking as a member of a group.

Drew and Heritage (1992) discuss features of institutional talk in which the participants are addressing themselves to these particular tasks. Institutional interaction normally involves the participants in specific goal-orientations that are tied to their institution-relevant identities: doctor and patient, teacher and pupil, etc. Moreover, institutional interaction involves special constraints on what will be treated as allowable contributions to the

business at hand. Institutional talk is associated with inferential frameworks and procedures that are particular to specific institutional contexts. Many of the different dimensions or levels of institutionalism in talk are thoroughly interrelated, he continues. Rather like Russian dolls that fit inside one another, each of these elements is a part of the next higher level: lexical choice is a part of turn design; turn design is a part of sequence organization; sequence organization is a part of overall structural organization.

The examination in this study analytically encompasses communicative projects and activities that both frame and premise the actors' conversational and musical organization. Following Linell, I pay attention to these activity designs when analysing the social interactions. This can also be seen as an extended form of Conversation Analysis, to which the level of communicative activity types is systematically oriented. His main point is to make the reader aware of the risk of bracketing the inherent dialogicality in the data by de-lineating categories in a monological manner. Treating the interactional data dialogically indicates a non-reductionist stance, in which an attempt is made to keep the double dialogicality mentioned in mind. For example, looking at utterances as strictly individual production, stripped of their dialogical local and global context, is a monological approach. Dialogism, in his terms, implies the notion of human interdependence and other-orientation, not autonomy and self-dependence. Consequently, speech acts are literally social acts; they are not simply transparent expressions of underlying individual, inner (pure) mental states. Therefore they have to be tied to their overall contexts in an ontological sense. They are entwined by socially constituted mental and emotional states and the social need to communicate and sign something to the other(s) due to the situational circumstances. If seeing the participants' social practices as framing activities, it may be helpful to apply Linell's particular concepts on the issue:

> In talk-in-interaction and texts, there are (more or less) coherent, sequen-tialised interactional structures, such as sequence types, (topical) episodes and activity phases which result from the accomplishment of *communicative projects* of varying extensions. Elementary contributions, 'interacts', are defined by their functions within these projects… (Linell, 2009, p. 281)

Linell's notion of (local) communicative projects is close to how conventional Conversation Analysis uses the term 'activity'. Hence, typical features of in-teractional data can be inferred from the situated social practice in which the studied communication is performed. Communicative projects (CPs)

are defined by their functions in terms of communicative problem-solving or tasks. They progress dynamically within the course-of-action, due to the nature of the joint problems or goals undertaken. Often they are characterized by asymmetrical participation and nested within other projects.

Moreover, *communicative genres (CGs)* share some affinity with the Bakhtinian idea of speech genre (Bakhtin, 1986). That is, utterances cannot be fully understood without recognizing them in their larger wholes, the genres of language use in action. The act of uttering something is linked to a more extensive discursive unit; we do not only orient to each other's previous or next- coming (anticipated) spoken utterances, we even orient to the situation type with embedded ideas and ideals of appropriate language use. Due to my particular study embracing musical language conventions, I find it fruitful to apply the latter (CG).

It is argued that Conversation Analysis (CA) in the spirit of Sacks and Schegloff makes social interaction and its mutual sense making and social reality construction explicable (Arminen, 2005; Heritage, 2004). The authors referred to also state that the analysis is built on the sequential order of inter- actional moves and, hence, sequential implicativeness. Arminen (ibid.) argues that such empiricism is an insurance against falling back to an immature methodology based on idealistic features. To uncover the sequential mean- ing by scrutinizing the interactional turn-takings and how the interlocutors orient themselves to preceding turns and project themselves to the forth- coming turn is therefore of relevance to a scholar practising this method of analysis. Nowadays CA analysts are more prone to incorporating institutional dimensions in their works, according to Arminen (2005). There are also an- alysts such as Evaldsson and Corsaro (1998) who demonstrate how children interactionally develop an orientation to the wider adult culture. In doing so, they contextualize the talk exchange displayed by the young participants into a wider cultural context. One way of avoiding the risk of a narrow focus on sequential orders in a strict demarcated interactional context is to recognize the collective knowledge inbuilt in cultural tools, as I have discussed before. Another methodological approach is to extend the conversation analyst no- tion of paired actions to look at three interlocking utterances (turn-takings) as a unit of analytical relevance. Here, the dialogicality in the data is meant to illuminate the creative response following from the initial turn. At least three consecutive utterances allow the analyst access to how the participants themselves understand and orient to one another's responsive utterances (see Linell, 2009, p. 183: "the minimal communicative interaction"). Mostly, I have analysed the children's utterances in episodes with three turn-takings

or more, in search of how sense making in discourses is built and sustained throughout several turns (three or more).

Linell (2011a) regards a dialogical analysis of communicative activities as an extended CA in the sense that it does pay attention to conversational features in detail, but also recognizes other aspects of relevance to the participants' sense making. The systematic notion of speech delivery aspects and temporality issues developed by Gail Jefferson could be seen as helpful in my search for an in-depth understanding of the ongoing dialogues. The transcription symbols are useful for the analyst who wants to identify details in the interactions.

Activity analysis

In the following, the focus is on the empirical analysis. The analytical approach is based on Linell's outlined principles of how to approach dialogues analytically (1998, 2009, 2010a, 2011a, 2014), see paragraphs 4.2 and 4.3. In the next chapter (7) I address results that concern how the children sign interactively with cultural tools.

6.1 ANALYSING 'THE MUSIC LESSON' AS A COMMUNICATIVE ACTIVITY TYPE

As stated earlier, individuals' situated sense making, and knowledge building, are related to how they define the whole encounter – the pre-given task. The following elaborates on the particular activity type the participants share. I go on to discuss other aspects of the interactional organization that appeared during the sessions they took part in. Here they face the music pedagogical challenges dialogically. The theoretical concepts applied here are based on the dimensions of social interaction in communicative activities, outlined by Linell (see section 4.3.2).

The four children participated in five sessions altogether. They accomplished their tasks in pairs (dyads). A presupposition based on their pre-planned social roles was that they would enact different epistemic positions. One of the partners was the given leader/instructor playing a kind of expert role, knowing the song to be taught. The other did not know the song and

was willing to learn from the instructor. In the following I most often call the instructing and teaching child the teacher and the other one the pupil. Both are seen as learners. Four of the five children chose to enact both epistemic positions, that is, to participate in two activity sessions: as a teacher in one session and as a pupil in another. Their specific activities were task-oriented in a double sense. They were committed to the concrete collaborative work of teaching and learning a song face-to-face. At the same time, the children oriented to fulfilling the aims of the research as explained to them at the start. Through my instructions, the situation was framed in a pedagogical, somewhat open-ended way that allowed for several options in their interactional organizations and pedagogical, musical work together. Here it may be appropriate to ask if the children's organized singing activities mirror a particular CAT in the analytical sense. Do they co-construct orienting communicative premises on the basis of such an activity type?

Due to its conditional nature, an activity type as a whole sets the frame for meaning making and the forms of talk appropriated as well. The children in my study are doing music (singing) within a teaching context. Hence, learning to sing a song interactionally is not about pure acts in a sequential organization in words and tunes on a moment-to-moment basis, stripped of culturally conventionalized knowledge and language ideals. Rather, we will see how the children's acts are ingrained in ideas of how to teach with words and signs, and how to sing a song a capella. Recalling the *act-activity interdependence* might shed light on the children's choices of interactional designs. They use talk, signs and music in ways that closely reflect the underlying activity type.

In a CAT the participants orient to specific habits, routines, norms and rules. Several expectations and rules were invoked in the dialogues. I shall delineate some below. Other CAT-specific phenomena from the body of data will also be explained throughout this chapter. That the participants expected a traditional classroom style, a formal music lesson, was fairly conspicuous from an analyst's point of view. That means a situation definition leaning on the norms of schooling: how to perform in school lessons. They maintained their pre-planned social roles during the sessions with few exceptions. There are, of course, some episodes in which they step out from the strict teacher – pupil order, for example, when they suddenly meet unexpected practical problems to solve jointly as a subsidiary activity. Due to that interactional order – the schooling style of organization, the children who enacted the pupil role expected the 'teachers' to give orders, request actions, explain things, ask and make assessments when they wanted pupils to implement ideas and

pedagogical training. They expected them to co-operate. This asymmetrical interactive order (i.e. the specific dominance pattern) was in most cases seen as unproblematic in the dialogues. For example, the one who was negatively evaluated by the leader in the expert-role accepted the criticism and made a big effort to please the teacher.

To continue with the schooling issue, the children clearly accepted the idea of not indulging in other talk events than the goal-oriented ones. They chose a task-oriented talk style that left no room (no topic-spaces) for personal discussions about things besides the pedagogical or practical problem-solving. That did not mean excluding open-ended situations, as dealing with democratic negotiations or creative, tentative collaborative attempts to deal with upcoming pedagogical situations. Rather, they preferred to stay on tasks in structured ways due to the topic-flow; to carry out terminating activities according to the particular communicative project introduced on the scene. One expression of this was their recurring praxis in working with critical comments as a step in their evaluative routines after song performances. As one of the participants expressed it to me: "I think it's funny to be trainer ☺ well like a music-teacher" (Sw. *ja tycker de e roligt å va tränare* ☺ *allså som musiklärare å så*) (Diana, in the interview with me and her learner Amy from the previous teaching activity). The instructors often talked in terms of being a helper, or of helping the apprentices and training them as, for example, explaining the purpose of pedagogical items.

The participants' way of posing question in question-answer patterns were also very typical for classroom discourse. They organized recurrent "known information questions" (Mehan, 1979), that is, teacher questions directed to the student when the teacher already has the answer. For example, after the practise to memorize the lyrics, guided by Paul in the instructor-role, Paul asked Michael (the apprentice) to answer him about the lyrical content in the song recently practised. This question was posed as a control-question, in order to request Paul's display of this specific knowledge. IRE sequences, common in traditional teacher-led classroom interaction (Cazden, 1988; Mehan, 1979; Lindblad & Sahlström, 1999, p. 85), were also common in the children's pedagogical activities. In an IRE sequence a teacher initiation (for example, a "known information question") is followed by a student reply and thereafter pursued with a teacher evaluation as a response to the latter (see section 3.2).

To sum up, it is notable how all of Linell's constitutive criteria for a prototypical CAT are illustrated by the participants' activity type in the present study. The participants recognized the encounter, with its underlying

conventional 'name': a music-lesson, that is, a school-lesson as the modelling activity. The activity was also clearly framed by specific purposes and expectations, as outlined above. The sub-activities within the overall main activity were intertwined in a consequent and logical structure. A similarity in all sessions was displayed here. The task-oriented activities were also based on a specific profession, from a societal organization: the idea of teaching and learning as in school, at least to a large extent.

Further, in all five cases there was an overall structural organization that also has to be given an account. The participants structured their task-oriented encounter into one core activity: to conduct song performances in which especially the child in the pupil role had to practise the song repeatedly. There were other activities too, based upon talk of different kinds, and with differentiated communicative projects (CPs), topics and sequence types, as we will see throughout the following. Those sub-activities mostly had a subsidiary function in relation to their core activity. For example, there was sometimes talk about what to amend in the next step, or what was explicitly evaluated as a good job in the singing, the core activity. I shall return to other examples and elaborate further on the details below. The subsidiary, co-produced activities are described in terms of sequence types and topical themes too. That implies that the content of talk and the style of talk cannot, and should not, be separated from the character of the activity phases (cf. the reasoning of the act-activity interdependence, and the act-activity co-constitution, in Linell, 1998, 2009, 2011a, 2014).

6.2 FORMALITY AS A FRAMING ASPECT

The children's ability to follow up ideas and routines systematically is a salient empirical result. Arguably, that was the socially accepted behaviour expected in the teacher role. That also implies an accentuated leader-role in the sense of being resolute, patient, persistent, consistent and sometimes authoritarian in front of the apprentice. The transcript fragment below took place after a talk episode. Now it is Paul's turn to practise the singing:

```
DP:87-128   VI MÅSTE TRÄNA LITE MER  (Diana undervisar Paul)

            WE MUST PRACTISE A BIT MORE (Diana is teaching Paul)


87 D:       ((ställer sig upp igen)) ett två tre .h= ((i puls))
            ["Inte visste vi vad kärlek var…
```

```
               ((stands up again)) one two three .h= ((in the right beat))
               ["We didn´t know what love was…
```

88 P: ["Inte visste vi vad kärlek var…
               ["We didn´t know what love was…

89 D: /…/"Hör hur mitt hjärta sjunger trall dill dill"]
               /…/"Hear how my heart is singin' trall dill dill"]

90 P: /…/"Hör hur mitt hjärta sjunger trall dell dell"]
               /…/"Hear how my heart is singin' trall dell dell"]

91 D: (.) ja .h allså (.) du säger (0.5) nånting (0.5)
               ((vevar kraftigt med höger hand)) "all dill dill"
               nånting
               (.) yeah .h then (.) you say (0.5) somethin´ (0.5)
               ((waves forcefully with right hand)) "all dill dill" somethin´

92   (.) men du man ska säga=
               (.) but hey we have to say=

93 P: ="trall dill dill" ((P. anger nu den korrekta versionen))
               ="trall dill dill" ((P. now gives the right version))

94 D: mm men man ska sjunga såhär (3.0) >°"Hör hur mitt hjärta
               sjunger"°< ((intensiv blick och samtidig handgest))
               [<"trall dill dill">]
               mm but you have to sing like this (3.0) >°Hear how my heart is
               singin'°< ((intense gaze and a simultaneoushand gesture))
               [<"trall dill dill">]

95 P: [<"TRALL DILL DILL>]
               [<"TRALL DILL DILL>]

96D: ja så va de
               yes that's it

97 P: ☺

98 D: .h= ((i puls))((nick och blick)) ett två tre ((i puls))
              [”Inte visste /…/trall dill dill”]
              .h= ((in the right beat)) ((nod and gaze)) one two three ((in the
              right beat))[”We didn´t know /…/trall dill dill”]

99 P: [”Inte visste/…/trall dill dill”]
              [”We didn´t know /…/trall dill dill”]

100 D: ja ((ställer sig upp igen)) .h såhär du måste liksom:
              (1.0) du måste liksom tänka på att du kommer i takten
              yeah ((stands up again)) .h like this you must li:ke
              (1.0) you must like think of getting the right time

101 P: ((vänder blicken från henne och tittar nu rakt fram))
              ((turns his gaze from her and looks straight ahead))

102 D: så att du inte sjunger såhär ((tittar ned i sitt papper))
              <”Inte visste vi vad kärlek var” > ((sjungs demonstrativt
              orytmiskt utan en bakomliggande puls))
              so you don't sing like this ((looks down in her paper))
              <”We didn´t know what love was”> ((is sung out of rhythm
              in a demonstrative way without any underlying beat))

103 P: ((tittar på henne igen)) °mm°
              ((looks at her again)) °mm°

104 D: allså du måste ((gest med båda händer)) [liksom]
              so you must ((gesture with both hands)) [like]

105 P: [ja de]
                                      [yeah]
              är också vissa som tycker de e lite svårt att komma me i
              takten i början=
              some think it´s a bit hard to get into the time at the beginning=

106 D: =ja såhär (.) man ska ju inte sjunga såhär <”Inte visste
              vi vad kärlek var”> ((tal utan puls igen)) allså ”Inte
              visste vi vad kärlek var” ((sjunger nu rytmiskt och

gestikulerar markant med båda händerna i 2/4 pulsen, tre
ggr)) typ (.) allså du måste tänka på att följa med i
[takten]

=yeah like this (.)you can´t sing like this <"We didn´t know what love
was"> ((talk without beat again))like "We didn´t know what love was"
((sings rhythmically now and makes marked gestures with both hands in the
2/4 beat,three times)) so (.) you must think of followin´[the time]

107 P: [(xxx)]

108 D: ett två tre ((dirigerar kraftfullt med båda händer, i
          puls)).h=

          one two three ((conducts forcefully with both hands, in the
          right beat)) .h=

109 P: ((takterar samtidigt med båda händer))

          ((conducts at the same time with both hands))

110 D: ["Inte visste vi vad kärlek var… och doppar skorporna]

          ["We didn´t know what love was… and dippin' biscuits]

111 P: ["Inte visste vi vad kärlek var… och doppar *skorporna*]
          ((stort leende))

          ["We didn´t know what love was… and dippin' *biscuits*]
          ((big smile))

112 D: ["…på ´Kaffe sjuan´hela *da´n*]

          ["…in ´Café Seven´all day *long*]

113P: ["…på ´Kaffe sjuan´hela *da´n*]

          ["in ´Café Seven´ all day *long*]

114 D: mm (.)ä::[:h]

          mm (.) e::[:h]

115   [ja] tappade bort mej[lite ☺]

          [I] lost my place [a bit ☺]

116 D: [((tittar på P.))]   ☺ ja de va <u>dror</u>porna:: ((stort
           leende))
           [((looks at P.))] ☺ yeah it was the <u>sbi</u>:scuits:: ((big
           smile))

117 P: ((stort leende))(0.5) eller nåt ☺
           ((big smile)) (0.5)) or somethin´ ☺

118 D: ähm (.) vi måste <u>trä</u>na lite mer på den
           ehm (.) we must <u>prac</u>tise a bit more here

119 P: ja
           yeah

120 D: s- att ((ställer sig upp, vänd mot P. igen)) så att du
           kommer ihåg den
           s- you ((stands up, turned towards P. again)) so you´ll remember it

121   ett två t<u>re</u> .h= ((i puls, även gester med båda händer))
           one two th<u>ree</u> .h= ((in the right beat, with hand gestures,
           both hands))

122   [″Inte visste vi vad kärlek var …″]
           [″We didn´t know what love was…″]

123 P: [″Inte visste vi vad kärlek var …″]
           [″We didn´t know what love was…″]

*De sjunger nu mycket mer samstämmigt, både i tonalt och rytmiskt
avseende.*
*They now sing much more in tune with each other, both tonally and
rhythmically.*

124 D: .h= ((en inandning på 2/4 som markör)) [/…/″<u>Hör hur mitt
           hjärta sjunger trall dill dill</u>″]
           .h= ((breathing in on 2/4 as a marker)) [/…/″<u>Hear how my heart is
           singing trall dill dill</u>″]

```
125 P     [/…/"Hör hur mitt hjärta sjunger trall dill dill"]
          [/…/"Hear how my heart is singing trall dill dill"]


126 D:    mm (1.0) vi behöver träna lite mer ((viftar stort med
          händerna)) på den (.) vill du ha nån hjälp:
          mm (1.0) we need to practise a bit more((waving her hands with
          large gestures)) here (.) would you like some help:


127       (3.0)


128 P:    ((tittar bort från henne)) ja e inte helt säker (0.5) ja
          vet inte riktigt om ja °behöver nån hjälp°
          ((looking away from her)) I´m not quite sure (0.5) I don´t know
          if I °need any help°
```

"Yes that's it" (Sw. *ja så va de*), Diana (as instructor) remarks after the completion of a correction sequence that concerns a few songtext words (96). Diana enacts a leader-style in the episode above, and clearly acts as the expert – the one who knows the right answers, at least with regard to the song melody, songtext and other song-specific details. Moreover, we can follow her (and Paul's) patient, consistent, hard and detailed work with the improvement of text and the beat. A language use such as "you must" (Sw. *du måste*) (see 100, 104, 106, 118) further underlines the requesting character signalling an activity in which there are learning obligations to realize, leaving few other options, as a partner, that might unsettle the demanding imperatives. In 128 Paul starts to be somewhat avoidant, looking away from her, displaying verbal hesitation ("I'm not quite sure") (Sw. *ja e inte helt säker*) and whispering that he perhaps does not want any more help from Diana right now. But he does not really question or give up his challenging learning task. The other way around, he later on takes the initiative to try the singing acts again. Diana also uses the term "practise" (Sw. *träna*) consistently, with an embedded demand: "we must practise a bit more here" (Sw. *vi måste träna lite mer på den*) (118) and "we need to practise a bit more here" (Sw. *vi behöver träna lite mer*) (126).

Another main result, relevant to mention already in this CAT analysis, and in relation to the above-mentioned theme of having traditional school lessons, is how the integrated written artefacts and inscriptional means of different kinds functioned as materialized cultural resources for teaching

and learning. I shall come back to this in section 7.1 when looking at the pedagogical function of written discursive tools within the activities. The lyrics were a crucial tool and was a central structuring resource for the leaders' teaching strategies: the task of helping the apprentices to learn and sing the pre-planned song.

Routinized conventions in accordance with musical traditions were notable too, both in the music performance and in the associated spates of talk. For example, the children embody the beat – the musical flow – in their feet as musicians usually do when they sing or play an instrument. Swinging one's hips was also often a means to mediate the musical characteristics in front of the other imitating the song-specific flow as well. They also move their bodies differently compared to how they express themselves with their bodies during non-musical acts. The rhythmical and expressive style was in conjunction with conventional musical expressivity. To count loudly and rhythmically before starting to sing, in order to coordinate the subtle transition from the talking to the singing mode, is another example of how to lean on established cultural knowledge forms. A detailed description of how these counting procedures were staged comes in the following, in 6.3.1.

Some remarks on the degree of formality have to be added. Drawing on the definition of institutional-like formality as something that has to be performed in the interactions, even if it does not seem to be necessary according to the situation as it happens (see the definition of the concept *formality* in 4.3.2), it can be concluded that my corpus is permeated by such kind of data. There are several situations in which the children, due to the challenges evoked, demonstrate a rigid order, and a special language form rather than a more reflexive and flexible attitude. Rather, the interactions are agenda-bound with functional routines and tasks at stake. Below is one example. Amy instructs Diana and wants her to continue with a particular practice although she cannot point to a concrete learning aspect to improve, and does not have Diana's support in the need of it either:

```
AD:43-56    DE VA INGET SVÅRT ME DEN (Amy undervisar Diana)
            THERE WAS NOTHIN' HARD ABOUT THAT (Amy is teaching Diana)


43 A:       vi kör igen (.) <ett två tre> ((ställer sig upp och intar
            sin vanliga position framför D.))
            let's do it again (.) <one two three> ((stands up and takes
            her usual position in front of D.))
```

44   [*"Kom Julia vi gå med höga klackar på /…/ med fina dojor*
             på."]
             [*"Come Julia we'll go with high heels on /…/ with nice shoes*
             on."]

45 D: [*"Kom Julia vi gå med höga klackar på /…/ med fina dojor*
             på."] ((stort leende))
             [*"Come Julia we'll go with high heels on /…/ with nice shoes*
             on."] ((big smile))

46 A: (.)de e bra du kom:- vi ska fotsätta öva
             (.) it´s good you wi:- we´ll carry on <u>prac</u>tising

47   men e >de nåt< du <u>ve::r</u>kligen tycker e svårt
            but if >there´s somethin´< you <u>rea::</u>lly think is hard,
            ((sätter sig ned i soffan bredvid D.)) så kan jag förstora
            °de lite (.)
            ((sits down in the sofa beside D.)) so I can make °it a bit bigger(.)

48   om de e nåt du tycker e <u>svårt</u>°
            if there´s somethin´ you think's <u>hard</u>°

49 D: n::äe ((skakar på huvudet och tittar på A.))
            no::
            ((shakes her head and looks at A.))

50 A: °aa°
            °aa°

51 D: den var <u>enkel</u> ☺ alltså (.) de va (.) de va inget svårt
            me <u>den</u> ((tittar på A.))
            it was <u>easy</u> ☺ well (.) it was (.) there was nothing hard
            ab<u>out</u> it ((looks at A.))

52 A: ((tittar rakt fram)) sen kommer ja:: att skriva upp lite
            saker °lite saker° tre saker som du behöver tänka på
            ((looks straight ahead)) then I´::ll write down some things
            °some things° three things you need to think about

```
53        (.)de gjorde ja på Paul så att du ska öva å lyssna lite
          >på de<
          (.) I did it with Paul so that you practise an' listening a
          bit >to it<


54        du kommer ju att öva här (.)
          you´ll be practising here (.)


55        å du får du FÅR om du vill ta med dej lappen hem °å liksom
          öva på just de°
          an' you can you MAY take the note home °an´ well practise
          just that°


56 D:     mm: ((nick))
          mm: ((nod))
```

In line 45 we can see how Diana ends up her singing with a smile on her face. Responding to that, Amy uttered an approval ("it's good…", 46). As the participants usually structure their activity phases, here we have a typical time slot for talk and work that is critical, with corrections and improvements. It usually has a transitional pedagogical function that leads to the next practise of the song as musicians. But in this case, Diana tells her leader in several ways that she has mastered her task already, and Amy, the leader, does not come up with anything to correct. Instead she tries to find a pedagogical challenge (a learning problem) to probe deeper into. She does it conversationally together with Diana (47–51). Again, no musical problem to solve turns up here. Consequently, exactly here is a potential choice to continue flexibly with other possible tasks and topics. Amy's choice looks different as it turns out, according to the turn design in 52–55. She chooses to continue the dialogue with a *routine* in these situations (according to my analysis of the whole corpus of data). To go on with written language-activities, or other penetrating problem-solving issues, after performing the song the first or second time within their overall communicative project is customary. Notice how Amy addresses this text issue to Diana in 52–55. In the other parts of the encounter, Amy usually looks at Diana when she instructs but this time, when she is not meeting Diana's own expressed need/perspective, she does not look at her when she starts to talk. Further, when she qualifies her claim of urging Diana to read and think over "some things" (Sw. *lite saker*) (52) she

refers to a routine she has followed with *another* learner (Paul). Still, she does not refer to the Diana's earlier attempts at singing. Going into deeper detail, we can also recognize how she utters the abstract learning aspects she wants Diana to work on: "some things" are packaged in a weak, soft voice (i.e. the voice-volume is lower than in the surrounding talk). Perhaps this is a sign of what she responsively knows here, that this is not a convincing argument in this particular situation. What Amy demonstrates in this episode is an example of being influenced by the activity form, an ability to achieve activity-sustained coherence. The situation definition here with the rigid order as guidance and the focus on specific tools (written text) and particular terms (like "practise", Sw. öva) whatever the partner expresses, might altogether be interpreted as a kind of formality in the sense mentioned above.

Moreover, it is important to pay attention to the phase structure within the whole activity when dealing with CAT-analyses. In all five sessions, the participants created a similar structural order, an organization that revolved around a core activity – the song performance in which the pupil tried to vocally practise the piece of music on the agenda. Around that musical core activity other types of communicative activities were accomplished, as a part of the phase structure in their CAT. Here I shall call them sub-activities. To introduce and close the encounter was one kind of sub-activity, and to evaluate the pupil's singing was another. To come with other types of reasoning, explanation, repetition and to introduce new teaching methods with an inbuilt question-and-answer pattern, were also a recurrent organizational feature, regarded here as sub-activities. They were also subsidiary in nature (i.e. supporting the core activity) sometimes as, for instance, when they had to defy technical computer-trouble. Another type of sub-activity noticed was preparatory episodes. One typical empirical example of this was the time-space occupied when addressing the song-text issue: writing down the lyrics as an instructor, in front of the apprentices. Entailed here were proactive acts and reasoning such as dealing with instructions, practical remarks to attend to before the core activity (the singing practice) and preparatory work with symbols on papers that have to be arranged in specific ways, according to the intention of the child in the teacher-role. Accordingly, there were discursive frames within frames in this structural sense – the various interactional organizations conditioned by the overall activity type.

But those sub-activities were further interlinked with the communicative projects – the CPs in action. CPs can vary in extension, encompassing both smaller and larger episodes. They fulfill the function of getting something

understood linguistically and are often related to problem-solving. Integrated in CATs are ways of using language: to communicate with relevant expressive styles. I apply the term *communicative genre* (CG). In the children's case, communication was not only about verbal talk but also about using tunes and a musical language. Three main CGs, inferred from the data, were salient: the pedagogical CG (the teaching and learning discourse), the musical CG, and a peer discourse (the friendly, more informal way of speaking and communicating with each other). The latter was not the dominant discourse, as hinted above, but it existed in short sequences in which a friendly, somewhat more childish interaction took place. Typically, they took place in the subsidiary moments when the more formal work of task-oriented teaching was not so emphasized. Here the children seemed to have been able to step out of their conventionalized social roles for a while (i.e. the positions as teacher and pupil).

6.3 SIX TOPICAL THEMES AND SEQUENCE TYPES

Topics may be classified into recurrent types or themes. Six such themes were found in the analysis of the transcriptions from the children's five interactional sessions. The six topical themes with their corresponding sequence types were embedded in the specific activity phases they were engaged in from moment to moment. In the following I shall describe the main topic types (themes) that the children centred on in their music pedagogical practice. Further, my aim here is an attempt to explain how the learning content can be related to the overt designs of their activity phases. In line with the analytical outcome, it seems plausible that the participants drew on both topical and organizational resources in order to stage their music-pedagogical scenes. As mentioned earlier, topical episodes cannot be separated analytically from the activity phase; the interactional structure that refers to situation-transcending premises. For instance, a CAT conditions situation-transcending orientations. The children's learning is thus characterized creatively by discipline-specific knowledge, constituting specific teaching topics, and interactional framings. Social interaction clearly constitutes learning (and teaching) and cannot be conceived of as separate from the (musical) learning content (cf. Melander, 2009, 2010, 2012; Melander & Sahlström, 2011). The remainder of this chapter deals with the six sequence types as they generally occurred in the accomplished activities; that means in the structured order. So, that leads me to start with the details on instructions and "countdowns" – the subsidiary sub-activity in preparing the learner for the transition into singing.

6.3.1 Instructional countdowns

Now to instructions for the song performances: In the interactional data we can find both *instruction with counting* and *instruction without counting*. In the first type we find topical sequences with two components, that is, first instructional talk and then the instructor's activity initiation with the explicit countdown. The latter emphasizes the importance of the temporal fixation of the singing and its starting point. However, the four children studied preferred the conventional counting to three, not to two or four that adult music teachers normally do due to the specific musical structure (songs divided into three beats as temporal units are generally more rare than songs building on four and two musical beats). Moreover, the children did not always continue counting with the same beat, which is also a crucial function for professional musicians – to keep the beat in a tightly structured musical flow.

Hence, for the children to utilize such a ritual convention, there must be another function. One such function comes, of course, from the school music world and other musical worlds experienced in their everyday lives. The pupils have probably heard teachers and musicians counting before as an activity-specific convention. Whether they counted to three or four is obviously of less importance to them. But it is arguably also possible to assume a specific communicative meaning originating in the pedagogical challenges in synchronizing and starting up a song activity dialogically. This is a complex social activity requiring multiple signs in order to articulate the music-specific expressiveness (to mark out temporality in several modes, including extra-linguistic resources such as bodily visual cues and auditive rhythms). The children's acts here could thus be interpreted as culturally sedimented knowledge in action. Their acts are constituent permeating acts of knowledge in this sense.

A practical function of the preceding counting is to make the pupil ready to quickly focus on the next-coming song performance - the sudden switch from talk to musical action. This can be seen in Diana's and Amy's interaction in which calling out the numbers is the signal for getting ready to sing, together with the counting.

```
DA:46-58   OKEJ ETT TVÅ (Diana undervisar Amy)
           OKAY ONE TWO (Diana is teaching Amy)


46         SÅ (4.5 )
           LIKE THAT (4.5)
```

47 A: oke:j (.)
           oka:y (.)

48 D: (1.5) ((ställer sig upp)) du får gå neråt där för den
           fotsätter li:te ((syftar på sångtexten på datorskärmen))
           (1.5) ((stands up)) you can go down there 'cos it carries on
           just a bit more ((alludes to the lyrics on the screen))

49 A: ja okej:
           yeah okay:

50 D: (3.0) okej (.) ett (.) två:=
           (3.0) okay (.) one (.) two:=

51 A: =hur går förresten melodin:
           =by the way what's the tune:

52 D: (0.5) ah så här
           (0.5) ah like this

D sjunger igenom melodin. Den första frasen ackompanjeras av
pulsmarkeringar med fingerknäppning.
D sings the melody. The first phrase is accompanied by the beat given with clicks
of the fingers.

53 A: (2.0) ja[:   ]
           (2.0) yes[:   ]

54 D: [okej:]
           [okay:]

55 A: okej
           okay

56 D: försök å ha- å sjung me okej:
           try an´ hav- an´ sing along okay:

57 A: ja ok[ej]
           yes ok[ay]

```
58 D:        [ett ] två: tre .h
             [one ] two three .h
```

Notice how Diana, the teacher, iterates a tied relation between "okay" (Sw. *okej*) and counting (50 and 56–58). The first attempt, in 50, is interrupted by Amy's sudden question that has to be dealt with promptly on the spot: the question of how the melody sounds. Diana understands her question, as her response shows (52). The lines in the next example illustrate the task- and action-oriented nature of the articulated counting, as it is used conversationally.

```
AP:76-82    ETT TVÅ TRE (Amy undervisar Paul)
            ONE TWO THREE (Amy is teaching Paul)


76          "Kom Julia vi springer med fina dojor på"
            "Come Julia we'll run with nice shoes on"


77 P:       "Kom Julia vi springer med fina klack- "
            ((ler och skakar kraftigt på huvudet flera gånger))
            "Come Julia we'll run with nice heel-"
            ((smiles and shakes her head energetically several times))


78 A:       nä de gör inget de:: e bara början=
            =no it doesn´t matter it´s just the beginnin=


79 P:       =°mm°


80 A:       vi kör igen :(.) kom ihåg att de e .h "vi springer med
            fina dojor på"
            let's do it again : (.) remember it´s .h "we'll run with
            nice shoes on"


81 P:       mm


82 A:       ETT två >tre< .h
            ONE two >three< .h
```

Again, a minimal response (81) is enough for the teacher to initiate a song performance with the counting procedure as starting point. She pronounces the

first number more loudly than she does the subsequent ones (82). Arguably, this may be interpreted as a directive sign too, cuing the transitional activity shift to the partner. In order to do such semiotic work successfully at the exact moment, the mediating clarity has to be functional. As we also will see in the following result chapter, the multi-semiotics is a key to the musical instructions that the 'teachers' have to give, and they often use several expressive modes when facing the issue of functioning communicative clarity. But sometimes they reduce the multiplicity so one mode guides their message at the price of another.

The following lines serve as another illustration of how counting can be used without related meta-communicative markers. Only a very short pause is shown here as a preface (182).

```
DA:180-182 ETT TVÅ TRE (Diana undervisar Amy)
           ONE TWO THREE (Diana is teaching Amy)


180 D:     nu: (.) ska du försöka kunna den utantill ((tar sig i
           håret))
           no:w (.) try and sing it off by heart ((ruffles her hair))


181 A:     o:::h SHIT ja kommer inte ens ihåg hur du börja ((tittar
           på D.))
           o:::h HECK I don´t even remember how you start ((looks at D.))


182 D:     (.) ett två tre .h
           (.) one two three .h
```

The learner, Amy, verbally expresses her shocked reaction (181) to the demand (180) from Diana, her teacher, thereby displaying that she is not yet prepared. Instead of a further discussion, Diana takes her immediately into the intended song practise with her counting directive, followed by a short silence (182).

Instructions without musical counting are in fact rare in my corpus of data, in the particular junctures (the transitions between talking and singing). That is why I regard the counting activity as a ritual, perhaps even as a musical semiotic device, typical of a musical CG. If we scrutinize the prevalence as it unfolds in the instructional conversations, there are only a few cases in which purely instructional conversations are pursued without this music-specific procedure. Recalling Linell (1998, 2009, 2010a, 2011a), it is readily apparent

that the underlying activity-type and the specific communicative genre has to be considered in relation to such empirically verified tendencies. That implies an agenda- and form-bound learning content.

6.3.2 Dialogues on evaluation

Continuing the apprentice's song performances – the core activity – with assessment as a topic that generates the collaborative learning in the children's dialogues was a conventional social practice. Hence, they demonstrated the ability to link situations and activity forms within their CAT. The critique delivered by the instructing child was permeated by the ambition to amend or try to improve the other's skill in singing the song through dialogic explication. In 39 of 41 analysed strips of interactions in this type of communication, the teacher chose to follow up the criticism, that is, the negative evaluation of the pupil's prior performance. They followed it up in, again, this strictly task-oriented sense: providing enough space and support to the pupil, enabling him/her to improve. In contrast to evaluative interaction episodes like these, it is possible for an instructor to simply ignore all these opportunities to improve the learning aspect called for and move on to other issues and topics, more inconsequently than in the cases in my data. For example, in AD: 21–34 below, the reader can follow how Amy's correction is followed by an offer to the pupil (Diana): to take the time to practise further on the melodic problem she is telling Diana to remember and, implicitly, to improve.

```
AD:21-34    DU SKA BARA KOMMA IHÅG HÄR (Amy undervisar Diana)
            YOU JUST HAVE TO REMEMBER HERE (Amy is teaching Diana)


20 D:       ☺ ((skrattar))
            ☺ ((laughs))


21 A:       ja:: de: (.) d- du skulle ju fortsatt m- ja stannade upp
            där ((slår ut med armarna))
            yea::h tha:t (.) y- you should have carried on b- I stopped
            there ((gestures with her arms))


22          du ska bara komma ihåg (2.0) här ((pekar på datorn))
            you just have to remember (2.0) here ((points at the computer))
```

23   "Kom Julia kom Julia med höga klackar på"
            ((viftar rytmen framför skärmen med sitt pekfinger medan
            hon sjunger))
            "Come Julia come Julia with high heels on"
            ((demonstrates the rhythm in front of the screen, using her index
            finger when singing))

24   så de e först vanligt där (.) å så blir de ljusare å så
            "Kom Julia" om man säger så "Kom Julia kom Julia med höga
            klackar på" (.) s- att de inte e bara
            so first it´s normally there (.) an´ then it becomes higher an´
            then "Come Julia" if you say like this "Come Julia come Julia
            with high heels on" (.) so it´s not just

25   (.)okej :
            (.)okay :

26 D: (.) mm

27 A: ska vi prova sjunga:
            shall we try an' sing:

28 D: (.) mm

29 A: ett två °tre° ((nick))
            one two °three° ((nod))

30   ["Kom Julia vi gå med höga klackar på /…/ höga klackar på"]
            ["Come Julia we'll go with high heels on /…/ high heels on"

31 D: ["Kom Julia vi gå med höga klackar på /…/ höga klackar på"]
            ((stort leende))
            ["Come Julia we'll go with high heels on /…/ high heels on"
            ((big smile))

32 A: ["Kom Julia vi springer /…/ kom Julia med fina dojor på"]
            ["Come Julia we'll run /…/ come Julia with nice shoes on"]

```
33 D:      ["Kom Julia vi springer /…/ kom Julia med fina dojor på"]
           ["Come Julia we'll run /…/ come Julia with nice shoes on"]


34 A:      (0.5) de e jättebra:
           (0.5) that´s rea:lly good
```

The situation ends up (34) with Amy approving Diana's new attempt to solve the problem in accordance with her expectations. This type of criticism points to one way of solving particular problems: to be aware of particular critical incidents. These critical guidelines are followed up by methods or further instruction for the sake of improvement on the music pedagogical issue the children are working on in the current study. This type of criticism points to one way of solving particular problems and working on music pedagogical issue that is central to this study. Only on one occasion in my whole corpus of data there was a conversational sequence not allowing for the chance to improve one's performance. If we take a look at the extract again at line 21, this only case is salient. Here Amy (the teacher) comments on a topical aspect she is then leaving and never coming back to during this encounter; an instructional concern related to the preceding performance. Probably, this short critical remark was designed to be an insert and not regarded as a main issue here. She was probably only accounting for her own teacher behaviour.

Let us probe deeper into my analysis of the dialogues on evaluative pedagogical issues and pin down a demonstrable detail of action. As described, the children worked systematically, as a part of a routine, with critical assessment referring back to the prior sub-activity: their attempts to perform part of the pedagogical task – to learn and enact the particular song from the child who teaches.

Pupil-initiated critical evaluations concerning the teacher's song performance were totally absent in my data, which may be explained by the asymmetrical nature of this type of communicative interaction. Moreover, only one sequence in my data corpus could be seen as being close to the notion of teacher-based criticism engendering overt denial from the criticized pupil. Hence, a main result related to the topical focus on ("criticism and correction") is the fact that the participants in this study who enact the social role of being a pupil prefer not to do argue when their leader is making critical comments on their song performances. This says something about how the apprentices orientate to the situation definition. Obviously, they see

the learning situation as based on a social interaction pattern in which the instructor is like a schoolteacher. With such an orientation there are things you cannot argue about as a pupil because of the specific knowledge distribution – the asymmetrical (pre-given) epistemic positions, like knowing the correct songtext, the melody and the rhythm in the songs and the teacher's own performance.

Three discursive themes may be seen as three main categories of evaluation methods to facilitate the ongoing learning dialogue about the sense making relevance of the present project from the perspective of the participants. These subcategories convey empirical differences in the conversational issue-in-focus: the specific evaluation episode-structure accomplished by the young participants. The differing stretches of discourses found in the data corpus contain the themes *approval, criticism and correction*, and *pupil-initiated evaluation* as joint topical progressions. I have reported findings that pertain to how the young participants criticize and correct within their communicative projects and CATs. A note is needed on another kind of discourse contribution: how to express approval as part of the teacher assessments.

It is arguably reasonable to distinguish between expressed approval as a rhetorical device, by which I mean approval prior to an adjacent critical remark(s) and correction(s), as an expression without subsequent critical remarks, and as a non-linguistic gesture as a single turn (a smile or another isolated bodily gesture). The latter is a relatively rare phenomenon in my data. More typically, non-linguistic facial gestures and other bodily gestures are accompanied by verbal explications, as the following demonstrates:

```
DA:174-176 MM NU KAN DU DEN JÄTTEBRA ☺ (Diana undervisar Amy)
           MM NOW YOU KNOW THIS ONE REALLY GOOD ☺ (Diana is teaching Amy)


174 D:     mm nu kan du den:: (.) jättebra: ☺
           mm now you know this:: one (.) rea:lly good: ☺


175        (1.5 )


176        äh (4.5) ((harkling)) (0.5 ) ska du försöka::̱
           ((sätter sig ned vid datorn))
           eh (4.5) ((clearing her throat)) (0.5) do you want to try::̱
           ((sits down by the computer))
```

Here, Diana, the teacher (D) emphasizes her verbal value-term "really good" (Sw. *jättebra*) with a happy smile (denoted by ☺ in line 174). The smile functions as a semiotic resource for supporting the verbal word; to express a liking in combination with verbal confirmation of the pupil's performance. Such smiles abound in the data. This is only one typical example.

A note is needed on the most customary way of signalling statements of appraisal and approval in the children's evaluating pedagogic procedure, here termed *approval as a rhetorical device*. Very frequently the teachers open up episodes with positive evaluations of the pupil's singing with remarks like "it's really good" (Sw. *de e jättebra*) but go on to modify as follows: "it's really good but…" (Sw. *de e jättebra men…*). Sometimes there are other verbal packages of such a hedging communicative function. This can be noticed when Amy engages in her evaluation of her pupil, Paul:

```
AP:115-118 DE E JÄTTEBRA DE E BARA (Amy undervisar Paul)
           IT´S REALLY GOOD IT'S JUST (Amy is teaching Paul)


P. sjunger igenom den själv. Denna gång tittar han inte A. i ögonen
förrän vid de sista orden i sången.
P. sings it one time on his own. This time he does not look in A´s eyes until the
last words of the song.


115 A:    de e jättebra de e bara lite i slutet när du tappar lite
          av melodin:_ de e jättebra annars
          it´s rea:lly good it´s just a bit in the end when you lose the tune
          a bit:_  otherwise it´s rea:lly good


116 P:    mm


117 A:    °nu försöker vi igen°
          °let´s try again°


118       ETT två tre
          ONE two three
```

Here, the melody issue comes up (115). The ways in which Amy repeatedly mitigates her critical comment on Paul's singing in her turn in line 115 leads me to consider the bidirectional course of such an utterance, being

both context-shaped in its relevance to the situational activity type and the preceding episodes (i.e. both locally and globally context-shaped), and context-renewing because of its potential to introduce new learning issues on the floor (cf. Heritage, 1984, who writes about double contextuality). Amy's pupil is facing a strenuous learning challenge that needs a lot of patience and courage to fulfil, but Amy tells him that he is actually doing well in his overall song performance. This appears to have social psychological relevance. Amy's utterance might be interpreted as an attempt to encourage him not to give up. As the pedagogical leader in this pre-planned task, she is accountable for the interactional progression too, in order to carry out this interactional and demanding music-learning task. Perhaps she sincerely wants him to feel good about his knowledge development as well. There are also several examples when the same person (Amy), in the same encounter, begins her utterance by declaring that the pupil is really easy to work with, but:

```
AP:102-105 DE E JÄTTELÄTT ME DEJ MEN (Amy undervisar Paul)

           IT´S REALLY EASY WITH YOU BUT  (Amy is teaching Paul)


102 A:     (.) de e: jättelätt me dej
           (.) it´s really easy with you


103        men DE E bara lite så att du ska hitta in i melodin
           ((gestikulerar med båda händer)) s- att de inte e liksom
           .h <°"Kom Julia: kom Julia:> med fina dojor på"° allså
           but IT'S just that you should get into the tune ((gestures with
           both hands)) so it´s not like .h <°"Come Julia: come Julia:> with
           nice shoes on"° like


104 P:     mm


105 A:     ☺ du förstår (.) men de e jättebra annars du kan den helt
           utantill:: (0.5) ((tar sig i håret)) JA: du kan den (.)
           he:lt (.) >flytande< ☺
           ☺ you see (.) but it´s really good otherwise you can do all of it off
           by hea:rt (0.5) ((ruffles her hair)) YEA:H you can do it (.)a:ll of it (.)
           >so it just flows< ☺
```

Here there are obviously still aspects of the pupil's song performance that the teacher seeks to come to grips with. This time she induces the pupil to attend to the melody in detail and, hence, in line 103, she initiates a topic glide within the evaluative framing (to introduce a particular musical problem). To sum up, two main variants of teacher evaluation with responsive features can be identified from the transcriptions (all sessions). In the first of these sequentially organized turn design, the teacher takes the initiative to make a positive evaluation, followed by confirmation or positive uptake from the pupil:

Teacher: positive evaluation
Pupil: confirmation / positive uptake

In the other interaction pattern, the teachers set out with a negative (critical) evaluation, with positive (non-critical) embedding. Sometimes the pupil inserts a very short response to this like "mm" or "yes" (Sw. *ja*). Latched to this assessment event is the teacher's unfolding correction or instruction directed to the child in the pupil-position. The fourth step is typically to proceed with a new song performance, either solo, as a pupil in front of the teacher, or together with the instructor in joint singing.

Teacher: negative evaluation (with positive embedding)
(Pupil: minimal response)
Teacher: correction / instruction
Pupil: performs the song

There are also other variants of applying negative evaluations with positive embedding. Here we can notice how Amy, in a teacher-position, again makes a communicative effort to retrieve a positive attitude:

```
AP:87-95    JA MEN DE GÖR INGET (Amy undervisar Paul)
            YEAH BUT IT DOESN´T MATTER (Amy is teaching Paul)


87 A:       de e jättebra
            it´s awesome


88          du tappar bara bort dej där på höga klackar(.)att [de ]ska
            but you lose yourself there on high heels (.) that    [it ] should
```

```
89 P:                                                      [ja ]
                                                           [yeah]


90 A:        [va dojor]
             [be shoes]


91 P:        [☺      ]


92 A:        men [de e bara att]
             but  [it´s just that]


93 P:        fi:na istället för hö::ga=
             ni:ce instead of hi::gh=


94 A:        ja men de gör inget de e bara början
             yeah but it doesn´t matter it´s just the start


95           (.) ett två tre .h
             (.) one two three .h
```

The episode starts with a positive evaluation (87) with a critical remark (88). When Amy notices Paul's admission of his earlier mistake, she returns to her initial encouraging, positive attitude (94). This responsive utterance "yeah but it doesn't matter it's just the start" (line 94) is packaged as an insert with a diminutive function of the occasioned problem. The interactional scheme in this sequence type is briefly:

Teacher: negative evaluation (with positive uptake)
Pupil: minimal but positive response (with a smile in addition)
Teacher: correction
Pupil: correction
Teacher: hedged evaluation
Pupil: performs the song

The third main category concerns pupil-initiated evaluations. Here the children deal with different kinds of pupil-initiatives. One typical communicative situation demonstrates the dynamics of recalling an earlier awkward performance or learning problem discussed jointly. Often this is about earlier

mistakes in reproducing the details of the lyrics in (musical) action as they were instructed to do. Hence, this type of discourse takes on a recontextualizing feature, transforming previous learning troubles into new open meaning potentials. The next example shows how the pupil (Paul) anticipates potential criticism from the teacher and chooses to articulate his earlier fault before the teacher suggests his problem. Again the issue is about the lyrics and the challenge of memorizing (i.e. reproducing the lyrics correctly).

```
AP:130-135 JA TAPPADE BORT MEJ ☺ (Amy undervisar Paul)
           I LOST MY PLACE ☺ (Amy is teaching Paul)


De sjunger igenom den på samma sätt som senast, dvs. att A. nynnar
("mimar") till P. som sjunger med text. På några ställen blir han
osäker på texten och A. fyller i muntligen med ord.
They sing it in the same way as before, that is, A. hums with P. who sings the words.
In some places he becomes unsure about the words and A. then fills in with spoken words.


130 A:     de e jättebra
           it´s really good


131        de e bara::=
           it´s ju::st=


132 P:     =att ja tappade bort mej ☺ ((stort leende))
           =that I lost my place ☺ ((big smile))


133 A:     nä men de e:: (.) nä men de e (.) okej
           no but tha::t´s (.) no but that´s (.) okay


134 P:     ☹ mm de e enkelt hänt
           ☹ mm that´s easily done


135 A:     ((nickar))
           ((nods))
```

As displayed in the turn in line 131, Amy expresses her last word ("just", Sw. *bara*) in that utterance in a prolonged way that constitutes a response point for Paul. He takes the chance to fill in the slot in her incomplete remark,

contributing with his perspective on what to improve in the singing. His fill in (132) is responsive to Amy's incipient critical remark (131). In that sense Paul's words do not constitute a full-fledged pupil-initiation. It is not his initiative to bring in the critical evaluation here. Rather, he should have paid attention to his instructor's occasioned remark. Thus, a joint evaluation took place in this episode. The second type of initiative from the pupil to account for is when the pupil takes the initiative to introduce a problem not previously expressed in the conversation. The pupil then highlights a contextually new aspect and invites the other party to discuss and co-evaluate the learning potential injected.

6.3.3 Negotiations after a performance

The third category to describe is the topical sequences that revolve around the participants' core activity, the song performance, consisting in practising the current song. Hence, these episodes are task-oriented and agenda-bound interactions connected with the song performance. Again we have to recognize the framing structure from the organizational level of activity. Their chosen topic leans on the musical task, in terms of training the singing skills in a practical and embodied manner. The recurrent music performances have a learning function as they are arranged structurally. A paramount concern in this type of children's communication is to count the beat verbally before the actual singing starts. It is possible to distinguish four subsumed analytical categories within this theme about performance-related communicative interactions. The first one has the character of negotiation and is here named *negotiation about song performance.* The second deals with *instructions and musical counting*, and the third with other *clarifying conversations.*

Joint negotiations between teacher and pupil indicate a less asymmetric interaction order in my data, telling us that the pupil is actually taking part in the decisions. These negotiations belong to a democratic discourse. Here the pupil is not totally subordinated to the dominant positioning of the teacher, according to how the specific idea units unfold in the overt dialogue. Of course, the teacher is still the one who takes control of the situation in the long run with regulating acts, but that does not mean that every conversational exchange is permeated with such power aspects when children are mutually engaged in learning situations. This kind of more democratic interaction order is, of course, expected in such interactional peer situations as these in this study. In these negotiation sequences, a corresponding verbal concern

to the children is to emphasize *we* instead of you or I (the pupil himself) when discussing seemingly necessary pedagogical actions connected with the improvement in focus. The following excerpt tells us something about this kind of verbal expression and its pedagogical implications.

```
PM:146-153 VI KÖR DEN IGEN LITE (Paul undervisar Michael)
           WE DO IT AGAIN EH (Paul is teaching Michael)


146 P:     tror du att du kan den nu: (0.5)
           do you think you know it now: (0.5)


147 M:     ää:[hh   ]
           ee:[hh   ]


148 P:     [kan- ]ska vi testa den:
           [can- ] shall we try it out:


149 M:     vi kör den igen lite (.)du vet de:n första raden
           we do it again eh (.)you know the first line


150 P:     "Jag [är en liten mygga och Hubert heter jag"]
           "I [am a little gnat and Hubert is my name"]


151 M:     ["är en liten mygga och Hubert heter jag"] ☺
           "I [am a little gnat and Hubert is my name"] ☺
           ((visar den "igenknipande" handgesten igen))
           ((shows the gesture of a closing hand again))


152 P:     vill du::
           would ya li:ke:


153 M:     ja JA KAN om ja fått lära mej första raden så kan jag den
           hela men "Jag är en liten mygga och Hubert heter jag"
           ((sjunger den mer rytmiskt än melodiskt))
           yes I CAN do it if I´d got to learn the first line then I can do all of
           it but "I am a little gnat and Hubert is my name"((sings it more
           rhythmically than melodically))
```

The conversation is fairly symmetrical, allowing the pupil to speak out his needs and regulate the course of the pedagogical arrangement.

6.3.4 Dialogues on unplanned events

We have now examined the dialogues in terms of talking about song performance, that is, the surrounding spates of meta-talk about the core activity itself: how to perform the singing skill. The next (topical) theme to describe is the talk caused by unexpected practical problems. This type of sequence constitutes an activity phase that was connected with the whole task organization but in a more improvisational, subsidiary way. These sequences topicalize problems that do not concern inherent musical challenges. It is noteworthy that I do not have other types of displayed non-focal topics, for example, (inter)personal associations or jokes not connected with prior discourse but to home life or other more or less common experiences from everyday life. There is no verbal reference to children's everyday life, a fact that I find both significant and interesting. The discursive activity analysis is also supposed to recognize absent discursive elements in the empirical data as well. So, the unplanned side sequences are indirectly task-related.

The dominant topic generated analytically from the data is about the computer in use. It is common to topicalize unexpected computer troubles. Such problems call for attention and seem to be legitimate to put on the shared floor. However, what is observable in the talk-in-interaction is that it is mostly the teacher who makes the first remarks on such issues. The following conversation displays a sequence that contains a discussion of this kind. The situated concern is the sudden shutdown of the computer and the joint attempt to deal with it communicatively.

```
AD:189-199 DUMMA DATOR (Amy undervisar Diana)
           STUPID COMPUTER (Amy is teaching Diana)


189 D:     ska vi sjunga den en gång tillsammans fö:r
           shall we sing it once together ´co:s


190 A:     (.) ja: då ((försöker få liv i datorn))
           (.) yea:h then ((tries to get the computer to come on))
```

191   (xx) har den dött: (.) åh så den har dött
           (xx) has it died: (.) oh it's died

192   den har dött helt HALLÅ ((reser sig också upp och kollar på
           den slocknade skärmen))
           it's died completely HEY THERE ((stands up and looks at the dead screen))

193   den har dött helt (9.0) DUMMA DATOR (3.0) °(xx) den har
           dött helt°
           it's died completely (9.0) STUPID COMPUTER (3.0) °(xx) it's died
           completely°

194 D: (.) vi struntar i de
           (.) let's not bother about tha'

195 A: ja måste ha me (.) ((stänger locket)) men ja har den ändå
           i min dator (.)
           I have to have (.) ((closes the lid)) but I´ve still got it in
           my computer (.)

196   men nu ljusnar den igen ((öppnar locket igen)) jag ska
           bara se till s- att ((undersöker skärmen)) den funkar
           but it's coming back ((opens the lid again)) I´m just goin´ to see
           ((examines the screen)) that it's working

197   (.) äh strunt i de just nu ((stänger locket och går till
           pappret))
           (.) eh don´t bother about that right now ((closes the lid and goes
           to her sheet of paper))

198   ett [två tre] ((i takt))
           one [two three] ((in the right time))

199 D: [två tre]
           [two three]

The somewhat out-of-issue passage here, as it comes up unexpectedly, is
the breakdown of a main tool in use – the computer (190–193). Diana, the

apprentice, helps her instructor (Amy) to take a flexible stand (line 194). Amy then displays such flexibility (197) and gives the problem some thought, leading to the decisive act of starting to count rhythmically before the intended joint singing act.

Although the children sometimes act out frustration with dramatic expressions when confronting such sudden practical problems, they generally meet such sudden practical problems with ease and good humour. They seem like interactional opportunities for more informal ways of talking, characterized by laughter and chatting between peers, rather than the formal style between a teacher and a pupil. The excerpt below from my interview with Diana (related to her previous teacher-role) and Amy (related to her previous pupil role) corroborates that. T = Tina (interviewer).

```
TDA:36-41   DE ROLIGA VA NÄR DE BLEV LITE KRÅNGLIT
            THE FUN THING WAS WHEN WE HAD TROUBLE WITH IT


36 A:       de roliga va när de blev lite krånglit
            the fun thing was when we had trouble with it


37 T:       hur då?
            how then?


38 A:       ☺ jo den åkte bort några gånger texten åkte bort några
            [gånger ]
            ☺ yeah it went away a couple of times the words went away a couple
            of [times  ]


39 D:       [(xx)   ] ja de blev blått å så tryckte ja så va de borta
            ((skratt och ett stort ☺)) så ja va tvungen att skriva om
            de några gånger ((skratt))
            [ (xx)   ] yeah it went blue an´ so I pressed an' it was gone((laughter
            and a big ☺)) so I´d to write it again a couple of times ((laughter))


40 T:       va du?
            did you?


41 D:       ☺ ((skratt))
            ☺ ((laughter))
```

As we can see on line 36, Amy takes the initiative to talk about how fun it was when the screen reacted unexpectedly. They smile a lot when recalling these incidents in the dialogue with me right after their joint activity.

6.3.5 Dialogues on pedagogical methods and artefacts

The children in this study voice different aspects of unfolding discussions on explicit learning issues, that is, dialogues on pedagogical methods and learning. These are faced communicatively, as their music educational activities actualize such meta-communicative explanations and clarifications. In these pedagogical discussions, one of the children initiates instructive reasoning around pedagogical and musical problems or musical learning issues. The partner latches on, and this leads to the emergence of a joint sequence type of pedagogical reasoning.

I shall set out to elaborate on their topical discourses on *songtext use.* As constructed in the children's talk and the unfolded actions altogether, the pedagogical issue of how to memorize and learn the songtext (the lyrics) was overlapped by explicit notions about *written language use.* To initiate talk about how to learn and use the songtext and how to work with written text were the most common themes to bring up and develop together in this category: dialogues on pedagogical methods and learning. Within the textures of interactions, it is readily apparent how tool-dependence is an issue for them when working with learning a songtext. Hence, this is a topical resource for negotiations and discussions between the music performances. The excerpt below denotes how a computer-mediated songtext issue is typically itemized in and through social interaction.

```
AD:73-79    INTE FÖR ATT FUSKA MEN JA VÄNDER PÅ SKÄRMEN
            (Amy undervisar Diana)
            NOT TO CHEAT BUT I'LL TURN THE SCREEN TOWARDS ME
            (Amy is teaching Diana)

73 A:       tycker du den e så lätt att du kan sjunga utan text (0.5)
            do you think it's so easy that you can sing without the words

74          (0.5)

75 D:       mm=
```

```
76 A:      =eller vill du [ ha den  ]
           =or do you     [ want it  ]


77 D:                     [ ja vill ] ha den utan
                          [I´d like to] have it without


78 A:      okej (.) ä::h (.) inte för att fuska: men ja vänder på
           skärmen: mot mig ((gör detta))
           okay (.) e::h (.) not to cheat: but I'll turn the screen towards
           me ((does that))


79         så vi kör igen :
           so we'll go through it again :
```

Examples such as the sequence above indicate a shared, mutual understanding of the co-text established (the prior invoked discourse) in which the two children have been using computer-based texts as an aid for memorizing learning. Such topicalizing episodes are common in the jointly attended discourse – a socially shared knowledge put into educational practice. Accordingly, in AD: 73–78 they establish an intersubjectively oriented stretch of talk. Lines 74–77 reinforce the intersubjective dynamics; their latchings without intervening pauses. Clearly, the participants are reciprocally building upon each other's contributions and trade on each other's understanding. After that, Amy, the teacher, realizes their intentions practically when turning the screen away from Diana's eyes (78). Further, she also marks out the underlying value of the somewhat dichotomous relation: mastering the lyrics with or without the written text. To rely on written text as a learning aid is viewed as a shortcoming in the sense of being so obviously dependent on a tool, but it is also held as the golden way to gain the key knowledge set up as the learning goal in their core activities. I shall come back to this phenomenon when discussing artefact-based learning in chapter 7.

To continue the considerations about the tool-dependence as it is brought out in the empirical dialogues, the next excerpt can serve as an example of how a lengthy conversation can embrace a written songtext dialogically, here, with the computer as the helping tool. It is noteworthy how the character of their communication, and in the social order, changes when they become involved in written language problems and computer-based problems. The reason for this shift in talking style has partly to do with the

activity structure. They are now engaged collaboratively in a subsidiary activity phase in relation to their core activity: to write down the current lyrics, that is, to prepare the learning resources for the singing performance-tasks. The transcript fragment starts out with Diana's attempt to write down the lyrics for her learner, Amy.

```
DA:18-52   MEN JA KAN INTE SKRIVA (Diana undervisar Amy)
           BUT I CAN´T WRITE (Diana is teaching Amy)


18         ((börjar skriva vid datorn)) (xx) ((skriver)) (11.0)
           ”Inte visste (.) vi” (5.0)
           ((starts to write at the computer)) (xx) ((writes)) (11.0)
           ”We didn´t (.) know” (5.0)


19         OJ (0.5) de ska va stor bokstav ((skriver)) ”Inte visste
           vi”((skriver)) (2.5)
           OH (0.5) it must be a capital letter ((writes)) ”We didn´t know”
           ((writes)) (2.5)


20         men (19.0) ja kan inte skriva
           but (19.0) I can´t write


21         (5.0) °”varför li::lla Dagny kom till”°
           (5.0) °”why li::ttle Dagny came to”°


22 A:      ((viskar)) ”inte visste vi vad kärlek var förrän lilla
           Dagny
           ((whispers))”we didn´t know what love was ’til little Dagny


23         (3.5) ”lilla Dagny” står de här
           (3.5) ”little Dagny” it says here


24         ”kom ti- till stan och alla så ropar vi i kör att Dagny”
           ”came ta- to town and all of us together shout that Dagny”


25 D:      åh ja har skrivit fel ☹
           oh I´’ve written the wrong thing ☹
```

26   "Inte visste vi (.) h vad kärlek (.) var för-" (3.5)
              "we didn´t know what love was 'til" (3.5)

27   OJ((skratt))☺
              OH ((laughter))☺

28   "*i:nte:* (.) viss:::te vi" (18.0) ((skriver))
              "*we::* (.) didn't kno::w" (18.0) ((writes))

29   MEN (.) varför händer de så:
              BUT (.) why is it like this:

30   A:(0.5)h ja vet inte °ja: va inte ens me° ((skratt))
              (0.5)h I don´t know °I: wasn't even there° ((laughter))

31 D: "i:nte" (0.5) inte: vis[s::]
              "we::" (0.5) didn't kn[o::w]

32 A: [nisste] ((big smile)) nisste ((skratt))
              [bnow] ((big smile)) bnow ((laughter))

33 D: ((skratt)) *"inte* viss:te" (4.5)
              ((laughter)) *"we* didn't kno::w" (4.5)

34   "kaärlek:" ((skriver)) (3.5) °"kär-"°((uttalar "kär" med
           k- inte med tj))
              "lo::ve:" ((writes)) (3.5) °"lov-"°((pronounce "kär" (in Swedish)
              with k - not with sh))

35 A: "kä:rle:k"
              "lo::ve"

36 D: "kä::rle:::k" ((skriver)) (16.0)
              "lo:::v:e" ((writes)) (16.0)

37 A: "inte visste vi vad kärlek var förrän lilla Dagny" "inte
           visste vi vad förr (.) än lilla Dagny"
              "we didn´t know what love was 'til little Dagny "we didn´t know what
              love was 'ti:(.)l little Dagny"

38 D: ”där” °”där”° ((viskar)) hur stavas Dagny:
           ”there” °”there”° ((whispers)) how is Dagny spelt:

39 A: e inte de med stor bokstav:
           isn´t it with a big letter:

40 D: jo (.) h ah men skit samma
           yes (.) h ah it doesn´t matter

41   ”inte visste vi vad kärlek var (0.5) förrän lilla Dagny
           kom till stan ((skriver)) (22.0) (xx) ((skriver)) (17.5)
           ”we didn´t know what love was ’til little Dagny came to town
           ((writes)) (22.0) (xx)((writes)) (17.5)

42   vänta (.) ”inte visste vi vad kärlek var förrän lilla
           Dagny kom till stan” .h
           wait (.)”we didn´t know what love was ’til little Dagny came to town” .h

43   ”nu sitter vi där och doppar sko::rporna:” (22.0) HH
           ”now we´re sittin’ there an’ dippin’ bis::cuits:” (22.0) HH

44   >”in- visste vi vad kärlek< var förrän lilla Dagny kom
           till stan nu sitter vi där och doppar skorporna på Kaffe
           Sjuan hela da´n”
           >”we didn´t know what love< was ’til little Dagny came to town
           now we´re sittin’ there an’ dippin’ biscuits in Café Seven all
           day long”

45   då <”och a::lla så rop> ((skriver)) (4.5) ”vi i”
           ((skriver)) (19.5) ”och” ((skriver)) (17.0) (xx)
           ((skriver)) (18.0) (xx) ((skriver) (25.0) ”trall °dill (.)
           dill°”
           then <”and a::ll of us together shout> ((writes)) (4.5) ”in”
           ((writes))(19.5) ”and” ((writes)) (17.0) (xx)((writes)) (18.0) (xx)
           ((writes)) (25.0) ”trall °dill (.)dill°”

46   SÅ (4.5)
           LIKE THAT (4.5)

131

```
47 A:      oke:j (.)
           oka:y (.)


48 D:      (1.5) ((ställer sig upp)) du får gå neråt där för den
           fotsätter li:te ((syftar på sångtexten på datorskärmen))
           (1.5) ((stands up)) you can go down there 'cos it carries on just
           a bit more ((alludes to the lyrics on the screen))


49 A:      ja okej:
           yeah okay:


50 D:      (3.0) okej (.) ett (.) två:=
           (3.0) okay (.) one (.) two:=


51 A:      =hur går förresten melodin :
           =by the way what's the tune:


52 D:      (0.5) ah så här
           (0.5) ah like this
```

D sjunger igenom melodin. Den första frasen ackompanjeras av
pulsmarkeringar med fingerknäppning.
D sings the melody. The first phrase is accompanied by the beat given with
clicks of the fingers.

Notice how they display a reversed interaction pattern due to their epistemic positions as knowers. The instructor, Diana, clearly tries to step away from the expert-role in lines 19–40 and invites her apprentice to come up with her knowledge and suggestions instead. Diana demonstrates this to her partner in several ways. In 19 she shouts "oh" (Sw. *oj*) and corrects herself when she recognizes her own failure at writing. This follows of her self-critical statement of her inability to write (20). Amy then has the courage to start helping her instructor with the task of writing down the songtext (22–24). Again, Diana explicitly emphasizes her own state of making mistakes, prefaced with an affective expression ("oh" in 25). She now starts to laugh out loud and repeat her "oh" loudly (27). When the next writing challenge turns up she asks Amy, again explicitly, why the work with the computer does not go as expected: "but why is it like this?" (Sw. *men varför händer det så*?) (29). Amy

laughs in return and tells her that she does not know either, adding "I wasn't even there" (Sw. *ja va inte ens me*). In 38 Diana again asks her partner about a factual aspect of the lyrics, as it is written down. She asks how a central word has to be spelled, and Amy gives an answer, which is also the right one in this case. Amy's answer to her question is accepted by Diana with a "yes" (in Sw. *jo*) that prefaces her turn in line 40. After that short response word, Diana chooses to bring back the more typical interaction order again; a social order that Amy picks up quickly and supports. The transition is heavily marked by Diana's "like that" (in Sw. *så*) (46), followed by the embodied activity signal they have applied earlier in the encounter in 48 (to stand up from a sitting position) and the response "yeah okay" from Amy (49).

The notion of tool-dependency in the multi-semiotic dialogues of the children studied brings us to another salient empirical result; their explicit concerns about text (written language). As we have seen, the partners are challenged by decision-making of differing kinds. One crucial type of situated challenge is to make choices about the mediating tool needed. Very frequently they negotiate about this. In terms of socially shared knowledge and understanding, there are several examples of a consensus on the use of written means when confronting learning challenges as well as musical demands. The next excerpt implies a vivid intersubjective density in which the two children orient to each other with ease in this matter. I shall discuss this further later.

```
DP:62-68    JA KAN SKRIVA TEXTEN TILL DEJ (Diana undervisar Paul)
            I CAN WRITE THE WORDS FOR YOU (Diana is teaching Paul)


62  D:      (0.5) bra (1.0)
            (0.5) good(1.0)


63          fast (.).h du har lite: svårt me den- (.) ja- ((vänder
            bort huvudet))
            but (.).h you find that a bi:t hard(.) yeah- ((turns her head away))


64          hm:: (3.0)((vänder huvudet åt andra hållet, tar upp
            fingret mot kinden)) ja kan skriva texten åt dej så kan du
            hå::lla:((gestikulerar))(0.5) å titta::
            hm::(3.0)((turns her head in the other direction, puts her finger to
            her cheek)) I can write the words for you and then you can ho::ld them
            ((gestures with her hands and arms)) (0.5) an´ loo::k
```

```
65 P:       ((nickar))
            ((nods))


66 D:       medans  [ja sjunger]((sätter sig vid ett papper))
            while   [I  sing ]    ((sits down besides a sheet of paper))


67 P:                   [((nickar tre gånger))] mm
                        [ ((nods three times))  ] mm


68 D:       okej
            okay
```

The episode starts out with a positive evaluation from the teacher, Diana (62). The consecutive comment is a more critical evaluation (63) and is followed by a practical advice: to use the written songtext as a helping resource (64). Paul, the pupil, reacts quickly with his affirmative head nods (65) that overlap with Diana's continued explanation (see 64–67). Moreover, he adds a short verbal affirmation ("mm" in line 67), which Diana responds to smoothly with a closing affirmative decision marker: "okay" (68).

There is a general tendency to work intensely in order to overcome the practical obstacles when computer problems arise. A lot of time is spent on solving practical problems of this kind. Similarly, when writing digitally on the spot is required, the apprentice has to wait for a relatively long period of time. An interesting fact here is that the children (both pupils and teachers) do not describe this potential "waiting-problem" as a situational problem at all. They are not impatient in their interactions. The argument about choosing the screen as the medium instead of writing by hand on paper is frequently based upon the idea that the text is easier to read out for the apprentice, from the standards in the digital style. It is possible that they share an experience of not being skilled enough in writing legibly. The size of the screen text was also of importance to them when recognizing learning issues of the songs. To sum up, they view symbolic written tools as useful in the long run, giving them a lot of time, patience and energy. This applies both to conventional written modes and to invented notations and symbols, digital or not.

6.3.6 Closing the encounters

The structural textures of turns at talking within the next analytical theme are located at the beginning or the end of the sessions. They constitute dialogues on the ongoing task. In contrast to the openings of the task, it is of sense making relevance to the children to pose questions and raise discussions about the undertaken task in action. Apparently, they are also viewed as appropriate situations for inserting such topical episodes in a co-productive way. The dialogical significance of these empirical findings can arguably be inferred from the fact that these are not full-fledged topical episodes in themselves. Rather, these interaction patterns can be related to Linell's (1998) reasoning: the meaning-potentials in semi-topical progressions having a regulating function in the specific social interaction. Along similar lines, I would suggest that they are not even based on local interactional interdependence but also on a macro-topical sense making perspective, that is, the relevance of pertaining to a cultural constituted context. Some educational interaction patterns are embedded traditionally in verbal school procedures. In the introductions of the sessions it is only the teacher who initiates such meta-oriented utterances.

When analysing the completion of the tasks, both teacher initiated and pupil initiated discussions occur. When a pupil wants to bring the session to a decisive conclusion, s/he tells the teacher more or less explicitly that there is no need to carry on any longer. This is, for example, clearly demonstrated by Michael in the next excerpt. Paul, who enacts the teacher-role, has the ambition to continue further with verse 2, which he thinks, is very amusing with its funny lyrics, but this is impossible from the perspective of Michael now.

```
PM:288-301 MEN JA TROR INTE JA VILL FOTSÄTTA
           (Paul undervisar Michael)
           BUT I DON´T THINK I WANT TO CARRY ON
           (Paul is teaching Michael)


288 P:     den e väl lite rolig ändå:
           well it's a bit of fun yet isn't it:


289 M:     ja de var den men ja tror inte ja vill fotsätta lära mej
           den här låten
           yeah it was but I don´t think I want to carry on learning this song
```

290 P: °ja° ((tittar bort mot dörren som är stängd)) (0.5) då får
           vi nog säga till T<u>i</u>na°
           °yes° ((looking towards the door that is closed)) (0.5) then we'll
           probably have to tell T<u>i</u>na°

291 M: °å <u>va</u> är hon nu° ☺
           ((knapp hörbart, uttalat med en humoristisk ton och min))
           °an´ <u>whe</u>re is she now° ☺
           ((hardly audible, articulated with a jocular style and face))

292 P: mm

293 M: ja
           yes

294 P: ((ropar högt)) TI:NA
           ((calling in a loud voice)) TI:NA

295 T: ja
           yeah

296 P: klart (.) Michael vill inte fotsätta mer
           we're ready (.) Michael doesn't want to carry on anymore

297 M: nä
           nope

298 P: han kan den nästan <u>ut</u>antill
           he knows it nearly off by <u>hea</u>rt

299 T: är ni <u>klara</u>:
           are you <u>rea</u>dy:

300 P: [ja]
           [yes]

301 M: [mm]

In the end, Michael is allowed to stop his teacher's ambitions with the musical learning project. He agrees with Paul to call on me in accordance with my initial instructions. He shows a happy face (291) and adds a confirming "yes" in his next turn (293). In line 297 he contributes with a minimal confirmation in this decisive direction, and in addition a final sound indicating a definitive completion point: the overlapping expression "mm" in 301, that reveals an eagerness to orient quickly to my question if they now regard the assigned activity as finished (not letting his teacher in without his perspective here). They had been told to tell me when they had decided to come to an end and wanted me to go into the room and stop the video recording.

Also of interest is the type of task completion that I name *potential completion*. Due to the sense making interactional development, there is another type of negotiating completion. In these discourse fragments, the apprentices talk together deliberately about the needs in the actual learning task. In the following excerpt, Amy (the teacher) makes her last intended written notations for Diana and then puts her pen aside, reflecting on their phase in the learning process.

```
AD:205-211 OM DU VILL FOTSÄTTA SJUNGA SÅ SÄG TILL

           (Amy undervisar Diana)

           IF YOU WANT TO CARRY ON SINGING THEN TELL ME

           (Amy is teaching Diana)


205 A:     ((sätter sig ned och skriver))(xx)"gå" å så e de två:

           ((skriver vidare)) "gå" å "springer"

           ((sits down and writes)) (xx) "go" an´ so there are two:

           ((writes more)) "goes" an´ "runs"


206        SÅ:_((lägger ifrån sig pennan))

           SO:_ ((puts her pen down))


207 D:     mm


208 A:     (1.5) då:: h (.) °ja tror nästan att vi är klara° (.)

           (1.5) the::n h (.)°I think we´re almost ready° (.)


209        om du: vill fotsätta sjunga så säg till°(.)

           if you want to carry on singing then tell me°(.)
```

```
210          vill du: alltså fotsätta: ((slår ut med händerna och
             tittar frågande på D))
             so do you want to carry on : ((waves with her hands and looks
             at D. in an inquiring way ))


211 D:     (1.0) °mm:_°
```

Amy's message to Diana in 209, to evaluate her needs in relation to the local situation, becomes a decision point for Diana, and in line 211 she chooses to respond with a weak and delayed agreement token (211). For some reason her decision is not directly and clearly articulated in front of Amy. Diana's reaction here is possibly unexpected as far as Amy is concerned. Amy's suggestion in line 209 might be interpreted as a dispreferred alternative to Diana to continue with singing instead of terminating the task at this point. In any case, it seems that Diana wants to continue but she does not provide an explicit reason for that (as in many dis-preferred stance-takings).

Amy's preference for a continuation guided what follows. The lines 212–223 in my transcription (not reported here) embrace a sequence about the computer screen, with the printed songtext, that has suddenly died. Then Amy again, and this time quite emphatically, brought up the expected ambition of further practise before the whole task could be terminated:

```
AD:223-239 SÅ VI FOTSÄTTER (Amy undervisar Diana)
           RIGHT LET'S CARRY ON (Amy is teaching Diana)


223 A:     hhh (3.5) oj då (1.0) den också
           hhh (3.5) oh (1.0) this too


224        (1.5 ) SÅ:: (1.0) vi: (.) fotsätter
           (1.5) RI:GHT (1.0) let's: (.) carry on


225 D:     mm


226 A:     ett två tre
           one two three
```

De sjunger igenom sången. D. tittar på A. i samband med starttonen och kommer in på ettan.

They sing the song. D. looks at A. for the first note and starts singing on
the first beat.

227 A: (0.5) du klarade de fint (.) både <u>ljus</u> stämma och komma
           ihåg dojorna (.)
           (0.5) you managed it nicely (.) both the <u>high</u> part and to remember
           the shoes (.)

228   [men]
           [but]

229 D: [mm]

230 A: ja vill <u>ändå</u> att du tar me lappen
           I would <u>still</u> like you to take your piece of paper home with you

231 D: °mm°

232 A: om ifall att(3.0) vi <u>fotsätter</u> (.) ((tittar på D.))
           in case (3.0) we carry <u>on</u> (.) ((looks at D.))

233   vill du sjunga själv (.) lite<u>:</u>
           do you want to sing on your own (.) a bit of it<u>:</u>

234 D: eh::
           eh::

235 A: så kan ja <u>mima</u> till<u>:</u> (2.5)
           so I can <u>mime</u> to it<u>:</u> (2.5)

236   du bestämmer själv (1.5)
           you decide (1.5)

237 D: okej ja kan testa
           okay I can give it a try

238 A: ett [två tre]
           one [two three]

139

```
239 D:    [två tre]
          [two three]
```

The first line (223) is related to the computer problem described. In 224 a new phase of repetition is initiated by Amy's decisive utterance "right let's carry on" (Sw. *så vi fotsätter*). The emphasized "RIGHT" (Sw. *SÅ*) can also be explained by the fact that she needs to make a contrasting sign to mark out the new direction in their activity structure: the sudden leap from computer talk to the continuation issue introduced earlier in their dialogue. Without hesitating, Diana responds supportively this time, but still with a minimal response. Perhaps this discloses her ambivalence to further practise; ambivalence not easy to express in front of Amy in this situation.

As the situation of closing the whole encounter unfolds, Diana has to practise the song four more times. At last this closing sequence occurs:

```
AD:264-268 DU KAN DEN HELT UTANTILL
           YOU KNOW IT COMPLETELY OFF BY HEART


264 A:    ☺ du kan den helt utantill
          ☺ you know it completely off by heart


265       (.)


266 D:    mm ☺
          mm ☺


267 A:    ska vi säga till Tina att vi är färdiga
          shall we say to Tina that we're ready


268 D:    ja
          yeah
```

To reproduce the song perfectly with regard to lyrics was the teacher-ambition in this learning session. Now they even smile, obviously responsively, and agree to close the session at this point (264–268).

Teaching with cultural tools

In this chapter I examine how the participants make sense of mediating cultural tools of different kinds. Mediating acts in interaction are studied in instructional activities. Due to my interest in instructional learning issues I pay attention both to the contributions made by the child in the expert role and the ones made by the apprentice in the pupil role. I shall scrutinize and analyse the transcriptions of activities, paying special attention to communicative abilities, musical knowledge and how the children collaboratively conduct a pedagogical project.

Analysing teaching and learning implies uncovering the children's design of semiotic resources and the interactional, discursive and musical uptake of the various sign-systems. Seen from the theoretical perspective applied in the present study, teaching is also an interpretative practice. The actors involved in this particular social practice need to constantly interpret meanings in each other's signs, acts, attitudes, perspectives and expressions. Coordinating each other's understandings and learning to communicate with different tools and symbols in instructional settings leads to the acquisition of knowledge and skills both for the pupils and the teacher. Specific attention is paid to mediation within discipline-specific knowledge in music: how do the participants in my study enact musical features and what mediating means are crucial for carrying out the actions? Multimodal realization and multi-semiotic functioning are crucial for learning music collaboratively, according to the results presented in this chapter. Aural and visual modalities

are addressed in their interrelated multiplicity in action. Having an interest in mediated activities, in the following section I shall explore the interface between verbal language and other representational sign systems, as they are used in the pedagogical dialogues.

The children in the present study produce their pedagogical signing with an admixture of cultural tools, sometimes used simultaneously as semiotic resources in the particular learning situation. Verbal tools in use are, for example, talk, text-based song and instructive written devices on the screen or on paper. Signing with other sign-systems (i.e. other mediating, cultural tools) means applying artefacts such as visual demonstrations, iconic signs, and ways of expressing tonality through embodied signs, rhythmical patterns and volume- and tempo-based dynamics.

7.1 DISCURSIVE TOOLS AS LEARNING POTENTIALS

In this section I shall start to elaborate on how text-mediated semiotic work can function as meaning making tools for musical knowledge building. Further, I shall outline how the participants make sense with other artefacts than the ones that are based on written text. Using verbalized text played a crucial role in the children's learning and teaching processes. Such use abounds in the current interactional corpus of data. In the children's teaching, such mediation mostly served as visualizing thinking-tools in demonstrations. That is, as further clarification of instructions and explanations that often has been introduced verbally in addition. The texts have a clarifying function, contributing to the multiplicity of teaching alternatives. For musical learning they constitute a materialized way of bringing musical phenomena into stable and investigable existence.

As will be seen, there is also reason to interpret the participants' textual work as constructing authority for the teaching situation – imitating school in the traditional sense, based on the importance of written language use. Referring to the written language, as in school, such artefacts seem to offer an established form of legitimation and justification for talking about the items both instructively and lengthily. The children who try to enact the teacher role lean on this culturally embedded power, inbuilt in the school culture, and in society in general. The transcript fragment below reveals how Amy, teaching Diana, is reasoning when she indulges in evaluative correction, emphatically referring to her written text, based on songtext extracts:

```
AD:85-87    DE HÄR GJORDE DU INGET FEL (Amy undervisar Diana)
            YOU DID NOTHIN' WRONG IN THESE (Amy is teaching Diana)


85 A:       äh: (.) då va de
            eh: (.) then it was
            ((skriver på pappret och sätter sig i soffan))
            ((writes on her paper and sits down in the settee))


86          (10.5) de här gjorde du inget fe:l ((tittar ned i pappret
            som hon skriver i medan hon pratar))
            (10.5) you did nothin' wro:ng in these ((looks down in her paper,
            which she writes on, when speaking))


87          (1.5) me::n s- att (.) >du kommer ihåg de i alla fall<
            (1.5)bu::t s- that (.) >you remember them anyway<
```

The written text on paper confers a somewhat authoritative agency here, also mediated by Amy's gaze: she talks emphatically about doing wrong, and designs the talk to concur with her intense look at the written words she mentions (line 86). Amy continues to refer to the text sheet in front of her (until line 101 in my transcription). In fact, Amy herself referred earlier to the text sheets she made, in terms of "writing down some helping means" (Sw. *skriva upp lite hjälpmedel*). When Amy has carried out the activity in her pupil role, she tells me (T) that she thinks it is helpful to learn through visual means:

```
TAD:20-22   RÄTT SÅ LÄTT NÄR MAN VÄL SÅG ALLSÅ
            QUITE EASY WHEN YOU AKCHULLY SAW THEN


20 A:       å sen ja trodde ju först från hela början att de skulle va
            jättesvårt liksom
            an' then ya know, when I first started I thought it would be
            really hard like


21 T:       mhm


22 A:       lära sej den låten men de va rätt så lätt när man väl såg
            (.) allså (.) hur den va
```

143

```
           to learn the song but it was quite easy when you akchully sa:w
           (.) then (.) what it was like
```

To see the song visually, in texts and/or invented symbols, was thought to be a helpful pedagogical strategy, as Amy points out in line 22.

The children often practised the lyrics step-wise in and through various semiotic means. Creating a new format, a new representational field, seems to be at least partly about gaining additional discursive space to probe further into the particular learning content at issue. Phrased differently, the lyrics gained new learning potential when the participants collaborated to re-situate it with the help of new sign-systems. The learning issues at stake could hence be reconceptualized to address the teaching in various ways, with various cultural tools. For example, embodying the songtext in the singing mode does not imply the same type of learning as the reading mode. The latter offers an externalized, abstracted knowledge form (the written text), the former a basis for acting out the music artistically in a highly embodied fashion – in a face-to-face dialogue with the receiver of the music produced (in these cases that mean the other child). The written means constitutes a systematic base for visual fixation and, as such, provides abstract and fixated representative functions.

It was customary to use the given songtext when doing further symbolic notations for the pupils. Consider the following example. Here, Amy practises an assessment sequence in which correction of the songtext is a key part.

```
AD:123-129 MM MEN DE E JÄTTEBRA ANNARS (Amy undervisar Diana)
           MM BUT IT´S REALLY GOOD OTHERWISE (Amy is teaching Diana)


123 A:     å så e de "Kom Julia vi springer med fina dojor på"
           ((markerar med penna i bordet på "spring- och "doj-"))
           an´ so it´s "Come Julia we'll run with nice shoes on
           ((taps with a pen on the table, on "run" and "shoe-"))


124        (.) mm så att de e (.) "gå" (.) e denna ((stryker under i
           pappret framför sig på bordet))
           (.) mm so that it´s (.) "go" (.) is this ((underlines on the paper
           in front of her))


125        å så e de (.) "springer" ((stryker under det också)) °i den°
           an´ so it´s (.) "run" ((underlines that too)) °in this°
```

```
126 D:      ja
            yeah


127 A:      så att du inte: liksom glömmer av :
            so you do:n´t like forget:


128         mm MEN DE E JÄTTEBRA ANNARS: ((reser sig upp igen))
            mm BUT IT´S REALLY GOOD OTHERWISE: ((stands up again))


129 D:      mm
```


Figure 1. Amy instructs Diana with co-occurring semiotic means.

As displayed in the denoted actions, the instructional item coincides with textual and symbolic work in a number of representational systems. The instruction is achieved through several co-occurring semiotic means. Using the handwritten text sheet as the main resource in her framing, Amy further creatively builds upon additional signing. Here, underlining the text serves the function of highlighting the correctives in a visual form – the specific words she wants her pupils to pay even more attention to. She even underlines her message by tapping her pen on the table; a powerful and distinct visual and aural sign simultaneously. Her use of the pen here was not the traditional one: to write with. She uses it as a resource for demonstrating the point she is

trying to make, as the illustration above shows. When she has finished doing this, she adds a verbal qualifier: "so you don't like forget" (Sw. *så att du inte liksom glömmer av*) (127).

The children work with written texts as memorizing aids in their learning, that is, they constitute potential for learning in the future. In this sequence, Amy encourages Diana instructively to bring the text sheet home in case they have the opportunity to continue their practise another day.

```
AD:227-232 OM IFALL ATT VI FOTSÄTTER (Amy undervisar Diana)
           IN CASE WE CARRY ON (Amy is teaching Diana)


227 A:     (0.5) du klarade de fint (.) både ljus stämma och komma
           ihåg dojorna (.)
           (0.5) you managed it nicely (.) both the high part and to remember
           the shoes (.)


228        [men]
           [but]


229 D:     [mm ]


230 A:     ja vill ändå att du tar me lappen
           I would still like you to take your piece of paper home with you


231 D:     °mm°


232 A:     om ifall att (3.0) vi fotsätter (.) ((tittar på D.))
           in case (3.0) we carry on (.) ((looks at D.))
```

In line 230, Amy tries to persuade Diana to take the text sheet with her notations home, and after Diana's minimal supportive response "mm" (229), Amy adds "in case we carry on" (232), alluding to the possibility of further work another time. Throughout the dialogues, it was instructive to work with one prime expressional mode, and one learning aspect at a time, instead of practising an admixture of all learning aspects in the process of mastering the songs. Stepwise, as the learning sessions unfolded, the instructors put the learning aspects together in more complex entities. It was also customary to encourage the pupils to imitate the teacher's song performance or verbatim

lyrics, phrase by phrase. When doing so they narrowed down the musical items pedagogically:

```
PM:123-128 JA Å SÅ KAN VI JU TA DEN NÅGRA GÅNGER
          (Paul undervisar Michael)
      YEAH AN´ THEN WE CAN GO THROUGH IT A FEW TIMES EH
       (Paul is teaching Michael)


123 P:    ska vi testa u- utan ((lägger undan sitt papper)) så kan
          vi göra så (.)
          shall we test wi- without ((puts his paper down))so we can
          do like this (.)


124       ”Jag är en liten mygga” ((klappar med händerna till och
          läser texten högt och tydligt för M.))
          ”I am a little gnat” ((claps his hands to the song and reads
          the words out loud and clear to M.))


125 M:    ”Jag är en liten mygga”
          ”I am a little gnat”


De tar fras för fras på samma vis tills låten är avslutad. M. imiterar
P. Ej tonalt denna gång, endast text- och rytmträning.
They take phrase by phrase in the same way throughout the whole song. M. imitates P.
Not singing notes this time, but just with the spoken words and the rhythm.


126 P:    ska vi säga så:: vi ska försöka lära de- dej en mening
          först i taget å sen lägga på en annan:= shall we say this
          then, that we´ll try to teach y- you one sentence at a time an´ then
          add another one to it:=


127 M:    =ja å så kan vi ju ta den några [gånger]
          =yeah an´ then we can go through it a few [times] eh:


128 P:    [ja ]
          [yeah]
```

To learn one sentence at a time (126) is the way Paul puts it when he suggests this method to narrow down the ongoing learning issue. Michael latches on very quickly, eager to talk further about the idea (127).

The computer screen was a common resource as an inscriptional artifact. In one of the instructional situations, Diana in her teacher-role suggested doing her transformative semiotic work with an invented symbolic representation. She did not use the text traditionally. Instead she invented a screen-based notation with a learning function. In this episode Diana acted to directs Amy's attention to a pause, important but somewhat tricky to perform in the musical context due to the need for precise timing between two phrases. Having only the lyrics available on the computer screen, the program Word, and not being familiar with the conventional printed score-system, Diana is looking for an alternative to mark out the pause in the textual representation in front of them. Here, she realizes the idea of typing something to indicate a space between the written words in the row as a signifier, calling it "a line" (Sw. *ett streck*):

Figure 2. Diana invents a visual representation for a musical space.

```
DA:63-66   DÅ SKA DE VA ETT STRECK HÄR
           (Diana undervisar Amy)
           THEN THERE SHOULD BE A LINE HERE
           (Diana is teaching Amy)
```

63 D: mm:_ ((plockar undan papper på bordet)) okej (.) mm:: (.).h
          liksom (.)"inte visste vi vad kärlek <u>var</u> förrän lilla Dagny
          kom till stan<u>:</u>" ((hon följer linjen med pekfingret på
          datorskärmen)) då ska de va ett <u>stre</u>ck här ett (.) ett
          mellanrum<u>:</u>

          mm:_ ((takes the paper off the table)) okay (.) mm:: (.).h like (.)
          "we didn´t know what love <u>was</u> 'til little <u>Dagny</u> came to town<u>:</u>"
          ((she follows the line with her index finger on the screen)) then
          there should be a <u>li</u>ne here a (.) a space<u>:</u>

64 A: °m[hm°]
          °m[hm°]

65 D: ["nu]sitter vi där å doppar skorporna: på Kaffe Sjuan
          hela dan<u>:</u>"((pekar på skärmen))
          ["now] we´re sittin' an' dippin' biscuits: in Café Seven
          all day long<u>:</u>" ((points at the screen))

66   .h (1.5) å så e de ett <u>mellanrum</u> här ((slår ut med händerna
          i en illustrerande rörelse))
          .h (1.5) an´ so there's a <u>spa</u>ce her ((strikes out with her hands in
          an illustrative gesture))

Figure 3. Diana invents a new visualizing gesture for the same musical
phenomenon (see Figure 2).

Here Diana gave Amy a visualization tool, a semiotic device; "a line" (Sw. *ett streck*) representing a musical pause to notice and to enact in the pedagogical practice (line 63). The line she referred to functioned as a metaphor. On the screen she actually used lengthy interspaces between the relevant words, as symbols for the musical interspaces. To Diana it was conceived of as a line. She used this figurative representation (the metaphor) when conceptualizing it with a visual sign for musical structure – the musical temporality. Here a metaphor of a linear phenomenon is a resource for invoking the association of linear progression, appropriate when illustrating the ongoing structure of a regular flow in a music piece. However, from the perspective of the apprentice, having to understand and use an unfamiliar notation symbol relatively suddenly required verbal explanations and comments. Diana talked about a "space" (Sw. *mellanrum*), while pointing with her index finger at the critical junctures. Here it is also notable that constructing differences and contrasts are not purely linguistic accomplishments. In this case, the invented non-linguistic sign (the typed interspace on the songtext row) was intimately interrelated, and co-constituted, with the linguistic elements in the denoted text.

In terms of the participating children in this study, knowledge was chiefly associated with *textual knowledge*, as established in the interactions. But, paradoxically, textual knowledge was not espoused to be the superior knowledge ideal in the end. Rather, to succeed musically *without* the use of text was the ideal value in these young teachers' practice. Moreover, they consistently used written methods with the paper and the computer screen as tools for remembering: offering the pupils a visual overview of the songtext with a request to memorize highlighted parts. This is an interesting empirical fact, pertinent to the theme in this chapter. When the instructors wanted their learners to memorize the lyrics in its entirety, they did not typically use text sheets or the screen as a learning affordance. Instead, they worked with the song bit-for-bit vocally, through imitating sequences in call-and-response style, preferring not to apply visual artefact-based methods in the end, other than bodily means as gestures, talk and singing. To be tool-dependent (as a pupil) in obvious ways, as with text sheets, computer and other materialized artefacts, was recommended practice for learning the song. However, when the children had finally appropriated the song, they made sense of being able to sing it without such tools. That is, they moved from a materialized practice to an embodied practice. It is incorrect to state that they were totally independent of using tools at the end phases. The point here is what the nature of appropriation looked like in the children's typical learning progressions

within the given task. Not leaning on material resources after a while does not mean that the children expressed their gained knowledge without any type of mediating tools at all. Rather, when they had learned to master crucial elements of the whole task of singing the song, they drew on other semiotic resources as, for example, in-depth breathing, hand gestures, nods, gazes, hand claps, postural orientations and prosody, volume and tempo in talk.

The example below illustrates how the instructor, Diana, communicates her final ambition to teach Amy to reproduce the song without text-based tools. As an ultimate completion of the task, she recommends Amy not to use a number of aids.

```
DA:178-183 OH SHIT (Diana undervisar Amy)
          OH HECK (Diana is teaching Amy)


178 D:    ja gör så ((klickar bort texten)) mm [((skratt))]
          yeah do like that ((clicks the text away)) mm [((laughter))]


179 A:                                        [((skratt))]
                                              [((laughter))]


180 D:    nu: (.) ska du försöka kunna den utantill ((tar sig i
          håret))
          no:w (.) try and sing it off by heart ((ruffles her hair))


181 A:    o:::h SHIT ja kommer inte ens ihåg hur du börja
          o:::h HECK I don´t even remember how you start
          ((tittar på D.))
          ((looks at D.))


182 D:    (.) ett två tre .h
          (.) one two three .h


De sjunger igenom sången igen tillsammans.
They sing the song through one more time together.


183 D:    n- försöker du sjunga(.)utan mej ((slår händerna mot sitt
          bröst))utan (1.0)((visar med en handgest på skärmen))
          allså utan allt de som ((viftar med handen vid skärmen))
```

```
n- try and sing (.) without me ((beats her hands against her chest))

without (1.0)((shows with a gesture of her hand on the screen)) without

all of the things that((waves with her hand at the screen))
```

Notice how Diana explicitly refers to herself as a resource for mediating teaching knowledge (183). Implicitly, she also refers to her body here, clapping her hands on her chest simultaneously. In sum, in line 183 she explains to Amy that both the lyrics on the screen and her own body as a signing and singing resource now have to be left behind.

Moreover, interactional episodes with non-text-based artefacts were found in my corpus of data. The participants mediated some issues within the framing of another sign-system than discursive tools. The children dealt collaboratively with issues in other symbolic, mediating systems, as already discussed. In the remainder of this section, I point to the learning aspects during the materializing sequences: how learning and development were facilitated and constrained by the use of equipment, that is, artefacts within the pedagogical communication. Hence, I shall continue to acknowledge other co-produced materialized tools. For example, to trade on the semiotic mediation from the cuddly dog placed on the couch, inventing signs with a pen on a paper, using the room as a referential space; these kinds of interactions supported their pedagogical dialogues with crucial meanings. The children's construction of artefacts for pedagogic communication is an important finding.

There are reasons for acknowledging the children's *scaffolding communication* with artefacts as guiding and framing aids. Guiding the pupils methodically seems to be a conventionalized practice. For example, the toy dog placed on the sofa was used as a teaching aid to demonstrate the music rhythm, marked out by the song-specific rhythmical movements of the dog's cheek. Consider how Paul, the instructor, invites the dog as a new actor:

```
PM:94-101  VILL DU ATT HUNDEN SKA KOMMA Å HJÄLPA DEJ NU
           DO YOU WANT THE DOG TO COME AN´ HELP YOU NOW


94 P:      vill du försöka utantill nu:
           d'you want to try it off by heart now:


95 M:      usch ☺ den e ju så (.) s:vår ☺
           ooh ☺ it´s so (.) ha:rd ☺
```

96   ”Jag är en liten mygga /…/ om du vill veta *var* hobby
            som ingen *annan h-*”
            ”I am a little gnat /…/ if you want to know *where* hobby
            that no *one else ha-*”

97   ☺ ((stort leende))ah ja klarar de inte ((tar ned
            pappret) ja har så svårt för melodin just den e liksom
            lite klurig (2.5) ((P. tittar på pappret framför sig och
            ser ut att fundera))
            ☺ ((big smile)) ah I can't do it ((takes down his paper)) I think
            the tu:ne's so hard(1.0)it's a bit tricky like (2.5) ((P. looks
            at the paper in front of him and seems to be having a think))

98 P: vill du att hunden ska komma å hjälpa dej nu: ((tar tag i
            hunden i soffan))
            do you want the dog to come an´ help you now: ((grabs the dog on
            the sofa))

99 M: HUR DÅ : ja visst vovve då får du väl hjälpa till då
            ((tittar på hunden))☺
            HOW THEN: yeah right doggy then you can help me then ((looks at
            the dog)) ☺

100 P: ”Jag har en liten [hobby”]
            ”I have a little [hobby”]

101 M: ”Jag har en liten [hobby”]
            ”I have a little [hobby”]

Paul's initiative to call for the dog (line 98) was introduced when his learner Michael needed to focus on one learning aspect – the melody that Michael said was so difficult for him to perform (95, 97). In this case, the dog provided the articulation of the rhythm in the song melody but not the pitches (the melodic aspect). Even if this was helpful, it did not fulfill the need completely for Michael. They moved on, trying hard to find productive ways of coping with the musical challenge.

Figure 4. Paul introduces a new actor on the scene: a cuddly toy as
a visualizing learning tool.

7.2 VOICE-MEDIATION

In this section the verbal, voice-mediated utterances are scrutinized and ex-
emplified; the subtle functional regulation of voice-volume and speed within
the language use. This does not exclude co-occurring mediating acts such as
pointing with the index finger, using other body-based gestural alignments
as semiotic signs or applying artefact-based demonstrations with the material
setting as aids. Verbal and voice-mediating expressions do not rule out the
tonal use – the singing acts analytically. As we will see, the conversational
speech and the singing are intertwined in practice. In fact, co-occurring, ex-
pressive semiotic representations were nearly always present in the conversa-
tions examined. Here I describe a selection of analytically relevant situations
found in the transcriptions.

7.2.1 Voice-volume in talk

The children clearly demonstrated how they operated with a low voice volume
and reinforced talk as well, in order to clarify particular pedagogical actions in
their task-based encounters. Verbal acts of these kinds have different meaning
potentials, as the following will clarify. Furthermore, the analytical ambition

here to highlight some instructional issues in interaction, particularly language mediation (verbal language use). I shall not describe every single example I have identified in the transcripts but will only select examples that are informative with regard to the aural semiotic functions related to the pedagogical premises in the current task.

In relation to the surrounding talk, some of the children's utterances were produced in a low voice. One salient situation type with this message-design was when the verbal utterance was somewhat unclear or incompletely expressed. Hence, these utterances were tentatively expressed, as a communicative part of the learning process. This can be exemplified with an excerpt from session number three in which Paul instructs Michael.

```
PM:110-114 MEN HUR KAN MAN VE- (Paul undervisar Michael)
           BUT HOW CAN ONE KN- (Paul is teaching Michael)


110 P:    ja (.) först måste du lära dej melodin ju=
          yeah (.) first you´ve got to learn the tu:ne=


111 M:    =ja visst men kan du inte humma melodin lite:
          =yeah right but can´t you hum the tune a bit_:


112 P:    ((nynnar melodin - versen))
          ((hums the melody - the verse))


113 M:    °men hur kan man ve-° men allså ((tittar ned i pappret))
          °but how can one kn-° but ((looks down in his paper))


114       (.) °den här melodin kommer nog bli väldit svår att lära°
          (.) °this tune'll probably be very hard to learn°
```

In line 113 Michael raises a tentative question about how to really learn the expected melody. In the end he hesitates and leaves his utterance incomplete. The following words in, line 114, are also somewhat tentatively expressed in the sense that he uses the word "probably" (Sw. *nog*). This kind of mediation was also frequently used in instructions. When the instructor was somewhat unclear in his/her intentions and, for example, used the words as a means for thinking aloud in the process, directed to himself/herself, this type of talk was scattered within the message structure.

Another empirical result on this theme was the significant role of a mediating voice-volume when talk was combined with other emphasized gestures or tool references. The children usually referred to artefacts through pointing while talking more softly (with a lower voice volume) than in the surrounding discursive context. The children nodded with their heads or pointed with their hands/fingers while looking at the artefact referred to. In the next excerpt, an example of such talk is illustrated, in which this signing style is employed twice within the sequence. Here, Amy (as teacher) does not nod with her head at an artefact, or point with her index finger but instead refers to the material object – the computer – gazing intently at it and, then, through her absorbed activity with this artefact:

```
AD:210-216 VA VA DE NU DÅ (Amy undervisar Diana)
           WHAT'S UP NOW THEN (Amy is teaching Diana)


210        vill du: alltså fotsätta: ((slår ut med händerna och
           tittar frågande på D))
           so do you want to carry on : ((waves with her hands and looks
           at D. in an inquiring way ))


211 D:     (1.0) °mm:_°


212 A:     (2.5) °va va:(.) de nu då:°((tittar på skärmen som
           slocknade tidigare)) (5.0)
           (2.5) °what's up (.)now then:°((looks at the screen that had
           died earlier)) (5.0)


213        (.) så kommer den upp NU: ((arbetar med datorn, D.
           reser sig upp och böjer sig över skärmen för att titta på))
           (xx)(15.0)
           (.) so it comes up NO:W ((works with the computer, D. Stands up
           and leans over the screen to look)) (xx) (15.0)


214 D:     varför e den så :
           why's it like that :


215 A:     OJ (2.0)
           OOPS (2.0)
```

```
216             °vi gör sådär° ((fotsätter att arbeta med datorn)) äsch
                °we can do it like this° ((continues to work with the computer))phew
```

As disclosed, Amy reacted to the sudden trouble with the computer screen – an artefact that apparently played a central role in the pedagogical organization. But as long as it functioned in the way that was expected, the artefact issue did not have to be thematized explicitly in verbal terms. This was also a recurrent empirical feature in my corpus of data. It seems that deictic gestures are accompanied by a more vague way of speaking. In addition to her remarks about what happened to the screen, Amy looked, and worked, intensely with the practical issue of retaining the computer function. The particular topic Amy introduced with her soft speaking voice in line 212 and 216 was also an incipient communicative project (CP) – a joint CP to solve in the dialogue. As it unfolded, these two utterances directed to the sudden death of the screen did not pave the way for adjacent response points to which Diana (the apprentice) latched on. This may be seen as indicative of a self-directed way of talking related to the problem-solving process she was engaged in at the moment. There are other examples of instructions attending an artefact and at the same time speaking in a soft voice. Let us take a look at another sequence, as it unfolds in the dialogue. Here, Diana is instructing Paul.

```
DP:278-282 Å SÅ FOTSÄTTER MAN ME DE (Diana undervisar Paul)
           AN´ THEN YOU GO ON WITH THAT (Diana is teaching Paul)


278 D:     att ((hon skriver fortfarande medan de textar högt))
           that ((she still writes while they say the words out loud))


279 P:     "Dagny" (.) "kom hit och spill"
           "Dagny" (.) "come here an' spill"


280        °å så fotsätter man me de° ((vevar med armen snabbt))
           °an´ then you go on with that° ((waving quickly with her arm))


281 D:     °kom ihåg de° ((räcker honom det färdigskrivna pappret))
           °remember that° ((gives him the paper with the words written on))


282        (0.5) ett två tre
           (0.5) one two three
```

What we see here are two interesting contributions. The verbal act is softly spoken (in a relatively low volume) simultaneously, referring to either bodily gestures (280) or with an artefact, a text paper given to the partner at the same time (281). It may be claimed on the basis of turns such as these that verbal talk in these activities was not designed to be the primary semiotic resource (and mode). Instead, Diana provided the bodily gestures, the iterative waving, the illustrative and crucial dynamics in the word meaning "remember that" (Sw. *kom ihåg de*) (281) and the physical and concrete act of giving the paper the key role in line 281. On the basis of these transcriptions, it is also worth noting how the young participants used a mediational technique in a similar way when they raised their voices. They signalled aspects of relevance to the teaching- and learning-situations by regulating their voices.

The most salient result regarding this aspect was when other gestures were accentuated, accompanied by the talk. Such an utterance hence directed the addressee to bodily signs. Some strongly exaggerated gestures beyond the spoken word were found. Perhaps the most common was a loud sigh from the instructor (and a frustrated face in addition), not directed at the pupils and her/his performed abilities. It was then used as an expressive sign of subjectivity, showing the partner, for instance, that the writing issue was a tough challenge requiring patience.

A number of interactional strips of talk consisted of sequences that centred on the reproduction and imitation of the lyrics: imitations of the instructors' singing in front of the apprentice. Here, the accentuated voice-volume served to elucidate key words in the lyrics. The song words repeated often served the function of clarifying correctives with the instructor's redirecting of the learner's action. The following is an illustration of how Diana and Paul carry out such courses of action in concert with each other in instructional episodes:

```
DP:6-15    "FÖRRÄN LILLA DAGNY KOM TILL STAN" (Diana undervisar Paul)
           "'TIL LITTLE DAGNY CAME TO TOWN" (Diana is teaching Paul)


6 D:       vi tar den lite i taget då (.) så sjunger ja
           we can go through it a bit at time then (.) an´ so I sing


7 P:       (.) mm
```

```
8 D:        "Inte visste vi vad kärlek var förrän lilla Dagny kom till
            stan"

            "We didn´t know what love was 'til little Dagny came to town"


9 P:        "Inte visste vi vad kärlek var innan Dagny kom till stan"=

            "We didn´t know what love was 'til Dagny came to town"=


10 D:       =nä .h "Inte visste vi vad kärlek VAR (.) förrän Dagny kom

            till stan" ((sjunger i en tonart en halv ton högre upp))

            =nope .h "We didn´t know what love WAS (.) 'til Dagny came to town"

            ((sings in a key that´s half a tone higher))


11 P:       .h <"Inte visste vi vad kä:rlek var innan Dagny kom till

            stan:">

            .h <"We didn´t know what lo:ve was 'til Dagny came to town :">


12 D:       "FÖRRÄN lilla Dagny kom till stan"

            "'TIL little Dagny came to town"


13 P:       "FÖRRÄN lilla Dagny kom till stan"

            "'TIL little Dagny came to town"


14 D:       mm "Nu sitter vi där och doppar skorporna på Kaffe Sjuan
            hela da´n"

            mm "Now we're sitting there an' dippin' biscuits in Café Seven all
            day long"


15 P:       "Nu sitter vi där och t- (0.5) doppar skorporna (.) hela
            da´n"

            "Now we're sitting there an' t- (0.5) dippin' biscuits (.) all day long"
```

Here Paul imitates the lyrics, the intensified volume when he puts the accent on the first part of the word "'til" (until) (Sw. *förrän*) in his turn (line 13). He thereby displays his understanding of Diana's song interpretation. Moreover, their accent on precisely the first part of this song sentence – the accentuated word "'til", draws attention to an interesting pedagogical implication from the analyst's perspective. Musically, this accentuation is not appropriate at all. If the tonality and temporality were the guiding principle here in line

159

12–13, the words "Dagny" and "town" (Sw. *stan*) should have been articulated instead. But it is possible to see another instructive function here: for the sake of textual clarity, that is, coming to grips with the lyrics correctly, this kind of pronunciation is a sense making learning aspect. That means holding on to the issue of lyrics, the matter of reproducing the songtext words correctly and verbatim, and not engaging with the musical language at the same time. Doing this, Paul's missing word "little" (Sw. *lilla*) in line 11 is repaired in the subsequent joint work, the repair in 12–13 (embedded in a more extended correction sequence, 10–14). This implies that the musical demand for the learners who acts as pupils is to transduce this explication to a more musically correct form of expression later: in other words to transpose the textual talk genre into a tonal musical genre. The results indicate that the children were often able to manage such a complex or diverse use of language – the transformation into the genre-specific musical phrasing. This instructional phenomenon was found in other similar situations, pointing to the same tendency. In general, the children preferred to work explicitly on the songtext element before they penetrated the tonal, musical issues. The musical accentuation (pitches, articulations and rhythms) was instead more frequently indicated with bodily gestures.

7.2.2 Temporality in talk

In this section I probe deeper into the matter of how the children regulated the dialogues with both words and ways of producing them (as the sounding dynamics in tempo, prosody and voice-volume). According to the findings, I shall demonstrate another acoustical technique that they used in order to highlight specific issues in the participants' joint reasoning. By using contrasts in tempi, the conversation partner received aural semiotic mediation (i.e. signs with subsidiary, auditory features in the spoken words). The highlighted issues were not always confined to the orientation of verbalized acts, activities or sub-activities. As we will see throughout this section, the participants also referred to gestures, tools and musical expressions at times. I shall explain the various pedagogical and communicative functions mediated by speaking in a quick tempo in interactional talk. When scrutinizing the surrounding turns and word-meanings in the episodes that occurred, the fast-talking style could be seen as ingrained in different, complex micro-situations. An example is when Diana prompts her apprentice Amy to sing the pitches in the tonality accurately:

DA:137-146 SÅ ATT DU LIKSOM SJUNGER SÅHÄR (Diana undervisar Amy)

              SO THAT YOU LIKE SING LIKE THIS (Diana is teaching Amy)

137 D: hh ((tar sig i håret och ser ut att fundera)) (1.5) va va

          de ja tänkt-

          hh ((ruffles her hair and looks as though she's thinking out something))

          (1.5) what was it I thought-

138   jo (.) såhär:: ähm (.) i:: första versen

          yes (.) like thi::s: ehm (.) i::n the first verse

139   "Inte visste vi var kärlek var förrän lilla [Dagny kom

          till stan"]

          "We didn´t know what love was 'til [Dagny came to town]

140 A: [Dagny kom till stan"]

          [Dagny came to town]

141 D: se:n:_ (.) så sjunger man så här .h sen sjunger man lite

          ljusare

          the:n:_ (.) you sing like this .h then you sing a bit higher ((she

          used a word that refers to "light" and "bright" rather than literally

          "high" in the original Swedish))

142   "nu sitter vi där o doppar skorporna på Kaffe Sjuan hela

          da´n"

          "Now we're sitting there, an' dippin' biscuits in Café Seven all day long"

143   >så att du liksom sjunger så här<

          >so that you like sing like this<

144   "inte visste vi var kärlek var förrän lilla Dagny kom till

          stan. Nu sitter vi där och doppar skorporna på Kaffe Sjuan

          hela da´n"

          "We didn´t know what love was 'til little Dagny came to town. Now

          we´re sitting there an' dippin' biscuits in Café Seven all day long"

```
145        så att du sjunger lite:: (.) [ah lju]sare

           so you sing a bi::t (.)          [ah high]er

           ((see my remark on the word "higher", line 141))


146 A:                                  [okej  ]

                                        [okay  ]
```

At the very outset of this episode, Diana designs the verbal mode to in-
form what she is thinking about and how to move on from this point (line
137–138). Following this, she sings the song verse she has talked about,
engendering the co-singing with Amy at the end of the musical phrase (line
139–140). After this, a verbal clarification is needed, followed by a tonal
demonstration (line 141–142). Then comes the conversational point at which
Diana uses the fast talking-style functionally. In 143 she articulates her new
verbal clarification very hastily, enabling the musical flow to remain in mind
during the spoken instruction, and turns to the demonstrative melodical
mode again (line 144). In this way, the risk of forgetting the musical ex-
pression (the specific ongoing beat) was minimalized for all involved. As
an instruction it turned out to be crucial to embody the uttered device "so
that you like sing like this" (143) (Sw. *så att du liksom sjunger så här*) with
such a quick expression, anchored in a contrasted tempus. At the same time,
talking so fast has a hedging effect on the verbal clarity. However, Diana
directs Amy forward to the musical matter in focus. The contrasting work
contributes to making the musical (tonal) issue very clear, as Amy's overlap
"okay" (146) points to.

The next excerpt serves as an illustration of the other aspect alluded
to above: when the children are contrasting the talk with an artefact that is
focused on. The participants are now Amy and Diana, this time with Amy
in the instructional role:

```
AD:13-16   MEN OM DU VILL SJUNGA SÅ HAR DU TEXTEN DÄR

           (Amy undervisar Diana)

           BUT IF YOU'D LIKE TO SING THEN YOU HAVE THE TEXT THERE

           (Amy is teaching Diana)


13 A:      .h ä:h(1.0) vi kan börja mima lite

           .h e:h (1.0) we can start to mime a bit
```

```
14          (.) men om du vill sju:nga så (.) >har du texten där<
            ((medan hon säger detta vänder hon datorskärmen mot D.))
            (.) but if you'd like to si:ng (.) >then you have the text there<
            ((while she says that she turns the screen towards D.))


15          °de e lite svårt de har hänt nåt me datorn°
            °it´s a bit hard somethin's happened to the computer°


16 D:       ((tittar på skärmen))
            ((looks at the screen))
```

The turn in line 14 shows how Amy increases her tempo in talking when re-
ferring verbally to the screen-based lyrics and, simultaneously, working with
the computer screen when turning it towards Diana. In addition, she talks
extremely softly (15). Again this takes the focus away from the verbal clarity
in the acoustic sense. Diana's responsive act to these turns was to look at the
screen referred to in front of her. The talk style discussed, using manipulation
of the temporality in talk as a clarifying and contrasting means of communi-
cation, was also expressed in slow talk. To slow down the speed to create
a signing contrast, implies multi-semiotic patterns of orientation within the
learning activity. In addition, the theme elaborated on in this paragraph tells
us something about how the children talk slowly as practice in the adaption
of the demands of teaching the song.

   A typical challenge that is related to the use of a slow talking speed
is the learner's imitation of the lyrics. The children sometimes emphasized
the text in the song slowly, facilitating both the partner's perception of the
spoken words and, at the same time, the process of enacting the articulated
sentences. One example is when Diana later in the session explains the lyrics
with the help of multiple simultaneous semiotic mediations. In response to
her demonstrative, co-occurring signs Paul orients immediately to her means
of expression.

```
DP:89-97   TRALL DILL DILL (Diana undervisar Paul)
           TRALL DILL DILL (Diana is teaching Paul)


89 D:      /…/"Hör hur mitt hjärta sjunger trall dill dill"]
           /…/"Hear how my heart is singin' trall dill dill"]
```

```
90 P:      /…/"Hör hur mitt hjärta sjunger trall dell dell"]
           /…/"Hear how my heart is singin' trall dell dell"]


91 D:      (.) ja .h allså (.) du säger (0.5) nånting (0.5)
           ((vevar kraftigt med höger hand)) "all dill dill" nånting
           (.) yeah .h then (.) you say (0.5) somethin' (0.5)
           (.)((waves forcefully with right hand)) "all dill dill" somethin'(.)


92         men du man ska säga=
           but hey we have to say=


93 P:      = "trall dill dill" ((P. anger nu den korrekta versionen))
           ="trall dill dill" ((P. now gives the right version))


94 D:      (.) mm men man ska sjunga såhär (3.0) >°"Hör hur mitt
           hjärta sjunger"°< ((intensiv blick och samtidig handgest))
           [<"trall dill dill">]
           (.) mm but you have to sing like this (3.0) >°Hear how my heart
           is singin'°< ((intense gaze and a simultaneous hand gesture))
           [<"trall dill  dill"> ]


95 P:      [<"TRALL DILL DILL>]
           [<"TRALL DILL  DILL> ]


96 D:      ja så va de
           yes that's it


97 P:      ☺
```

Line 92 shows how Paul latches on to Diana's urge to sing with the correct lyrics, by amending this item of correcting the songtext words. This is responsive to her verbal imperative but also to her prior intense hand waving (91). However, she is clearly not pleased enough and indicates that she wants to continue working on improving the singing. In this situation she uses instructional words before her soft and fast recitation (94). The latter is followed of two salient bodily signs, used transitorily: an extremely intense gaze and a quick gesture with her hand before the recitation of the remaining lyrics. Again, the bodily gestures can be related to Paul's initiative of displaying his

understanding of Diana's expectation. Moreover, Diana calls for his attention so successfully that he orients to the new slow speed of the speech, reading her lips (he also looks at her when accenting the last key words). Why slow down here and why speed up during the prior articulation of the lyrics?

Recalling their reciprocal act in lines 94–95, embracing a reinforced intonation contour from Paul in line 95, it is notable how they trade on multi-semiotic designs (i.e. with various simultaneous semiotic resources): to use contrasts in tempi, volume and demarcate spoken words with embodied gestures. The technique of *contrasting* as a way of teaching is again salient. When uttering the first part of the lyrics fast, then signalling attention, and after that slowing down, Diana also facilitates another learning potential, and another meaning potential, in the last part to recite accurately. With her sudden fast talking style (and the sudden change of voice volume) she is also signalling a dynamic change, which something now calls for immediate attention. This is further underlined through her accompanying bodily signs. It works out for Paul, as displayed in Diana's responsive utterance: "yes that's it" (96). As semiotic resources in this scene, voice-regulation and embodied gestures worked as mediating tools, prefaced by a verbal correction of what to acknowledge. Altogether, these communicative signs obviously helped Paul to orient in a temporarily perfect manner in relation to the demands imposed by Diana and the learning situation.

Finally, the explicit musical function of slowing down the talk should be mentioned. It happened to be very frequent, somewhat habitual; to practise the lyrics of the song without the melody attached (repeating the lyrics without musical tonality but in a talk mode). In general, the children seemed to prefer lifting out this singing modality temporarily, while practising this moment in the learning activity. That means that they practised the musical tempo in combination with the correct words in the song worked on; to spell them out verbally in the speech mode and not melodically. Enacting the tonal melody upon the rhythmical lyrics, did not usually follow until the first elements were appropriated – the final step in the whole learning task (as the children conceived of it).

7.3 COUNTING PROCEDURES

As the following section will illustrate, the young teachers' counting to three, more or less rhythmically, directed interactional and musical meaning. They directed the pupils to the singing achievements, thereby enabling the critical

moment to be in sync, musically speaking. One meaning function resided in the interface between the linguistic (spoken) elements and other types of voice production such as voice volume, prosody and the temporality chosen. When the children moved over from verbal discussions to the core activity of singing the song (either solitary pupils singing or both of them simultaneously singing), the multi-modal density was accentuated during a very short transitory span of interaction. Here, in this communicative transition, bodily postures and other embodied signs in action provided significance along with the incipient singing.

As commonly known by musicians, temporality is a primordial prerequisite for doing music traditionally; the underlying beat – the temporal flow – has to be established even just before the piece of music is enacted. It conditions the whole subsequent activity phase in that sense. Communicatively, that has to be established interactively due to the demand of activity type. That is, to set the framing due to the tempo and, at the same time, to pay attention to the more or less sudden switches in the activities and genres. Consider the implied switch of the new language genre that follows with the new activity phase – the shift from the expressivity in spoken words to a tonal one. The participants' communicative project was often very suddenly turned into a musical and artistic one: to perform and practise the current song. This rapid transition to their core activity of singing, with a new form of genre-specific expression (CG), had to been launched and anchored successfully in the dialogic situation. Here, the children as teachers appeared to have had a crucial role in the sign-making guidance of the other child, the apprentice. Hence, the musical language was prefaced by subtle but distinctive communicative means, displayed in a compound sign-system.

The following lines will show the importance of co-construction of multi-functional communicative gestures used by the children to uncover the time-based nature of music, contained by the challenging and decisive junctures indicated above. On a moment-to-moment basis, I shall describe how *talking about music* is jointly transformed into *doing music*. This means that the children shift their activity from analysed music to the actualized music, the singing. In doing so, they proceed from meta-talk to embodying musical knowledge tonally. These significant shifts are also supported by the sequential interpersonal organization within the instructional situations, related to the signing acts. Moreover, the signifying moves serve to function in a supplementary manner in the courses of action, supporting each other in the process of directing symbolic meanings within the interactions.

Crucial to the organization of the children's core activities – the singing events – is the verbal and recurrent routine of counting to three before the apprentice (sometimes with his or her teacher) performs the actual song. In nearly every case, the convention of counting worked practically to signal this activity. The one who was expected to latch on and sing quickly responded to the instructor's introduction. S/he was mostly both willing and able at that moment to cooperate with the singing contribution that plays a key role in their pedagogical organization. However, the children's practice of the counting was not conventional according to established music traditions. Instead of using the conventional principle of counting the appropriate beat of the underlying bar system of the song, they counted to three in all cases, even when counting to four or two would be used conventionally of a full-fledged musician. Another basic principle of counting for musicians is to count exactly on the beat of the particular song. The point here is to structure the music prior to the activity itself, guiding the musicians to enact the tempo with precision and to start together in a highly coordinated fashion. The young participants also often did so. In many cases, the instructors prefaced the singing with counting that was followed up by the musician in the pupil role. But there were also many cases in which the function of counting was not to guide the exact beat but rather to introduce the sudden activity shift mentioned, and to call for immediate attention. That is, as a preparatory act instead of musical guidance, indicating the musical structure.

Evidently the children shared some cultural knowledge. Starting to count means following up with singing. Such a common procedure – a socially shared act of knowledge – might be rooted in everyday life, but it is also appropriate here to ask why it worked out so functionally for other reasons as well. How could the pupils actually latch so very quickly and unproblematically onto this pedagogical practice – the step to start singing the song tonally? In some situations the teacher introduced the next-coming singing activity through meta-talk about what waits 'around the corner', and what to think about next. There were also several scenarios in which such a teacher-initiative was totally absent. Instead, practising the song started abruptly, without other words than the counting ones (one, two, three). From here on I shall refer to the former type of introduction as *thematized counting in* and the latter as *unthematized counting in*, depending on the differing kinds of preceding talk (before the coordinated start). To proceed with the first type, the thematized counting in, responsive affirmations from the pupils in the dialogue, seemed to be decisive for the outcome of how to collaboratively move over

unproblematically into the singing. In the extract below we can notice how the counting procedure continues readily in its interactional uptake. It is the instructor (Amy) who administers her musical initiation together with Paul.

```
AP:65-69   ETT TVÅ TRE (Amy undervisar Paul)
           ONE TWO THREE (Amy is teaching Paul)


65 A:      vi försöker igen
           let's try again
66 P:      mm


67 A:      ett två tre
           one two three


68 A:      ["Kom Julia vi gå /…/ med fina dojor på"]
           ["Come Julia we go /…/ with nice shoes on"]


69 P:      ["Kom Julia vi gå /…/ med fina dojor på"]
           ["Come Julia we go /…/ with nice shoes on"]
```

Amy and Paul accomplish the quick transition from talking to singing without recruiting semiotic signs such as marked pronunciations of the words or bodily gestures. Paul's minimal response "mm" in line 66 was sufficient enough for Amy to pursue her idea of continuing ("let's try again" / Sw. *vi försöker igen*, in line 65). In many similar episodes "mm" or a nod work was a responsive preface sufficient for initiating the counting procedure. Along similar lines, the second example shows how an explicit yes and a smile from the learning partners are sufficient to enable the instructor to accomplish the counting without any additional clarifying signs to aid the particular communicative situation:

```
AP:197-199 ETT TVÅ TRE (Amy undervisar Paul)
           ONE TWO THREE (Amy is teaching Paul)


197 A:     ska vi prova:
           shall we try :


198 P:     ja ☺
           yep ☺
```

```
199 A:     (.) ett två tre
           (.) one two three
```

The responsivity of the pupils here, and in many similar episodes, is based on
the instructor's use of "us " (line 65 in 5:65–69) or "we" (line 197 in 5:197–199
above). This alerts the partner. The use of "we" or "us" seems to boost the
learner's willingness to cooperate and try to patiently sing again within the
common task.

When the preceding topic episode is about other issues than confirming
and planning the ensuing song activity, the transitional talk is typically pref-
aced by exaggerated articulations in the instructive wordings. Alternatively,
the transitions are designed by other demonstrative signs that mark out the
incipient event for the pupil, who has to latch very quickly onto the new
modality – the tonal, musical expression. This type of thematized transition
is worth highlighting before moving on to the unthematized shifts shown in
the transcriptions. One recurrent term uttered by the teacher in the dialogues,
"okay", works as an action-oriented signal. It is often articulated with a rising
intonation, implying a request for immediate co-operation. Another term with
the same dialogic function is "we go"(Sw. *vi kör*). To "go" is a way to call for
the learner's immediate participation. To use the pronoun "we" does not make
it less powerful as a means of engaging the partner. The term "go" works out
very well in the meaning of pursuing the teacher's intention of transforming
the pedagogical talk-activity into the practice of (repeatedly) singing the song.

Action functions at different levels of organization and there are multiple
ways of designating the goal-oriented acts, as the following extract illustrates.
In the following sequence, the counting is indicated by other complementary
mediating means than the word meanings only. This is partly due to the
unthematized nature, inadequate for preparing the pupils verbally for the
new type of activity – to embody the song in singing. Instead, Diana uses her
body positions in her teaching as orienting, demarcating resources to signal
the activity shifts:

```
DP:84-88   ETT TVÅ TRE (Diana undervisar Paul)
           ONE TWO THREE (Diana is teaching Paul)


84 P:      ja tror nog de blir lite lättare för mig utan papper
           (.)att lära mej den:
           yeah I think it'll be easier for me without the paper (.) to
           learn it:
```

```
85 D:      °ja° ((lägger bestämt undan pappret)) (.) vi gör så=
           °yes° ((puts the paper aside in a decisive way)) (.) right=


86 P:      =faktiskt
           =yeah ri:ght


87 D:      ((ställer sig upp igen)) ett två tre .h= ((i puls))
           ["Inte visste vi vad kärlek var…
           ((stands up again)) one two three .h= ((in the right beat))
           ["We didn´t know what love was…


88 P:      ["Inte visste vi vad kärlek var…
           ["We didn´t know what love was…
```

Diana sat beside Paul on the sofa when they talked about the pedagogical issue. But as usual, she preferred to stand up in front of him just before it was time to count in and to repeat the song tonally (line 87), to move over into the singing phase within the activity type. Standing up just before it was time to engage her apprentice in singing was part of the instructional strategy for other children. To posit the body in this way was more than a contrastive signing gesture, telling the other that she was now ready to use the body more actively than sitting on the couch. It was also associated with the particular activity phase as such, thereby signaling an organizational feature, serving a structuring function. When the pupils got that sign, they also knew the mediated meaning due to the structure of the teaching activity. Moreover, pauses, nods, and intense gazes in the partner served as substitutions for voice-regulated means. Hand and arm gestures were also common ways of attracting the learner's attention. But, pointing with the index finger was not appropriate for them in this phase. They used such deictic gestures for work with written text and symbolic signs in inscriptions on the computer screen or a sheet of paper. Through the body positioning in space, the participants designated the incipient actions nonverbally. Scrutinizing the dialogic situations, it is evident that the postural semiotic orientations provided productive and contrastive tools for teaching and learning.

7.4 THE CO-CONSTRUCTION OF CONCEPTUAL KNOWLEDGE

Some verbal expressions are taken up as conceptual devices in the dialogues between the children, expressions that are not used conventionally in accordance with established music traditions. In contrast, other concepts are used by the participants in a conventional sense. In this study it is of interest to map the children's interpretative understanding, as they take up conceptions in situ, sometimes in a traditional way, sometimes not. They may use terms in unconventional ways for different reasons. In some cases, it depends on what is experientially given in accordance with the earlier back-ground of knowing. In other cases, it is because they creatively invent a new conceptual device for a particular pedagogical purpose, for example, problem-solving.

Some of the invented musical terms were not taken up conversationally for further discussion, but the interlocutors used such concepts in line with the introduced meaning. However, later in their encounters it was sometimes apparent that one partner knew the more appropriate term in its conventional sense. This applied to a term such as "the song" (*låten* in Sw.), used initially by the instructor. In one case they were later substituted discreetly, without further explanation. The child who did not enact the expert role introduced the traditionally correct term "verse" (Sw. *vers*) instead.

Sometimes other associated migrated concepts from the musical field were applied by the children. One of them talked about the "bar" (in Sw. *takt*) but used it practically in the sense of "beat" (Sw. *puls*). This is a common way of using the word even amongst adult musicians (in Sw. the imperative *håll takten* is common when musicians want a tight beat flow). Another child espoused the idea "first part" (*första stämman* in Sw.) in order to informatively distinguish between the first and second verse in the song. For professional musicians, the word "stämma" would be confusing here since it signals the tonal, melodic and polyphonical dimension rather than the overall structure of the songtext and verses. That means using other tonal melodies simultaneously with the ongoing prime melody, sung or played by another musician.

Other musical concepts used in unconventional fashions draw from word meanings that are traded in a non-musical language world. An example is "to mimic" (Sw. *mima*): forming the words with your lips but without speaking or singing them out. In these activities, the child acting as teacher

chose instead to sing the melody tunes in a very weak voice volume in front of the apprentice child, without spelling out the words overtly. In doing this kind of scaffolding as a teacher, the words are not displayed orally at all, only the tonality can be comprehended in this form of musical expression. And that is the point here: to emphasize the melodic item as an aid for the complex learning of the whole song.

To take "one sentence at a time" (Sw. *en mening först i taget*) was another way to provide scaffolding. This term does not traditionally refer to music but is adopted from the world of linguistic grammar. This term functioned conversationally (without a problematic interactional uptake) at the start, because the current teacher, Paul, built methodically on the sentences in the song, eliminating the focus on tonality at first. But it turned out to be a non-specific term here that gave raise to a clarifying episode on this topic. Michael, the addressee, indicated that he expected them to work with the melody issue also. He then brought it up in the conversation. Let us take a look at the topical episode, as it happened. Paul teaches Michael:

```
PM:126-139 EN MENING FÖRST I TAGET (Paul undervisar Michael)
          ONE SENTENCE AT A TIME (Paul is teaching Michael)


126 P:    ska vi säga så:: vi ska försöka lära de- dej en mening
          först i taget å sen lägga på en annan:=
          shall we say this then, that we´ll try to teach y- you one sentence
          at a time an´ then add another one to it:=


127 M:    =ja å så kan vi ju ta den några [gånger]
          =yeah an´ then we can go through it a few [times]


128 P:    [ja  ]
          [yeah]


129 M:    så ja kan lära mig den=
          so I can learn it=


130 P:    =ja:
          =yeah:


131 M:    men då måste vi ju: ta sången väl: °själva melodin också°
          but then we have to go through the song : a:nd °the tune itself too:°
```

132 P: ja <u>se</u>nare (1.5) vi kan börja me ”jag har-” ”jag är en
          liten mygga och Hubert heter jag<u>:</u>”
          yeah <u>la</u>ter (1.5) we can start with ”I have-” ”I am a little gnat
          and Hubert is my name<u>:</u>”

133 M: (xx) ska vi <u>sju</u>nga den nu så: med melo<u>di</u> : (0.5)
          (xx) shall we <u>sing</u> it like thi:s now then with the <u>tune:</u>(0.5)

134 P: mm

135   °också (.) måste du lära dej melod<u>in</u>°=
          °and then° (.) you must learn the <u>tune</u> too:°=

136 M: ”Jag är en liten [mygga och Hubert heter ja:g”]
          ”I am a little [gnat and Hubert is my name”]

137 P: [mygga och Hubert heter jag”]
                           [gnat and Hubert is my name”]

138   <u>”Jag är en liten mygga och Hubert heter jag”</u>
          <u>”I am a little gnat and Hubert is my name”</u>

139 M: <u>”Jag är en liten mygga o Hubert heter jag”</u>
          <u>”I am a little gnat and Hubert is my name”</u>

The two have to negotiate what "sentence "(Sw. *mening*) means and distinguish between "sentence" and "tune" (Sw. *melodi*). Moreover, Michael relates the term melody to the term song (131). The interaction becomes very tight and intersubjective, as we can see in the latches and 'yes-utterances' in lines 126–130, implying a common referential understanding and agreement on the topic at this point. Michael shares overt preferences to Paul's idea of teaching him the song in this way to narrow down the learning content to smaller linguistic and rhythmic entities. The sequence in lines 131–135 contains consecutive meta-statements about clarifying the need of adding the tonality, that is, "the tune itself " (Sw. *själva melodin också*).

The two boys pointed out the teacher strategy in the talk with me (my name is denoted T in the excerpt below), right after their accomplished task. They talked about the creative variation in methods and about how the strategy for learning the song was linked to one "sentence" at time:

TPM:53-63: VÄLDIT KREATIV I SINA SÄTT ☺

REALLY CREATIVE IN HIS WAYS ☺

53 M: fast[de där me] melo<u>din</u> tror ja du hade lite <u>svårt</u> att
         lära

         but [the thing with] the tu<u>:n</u>e I think you had a <u>hard</u> time

54 P: [vet inte ja]

             [da know   I]

55 M: mej ☺ för den va väldit <u>svår</u> för mej

         learning ☺ ´cos it was really <u>hard</u> for me

56 P: å så försökte ja <u>hjäl</u>pa honom på olika sätt

         an´ so I tried to <u>help</u> him in diff'rent ways

57 M: väldit <u>kre</u>ativ i sina sätt ☺

         really cre<u>at</u>ive in his ways ☺

58 T: jaså hur tänker du <u>då</u> Michael?

         mm how do you think <u>the</u>re, Michael?

59 M: <u>först</u> så tyckte han att ja skulle <u>härma</u> han å sen så tyckte
         han att ja skulle försöka hänga <u>me</u> ☺ helt plötsligt ville
         han att vi skulle göra ref<u>räng</u>en å sen <u>va</u> de ju inte
         refrängen så skulle vi göra de <u>andra</u> så de va mycke <u>bland</u>at

         <u>first</u> he thought that I should <u>im</u>itate him an' then he thought that I

         should try an' do it <u>with</u> him ☺ all of a sudden he wanted us to do

         the <u>cho</u>rus an´ then it <u>was</u>n't the chorus after all an' we should do the

         <u>oth</u>er parts so it was a <u>real</u> mix

60 T: mm

61 P: å sen (.) tog ja så först ska vi lära oss den <u>förs</u>ta
         meningen

         an´ then (.) I did, well first we can learn the <u>first</u>

         sentence

         å när ja tror han kan den utantill så ska vi lägga på <u>andra</u>=

         an´ when I think he can do it off by heart we´ll add the <u>other</u>=

```
62 M:      =å så [vi sätta ihop]
           =an´ we´ll  [put it together]


63 P:            [å  så   när ] han tror han kan den utantill så
           ska vi lägga ihop dom
                     [an´  so  when ] he thinks he knows it off by
           heart so we´ll put them together
```

There is another interesting discussion in the following dialogue between Paul and Michael. This episode tells us something about the role of shared knowledge in a teaching situation. Experiential givens, referring back to earlier learning experiences, are imbued in the conversational reasoning. Here, Michael does not share the musical knowledge that Paul has developed from his lessons with the trumpet and orchestra in the municipal music school. Michael has no experience of music lessons outside the school subject. His experiences are about listening to pop music and looking on pop videos, and his kind of experience contributed to an enriched and interesting discussion between him and Paul: an exchange of differing perspectives that ended up as learning opportunities for both of them. Paul has already gained ideas of what it means to enact a musical identity formally, through musical schooling. The conceptual issue they have to problematize and dwell upon together is what it means to have a musical *feeling* (Sw. *inlevelse*) in the song performance in order to handle musical phrasing. Michael finds it a little bit difficult how to conceive of, and transform, such an abstract instruction from Paul into musical action:

```
PM:152-162 NÄR DE E LITE MER INLEVELSE I LÅTEN SÅ KLARAR DU DE
           (Paul undervisar Michael)
           WHEN THERE'S A BIT MORE FEELING IN THE SONG YOU´LL FIX IT
           (Paul is teaching Michael)


152 P:     vill du::
           would ya li:ke:


153 M:     ja JA KAN om ja fått lära mej första raden så kan jag den
           hela men "Jag är en liten mygga och Hubert heter jag"
           ((sjunger den mer rytmiskt än melodiskt))
           yes I CAN do it if I´d got to learn the first line then I can do all
           of it but "I am a little gnat and Hubert is my name"((sings it more
           rhythmically than melodically))
```

154 P: NÄ:R DU <u>BÖRJAR</u>- NÄR de e lite mer inlevelse i låten så
           klarar du de
           WHE:N YOU <u>START</u>- WHEN there's a bit more feeling in the song you´ll
           fix it

155 M: hur ska man göra mer <u>inlevelse:</u> (1.5)
           how can I do more <u>fee</u>ling: (1.5)

156 P: tänk (.) lite mer på att göra lite=
           think (.) a bit more of doin´ a bit=

157 M: ="Jag är en liten mygga och Hubert heter jag"
           ((demonstrativt))
           ="I am a little gnat and Hubert is my name"
           ((demonstratively))

158 P: tänk eh lite mer såhär "Jag är en liten <u>mygga::</u> och Hubert
           heter <u>ja::</u>" ((sjunger mjukt på ett övertydligt vis med
           betonade och förlängda avfraseringar samt en hand som i
           rörelse illustrerar denna utdragna mjuka musikaliska
           egenskap))
           think eh a bit more like <u>this</u> <u>"I am a little gna::t and Hubert is my</u>
           <u>na::me"</u>((sings softly in a demonstrative style with marked and extended
           end-phrases, and a hand in motion that also illustrates this soft,
           musical feature))

159   man kanske (.) ska lägga till lite ex::tr- man ska <u>sjunga</u>
           lite mer <u>fin</u>are kan man väl säga
           p'rhaps (.) we should add a bit e::xtr- we should <u>sing</u> a bit more
           <u>fan</u>cier: we could say eh

160 M: menar du <u>så</u> är inte de som att de ska låta lite <u>bätt</u>re
           eller
           d'ya mean <u>li::</u>ke, well isn't that like it can sound a bit <u>bet</u>ter or
161 P: ja men de behöver vi e<u>gen</u>tligen inte bry oss om
           yeah but we don´t <u>rea</u>lly have to bother about that

162 M: sant (.) "Jag är en liten mygg-"
           true (.) <u>"I am a little gnat-"</u>

176

From my notation of Michael's song style in line 153, it is obvious how he emphasized the rhythm and the songtext at the price of melodic expression. This produced a music phrase that was not complete in this sense. Paul's following remark in line 154 may be seen as recognizing this, leaving out the possibility for him to help Michael improve on this further. When asked by Michael to clarify an explanation of what he meant by the word "feeling" (Sw. *inlevelse*), Paul suddenly chose to abandon the whole issue (161). And Michael agreed (162). But their meta-talk upon this intricate subject challenged their respective understanding of the musical problem. Without their differing background knowledge of the topic, the need of verbal explications would probably not have been actualized at all.

7.5 FUNCTIONS OF BODILY GESTURES

In the previous excerpts we have seen that the potential for learning and meaning in (bodily) gestures was considerable. I shall now exemplify how gestures and postures function within the interactional context. Gestures can be conceived of as a weakly lexicalized sign-system assigned for distinctive dialogical meaning functions. In my transcriptional data, gestures were significant throughout the organizing discourse. Here I shall outline how bodily gestures were ingrained in the organizing framework of the participants, in several situations playing a regulative and constituting role for understanding and learning. Displayed bodily postures might be rendered as orienting symbolic signs, deployed within the rich matrix of diverse semiotic resources. Gestures also had an impact on, among other things, social and social psychological issues.

Analytically, I have categorized the children's gestures into four main types, on the basis of their specific functioning in the communicative context examined. In the next section, I shall elaborate on the use of gestures found in the data. The differentiated functionality in them set the spotlight on what I name as transitional gestures, emphatic gestures, deictic gestures and emotive signs respectively. The gestures are not conceived of in isolation but in their multi-semiotic frame, that is, how they coincide with talk and other sign-systems. Although they are analysed as separate categories here, there are overlaps between their use and functions. For example, some of my examples of emphatic gestures are also deictic. The purpose of this section is to orient the reader in the diverse and complex ways of the children's sign-making.

7.5.1 Transitional gestures

Some gestures manage the transition from one type of talk to another, or from one communicative genre to another, for example, from educational talk to singing. The transition between talk and singing is typically achieved through demonstrative inhaling, sometimes co-occurring with a nod, and sometimes even accompanied by an intense gaze or hand sign to the other child who is expected to pick it up immediately. The symbolic function of breathing here has to be recognized. To breathe expressively, and excessively, in a distinct way was employed as a powerful sign in the children's activities: to manage the transformative actions in the direction of singing instead of talking (as already hinted). Signs of this kind may be referred to as *transitional gestures* – embodied semiotic resources pointing forward to other expressional acts, within other communicative modes.

But there are also other semiotic resources at play, facilitating transitional functions from one kind of activity into another. Another group of gestures of a transitional nature was postural signing, using the body in orientating positions. That indicated a major shift in the discourse. Mostly the children exhibited these stances in accordance with the regular activity phases within the whole organizational structure of their encounters, as they were jointly construed. The next excerpt illustrates how Amy used her embodied position as a signifier for an activity transition – from the assessment talk sequence to the preparations for the singing:

```
AD:41-43   VI KÖR IGEN (Amy undervisar Diana)
           LET'S DO IT AGAIN (Amy is teaching Diana)


41 A:      så att du inte gör för snabbt ((reser sig upp))
           so you don´t do it too fast ((stands up))


42 D:      ((nickar))
           ((nods))

43 A:      vi kör igen (.) <ett två tre> ((ställer sig upp och intar
           sin vanliga position framför D.))
           let's do it again (.) <one two three> ((stands up and takes her
           usual position in front of D.))
```

The singing activity here unfolded without problems in its uptake, and the subsequent activity shift was carried out within a very short interactional time span. Similarly, the children used bodily postures at the transitions between the songs and the following assessment. One of the children, for example, said nice encouraging things about the song the pupil had just sung. When doing so she shifted her body from standing to sitting. She sat down close to the partner on the sofa, thereby building an intimate talking style. In contrast, the same instructor pronounced her critical words in her evaluations, standing up some distance from her pupil.

7.5.2 Emphatic gestures

These are customary among the participants in this study. Consider how Diana, in the expert role, requests Amy's attention in a multi-semiotic manner:

```
DA:91-95    DU MÅSTE FÖLJA ME LITE (Diana undervisar Amy)
            YOU MUST FOLLOW A BIT HERE (Diana is teaching Amy)


91 D:       .h det var lite här i början
            ((viftar med handen framför skärmen))
            .h there was a bit here in the beginning
            ((waving her hand in front of the screen))


92          du måste följa [me lite  ]
            you must follow [a bit here]


93:                        [ ja      ]
                           [ yeah    ]


94 D:       i te:xten (1.5) eller så: ((gestikulerar)) melodin:
            in the wo:rds (1.5) or so:((do gestures with her hands)) the tu:ne :


95 A:       ((nickar))
            ((nods))
```

Amy's reciprocal nod in line 95 is clearly responsive to Diana's reinforced instruction sequence, beginning in line 91 with her post-positioned gesture of hand-waving at the screen as an embodied and demonstrative commentary to

what she has just said. Although this is produced as a post-positioned visual clue, she will soon apply the same communicative principle as a pre-positioned expression. In line 94 she prefaced her key word "the tune" (Sw. *melodin*) with another dynamic hand gesture, signalling to the hearer that an important key word in her message is about to be pronounced. Her bodily movement can be seen as a pre-announcement for the crucial key word to realize: the pitches in *the melody*. In this episode, her demanding phrase "you must follow…" (92), directs Amy to orient and follow her will on the spot. This is seen in the quick overlap with a co-operative response, the word "yeah" in line 93. In addition, her responsive nod in line 95, not being preceded by a hedge such as a pause or a verbally oppositional move, also illustrates Diana's functional and multi-semiotic mediation.

Let us move over to Michael and Paul. When teaching Michael the rhythmical nature of the song, the phrasing, Paul uses his hands to mark out and thereby specify the meaning of his spoken words:

Figure 5. Paul marks with his hand how to do a musical phrasing.

```
PM:142-144 Å SEN MÅSTE MAN STANNA (Paul undervisar Michael)
           AN´ THEN ONE HAVE TO STOP (Paul is teaching Michael)
```

```
142 P:    ☺ (0.5) å sen måste man stanna ((markerar stopp med båda
          sina händer)) såhär "Hubert heter jag" ((tittar intensivt
          på M. och visar sluttonen med höger hand))så man ((visar
          den stängda handgesten igen)) kniper ige:n
          ☺ (0.5) an' then one have to stop ((marks stop with the hands))
          like this "Hubert is my name"((looks intensely at M. and shows the
          last note with his right hand))so you ((shows a gesture of the hand
          in a closed position one more time)) cut if o:ff

143 M:    >"Hubert heter jag"< ((imiterar Pauls handgest på sista
          tonen))
          >"Hubert is my name"< ((imitates Paul´s gesture of the hand on
          the last note))

144 P:    ☺ lite så men (.) li:te saktare
          ☺ a bit like that but (.) a bi:t slower
```

The issue elaborated on here is how to express the end of a musical phrase.
Paul initiates the request to have a pause before moving on to the next phrase
(line 142). Paul uses the imperative "one have to" (Sw. *man måste*) when he
simultaneously produced a gestural framing in his utterance: "and then one
have to stop". This is depicted by a halt sign with both his hands, like the one
policemen use in traffic. He also emphasized the first part in the word "stop"
with his spoken voice (Sw. *stanna*).

Using their bodies to visualize explanations is also frequently applied in
the children's instructional activities. Amy explains to her pupil Diana how
to do the movements in the song they are soon going to practise together:

```
AD:139-143 ALLSÅ INTE DUNK DUNK (Amy undervisar Diana)
           WELL NOT LIKE THUMP THUMP (Amy is teaching Diana)

139 A:    om du vill så kan vi gå runt (.) men då går vi på tå
          ((visar med fötterna, D. tittar)) hela den versen
          if you want we can go round (.)but then we go on our toes
          ((demonstrates with her feet, D. looks back)) all that verse

140 D:    mm
```

141 A: ((tittar ned på sina fötter)) så att de e liksom "höga
          klackar" (.) och sen när de e "Kom Julia vi springer me fina
          dojor på" (.) då kan vi springa lite <u>smålätt</u> ((springer
          några steg)) (xx) men då ska de vara som små <u>klamp</u>
          ((stampar lite när hon går)) allså inte dunk dunk ((går
          ännu mer stampande)) utan att de e som <u>små</u> ((springer med
          mindre och snabbare steg tillbaka)) så att du springer
          runt:_ (.) så att de e <u>hela</u> fötter
          ((looking down at her feet)) so it´s like "high heels" (.) an´ then
          it´s "Come Julia we'll run with nice shoes on" (.) then we can run
          like <u>lightly</u>((running some steps)) (xx)but then it must be like
          small <u>stamps</u> ((stamps a bit when she walks)) well not like thump
          thump((walking in an even more stamping way)) without it bein' <u>small</u>
          ((running with smaller, quicker steps on her way back)) so you run
          round:_ (.) so it´s <u>whole</u> feet

142 D: mm ((tittar på henne))
          mm ((looks at her))

143 A: som dojor då ((slår ut med händerna))
          as shoes then ((waves her hands))

In this topical episode, Amy uses her body to depict how the actions she is talking about should be performed. For example, she stamps her feet when talking about the sound "thump thump" (Sw. *dunk dunk*). These are emphatic gestures with a particular meaning making function here. They clearly underline and illustrate the words spoken and thus confer a powerful embodied meaning to them.

7.5.3 Deictic gestures

Other emphatic gestures were also used, which I shall henceforth refer to as *deictic gestures*. They serve the function of pointing things out. Here the "teachers" usually use their index finger to refer directly to the phenomenon in question. Music pedagogically speaking, bodily gestures mark out how to perform in line with the teacher's will, often within a very short time span. Such gestures function as useful accountable tools when teacher and pupil arrive at the point when they need to interact when performing the musical

activity: Visual cues in embodied ways obviously aid learning, as the following text will illustrate.

Pointing to and nodding at certain features were typical and frequent deictic gestures in the activities investigated. They were often used to designate time or space: something the teachers wanted the pupils to pay attention to in the learning situation. The features indicated could be a visual aspect such as a written symbol, word, sentence, a part of the room, or a material object in the setting. Gestures with hands, fingers and/or arms in motion confer the dynamics of movement, associated with action and progression in time. When outlining the temporal conditions of musical directionality, a horizontal line pointed out by the instructor moving her index finger in the air in front her denotes tempo in an accentuated, visual way. The index finger has the potential for being a resource for precisely this crucial aspect. Words do not lend themselves to such a demonstrative understanding. However, words fulfilled the function of clarifying the gestural acts when a detailed commentary was produced.

When I talked to Amy immediately after her teaching session with Diana, she explained how she had experienced Diana's first song attempt. She illustrated the musical time flow that she found quite fast: "when you at last heard her sing like for the first time then one heard that it was quite fast" (Sw. *när man väl hörde henne sjunga allså så för första gången då hörde man att det gick rätt så snabbt*) and put her right index finger simultaneously in the air, drawing a fast-moving horizontal line with it. We can recall Diana's use of her pointing on the screen, reported in chapter 7.1, and consider how she used her index finger on the screen, moving along the lyrics that metaphorically move forward through time. To clarify the musical problem, Diana worked instructively by a number of different semiotic means. Here she continues to assign the previously discussed pause and audio-visual gesture with her fingers: the rhythmical snapping as a clarifying fill-in. She continued with both hands as an illustrating gesture, visually depicting the musical interspace that she obviously regarded to be crucial for the learning process.

Deictic signs work not only to highlight time but also to highlight material objects talked about. When acting out his frustration with the difficulties in the learning task commanded, Michael chose to design this expression with a brutal knock on his text sheet placed on his knee:

```
PM:121–123 JA HAR SVÅRT ATT LÄRA MEJ SÅNT
           (Paul undervisar Michael)
```

```
        I THINK IT'S HARD LEARNING THINGS LIKE THAT

        (Paul is teaching Michael)


121 P:   den var lite mer (.) klurig att lära sig=

        it was a bit more (.) tricky learning=


122 M:   =ja den var mycke klurig för mej ja har svårt att lära mej

        sånt ((bankar hårt på pappret)) ändå

        =yeah it was very tricky for me I think it's hard learning things

        like that ((hits the paper roughly)) still


123 P:   ska vi testa u- utan ((lägger undan sitt papper)) så kan

        vi göra så (.)

        shall we test wi- without ((puts his paper down))so we can do

        like this (.)
```

The words he uttered when knocking so aggravatingly (line 122) were "things like that" (Sw. *sånt*). When marking out this emphatically with a demonstrative embodied gesture, he hinted more specifically at what was actually the problem, as he experienced the situation. The problem here and throughout their encounter, as they talked about it, was exactly this: how to learn the tonal melody with a text paper that did not meet Michael's particular needs.

Another example of deictic hand and finger work is when Diana does her pedagogical evaluation of Amy's singing. The screen is the artifact of vital importance here and the printed text on it serves as their common reference tool. That is the reason for talking in terms of "here" and "there":

```
DA:121-124 DE HÄR (Diana undervisar Amy)

            THESE (Diana is teaching Amy)


121 D:   =°mm° (.) men allså (.) du sjunger lite långsamt här

        ((pekar på skärmen))(.)här ((pekar))

        =°mm° (.) but you sing (.) sort of a bit slow here ((points at

        the screen)) (.) here ((points))


122 A:   där tycker ja ((pekar också på samma ställe på skärmen))

        (.) att ja e sådär men just de där

        there I think ((also points at the same spot on the screen)) that

        I am a bit but just those
```

```
123 D:      de här ((pekar och gör en understrykande gest med fingret
            på skärmen))
            these ((points and does an underlining gesture with her finger on
            the screen))


124 A:      "och doppar skorporna på Kaffe Sjuan" ((pekar)) där (.)
            hänger jag liksom inte riktigt me
            "an' dippin' the biscuits in Café Seven" ((points)) there (.) I´m not
            like really with you
```

Pointing at a fixed text on the screen, as was done during each of their utterances illustrated above, means the learning potential for recalling the preceding activity, Amy's singing. Following this, they engaged in evaluative meta-talk, pointing out their reasoning visually. Hence, pointing at several fragments of the songtext enabled them both to give their attention to what they were talking about more precisely. This seemed to be necessary if they were to succeed in producing a dialogical, verbal evaluation together.

7.5.4 Emotive gestures

Emotive gestures are also found, that is, communicative responses embodied in facial expressions, putting emotive attitudes into action. A clarifying note on the link between these type of signs and cultural tools is needed. The heading of the chapter (7) is "Teaching with cultural tools". At a first glance, the concept *emotive gestures* might seem like acts of pure individual emotions. However, in this thesis the methodological stance is to analyse the participants' overt expressions; how they communicate about music and learning. That is not to say that personal emotions are excluded at the ontological level. On the contrary, emotions are seen as both important and constitutive for learning, but here I confine my reasoning to how emotive attitudes are a part of communication in social interactions; the overt signing that occurs between the children. Hence, emotive gestures are not conceived of as strictly individual units of analysis here, telling us something speculative about what the participants actually feel deep inside, 'beneath the surface', in isolation and so on. Rather, they are semiotic tools, bringing in emotive issues to social events and, consequently, serving to supplement or support verbal communication. As such, they are also mediating tools and, according to my theoretical arguments reported earlier, they too emerge from our social and cultural world. Bodily gestures are all embodied cultural expressions in

interpersonal dialogues, in contrast to materialized cultural expressions in inscriptions such as books, computers and the like.

Emotive gestures are relevant when probing deeper into social psychological aspects of social interaction. When building trust and intersubjectivity, the participants often used emotive attitudes with their bodies in interaction. It was found that smiles were a relatively usual sign from the apprentice, when trying to talk about difficulties within the task. I discuss this in terms of a paradox because it might seem paradoxical to smile instead of showing frustration or sadness in these situations. However, the children examined mitigated the critical junctures whilst verbally indicating the learning problems they were experiencing. Arguably, they were claiming a kind of mercy when doing so: they admitted a personal mistake or an obvious demerit, while at the same time wanting the leader to cope with the new fact with empathy. That is a way to cooperate dialogically, realizing the role of the other in challenging moments. This has also to do with the interpersonal sensitivity inbuilt in teacher – pupil relations like these. As earlier stated, such relations are asymmetrical in nature, making the subordinated child vulnerable.

Four types of communicative situations with smiles are further identified. The pupil employs them when talking about personal learning problems, when expressing happiness and pride, pointing out the teacher's mistakes/ inaccuracies, or due to a task-related achievement. Below are examples of how smiles can be accompanied by talk-exchanges of the former kind, telling something about the learning problem, in front of the other. Let us reflect on how Michael uses such facial expression when addressing this issue:

```
PM:94-97    USCH ☺ DEN E JU SÅ SVÅR ☺ (Paul undervisar Michael)
            UCK ☺ WELL IT´S SO HARD ☺ (Paul is teaching Michael)


94 P:       vill du försöka utantill nu:
            d'you want to try it off by heart now:


95 M:       usch ☺ den e ju så (.) s:vår ☺
            uck ☺ well it´s so (.) ha:rd ☺


96          ”Jag är en liten mygga /…/ om du vill veta *var* hobby
            som ingen *annan h-*”
            ”I am a little gnat /…/ if you want to know *where* hobby that
            no *one else ha-*”
```

```
97          ☺ ((stort leende)) ah ja klarar de inte ((tar ned
            pappret))ja har så svårt för melodin just den e liksom
            lite klurig (2.5)
            ☺ ((big smile)) ah I can't do it ((takes down his paper)) I think
            the tu:ne's so hard(1.0)it's a bit tricky like (2.5)
```

Michael repeatedly combines explicit messages addressing the difficulty of
learning the intended melody (line 95 and 97). In both utterances he signs with
a smile as a facial expression, adding multiple meanings to what has been said.
As mentioned in the introductory lines of this section, it is possible to interpret
such a turn design as a mitigating message; to embed the statement of a hard
and sensitive fact (about a failure in achievement) with a pleading gesture. To
smile at critical junctures has a social psychological meaning. Paul practises
the same type of signing in his dialogue with his instructor, Diana. The episode
is about Diana's request for improvement following Paul's attempt at singing.
She now urges him to pay more attention to the correct words in the lyrics:

```
DP:155-160 DE E ALLTID LITE SMÅ DETALJER MAN GLÖMMER ☺
           (Diana undervisar Paul)
           THERE'S ALWAYS A FEW LITTLE DETAILS YOU FORGET ☺
           (Diana is teaching Paul)


155 D:     (.)de var bra i slutet(.)du kan hela refrängen å "mitt
           hjärta sjunger trall dill dill" å SÅ:
           (.) it was good at the end (.)you know the whole chorus an-
           "my heart is singin' trall dill dill" an- THEN:


156        .h men du mås- å:: du måste tänka "nu sitter vi DÄR"
           ((knäpper och pekar demonstrativt med pekfingret))
           .h but you must a::n' you must think "now we're sittin' THERE"
           ((clicks and points demonstratively with her index finger))


157 P:     [((nickar några gånger))]
           [ ((nods a few times)) ]


158 D:     [  inte "nu sitter vi  ] HÄR" ((vänder sig mot bordet,
           niger snabbt, visar med båda händerna var "här" finns ))
           men "nu sitter vi DÄR" ((visar "där" med händerna och
           kroppen))(.)
```

```
            [not "now we sit ] HERE" ((turns to the table, curtsies quickly, shows

            with her both hands where "here" is located))but "now we're sittin'

            THERE" ((shows "there" with her hands and her body))(.)
```

```
159         fattar du:

            d´ya understand:
```

```
160  P:     ja ((nickar)) ja kan försöka (.) de e alltid lite små

            detaljer man glömmer ☺

            yeah ((nods)) I can try (.) there's always a few little details

            you forget ☺
```

Here Paul responds willingly to the request to try again with a more correct song version. In line 160 he puts his own words to the musical problem seen by Diana, thus reformulating it and, notably, adding a smile at the end. His mistake now appears less crucial and his words "a few little details you forget" (Sw. *lite små detaljer man glömmer*) minimize the critical moment in that direction too. Paul says "man" in the original Swedish language, which signs a distance to himself and his verbalized trouble. In the English translation this word meaning is not so clear. Here "man" is translated to "you" instead of "one". The latter (to choose "one" instead of "you") would be "a few little details *one* forget".

Smiles were also frequently used in situations in which the speaker, especially the apprentice, preferred to express happiness or pride with reference to a successful achievement. Such an outcome can be communicated like this:

```
DP:94-97    JA SÅ VA DE

            YEAH THAT'S RIGHT
```

```
94  D:      (.) mm men man ska sjunga såhär (3.0) >°"Hör hur mitt

            hjärta sjunger"°< ((intensifierad blick och samtidig

            handgest))

            [< "trall dill dill">]

            (.) mm but we should sing like this (3.0) >°"Hear how my heart

            is singin'"°< ((intensified gaze and simultaneous hand gesture))

            [< "trall dill dill">]
```

```
95 P:      [<"TRALL DILL DILL>   ]

           [ <"TRALL DILL DILL>   ]


96 D:      ja så va de
           yeah that's right


97 P:      ☺
```

Again it is Diana who instructs Paul to sing the song words with precision.
When she is pleased with Paul's efforts (according to her utterance, line 96),
he responds with a smile on his face, without a word (line 97). The smile
replaces a verbal comment here. We can also see how Amy, in her pupil role,
signals pride when talking about her specific ability in the current song:

```
DA:75-79   RÄTT SÅ BRA FAKTISKT ☺
           QUITE GOOD AKCHULLY ☺


75 A:      vill (.) du verkligen alltså just det hä:r ((pekar på
           skärmen)) (2.5) det sista[där ]
           would ya (.) rea:lly like then just thi:s((points at the screen))
           (2.5) the last [there]


76 D:                      [ mm ]


77 A:      (.) de: kan ja=
           (.) tha:t I know=


78 D:      =ah
           =ah


79 A:      *rätt så* bra faktiskt ☺ ((stort leende))
           *quite* good akchully ☺ ((big smile))
```

Line 79 tells us that Amy contributes with a happy, proud message, embedded
in a verbal and gestural design. Sometimes the pupil takes the initiative to
correct the teacher. In the following it is Paul, now pupil, who recurrently
directs his teacher Diana to her previous acts:

DP:22-34   EH ☺ JA TYCKER DU TAR LITE FÖR LÅNGA MENINGAR
          (Diana undervisar Paul)
          EH ☺ I THINK YOU TAKE A BIT TOO LONG SENTENCES
          (Diana is teaching Paul)

22 D: ="<u>och alla så ropar vi i kör att Dagny kom hit och</u>
          <u>spill</u>"
          <u>="and all of us together shout that Dagny came here and spilt"</u>

23   (2.5)

24 P: e:::h ☺ (0.5) ja tycker du tar lite (.) för <u>lå</u>nga
          meningar
          e:::h ☺ (0.5) I think you take a bit too <u>long</u> sentences

25 D: okej_: då börjar vi såhär då "<u>Inte viss::te</u>"
          "Inte visste vi vad kärlek var"
          okay_: we start like <u>this</u> then "We didn´t kno::w"
          "We didn´t know what love was"

26 P: "Inte visste vi vad kärlek va:<u>r:</u>"
          "We didn´t know was love wa:<u>s:</u>"

27 D: "förrän lilla Dagny kom till sta:<u>n:</u>"
          "'til little Dagny came to to:wn<u>:</u>"

28 P: "förrän lilla Dagny kom till sta:<u>n:</u>"
          "'til little Dagny came to to:wn<u>:</u>"

29   (0.5)

30 D: .h "och <u>alla</u> så ropar vi i kör att"
          .h "and <u>all</u> of us together shout that"

31   (2.0)

32 P: v- sa du<u>:</u> hh ☺ (1.5) men va inte de=
          wh- did you<u>:</u> hh ☺ (1.5) but wasn´t that=

```
33 D:      vänta ((gestikulerar)).h (.)
           wait ((gesticulates)) .h (.)


34         "Inte visste vi vad kärlek va:r:"
           "We didn´t know what love wa:s:"
```

As demonstrated in this excerpt, Paul's critical interjection is followed by a warm expression, a smile, on two occasions (line 24 and 32). Arguably, these are very sensitive utterances caused by the underlying asymmetric interaction order in which the teacher is the one who is expected to come up with questionings and critique. Anyhow, in the sequence above, Paul had the courage to point out both his need of shorter sentences to imitate (24) and a mistake that he noticed from Diana (30–32). It is understandable that he had to embed these remarks in a warm friendly gesture; bringing ease to the temporary situation Diana was exposed to.

The last type of smile noticed was one given by the teacher. It was produced when s/he was pleased with the pupil's musical skill, as in this case in which Diana teaches Amy towards the end of their learning task:

```
DA:219-221 JA ☺ DU KAN DEN JÄTTEBRA
           (Diana undervisar Amy)
           YEAH ☺ YOU KNOW IT REALLY WELL
           (Diana is teaching Amy)


219        (.) mm ett två tre .h ((i takt))
           (.) mm one two three .h ((in time))


220 A:     "Inte visste vi /…/ trall dill dill" ☺ ((hon skrattar och
           tittar på D.))
           "We didn´t know /…/ trall dill dill" ☺ ((she laughs and looks at D.))


221 D:     ja ☺ du kan den (.) jättebra ((slår ut med armarna))
           yeah ☺ you know it (.) really well ((waving with her arms))
```

Diana underlines her positive response to Amy's song achievement in several ways in line 221, both in words and gestures – a smile, which is reinforced by arm gestures. She also responds to Amy's preceding signs. Here Amy displays to her that she is satisfied with her singing efforts, laughing and smiling appealingly, and looking intensely at Diana for an affirming response.

Conclusions

This chapter contains a discussion of the relations between earlier research findings described in chapters 2 and 3, theoretical notions in chapter 4, and the empirical results presented in chapters 6 and 7. It is a conclusive discussion focusing on dialogical and cultural dimensions in (music) teaching, as actualized through my interactional data and theorists' contributions to the field of education. It is now appropriate to go beyond the strictly empirical level of the two preceding chapters in which I scrutinized the children's pedagogical communication. Although the analyses of the interactional data constitute the main results of this study, I want to give them a new, interpretative voice in accordance with my own theoretical outlook. That is why the epistemological discussion of dialogism is again explicitly on the agenda. The aim of this result chapter is also to contextualize my empirical results with the help of relevant research, for example, pedagogical research traditions.

The chapter is divided into four thematic parts. The first (8.1) outlines main characteristics of a dialogical outlook that holds a counter-position to traditional, monologist views of social science. Here I analyse the dialogicality that appears in the children's music-oriented teaching and learning processes. In the second part (8.2), the focus is on the role of culture, here elaborating on the participants' orientation to culturally established values and conventions. The third part (8.3) continues to describe another type of finding that is also related to existing collective knowledge: cultural tools and how they are used as mediating resources for learning and instruction. Finally, to draw these

points together, section 8.4 reflects on the contributions of the present study, as a kind of summary at a meta-level: 8.4.1 provides a summary of my findings and 8.4.2 suggests didactical, theoretical and methodological implications.

8.1 DIALOGICALITY IN SIGNING AND SINGING

The predominant research tradition in monologism tends to imply an analytical clash between subjectivism and objectivism (Linell, 2009). Linell describes the dialogical antidote to this, the attempt to overcome the clash described. The insistence on *other-orientation* and intersubjectivity is one such dialogical approach (cf. Bengtsson, 2001, and Cornejo, 2008, who also discuss the problematic dualism that Linell refers to, opting for an intersubjective, dialogical stance from a phenomenological life-world perspective). However, other-orientation has two sides, according to Linell: on the one hand, commonality, consensus, unity and sharedness with others (intersubjectivity), on the other, alterity (cf. Bakhtin, 1986; Derrida, 1981; Lévinas, 1969, Säfström, 2005; Todd, 2008). In contrast to intersubjectivity, alterity connotes difference, multiplicity of meanings, strangeness and open-endedness. The latter is about how to face the Other: someone who is by definition in an alienated relation to the self, thereby providing new perspectives – to make a difference. To be the Other as a teacher, embodying the 'strangeness' in relation to a pupil/student, might consequently imply important learning potentials (and, of course, also the other way around, i.e. students in relation to teachers). Thus, it seems reasonable to argue for *alterity* as equally significant as *intersubjectivity* in learning encounters. Both sides of other-orientation usually exist in social relations as learning dimensions, but so far has educational research mostly emphasized the significance of intersubjectivity (if focusing on other-orientation at all). We clearly need intersubjectivity in order to reach mutual understanding in the teaching situations, but we also need to *transform* such understandings in order to reach productive and creative learning, that is, to explore new perspectives and experiences in and through each other.

The children clearly build intersubjective meanings when they engage in responsive dialogues, face-to-face. Before continuing the reasoning here I need to say that ontologically speaking, intersubjectivity cannot be reduced to only the mental interpersonal aspect. It is a social phenomenon that is also about a co-existential dimension between people, and is thus not easily translated into narrow aspects of dialogicality (cf. Aspelin, 2010; Bengtsson, 2001, 2004; Crossley, 1996, and Linell, 2014, who accordingly prefers

to speak about "intersubjectivities"). But, in order to point at one kind of intersubjectivity empirically manifested in the excerpts, I shall here pay attention to intersubjectivity in the meaning shared understanding, confined to reasoning and thinking. In human communication some intersubjectivity is necessary in order to build an interpersonal dialogue, which means that some (partial) amount of shared understanding and common knowledge is presupposed (cf. Rommetveit, 1974). When Amy (the pupil) agrees with what her teacher means when pointing to a written sentence on the screen, and responsively points to the same line, adding a verbal qualification in the same direction ("there I think"), a temporary intersubjectivity in shared understanding is established between them (see excerpt DA: 121–124 in section 7.5.3). In the example referred to, we can also see an example of how *responsive understanding* is intertwined with the dynamics of intersubjectivity here. Such sequences abound in my data.

While stressing the notion of alterity in social learning, one more note is needed on the potential for learning with such an emphasis on other-orientedness, in order to discuss an empirical example. Linell (2009), Rommetveit (1998) and Marková (2003) reason that the lack of complete consensus often keeps the dialogue going, and that even misunderstandings in social interaction can be fruitful and generate new understandings at the individual level. At the common, interpersonal, level it can in fact promote intersubjectivity in the long run. Facing the strange or conflicting opinions or expressions of the other, mutual understanding can be reached after the partner's interpretative act of expanding and deepening the speaker's meaning. As I understand Linell's discussion, alterity might in this way imply intersubjective *transcending*, enabling transformative learning, as I have mentioned above.

One example of alterity in teaching can be illustrated by the transcription extract between Paul (the teacher) and Michael, who came to a critical point in understanding and reasoning. The displayed gap in shared understanding challenged them both in a productive way, as described in section 7.4. The learning issue at stake was how to express musicality with "feeling" (Sw. *inlevelse*) and sensitivity. To the boy in the teacher role the concept of "feeling" was unproblematic, and was used with ease because of his earlier experience of other music education (trumpet lessons and orchestral activities). He referred explicitly to this experience in this encounter with Paul. But for Michael who had never taken any lesson in music apart from school lessons, the request to sing with feeling was not immediately understood. He asked Paul how to sing the song in the expected way, forcing his partner to reflect on the meaning

of his particular concept ("feeling"). I render Paul's pedagogical exhortation to sing with feeling to indicate that it was his idea to introduce the notion of musical phrasing; how to end up musically with the song phrase (he refers to what musicians call *avfrasering* in Sw.). This implies singing in a very soft and nuanced manner. Although it seems to be a technical aspect of accentuation and articulation, it is a common idea in the musical world to associate this particular kind of expressivity with feeling – to enact the music emotionally:

```
PM:158-162 (see PM:152-162 in section 7.4)
```

```
158 P:   tänk eh lite mer såhär "Jag är en liten mygga:: och Hubert
         heter ja::" ((sjunger mjukt på ett övertydligt vis med
         betonade och förlängda avfraseringar samt en hand som i
         rörelse illustrerar denna utdragna mjuka musikaliska
         egenskap))
         think eh a bit more like this "I am a little gna::t and Hubert
         is my na::me"((sings softly in a demonstrative style with marked
         and extended end-phrases, and a hand in motion that also illustrates
         this soft, musical feature))

159      man kanske (.) ska lägga till lite ex::tr- man ska sjunga
         lite mer finare kan man väl säga
         p'rhaps (.) we should add a bit e::xtr- we should sing a bit more
         fancier: we could say eh

160 M:   menar du så är inte de som att de ska låta lite bättre
         eller
         d'ya mean li::ke, well isn't that like it can sound a bit better or

161 P:   ja men de behöver vi egentligen inte bry oss om
         yeah but we don´t really have to bother about that

162 M:   sant (.) "Jag är en liten mygg-"
         true (.) "I am a little gnat-"
```

Here Paul's understanding, informed by earlier encounters with music teachers, met Michael's understanding, and his ignorance of this particular form of musical convention, but in the end this turned out to be fruitful

problematization (see above on Rommetveit). It "forced" them to probe deeper into the situated musical learning, and led to the joint effort to problematize dialogically. "Perhaps we should add a bit extra we should sing a bit more fancier we could say eh?", Paul adds after demonstrating the song with bodily gestures (158–159). Michael replies, again querying the actual meaning: "d'ya mean like, well isn't that like it can sound a bit better or?" (160). The whole sequence of alterity in understanding and reasoning ended up in intersubjective agreement (161–162). They decided explicitly to leave the topic and started to sing instead. The knowledge gap was perhaps too wide to resolve at that particular moment, but together they had now reached a new incipient understanding of the problem and of the musical concept introduced by Paul. Such meta-communication, and meta-cognition, constitutes a new learning potential. Without facing the other's alternative reasoning, learning to think and act through alterity would, by definition, be impossible.

Sense making in teaching and learning does not occur in a vacuum. Meanings are made in situated discourse and are brought to life in situations (Linell, 2009). The participants in the current study build meaning, reasoning and understanding from cultural objects and social phenomena imbued with knowledge and values, as they are experienced in distinct contexts. Hence, they are both tool-dependent and activity-dependent (more precisely interdependent with the communicative activity type, as I shall return to below). As Linell (1998, 2009, 2010a, 2011a, 2014) proposes (cf. Säljö, 2000, 2005, 2011a), there exists an intricate interdependence between acts and activities: a co-constitution of acts and activities. Communicative activities are tied to situation types, and this involves dialogical sense making as well. In this thesis, talking, gestures, practical work and thinking are all conceived as actions, and, consequently, all participants are seen as actors with agency. Although their agency is confined within the situated task-related constraints, the children still have agency to act and interact in sense making and promote their knowledge development in social and musical ways. To invoke meanings in situated dialogues is thus not about creating entirely new meanings on the spot. Sense making is also something that profoundly concerns trust, emotions, the exchange of perspectives and role-taking. Social psychological dimensions are thus arguably realized in teaching social interaction.

To continue with Bruner's (1996), among others, statement that emotions are included on a very substantial level in the formal education systems, and Aspelin's (1999a, 1999b, 2006) recognition of emotional sense making in the knowledge construction in classrooms, let us look at my interactional

data again. In my transcriptions emotional attitudes are often indicated by signs from the digital chat-culture (i.e. "emoticons"). Some of the children's facial expressions: are denoted by ☺ when they smile moderately but in written words (as a comment) if the smile is very big, and when they express sadness, this is denoted by ☹. There are only a few sad faces ☹ in the whole corpus, but smiles (☺) and laughter are ubiquitous. My conclusion is that they encouraged each other with supporting, positive signs in this way. The social quality of their interpersonal meeting might be of central importance to them when carrying out a lengthy, demanding activity and trying to accomplish the task given to them. Moreover, the smiles expressed are usually indicative of other phenomena at the micro-genetic level, the interpersonal level of dialogic learning. It seemed as if they showed sensitivity to each other when coming to critical, sensitive talk about their self-presentations, for example, when they indicated feelings of incompetence and shame.

This leads me to Aspelin's (1999a, b, 2006) notion (from Thomas Scheff) of showing shame and pride in teacher-pupil relations in which the social bonds are constantly challenged (cf. Johansson & Lalander, p. 54ff., 2013). The bonds between them are fragile in that sense. To feel, and to express, shame and pride is regarded to be the two paramount basic emotions in the educational context that centre on pupils abilities and evaluations, Aspelin claims. Diana told me after her teacher-work with Paul that she was so proud when she noticed how she had helped Paul to sing the song successfully. That was one of the best parts of being a "trainer", "a music-teacher", according to her. Aspelin also suggests that such transitory, socially constituted emotions become embodied in bodily gestures rather than clarified in words. This may seem somewhat paradoxical given my analytical statement about linking dialogical smiles to the expression of shame and incompetence, but that is how it mostly worked in the dialogues I have analysed. They smile when they seem to be expressing pride too, for instance, after singing in a way that was regarded as successful by themselves, their teacher or by both. They also usually smiled communicatively in the recurrent transition-spaces between talk about music and singing, thus signalling that they were ready to continue the activity and sing.

Smiles may also accompany difficulties and embarrassment. Let us again take a glance at Michael's smiles, as displayed in the example PM: 94–101 in section 7.1. Here, the episode is prefaced by discussions about Michael's pointing to the intricate musical problem of how to learn to sing the pitches in the song melody. It has been the occasioned object of learning for a long time throughout the conversation. Facing Paul's, the teacher's, request to try and

sing it without looking at the text, he expresses here a notable ambivalence in his multi-semiotic turn design: "uck ☺ well it's so hard ☺" (*usch ☺ den e ju så svår ☺* in Sw.). The smiles mitigate the negative words he obviously feels a need to deliver, perhaps both for himself and for the persistent teacher in front of him. Sensitive messages about experienced mistakes or problems need trust in the relationship with the other. In the interview with Michael after his performance together with Paul, he explained his emotional frustration with the recurrent feeling of not succeeding with the issue of singing the correct melody, and how he wanted to succeed better in the next try.

Another finding that corroborates this is how the spoken messages of criticism were delivered: often with a weaker voice-volume or with a rush-through, also mitigating the most critical aspects to the other. Altogether, the children examined here demonstrated abilities in subtle social psychological inter-acts. They did not only talk and sign in order to enhance the musical knowledge demands in the strictest sense. Instead, they gave each other a lot of support and helped to build social relations simultaneously, expressed in subtle social ways that call for in-depth analyses of their pedagogical actions on the micro- and meso-levels. The microanalyses of the multi-faceted communication, the attention to multi-functionality and multi-semiotics in the detailed transcriptional work, generated pedagogical understandings from a social psychological (and culture-psychological) perspective. Such alignment concerning the complex multi-vocality in human communication is consonant with the dialogical reasoning of Bakhtin (1986), Jovchelovitch (2007), Linell (1998, 2009, 2011a), Marková (2003) and Rommetveit (1974, 2008), Säljö (2005) and Wertsch (1998), among others.

Further, communication has to build on many aspects of trust, according to Linell (2009, 2014). We rely on others, and that may be seen as another dialogical aspect of the other-orientedness described above, and the conflated interdependence as well. Trust and intersubjectivity (sharedness) are linked together because we often take the shared background knowledge about the world and specific topics for granted. Epistemic trust in institutional knowledge development builds on interpersonal trust (Lilja, 2013; Zittoun, 2014), and learning is thus a risky undertaking in a social psychological sense (Aspelin, 1999a, 1999b, 2005, 2006; Evensen, 2014; Herbert, 2010). I have earlier referred to the children's *emotive gestures* found. They illustrate how decisive emotions are at stake in the evaluative pedagogical dialogues; the intricate relation between emotional trust and interpersonal teaching (and learning).

In the remainder of this section I shall elaborate on *the double dialogi-cality* as displayed in the young participants' acts of knowing. To recall Linell's (2009) concept of double dialogicality, it has to do with the twofold dimension of the dialogues in specific situations as well as sociocultural practices (i.e. traditions, cultures): the one on the local, situated and interpersonal level, and the other with socio-historical (and sociocultural) praxis. That means, in the-oretical terms, a combination of interactionism and social (socio-historical) constructionism (Linell, 2009, p. 52). Accordingly, the children not only orient to each other's signing and singing acts in their pedagogical practice, but also to knowledge, conventions and norms of music-life in society and formalized, institutional pedagogy from school-life. Such conventionalized knowledge is based on social practice with a socio-historical and sociocultural connotation.

The notion of *act-activity interdependence* has to be recognized here. People's acts are fundamentally intertwined with activity, or activities. Such a relational statement is also pertinent to the notion of *activity-sustained co-herence* in the participants' talk rather than *topic-sustained coherence* (i.e. building the conversational issues, the CPs, on the particular activity type, the CAT). Further, this kind of orientation in talk has to do with the co-construc-tion of the *monotopical episodes* that characterized the children's pedagogical conversations (in contrast to *polytopical episodes,* which entail several topical themes within the bounded talk-sequence). That means they had specific goals for their interaction and topics on their agenda, trying to stay on ho-mogeneous topic spaces (bounded sequences with the same topic discussed). For example, the children in this study demonstrated a coherent focus on preparing and evaluating the apprentice's song performances (i.e. the core activity within their main activities). The actual song then, and how to learn it, was strictly the conversational agenda. If they lost their focus for a little while, as when solving unexpected practical problems, they quickly moved back to their activity-specific communicative project (the introduced CP). Their recurring procedures of spoken counting before singing the songs also illustrate this principle. They did not thematize why their counted, or talked about their counting; it was not a topic as such in their dialogues. Instead they did count interactionally due to the pedagogical routine practised – the ori-entation to a music convention and a pedagogic convention in music learning as well. Monotopical episodes are especially common in institutional activity types (Linell, 1998, p. 190).

I shall now try to clarify the theoretical idea of double dialogicality (as reported in chapter 4.2). In short, the children examined based their sense

making on the particular situation definition. It was evident that the situation definition was built upon sociocultural resources from the context of the school culture. The activity analysis in chapter 6 describes that in detail. Hence, 'the music lesson' in the traditional school culture seemed to guide their sense making and knowledge development.

When facing the research-designed challenge to organize a pedagogical, task-oriented activity (to teach each other songs in dyadic constellations), the children needed cultural resources from their institutional pedagogical life-experiences: the school-life. They also had a shared understanding of what it means to participate in (musical) schooling. And as peers in the same school they had a common, implied reference. That is, they could build on experiences of how to carry out instruction in school-lessons and how to enact the social roles as pupils. They were aware of their teacher's conventional behaviour too. However, the children studied did not explicitly mention anything about their school, or the music teacher, but that fact does not exclude the idea that they implicitly trade on schooling as a meaning making framework. The situation definition was realized in the social interactions, and implied reference to a particular CAT – the institutional activity of singing instruction and learning, that is, usually contained in lessons in music as a regular school subject.

8.2 THE REPRODUCTION OF SCHOOLING

By way of introduction to this section, to recall the social premises for pedagogical activities means to recall cultural resources as well. In the case of the children studied, institutional rules mediated social structures and educational principles that they transformed into their local, situated context (the given task). To recontextualize and resituate as in this transformative sense is to draw on a creative social dynamic (Säljö 2005, 2011a; Sawyer, 2004, 2006; Vygotsky, 1925/1971, 1930/2004). That leads us to "the double dialogicality" (Linell, 1998, 2003, 2009, 2011a, 2014) again; the point at which to examine the relation between the sense-makers at the embodied level, their interactional co-construction of knowledge, meaning and attitudes, and the socio-historical dimension over time. This could be discussed in relation to Bernstein's theorizing about the social construction of *the pedagogic discourse* (PD).

Bernstein (1990) reports how paramount it is in educational systems to produce a particular social order. In fact, it is so fundamentally central that the discourse of social order often dominates the discourse of competence (the transmission of knowledge skills from teachers to pupils, as he puts it).

That can explain how crucial it was for the children in the present study to reproduce an asymmetric interaction order: the social rules that inform the teacher and pupil roles (to co-produce the certain type of interaction in the classrooms). Moreover, Bernstein distinguishes between these two types of cultural discourses being recontextualized in formal pedagogical systems and, hence, containing the specific pedagogic discourse. Pedagogic discourse relies on rules of specialized communication that emphasize continuous evaluations and measurement procedures in the pedagogic practice, he states (cf. Aspelin, 2012; Bergqvist, 2010, 2012; Biesta, 2009a; Ericsson & Lindgren, 2010; Liedman, 2011; Mehan, 1979; Säljö 2000, 2005). As the children under investigation demonstrated too, *evaluation* was one of the most salient sub-activities within the task-oriented encounters.

According to this evaluative aspect, they organized their whole activity-structure in all sessions in a similar manner. That is, the core activity of performing a song as a "pupil" in front of the "teacher" was always followed up by an evaluation routine (i.e. an assessment sequence). The evaluation procedures were also very consistent regarding the type of critique and approval shown by the instructor. The ambition to work for improvement, enabling the pupils to amend the articulated musical problems, was thus a guiding principle in their joint tasks. They also displayed a systematic preference for a specific form of critical remark: "teachers" used a rhetorical device in their critical utterances in which the problematic gist of their messages was prefaced by explicit approval. Here we see one more example of how they mitigated socially sensitive topics, in this case by embedding their critique within a positively loaded message. One more thing to note here is how the young participants' co-constructed social order amounts to a conventional teaching rule: to respect the norm of speaking rights (Cazden, 1988). The teacher is the one who is allowed to control the conversation in classroom teaching and also the one who has the right to take initiatives to talk and, moreover, to delegate talk in such a pedagogical setting. S/he is also the one who can monopolize the floor whilst urging the students to give focal attention to her or his utterances. The children in the present thesis followed this underlying social rule very strictly, always respecting the teacher's right to take verbal initiatives, to correct mistakes, and to judge the singing efforts. Hence, they all enacted the inscribed "speaking rights". This is also notable in relation to Bernstein's (1990) idea of the intimate link between pedagogic discourse and social order. Although the participants also oriented to a democratic discourse type sometimes, they did not step aside from their consistent

norm of an asymmetric division of communicative labour. There were a few, very short moments with episodes in a more symmetric peer genre, but as I have demonstrated earlier, they were very temporary in their nature. Those moments occurred when the intended activities were abruptly disturbed by practical problems.

To continue with communicative teaching patterns, let us again consider how Säljö (2005) depicts institutional language in relation to everyday language. In contrast to everyday language use, it is characteristic of an institutional language to use specialized terminology. Säljö describes how schoolwork aims at the appropriation of this specialized, abstract terminology with academic and scientific connotations (cf. Bruner, 2006; Vygotsky, 1994). The meanings of these academic and subject-specific concepts are a central part of the institutional activity itself, and the teachers often put a great amount of effort into guiding this learning process of appropriation. Further, Säljö (ibid.) describes how the institutional language use is linked to reflective reasoning, often with clarifying explications, in contrast to more spontaneously everyday talk (cf. Wells, 1999). The participants in the present study engaged in precisely such institutional talk. They co-produced reflective, explicated reasonings in pedagogic ways, also focusing on aids (cultural tools) as guiding help in these verbal interactions.

Bjørkvold's (1991), and Sundin's (1995), concern for children's more or less spontaneous expressivity when they enter school is also interesting from this point of view. It is the "process of disconnection" Bjørkvold (ibid.) finds critical: spontaneous play, peer talk, and the children's way of learning as well, are relegated to the short breaks between school working passes when they are old enough to participate in school-life. The transition from child culture to school culture is thus very problematic, in his view. In art subjects as music, it is therefore important for the beginners to meet a creative, spontaneous and energetic music teacher with abilities to improvise and build trustful relations. As I interpret Bjørkvold here he search for teacher abilities that might facilitate children's critical changeover between the informal children culture and the formal school culture. The pedagogic significance of interpersonal trust and improvisational dialogues has been discussed in the preceding sections (and, below I continue to discuss the issue of improvisational creativity in teaching).

To continue with implications of the institutional language use due to musical learning, there are music educational findings in which the authors argue that *scaffolding* by teachers serve the function to help apprentices appropriate adequate (i.e. institution-specific) language use and reasoning in

school. This is further analytically linked to the appropriation of *cultural tools* (Barrett, 2005; Hultberg, 2000, 2009; Pramling, 2009; Pramling Samuelsson et al., 2009, 2011; Pramling & Wallerstedt, 2009; Wallerstedt, Pramling & Säljö, 2013). It resonates with Kempe & West (2001), who demonstrate the music educational language in teacher-student interactions and the exclusive institution-specific teacher focus on the printed scores. In the musical education in comprehensive schools, musical concepts, musical instruments, musical conventions and traditions are examples of cultural tools. These appear as both physical and discursive tools and as a combination of these in inscriptions such as a keyboard with digital symbols, a sheet of paper with printed scores, or a computer screen with instructions how to create pop music.

Ericsson and Lindgren (2010) present an interesting outcome of their study in music classrooms at Swedish elementary schools. They noticed a clear tendency to emphasize pedagogic assignments and lesson activities that preoccupy the pupils in a system of academic rules rather than engaging them in how to achieve skills in musical creativity and music playing. The authors name this classroom phenomenon *the task culture* in elementary musical schooling. In relation to the remarks above about institutionalized music pedagogical communication, this is one more study that points in the same direction as other studies of schooling. The talk and activities in classrooms centre altogether on assignments, conceptual knowledge, evaluations and social order. Hence, subject-specific skills such as musical knowledge are not always in focus; a large part of the scheduled time in school is dedicated to other things. It has also been reported that Swedish late-modern school education quite frequently concerns the issue of organizing time and efficiency in productive ways (Bergqvist, 2001a, 2001b, 2010; Bergqvist & Säljö, 2004).

That implies a new type of discipline in practice – the imperative to build a self-disciplined pupil's identity (Bergqvist & Säljö, 2004). Bergqvist and Säljö contend that the common sense idea of the Swedish contemporary school culture is to liberate, rather than imposing an authoritarian teaching style on the pupils, who are supposed to make choices and plans in keeping with their own preferences and knowledge needs. What can be said here, on the basis of the empirical results presented in chapter 6 and 7, is that the children who participated in my research project were committed to the teaching idea of planning, structuring time, using self-discipline and encouraging the pupils to use it too, and also expressing reflective reasoning. The latter amounts to meta-awareness and meta-communication, also discussed in Bergqvist and Säljö's work. Bruner (1996) and Pramling (2006) also point

to this development of school culture: to develop meta-cognitive skills and learn to reflect over learning as such. It is no longer enough to learn the skills; the ability to think *about* the skills is now also presupposed. The children in this project demonstrated a very conspicuous ability in precisely this – to construct meta-reasoning about their own activities and to plan productive teaching and learning according to their intentions (and the premises set up initially by me as the research leader). As I have described in the result chapter, the young participants were strictly task-oriented and used a focused style of talking that did not make room for digressions about their everyday lives, their common friends, teachers or other conversational issues as peers. They clearly preferred to stay on task. It was their disciplined guiding orientation that was the mainstay of their social and organizational order, I would say. As the video-documentations reveal, they did not take a break for some other reasons either, for example, in order to drink a glass of water, make a phone-call, receive a phone-call, or even go to the bathroom.

Moreover, the social order was disciplined in a remarkable way, which did not allow disputes or conflicts that could have risked unsettling the structured role-play on the scene, relationally embedding the teacher – pupil asymmetries. Their joint foci were not only directed to the singing skills and fact constructions. Their attention was also directed to the consistent reproduction of formalized education-specific social structures. Hence the children helped me to get the gist of Bernstein's (1990) idea of pedagogic discourse, a significant part of which is constituted by the social order, meaning that the discourse tends to be socially constructed in institutional learning. Bernstein adds that those who reproduce legitimate knowledge *institutionalize the thinkable,* whilst those who *produce* legitimate knowledge *institutionalize the unthinkable*. Here he alludes to thinkable (i.e. conventional) versus unthinkable (i.e. unconventional) practices in educational systems, and concludes that institutional reproduction favours already established knowledge-skills. In contrast, to produce innovative thinking ("the unthinkable") is not so legitimate, but possible. I have written about this issue in section 3.2.

My empirical results resonate with Bernstein's reasoning. It was evident how the participants institutionalized the thinkable rather than the unthinkable, that is not to say that they did not invent concepts, symbols and acted with some imagination. But mostly the jointly constructed knowledge production fits a traditional style, not bringing out the most unexpected, unthinkable in ways of reasoning and learning as a whole. The children knew that I had been a music teacher before, and they shared knowledge of how the

school subject of music is approached in their school. That is, what kind of knowledge and attitudes is expected from the pupils, and what teacher style is legitimate and possible to draw on as organizing, structuring resources in their music-pedagogical activities. It was therefore reasonable for them to model their activities on formalized music-lessons, an established type of communicative activity. To institutionalize the thinkable rather than the unthinkable, with institutional guidelines, as in the case of my participants, also means to construct musical knowledge in a conventional style. So, in my present study, the children's dealing approach to the songs might be linked to Barrett (2006) who identified how children were guided by adult-norms when working creatively with institutional music (i.e. "re-creative practices" in contrast to what she denotes "creative practices"). In my investigation the children worked systematically with music in pieces: first narrowing down the whole songs in comprehensible pieces and then, through hard repetitive musical work, building together the memorized pieces into the song structure again. Such decontexualised approach to music has been a Western adult ideal for long (Kempe & West, 2001). Moreover, *echo singing* (to imitate each other's song phrases) is a very common musical activity in elementary schools, preschools and method texts (Flowers & Dunne-Sousa, 1990). Here, in my corpus of data, it was the apprentices who tried to echo their instructors' melodical phrases so exactly as possible, according to the instructor's ideas of how to sing them.

Now back to Bernstein again. Bernstein's conclusions of the thinkable vs. unthinkable in education are interesting in relation to Sawyer (2004) and Säljö (2000, 2005), who problematize text-based learning in school, based on a sociocultural approach. Sawyer prefers to view teaching as an improvisational performance: a disciplined improvisation. Here the role of what he terms *scripted teaching* is undermined. To behave like actors in a given theatre-play in a classroom, that is, to pre-plan the school-lessons in detail and follow the printed words strictly may be at the expense of the creativity, according to Sawyer's view of dialogic teaching. Sawyer points to the paradox in the new educational trend, that is, to facilitate creative classroom learning while opting for planning instead of a more improvisational social attitude as a teacher (cf. Sawyer, 2006, paying attention to a collaborative and improvisational group flow in interactional learning). With Bernstein, I can see how the legitimate tendency to institutionalize the thinkable is superior to the possibility of instutionalizing the unthinkable. That means to construct knowledge ideals and knowledge forms that somehow transcend the institutionalized pedagogical routine. As Sawyer (2004), Säljö (2000, 2005),

Ericsson and Lindgren (2010), and Bergqvist (1990, 2001a, 2001b, 2010, 2012), among others, remind us, there are underlying rules, and a specific style of talking, in the schooling discourse that produce some types of knowledge before others.

The four children investigated in this study preferred a fairly consistent prosaic communicative genre, in line with talk in general late-modern schooling. An interesting fact here is that they were encouraged to talk and interact voluntarily in the given tasks, and they were also expected to work with learning processes within an aesthetic activity: music. Furthermore, singing may be seen as a kind of poetic praxis if we see to how poetic lyrics are put into musical meaning. Anyhow, the children preferred to express themselves mostly in a non-poetic communicative genre. I can see a parallel here to Gee's critical analysis of school discourses. Gee (2012) is concerned with the Afro-American children who are not allowed to express themselves with expressive, interactional fantasy in the school-activity in story telling, although their home community has socialized them to express themselves in this way. This finding is of interest to me as well, even if I do not have Afro-American participants in my current research project. Gee distinguishes between a prosaic and a poetic discourse. The first one – the prosaic – was favoured by the schoolteacher. The black girl Leona's poetic way of talking in front of her classmates and her teacher was in fact highly creative and art-based in terms of Gee's linguistic analysis. He also argues that her ability to make up stories should be appreciated because such are needed in art subjects in the school-curriculum. She tried to add a lot of other expressions besides linguistic ones; she used poetic metaphors, involved visual demonstrations (instead of only describing words in the abstract), and engaged her audience intensely with gestures and an interactive talking style. All these creative abilities in language use were met by correction from her teacher, and Leona had to change her way of speaking radically in order to fit in and please the teacher's norm (cf. S. Heath, 1983, who also discusses the problems in school socialization and language use for some children who enter the school). Instead, Mindy, the white girl, was the good example to the teacher – the one who got a positive feedback. She followed the academic (prosaic) story telling-norm with ease, refraining from creative expressions and illustrations beside the linguistic means. She also refrained from poetic, figurative talk and chose to focus on illustrative facts in the more precise and prosaic style.

Following Gee (ibid.), I think it is appropriate to discuss the issue of creativity and language in school and, more specifically, in an art-based subject

such as music (cf. Folkestad, 2006, who problematizes formal vs. informal ways in musical learning). The children in my present study also clearly built on the academic, prosaic school-norm in their music teaching and learning. However, some attempts to break away from it can be recognized, as the situations with the toy-dog as a guiding artefact. But mostly, they used the prosaic Western discourse Gee points to, as a resource for their teaching activities. I have described the discursive features in the previous analytical sections. Here I shall only briefly recall the ability the children showed in organizing institutional schooling: to re-contextualize central features of the Swedish school discourse in their co-construction of music teaching.

The children also helped me to appreciate Bergqvist and Säljö's (2004) insight that children in contemporary Sweden can be skilled in meta-communicative and self-disciplined abilities (cf. Bergqvist, 2010, 2012; Bruner, 1996; Pramling, 2006; Säljö, 2005). These abilities could not have been conjured up on the spot in these situated encounters if they had not had experienced how to learn and teach each other the songs earlier. One of the four children had had trumpet lessons, and the others had experienced school music classes. They had no instructions from me about teaching, or how to take a school lesson, nor any guidelines for how to behave dialogically. Further, I had not selected them for the research project on the basis of any pre-given knowledge about their academic abilities in school, or in music. Neither did I have any criterion regarding what social class they should belong to. All I knew about in this respect was that the school they were from is placed in a village that had had a strong working-class tradition but where social classes are now mixed but still not predominantly middle-class.

In terms of communicative genres (CG's) (Linell, 1998, 2009; Luckmann, 2002), the three main genres noticed in my analysis of their ways of talking and expressing themselves were a pedagogical CG, a musical CG, and a peer CG. *The pedagogical CG* was central to the participants' communicative orientations, for example, when they itemized interaction (i.e. talked systematically about pedagogical items and structured the lesson-like sessions with explicit, agenda-bound items). *The musical CG* was perhaps most noticeable when enacted bodily in classical ways like beating time with their feet, or moving their hips rhythmically or breathing in a way to show the musical phrasing and, of course, their musical singing styles. One girl used her bodily positions musically too. She was sitting down in the verses, standing up in refrains and acting out the music through a wide range of bodily gestures. As a pedagogical correlate, the pedagogical CG was sometimes also expressed with bodily

positions as regulative functioning. In this genre some of the children were seated when talking about the learning issues and stood up as a sign to make a decisive activity shift (the transition-space described earlier between talking about music and singing). The multi-functional signing at these junctures could be described as dense. The children hence used signing for multiple purposes, for example, coordinating musical elements, coordinating activity phases, signalling encouragement, and indicating nextcoming actions. So, notably, the children's signing and singing acts were intimately intertwined in several ways (for a detailed description see paragraph 7).

The peer CG was only displayed when something unexpected suddenly happened to them. Practical surprises to deal with, as when the digital screen stopped working, or when they faced something extremely funny and burst out laughing. As I have reported in 6.3.4, there were such moments when the everyday framing of the social order returned temporarily, causing another type of talk; a more informal and childish social interaction in which they sometimes explicitly talked about their social roles and demonstrated a new dominance pattern. However, they had no difficulty in going back to their conventional interaction pattern with a structured, agenda-bound topic-flow with activity-sustained coherence rather than a topic-sustained coherence (for example, imposing text-based activities in the initial activity-phase, or following routinized conventions as talking in evaluative terms after the pupil's song performances). Moreover, in their conventional interaction style, with transactional talk, *communicative formality* was usually applied (see Linell, 2011a, and how I apply his definition in section 4.3.2). They addressed issues routinely to each other, based on recurrent pedagogical conventions in practice rather than adjusting to specific interactional micro-situations, as I have demonstrated especially in section 6.1 and 6.2. These sudden interruptions, caused by computer-problems, and the repercussions on the shift in the talking style is also of pedagogical relevance. As I have discussed in the section "Dialogic Teaching" (3.1), some educational scholars point at the importance of interruptions from habitual, routinized orders, improvisation and dialogic uncertainties, in order to facilitate creative 'new-thinking' in learning (Aspelin, 2005, 2014; Biesta, 2011; Saywer, 2004, 2006; von Wright, 2000). In the corpus of data in the present study, I have no opportunity to follow such an alternative, extended learning-trajectory. The participants were eager to quickly go back into their established main talk- and learning-style very quickly and, hence, my talk extracts of this type is clearly limited. Consequently, I cannot draw any conclusions of significance here.

It may be argued that the children's formal talk was responsive to the institutional way of conducting their dialogical encounters. One example is when the children who enacted the teacher/instructor role imposed a certain pedagogical practice; an assignment procedure not actually experienced as needed, or wanted, by the partner (the apprentice). Rather, such imposed assignments were conducted as routinized procedures that contributed to the preferred educational discourse type – the school-specific talk convention. With Ericsson and Lindgren's (2010) words, they constituted a typical "task-culture" in that respect.

8.3 TEACHING AND LEARNING WITH CULTURAL TOOLS

As already outlined, individuality, personality and expressive acts are profoundly rooted in both social and cultural circumstances. Personal skills have to be considered in dialogical terms, and abilities in art forms are no exception. Rather than being autonomous as human beings, we are fundamentally interdependent, as I have argued. As earlier pointed out, Linell (2009) suggests that *double dialogicality* is one of the most dialogical features to recognize. In the present work I have studied what kind of situated meaning making the young participants construct together. The findings imply a significant tendency to draw on schooling when performing singing as a music activity. They were also influenced by my instructions to engage in a pedagogical task. There are several ways of teaching each other songs, however, and the children preferred to act in accordance with a lesson-like school practice. Here the culturally established conventions of schooling framed the understanding and functioned as a mediating resource for the collaborative organization of the given task.

Vygotsky drew a distinction between two research approaches to art at his time: aesthetics from above vs. aesthetics from below. He searched for an alternative approach to these existing traditions in psychology: a social psychological approach, emphasizing the role of culture in learning and being. Consequently, art should be seen as intimately connected to all other spheres of social life. As a substitute for the mentalist philosophy that he criticized so emphatically (aesthetics from above), he did not view art as pure brainwork (cf. Smagorinsky, 2011, p. 324). Aesthetic pleasure was of a radically different nature. Art was also about embodiment, it performs with our bodies and through our bodies, he argued. My participants demonstrated this. They used their bodies creatively both in the singing and as instructional,

music pedagogical functioning in its signing multiplicity (see paragraph 7.5). To Vygotsky, the musical embodiment also embraced the power of the emotional, volitional and unconscious. They are all human powers that are experienced bodily. That does not mean isolating experiences from contexts and cultural norms. As Säljö (2011a) puts it, there is no unmediated, objective truth of knowledge.

Referring back to the cognitivist music studies of Brand (2000), Flowers (1984), Sundin's IQ-testing of children, and the idea of the natural developing child – "the maturational view" (Davidson & Scripp, 1989), Peretz et al. (2009) and their neurological reasoning about the "amusic brain", we may recall that they did not design their research to explore the children's interactional expressions, or the use of tools for learning, in relation to the actual musical challenges. If music learners are deprived of helping aids and communicative reasoning, the musical abilities will, as a corollary, yield quite a different picture. For example, when they asked children of about eight years of age to describe their various perceptions of music they had recently been "exposed to" in their own words (Flowers, ibid.), it seems that these authors ran into problematic aspects that affected the validity of their studies. Furthermore, they explicitly declared their ambition to map the children's "singing errors", "inaccuracies", "mistakes" (Brand, 2000; Flowers, 1984) and so on. In the present study, I did not share that ambition of mapping the children's singing errors or musical inaccuracies, according to presumed "mental organizations". They were told initially that I would instead look at how they achieved the task jointly, and how they preferred to learn and work with songs. I did not share the intention to put them in a situation where pure singing was at stake. I agree with Vygotsky (1925/1971) that there is no 'pure' music and hence no pure (isolated) singing ability, also in line with other music- or art scholars within the sociocultural tradition (Folkestad, 2012; Hultberg 2000, 2007, 2009; K. Johansson, 2012; Pramling, 2009; Wallerstedt et al., 2013). Knowledge resides in social practices, not solely in individual minds. Thus, individual singing skills are intertwined with knowledge of a collective and cultural dimension, which is something that I have demonstrated throughout this work.

Conceptual knowledge contributes to the co-construction of the reality. The issue of the pedagogical role of verbal language versus music language is contentious among music educational scholars. On the one hand Vygotskian music pedagogical scholars (Barrett, 2005; Pramling & Wallerstedt, 2009; Wallerstedt et al., 2013; Wallerstedt, 2013) argue that it is crucial to verbalize

and conceptualize music in order to share and develop experienced musical phenomena together in the learning situations. On the other hand, Sundin (1995) debates the developmental threat in children's new conceptual, verbal skills (due to the current type of schooling that emphasizes abilities in formal language use and thinking). In his view, our cultural language demusicalizes young people who have to read, write and count. Verbal skills can have the effect of undermining musicality. The children no longer hear tunes and melodies because they are too attuned to the verbal language. To recall Sundin's own words: "The language learning also implies that one learns 'not to hear' differences in tempo, pitch, timbre etcetera; the attention to that decreases" (Sundin, 1995, p. 79, my translation).

Earlier research on children's musicality and singing was reviewed in chapter 2. The experimental research tradition with influences from cognitive psychology was discussed in relation to studies with a sociocultural perspective. Such studies do not aim to model musical development on activities outside musical instruction or indulge in the inferential work of considering the participants' mental states shown by their overt actions in decontextualised test situations. Imagine Vygotsky and other classical thinkers within the sociocultural tradition searching for young people's ability to maintain tonal centres, target pitch and express vocal ranges or act out mental representations, analytically stripped from wider contexts, signs, tools and situated communication. This seems unthinkable to me. There is an ethical problem too; to tell, or not to tell, young children under experimental conditions that the research focus is to systematically examine their errors and musical mistakes. This is a precarious enterprise in my eyes. With the research design demonstrated in this study, the children were explicitly told that nothing was right or wrong according to me. They contributed generously with their creative, vivid involvement in the pre-given music task. Obviously, they felt relatively free to try out different teaching and learning strategies, and to use accessible artefacts in explorative ways. In fact, the variations that they applied in the use of tools, teaching methods and language are an outcome of paramount importance in this particular study. Another important outcome of my investigation was that the participants demonstrated that they were capable of social interplay for lengthy stretches of time and persisted in collaborating communicatively throughout very strenuous activities.

Before leaving the issue of signs and tools, reminiscent of Vygotsky and the sociocultural approach, the notion of *semiotic mediation* should be mentioned again. Vygotsky and Luria (1994) argued that children's signing in a

symbolic action such as speech was in practice often used as a problem-solving thinking tool. They entitled such actions *auxiliary signs*. They help the learner to solve challenging tasks and are seen as subsidiary thinking tools, often used as memorizing tools. The signs (speech or symbolic drawings) can be directed not only to a co-present partner but also to the learner her- or himself. In my corpus of data, the children did precisely the latter when, for example, confronting the dying computer screen or reasoning about a text sheet that was conceived in problematic terms. They did the former too, but perhaps even more interesting is how they designed their auxiliary signs when they made self-critical remarks. My findings show that the learning participants typically talked softly here. It is plausible to interpret this as the children's way of indicating that the formulated utterance was not a central message to the other child (the instructor). Rather, they wanted to think aloud at these intense learning moments. Then it is functional in the situated dialogue to change the voice volume in this direction, making it harder for the teacher to hear.

8.3.1 Signing with bodies, artefacts and concepts

The examples of varying voice dynamics, with children talking in a more forceful manner or in the opposite style with a temporarily soft voice, suggest the notion of what I have named *voice-mediation*. Especially teachers' instructions were regulated with these modes of talk. This specific finding can be related theoretically to some assumptions stated in the field of educational science. To understand and learn from conversations is not only about *what* has been said, it is also about *how* it has been expressed. Vygotskij (Vygotsky) (1934/1999) points to the role of intonation and voice qualities; how understanding of uttered words is related to various acoustic features (in contrast to the written word). Spoken dialogue presupposes both a visual and an auditive perception of the conversational partner. Along similar lines, Säljö (2005, p. 37) discusses meditaional resources in human conversations, underlining how people talk to each other with various distinct mediating means, enabling situated learning. That includes embodied mediation of different kinds, as discussed in section 4.1.2 and chapter 7 and, from a methodological perspective, in 5.1.2 and 5.2.2.

Linell (2009, 2010b, 2014) suggests integrating the notion of embodiment into sociocultural reasoning. The embodied voice is profoundly a dialogical medium, according to him. Further, Aspelin (1999a, b, 2006) gives a detailed account of nonverbal meaning making in classroom teaching, also

pointing to intonation and prosody as communicative features that should not be overlooked. Hence, I argue that it is not merely the words, that is, the explicated conceptions that mediate dialogical aspects. Embodied phenomena such as the use of the voice and bodily gestures, different types of gaze and orientation are also significant resources in interpersonal encounters.

While the voice was a bodily resource, the children also used cultural artefacts in creative ways, adjusting them to new situations and new functions. Hence, they did not demonstrate any fixed understanding of how to employ these mediating means. Rather, they were reflexive, flexible and susceptible to various interpretations. For example, they creatively used a stuffed cuddly dog to mediate the rhythm in the song melody. In a girl's hand, the pen was used to write with at one time, to mark time with her talk at another. Here we may recall Vygotsky's illustration of the knife as a tool that has the capacity to serve the function of cutting a body radically in the hand of the surgeon but is supposed to be used differently in the hand of a child. It can have the function of cutting food, being used in or symbolizing something in a conversation (my examples). Vygotsky's point is that representations and tools in art and in learning are not simply a question of transmission (cf. Miller, 2011). Their meanings and functions are created for situated purposes, and are not, in practice, readily specified in pre-given terms. Here again it may be appropriate to discuss the issue of creativity, production and reproduction, to continue in accordance with the Vygotskian approach.

Metaphors in language use can also be seen as cultural tools (Pramling, 2006). Such figurative representations do not work as transmissions to "take in" or "take over" as something finished and fixed. They have to be appropriated and made relevant by the learner. We do not simply reuse the tools of our language in a repetitive way, Pramling claims. We also transform them when adjusting them to new needs, purposes and experiences. Eventually, a metaphor tends to be conventionalized, that is, becomes simply 'the way to say it' in a practice or in a wider culture. It is no longer understood as a metaphor, but as saying what it means in a more 'direct sense'. The metaphor simply comes to say how *it is*. The now familiar figurative words are no longer two-dimensional but have become one-dimensional: a transformation from an 'as if' mode of thinking to a set understanding of how 'it is' in itself. An example from my analysis is the children's conceptual use of "go", or even closer to the Swedish word is "drive" (*kör* in Sw.). The Swedish word "kör" means to drive a car or another vehicle. But nowadays Swedes use this metaphor in various ways, for example, when ordering a pizza in the restaurant (i.e. confronting

a choice between things) in Swedish words: "Vi kör en pizza!" (literally, "We go for a pizza"). In the children's discourse "kör" signals an action-oriented meaning, directing them to the upcoming activity. In the very short transition-space, "kör" worked as a functional spoken sign in this sense. But the children did not reflect on the original word meaning, as I could infer from the transcriptions. It is a conventionalized metaphor, in Pramling's words.

In school the written text is central (see the discussion in 3.2). Printed text in inscriptions is moreover a visual representational tool that aids memorizing and fixates human ideas, allowing a focused exchange of talk around the printed facts. Furthermore, texts on the paper or the screen enable future-oriented actions – to talk about further steps in the learning process (Mäkitalo, 2011). Following on from the empirical outcome described in chapter 7.1, the participants relied both heavily and ritually on text-based teaching. They sometimes imposed this tool even when the partner (i.e. the child in the pupil role), did not see any need for it. In several learning situations, it facilitated understanding and knowledge building. In other episodes, this mediating means was a challenge to the child who was expected to understand and learn from it.

Other visual tools (representations) need to be considered in children's teaching of music. Invented notations and symbolic work other than linguistic representations enable the learner to grasp common understanding of musical structures (Barrett, 2005; Pramling, 2009; Pramling Samuelsson et al., 2009, 2011; Pramling & Wallerstedt, 2009). The participants referred to in this work brought visual representations into action constantly. They pointed to them, talked about them, clarified them, used them together with the singing, memorized from them and relied on them in a number of situations. The reasons for this type of tool-dependence seem to be threefold. Traditionally, visual demonstrations in the classroom were ubiquitous (cf. Kress et al., 2001; Jewitt, 2006; Melander & Sahlström, 2010, 2011). To reproduce that school tradition may be one reason for the children, as discussed above. The second function, the visualizing symbols were used in accordance with the proposals by Pramling (2009), Barret (2005) and Pramling Samuelsson et al. (2009, 2011) to make music tangible and fixated. The third reason for conducting their teaching with symbolic, visual tools as an aid may have to do with the lyrics in use. Learning a song inevitably implied learning the words in the song too, according to the acts displayed in their teaching sessions.

The four children worked intensely with the mediation and appropriation of visual means. As Mizener (2008) reports, visual signs with the body are also important in teaching songs, to improve singing accuracy.

Especially "kinesthetic activities" such as the hand-based guiding and conducting method of representing the melody contour in front of the learner is a successful teaching strategy, according to some empirical studies she refers to. One of the children in the present study tried this method too, as one out of many ideas of how to teach melodic issues. Deep inhalations, nods and conducting with arms and hands were frequent methods of visualization that were coordinated with singing and musical orientation. Audio-visual representations were used as well to facilitate musical attention and understanding. Examples were clapping demonstratively, tapping a pen sharply on a table to draw the apprentice's attention, or snapping the fingers loudly. In my analysis, four types of bodily gestures stood out clearly: *transitional, emphatic* (underlining), *deictic* and *emotive*. The first two categories constitute gestures that functionally indicate musical or structural phenomena that have to be noticed immediately. Pramling and Wallerstedt (2009) discuss teachers' use of deictic references. They often serve as a starting point for discussions; further verbal clarifying facilitating meta-communication. The same was noticed in this study. The children employed deictic references (gestures as pointing or nodding at something, often a symbol) and created discursive topic-spaces from these types of gesture, that is, talk episodes. By contrast, two transitional gestures were used to initiate embodied action rather than talking, for example, singing or doing something practically. *Emotive gestures* are communicative means, embodied in facial expressions. They bring emotive attitudes into play and supplement talking. Signing with non-linguistic mediation is often crucial in interpersonal issues. For example, smiles clearly worked among the participants in this study, as encouragement, among other social psychological functions. In contrast to facial gestures, visual cues represented by hand and arm gestures helped to reinforce specific word meanings in what had been verbally articulated in talk. They had an underlining function in the interactional context, and are therefore named *emphatic gestures.*

8.3.2 Appropriation in scaffolding dialogues

Mizener (2008), who has studied music-teaching conventions in depth, reports the teaching method of narrowing down the music to be learned, for example, to start teaching songs without words in the lyrics. Instead, she recommends the teachers to set off with neutral syllables, allowing the melody and, hence, the specific pitch-pattern to be highlighted. The children in my study narrowed down the teaching and learning processes systematically,

and in a number of ways. They usually took "one sentence at a time" when scaffolding each other through the process of learning to master the basics of the particular song. Another step-by-step method was to focus on one mode at time, that is, one type of expression and the sign system entailed. According to my corpus of interactional data, it was more usual to start with the songtext words than to set off with the melodic training. The decisive point was to manage one main sign-system at a time. When that step was mastered, the instructors continued to guide the partner through a new sign-system, and a new piece of work, step by step. The analysis shows that through scaffolding with the teacher's talk and gestures, or with other mediating tools, the knowledge development was a gradual process of accretion. Where do this need and this skill of splitting up the music elements so methodically come from? According to Wallerstedt et al. (2013), teachers do not leave the children in the classrooms without guidance. Rather, they practise scaffolding, which enables the appropriation of institutional mediation. Appropriation of cultural tools often requires extensive familiarization with a specific activity, and it is mainly through participation in institutional forms of schooling that children come into contact with them, the authors conclude.

To learn and to know is not the same thing, according to the knowledge ideals that the children displayed. In a sociocultural parlance, the process of learning is one in which cultural tools of different kinds are gradually mastered. When they are mastered completely, a context- and tool-specific knowing is achieved. Learning to *appropriate* means handling mediating artefacts, signs and language in increasingly subtle ways. In doing so the actors make sense of them as objects of learning, in a social context (Linell, 2009; Säljö, 2005; Wertsch, 1998). In addition, appropriation often takes on a local relevance, useful in the particular local context (Linell, 2009). To repeat something over and over again seems to be the key strategy in appropriating music-specific knowledge. The same teaching device is reported in Mars' (2012) study (cf. Mars et al., 2014), in which teenagers from Sweden and Gambia learn to play musical instruments and sing collaboratively in mixed cultural encounters. The Gambian way of familiarizing themselves with the music was to imitate each other's playing and to echo the singing persistently. That meant repeating it over and over again. In the end, the learning musicians mostly gained the skills that the young teacher expected of them. The Swedes repeated the music in progress too, but used texts and notations to a larger extent. They did not show the same preference for imitating songs without the chance to rely on printed symbols. In the present study, the

children made use of both kinds of repetition: dismantling the whole melody in order to echo song phrases (with tonality) and songtext phrases (without tonality), and working intensely with the written text and other printed symbolic representations.

An interesting fact was the children's organization of *when* it was time to actualize the specific type of musical repetition in the whole activity. For these children a particular pedagogical ideal was practised in all five encounters studied. They staged their pedagogical method systematically in a specific direction. At first they usually started teaching with a pronounced focus on visible and discursive tools, especially written text incorporated in artefacts (i.e. inscriptions). Even demonstrative bodily signs such as practising snapping the fingers to mark musical time, directive nods as support for marking out musical openings and closings, deictic pointing at musical details to attend to, etcetera. The given leader was 'the expert' who instructed and taught in ways that made the apprentice-child very dependent on him/her and the situated expert knowledge. The leader-role was hence emphasized. Other teaching features that highlighted the instructor's song skills and the emphatic leadership were the critique and approval articulated and demonstrative procedures of singing phrase-by-phrase which s/he expected the pupil to echo.

The asymmetrical interaction pattern (with the articulated leader-role) becomes more blurred later in their work with the songs, that is, there was less dependence on the expert knowledge of the instructor. However, the leader was still the leader and the characteristic asymmetry still existed overall. Paul's and Michael's dialogue was an exception. Here the leadership, and the teaching methods too, were sometimes challenged on the initiative of Michael, the apprentice. Appropriation of knowledge in scaffolding allows precisely that: to decrease the dependence on external support and to strive for a kind of "naturalization" (Pramling, 2006): the competence of using the tools without thinking so much upon it. That implies a more transparent relation between the tool and the user (Säljö, 2005, p. 230). Gradually, the teachers as well as the pupils moved over collaboratively to another learning style in which the apprentice had to try out the newly mastered knowledge in a seemingly more self-dependent manner. Here the external support was not totally dismissed, and so pure self-dependence did not exist in practice. Rather, *the illusion of both self-dependence* and *tool-independence* turned out to be a guiding pedagogical ideal for these children. Going from the pedagogical procedure *of emphasizing external support* to *decreasing external support* was in the pedagogic practice organized into the issue of visualization of semiotic means.

Another way to phrase this is: the children moved gradually from a materialized practice, based on artefacts, to an embodied practice, leaning on subtle mediation such as the bodily language. The latter implies signing as well but in a more "humanized" design, in and through the human body as a signing (mediating) tool. This type of signing is also viewed as more "naturalized" than working with externalized knowledge inbuilt in material artefacts.

The written text as an externalized knowledge form had a prominent position in the children's co-constructed learning situations, as I have pointed out earlier. So had invented notations, especially in Amy's teaching. The teachers generally centred on written means in their organization of the task. Notably, there was a tendency to view hard work with complicated written text and symbols as significant learning. The teachers accordingly provided the pupils with a range of cultural tools – a variety of externalized knowledge to be mastered on the way to 'knowing'. To put it differently, *auxiliary signs* (Vygotsky and Luria, 1994), the verbal use of symbols as mediated action, facilitated transformative learning in the direction from general (less conscious) attention to a specified, intended attention (cf. Miller, 2011, who urges us to distinguish between semiotic mediation and other meditational forms when discussing consciousness and learning with a Vygotskian perspective). Through tool-based scaffolding, the instructor directed the apprentice's attention to remembering and learning details in the song reproduction aimed at.

Without having any theoretical knowledge of how appropriation with tools really works, the children acted as if they actually had that knowledge, and that is a fascinating result I think. Pramling's words above about naturalizing and Säljö's about the increasingly transparent relation between the tool and the user in learning processes were clearly at stake in how they preferred to visualize the external support. In the first phase of learning to work with sign-systems as aids, a multitude of demonstrative visualizations was the pedagogical idea practised. In the end phases, the opposite ideal guided their learning strategies. Here the external, visible aids became more and more subtle, leading to the constructed illusion that they did not use tools. To master the song was to master it without any visible tool, to act in a self-dependent and 'natural' way. The naturalistic stage of appropriation meant embodiment to them. Subtle bodily gestures such as beating time with the feet and breathing in harmony with the music were signs that minimized the gap between the tools and the users: the tools were now embodied. In addition, they were now used in a highly personal manner with the user's own body. The music was expressed with both personal and locally relevant means (cf. Linell, 2009, and

his words on appropriation, discussed in section 4.1.1), less visible to the other.

The pedagogical ideal discussed above can be described with Diana in the teacher role in a later stage of "the lesson" (excerpt DA: 178–183 in chapter 7.1). To begin with she took away the lyrics on the screen, requesting her partner, Amy, to learn the text by heart without looking anymore. Amy objected heavily, but Diana's counting started anyhow, and they sang the song together. The next pedagogical initiative from Diana was the request that Amy should try and sing "without me" (clapping her hands illustratively on her chest), "without" (pointing at the computer screen with her hand), "without all of the things that…" (pointing to the screen again). *"Without"* (Sw. *utan*) was her key word in this episode, underpinned by clarifying gestures.

As stated above, learning and knowing were dealt with in distinct ways, according to my analysis. In my terms, learning was related the process of appropriation – learning to master knowledge embedded in tools such as sign systems and musical representations. *Learning* may be the children's process of trying out demonstrative external support, working in very visual ways. *Knowing* may be the later stage, the knowledge the children strive for in the end: the skills in using the knowledge 'naturally', with ease. If the children had had the opportunity to continue in one more encounter, it seems reasonable to assume that they would have worked on the artistic, expressive musical aspects even more. Now they only had time to teach and learn the basics of the songs, as the video-documentations show. Hultberg (2009) articulates a distinction that has to do with this reasoning. She does not distinguish between learning and knowing but contrasts musical learning with musical development. To Hultberg musical learning is when musicians gain knowledge intellectually in and through cultural tools in "the tool-kit" for musical learning, for example learning to use musical instruments, conventions and notation. This links up with the first stages in the children's learning approach, described above. They learned to use and understand tools on a basic level, although I would say that these were not purely intellectual as such. They were practical, embodied and perhaps emotional too. When coming to musical development, musical knowledge externalizes practically (i.e. musically). My conclusion is that she alludes to the full-fledged appropriation of musical knowledge, enabling musicians to play in a more artistic and expressive way.

To summarize: children (and adults too) have to lean on reproductive elements from their culture when producing new knowledge (Säljö, 2005; Vytgotsky, 1930/2004). They often memorize and use existing ideas, traditions

or tools, but locate them in new manners, situations, and in new contexts. Such re-contextualizing acts are profoundly creative, that is, they are not acts of simple knowledge transmission or mechanical imitation. As illustrated in the result chapters (chapter 6 and 7), the young participants in this study focused on knowledge reproduction to a large extent. Due to their situation definition, their sense making was immersed in the idea of doing teaching as a school activity. That means to act according to a given pattern (i.e. shared knowledge) that is culturally conditioned. Moreover, their espoused belief was clearly to bring about reproductive episodes that focus on remembering; the pupil's ability to demonstrate retention of the information given by the instructing child was thus highly expected. Of particular interest is the fact that the children focused not only on the retention of the words in the songtext verbatim, but also on imitating the tonality (the pitches in the melodies) and rhythms correctly, with the instructor's preferences in mind. Their productive creativity was displayed in their joint ability to work innovatively and flexibly with the established, externalized knowledge forms as structuring resources. It is reasonable to suppose that the specific research-conducted activity actually contributed to such a type of organization of knowledge development. The task I gave them explicitly was loosely framed; leaving out so many potential ways of accomplishing it on their own without adult help. In this situation it was wise from their perspective to draw on shared cultural knowledge: school music and school teaching from their everyday life of the elementary school. With other words, that means orienting to an established communicative avtivity type (a CAT).

8.4 CONCLUDING REMARKS

The following lines recap the main findings reported in earlier chapters. With those facts in mind, the reader will meet a conclusive discussion about implications of different kinds. Here I reflectively discuss the contribution of the present work, pointing to consequences for music teaching, teaching in general and future research within the field.

8.4.1 Summary

The aim of the current thesis was to explore children's knowledge processes and their perspectives on learning and instruction, as they are established in their co-constructed pedagogical dialogues. I have argued for an approach

that does not focus on the young people's individual singing errors or musical inaccuracies. Crucial to the aim was also to get an idea of how the participants communicate with each other; how language uses of different kinds is displayed in the video-documented encounters. In this thesis, understanding teaching, instruction and learning implies considerations of the participant understandings at play. In the previous chapters I have proposed that *culturally inherent knowledge*, such as ideational values, shared knowledge, and materialized knowledge of cultural tools, is brought into action.

The focus has been on a music activity and how the situated resources were put into action when the children teach each other songs. Knowledge building is seen in relation to how the participants make sense together in their dyadic work in pairs with teaching and learning songs. Two guiding questions were explicitly addressed:

- How do the children go about teaching and learning to sing songs in their social interactions?
- What role does culture play in their joint task?

On the basis of the findings, the following points serve as a summary.

i) The notion of *double dialogicality* (Linell, 1998, 2009, 2011a, 2014, cf. Kullenberg, 2014b) is significant due to the children's demonstrated knowledge ideals, and the ways in which they chose to organize their pedagogical activities. That means, they oriented to each other as the situation unfolded interactionally and sequentially on the spot. They also reflectively presupposed and developed a particular communicative activity type, which fell back on schooling as a situation-defining context. They talked and acted in a number of ways as if they were in a traditional school. Highlighting the participants' formality in their established disciplined and systematic hard work, this finding is further elaborated on when discussing educational and aesthetic-pedagogical consequences of schooling below. Hence, I discuss both the opportunities and constraints within the reproduction of schooling as it has been identified (see section 8.2). Noteworthy for the music educational field is the prosaic, academic discourse that was found instead of a more poetic one, and its relation to creativity. Moreover, the double dialogicality found suggests an answer to the second research question: What role does culture play in their joint task? Here the culture that was warranting

the children's dialogical sense making was clearly the school culture. My participants demonstrated a knowledge norm that is typical for a school culture: *the task culture* (Ericsson & Lindgren, 2010) that directs pedagogical activities to (written) assignments and learning procedures entailed by instructional talk.

ii) In instructional issues, the instructor embodied crucial meanings in the production of talk, not only through words. This was found thanks to in-depth analyses of detailed transcriptions that served to facilitate an overview of a wide range of semiotic resources in use. It is important for the children in the communicative micro-situations to use signs in a multifaceted fashion. S/he mediated implicit messages through the regulation of voice volume as well as or, rather, in combination with the word meanings uttered. A louder voice-volume or a softer one, respectively, gained different communicative significance within the moment-to-moment sequence between the children in their roles of teacher and pupil. I have termed this *voice-mediation*.

iii) The children examined deployed artefacts creatively, in the sense of ascribing the tools different functions for different purposes in use. Sometimes they even used them non-traditionally, for example, to mediate and visualize rhythms with a cuddly dog (made as a toy) and or mark out particular spoken or written words and invented notations aurally with a pen (made for writing or drawing). In doing this they clearly did not believe artefacts to have prescribed, fixed meanings. Rather, artefacts were seen to represent visual or aural phenomena that could contribute learning solutions to highly situated and local pedagogical problems. And so they functioned as mediating thinking tools in a number of ways. Further, with the cuddly dog as a third actor on the scene, the dialogues took a new kind of framing and, hence, transformed the awkward learning situations deliberately. Thus, artefacts were an important element in the children's pedagogical construction, especially when facing challenges linked to thinking, singing and reasoning. They were appropriated situationally with intense guidance (i.e. scaffolding) and given local meanings as described in detail earlier.

iv) As displayed in the participants' actions, artefacts also played another crucial, interesting role. This was intertwined with their views on *how to learn* a song versus *how to know* a song. Moreover, it was related to an instructional shift from a *tool-based practice* (using artefacts) to an *embodied practice* (without artefacts). In the strenuous learning processes

that jointly focussed on how to achieve the performance of the specific song, the instructor taught demonstratively in an artefact-based teaching style. They talked explicitly about these recurrent procedures and tools as a pedagogical ideal to embrace – a highly valued norm. By contrast, coming to the end phase in their task-oriented activities, they instead diminished precisely this value of reinforcing the role of artefacts and signs. Now the teaching style emphasized the opposite. The teachers mostly encouraged their apprentices to demonstrate that they had now learned the basics and did *not* need external help from mediating means or the teacher any more. Knowing a song in the meaning of being able to sing it was hence equated with both tool-independence and self-dependence. However, I have argued that, in practice, no tool independence existed, as the excerpts demonstrate. What happened was that the participants gradually changed their ways of using and talking about mediating tools, into more subtle designs of signing.

v) In problem-solving the participants employed *auxiliary signs* as subsidiary thinking tools. They talked in a self-directed style when they faced problems to solve. The nature of the problem could be practical or musical but intense thinking expressed as verbalized reasoning occurred frequently in those situations. Such reasoning was mostly produced in a weaker voice volume, simultaneously indicating it was not primarily addressed to the partner.

vi) When working hard and repetitive on remembering music (memorizing lyrics, musical phrases, rhythms and particular pitches), written song lyrics were very central to the organization of the given activity. At the same time, the idea of music and learning songs centred on reproductive elements; to imitate the instructors' song versions correctly. The music was narrowed down into pieces, especially key words and symbols written down, in order to achieve these song reproductions.

vii) Bodily gestures played a significant role in the communicative, musical learning established. To be in sync musically was a central issue among the children due to the performative elements in their singing activities. Gestures were important mediating means, in particular to visualize the time-based nature of music for each other. That implies recognition of dialogic gestures as not only spontaneous but also as a disciplined part of an integrative signs system. Multi-semiotic utterance designs mean combining representational systems creatively with a situated communicative purpose. The instructor employed such gestures most intensely.

Four types of gestures are distinguished analytically: *transitional, emphatic, deictic and emotive.* They have differentiated functions in the music pedagogic practice examined.

viii) A social psychological dimension was also at stake in the encounters. The participants established the positions of being a teacher and a pupil respectively, and maintained these consistently. Moreover, orienting to each other in teaching and learning requires trust and intersubjectivity. Intersubjectivity and alterity were both salient features of the dialogicality. They exist as temporary interactional states. The type of cooperation maintained throughout the pedagogical encounters is related to social psychology. The children did not upset each other or challenge each other emotionally in the dialogues. They preferred to meet each other with respect and a lot of smiles, especially in the sensitive moments when they faced difficult challenges together. It might seem like a paradox to do so, but from a social psychological perspective it is not. It is important to work on the interpersonal issues in ways that facilitate the collaborative situation. Learning and teaching lean on dialogicality – the interdependence between the interlocutors. This being so, disappointed or sad facial expressions were rarely found emotive attitudes compared to responses with happy faces. The participants in the learner role did not provoke their pupils with upsetting questions, and the pupils responded to the leader's questions in answer-relevant terms as well. However, there was a democratic discourse that allowed them to communicate different opinions and feelings. A peer discourse, or equity-oriented communicative genre, was also identified. It usually emerged during unexpected events in which their ordinary social roles as teachers versus pupils were put aside for a while.

8.4.2 Didactical, theoretical and methodological implications

My final lines will be devoted to meta-reasoning: to further consider the implications of my findings. They now need to be put in a broader context, discussing didactical and pedagogical aspects, theoretical implications and methodological consequences of the current work. Finally, I also reflect on what may be of interest for future research.

One of my main results demonstrates the young participants' ability to reproduce school-based ways of learning. This is named *double dialogicality,* that is, the children's double orientation to the interactional sequences in situ

on the one hand, and their orientation to culturally established knowledge on the other (the schooling as a sociocultural resource). Reproducing songs methodically, based on songtext notations on the screen or on paper is an example of such skills. The children made manifest an ability to work successfully with memorizing issues, and with the written text as a thinking tool.

If we turn to their social skills, they also reproduced the social roles in school consistently: the teacher role and the pupil role. That implies abilities in organizing the time and the pedagogical work productively, being able to structure the learning process in several ways that are common in school life. They were even skilled in constructing activities for practise and repetition of a musical aspect, sometimes even when not necessary according to their partner in the specific situation. I have referred to scholars who describe the central features in schooling routines. Here I have pointed to the relation between their conclusions and my empirical results, arguing that the children in the present study recontextualized, that is, resituated creatively in new settings, a typical school routine. Acting like a teacher and a pupil also showed that some children were obviously competent and interesting from a social point of view. They were able to listen to each other, argue with each other, respond and learn from each other in subtle and productive ways, without the immediate adult support. That is an important result in the educational discussions of pupil-centred work. Musically, they demonstrated both an interest in focusing and an ability to focus intensely on musical elements such as pitches, melodies, rhythms and other musical structures. That speaks for the fact that musically untrained children do not see musical facts as something empty of meaning in a pedagogical situation. I cannot speak for children other than the participants in the present study, but it is reasonable to state that they are not the only ones who indulge in this type of musical sense making. However, my conclusion is that the children's perspectives need to be considered carefully in order to make the children construct learning productively and dialogically when left on their own. They need to have an idea of the sense making premises at stake; otherwise it may be difficult for them to conduct teaching and learning activities without immediate adult support (see Bergqvist, 1990, p. 119, who discusses the problem of unclear task introductions as premises for pupil-centred, and peer-based, schoolwork).

However, that does not exclude informal sense making as productive for collaborative musical learning. Rather, I guess that informal musical conventions learned from TV-shows with popular cultural and other music activities are very fruitful resources for interactional knowledge building, in addition

to the formal school. My point is that the children probably need to rely on an idea of a socioculturally based structure of *some* kind. In the present study, it seemed to make sense for the participants to draw upon a shared understanding of a school culture. In addition, the experience I have from my life as a music teacher is that children can do a lot of creative and productive work without adult guidance if they have a clear idea of what to do and if – not to be forgotten – they are motivated enough emotionally to pursue the given task. The children in this study were well prepared together with me before they were left alone with each other in the video-documented activity. Perhaps the most important thing was not that they were well prepared practically. They told me that they liked to have options, to feel free to make a lot of choices related to the task. That was fun according to them. In other words, it contributed to their generous and persistent involvement through all the challenges they met. For example, they decided to do the activities in a setting outside school. I had told them that they were allowed to design parts of the project together with me. Looking back, I think such a choice matters. To launch a new research project in the future, in which learning processes in music or other art subjects can be framed differently, seems like an interesting challenge. For instance, one could explore how young people talk and learn music/art in formal vs. informal settings, which means studying the participants' dialogical sense making in and through aesthetic language but under various framings (conditions). To explore dialogicality in multi-party communication (i.e. more than two interlocutors) and with more or less complex pedagogical challenges is also something to probe deeper into in the future.

A follow-up issue in a discussion of the children's interests and collaborative achievements is the question: can children teach, as more or less educated adults are able to? My answer is both yes and no. If the conditions are simliar to the ones here, with one child knowing more about the intended learning content than the other child, and with a task children can handle (like teaching the basics in a known song), it is clear that children can be ascribed the ability to teach each other. That has important consequences for our knowledge of premises for peer work, I think. On the other hand, few learning situations look like this pre-arranged framing in my particular study. Before letting young pupils set up peer activities in school, teachers have to reflect on these two conditions: the knowledge of each participant considered in relation to the other child/children and in relation to the nature of the task. For example, to teach each other about the role of music in society does not seem to be an appropriate task for children aged 9–10 years. Likewise, the

task of accompanying a song with a set of musical instruments, playing in an ensemble, might be a precarious enterprise to launch in a classroom. It is not impossible, but arguably such complex music-pedagogical teaching aims require a skilled, professional adult who knows how to guide and stimulate the pupil developmentally.

That also brings us to the notion of a child perspective, or a partici-pant-perspective, in research designs involving children. Seeing them primarily as research subjects and not as research objects, as actors rather than informants, and as social beings rather than isolated individuals, seems like a way that generates new knowledge of children 'in action'. The participants did contribute actively with ideas of how to design the research. Moreover, their activities were responses in dialogue with me, and have to be interpreted as such, as I have underlined. They knew I had been a music teacher and was now interested in children's peer work with music.

To conceive young participants as constituent dialogue-partners is also an ethical alternative that fits in well with a late-modern view on children (cf. James et al. 1998; Sommer, 2005). Video-documentations in combination with their own voices have been interesting to work with. I agree with scholars who argue that it is difficult to study social interaction without the video-recordings as a base. Of course, it is possible to only have audiotapes and the like, but not if the ambition is to catch other central elements than the quality of the dialogues. As my results demonstrate, bodily gestures and other aspects of pedagogical interaction are crucial and need to be documented if the research questions concern multi-faceted mediation.

In this thesis, I have explored in detail how some children organize their musical teaching activities communicatively. In such work, the relation between human communication and learning is in focus. Furthermore, I have discussed the issue of creativity and musical language in relation to other types of knowledge forms, and interaction forms as well. In didactical terms, the demonstrated outcome should suggest to educationalists that they structure their teaching in ways that allow the children to pursue their communicative sense making. Clearly, under certain conditions, children are able to achieve a lot of work together if they are empowered in that sense, given the opportunity to engage in music and learning with their experience-based perspectives.

There is at least one more important issue for a music teacher, or a researcher in music education, to reflect on. As a result of this study, there is reason to recognize the children's somewhat instrumental pedagogic ideal, emphasizing linear rationality and efficiency. It is evident that their eager

interest in producing goal-oriented efficiency in the tasks given took over to such an extent that other aspects of musical creativity were ignored. To experience music are not only about reproducing, producing, or focusing on intellectual analyses of musical elements (cf. Leijonhufvud, 2011; McPherson et al. 2012; Welch & McPherson, 2012; Varkøy, 2003, 2009). A broader view of music should be encouraged in addition – a perspective beyond the issue of goal-rational learning efficiency. In order to provide music experiences of that kind, it is of importance to think of teachers not merely as didactic directors of class work but as providers of appropriate conditions, attitudes and environments (cf. Bjørkvold, 1991; Sawyer, 2004; Varkøy, 2003; Pio & Varkøy, 2012; Ferm Thorgersen, 2009). Accordingly, the link between communication and musical knowledge building has to be further explored (cf. Sawyer, 2006; Wallerstedt, 2013; Wallerstedt et al., 2013). Creating classroom creativity in music may call for creative languaging. What role has social psychology – the interpersonal dimension between the teachers and pupils – in children's musical creativity? It might here be an idea to continue with in-depth analyses of facial displays in pedagogic interaction: contributing to the research field by illustrating the social co-construction of emotive gestures and, further, to account for them in relation to other sense making processes in dialogic teaching and learning (as, for example, talk, other bodily gestures, acts with artefacts and situational framings). That would be yet another dialogical attempt to transcend Cartesian dualism and strict cognitivism in the educational science. Moreover, how can different contexts, framings or, more precisely, communicative activity types (CATs) (Linell, 1998, 2009, 2010a, 2011a) be understood in educational discussions? These are possible questions to pursue further in future research.

Svensk sammanfattning

Detta kapitel är strukturerat på samma vis som den engelskspråkiga avhandlingen, med den skillnaden att det utgör en mer kortfattad beskrivning av studien. Det innebär att den innehållsliga ordningsföljden kvarstår och att jag redogör för huvuddragen i varje kapitel.

INTRODUKTION

I studien undersöks hur barn i 9–10 års ålder lär varandra att sjunga sånger. I kapitel 1, introduktionen, presenteras de specifika frågeställningarna mot bakgrund av rådande trender på forskningsfältet och nationella förändringar i grundskoleskolämnet musik. I avsnitt 1.1 reflekterar jag inledningsvis kring min tid som musiklärare: vilka utmaningar möttes jag egentligen av i klassrummen genom åren? Därefter formuleras syftet med avhandlingen (avsnitt 1.2). Kapitlet avslutas med en guide för läsaren i vilken jag beskriver avhandlingens disposition (avsnitt 1.3).

I studien visas hur de unga deltagarna möter pedagogiska och musikaliska utmaningar då de arbetar med varandra i par, utan vuxnas närvaro, med den musikpedagogiska uppgiften. Ett grundantagande i forskningsdesignen är att barnens kunskapsideal och språkande synliggörs i de videodokumenterade aktiviteterna.

Mot bakgrunden av att skolmusiken har genomgått en genomgripande förändring sedan 1990-talet där elevstyrda grupparbeten (dvs. kollaborativa arbetssätt) har blivit ett alltmer framträdande inslag i svenska skolors musikundervisning (Skolverket, 2005), vill jag bidra till ny kunskap om hur barn samarbetar i musikaliska aktiviteter. Inte sällan är de grupparbeten som skolundervisningen i musik erbjuder komplicerade till sin natur, som exempelvis uppgifter i ensemblespel eller komponering (Ericsson & Lindgren, 2010). Sådana musikaliska aktiviteter kräver både musikaliska och kommunikativa förmågor. Det beskrivna skiftet rör också elevers musikerfarenheter utanför skolans kontext. Med detta följer ett större intresse för elevernas perspektiv och egna intressen (Skolverket, 2005). Till skillnad från den skolgång som tonåringar erbjuds bygger dessutom musiklektionerna i mycket hög grad på sång som pedagogiskt inslag, konstaterar Skolverket (ibid.) vidare. I ljuset av dessa utbildningsförändringar vill jag bidra med empiriskt baserad forskning kring just detta: hur barn närmar sig sjungande i kollaborativa lärsituationer.

Musikpedagogisk (västerländsk) forskning om barns musikalitet har riktat sig mot de ungas individuella musikaliska förmågor, talanger och prestationer (Burnard, 2012; Sundin, 1978; Welch & McPherson, 2012). Till bilden hör att musikalitet är något som endast tillskrivs ett fåtal. Därmed impliceras att resten av dem är omusikaliska av naturen, eller av andra skäl. Vidare pekar Sundin (ibid.) på konsekvensen av att forskningen uppehållit sig så strikt vid barns uppvisade prestationer, nämligen forskningsfokus med frågor av kvantitativt slag så som hur väl de sjunger (i kvantitativa termer) eller hur väl de lyckas reproducera musikaliskt beteende i testsituationer. Mot bakgrund av Sundin med flera söker jag här generera en annan sorts kunskap. Istället för att ägna mig åt mätningsprocedurer av individuella prestationer vänder jag här blicken mot hur barn förhåller sig till musik; hur de relaterar till musikaliska och pedagogiska normer och hur de i handling ger uttryck för olika preferenser i musikaliska aktiviteter. Med andra ord handlar det om en blickförskjutning från fixa individuella musikaliska produkter till dynamiska lärprocesser av dialogiskt slag. Det sistnämnda innebär också att jag med denna avhandling har som teoretisk och metodologisk ambition att bidra till ett dialogpedagogiskt perspektiv på lärande och undervisning. Mina forskningsfrågor är:

- Hur lär barn varandra att sjunga sånger genom social interaktion?
- Vilken roll har kulturen för deras gemensamma aktivitet?

FORSKNING OM BARN OCH MUSIKPEDAGOGIK

Kapitel 2 förhåller sig till tidigare forskning om barns musikalitet med avseende på pedagogiska och utbildningsvetenskapliga frågeställningar. Här tematiseras relevanta delar av den forskning som finns på fältet. Jag diskuterar också vetenskapliga resultat som rör barns sång. Kapitlet avrundas med en kort summering.

För att beskriva tidigare forskningsinriktningar utgår jag från Parkers (2005) beskrivna ingångar om lärandeforskning. Den första kunskapsteoretiska analysnivån ser lärande som ett resultat av biologiska och kognitiva processer – ett perspektiv där den mänskliga hjärnan på så vis är grundläggande för mänsklig kunskapsutveckling. Den andra nivån betänker enligt henne även faktorer som omfattar omständigheter, det vill säga ålder, kön, utvecklingsstadier, erfarenheter och kontext. Den tredje och sista ingången intresserar sig för lärande som effekter av sociala och kulturella kontexter.

På ett övergripande plan menar jag att det finns, och har funnits, ett kraftfullt pedagogiskt fokus på individen i betydelsen *individuellt lärande*. I avsnittet 2.1.1 tas kognitiv och neurologisk musikvetenskap upp, med syftet att redovisa de argumentationslinjer som förts på fältet. Avsnitt 2.1.2 behandlar en annan yttring av det individbaserade, kognitiva perspektivet. Här är musikaliskt beteende hos barn föremål för experimentella studier. Utifrån uppvisade beteenden dras slutsatser som har med mental organisering och inre tänkande samt inre musikalitet att göra. Exempelvis fastställs små barns förmågor att eka tonhöjdsmönster och upprätthålla tonalitet i deras sjungande (Flowers & Dunne-Sousa, 1990). Inom denna forskningsinriktning är det inte ovanligt att kartlägga de unga deltagarnas "sångfel" och musikaliska "misstag" (Brand, 2000; Schellenberg et al., 2007), i syfte att analysera hur barnens outvecklade musikaliska perceptioner kan förstås på ett kognitivt plan. Ytterligare en forskningstradition som utgår från hjärnans betydelse för musik och musikalitet är den som förutsätter det naturliga, spontana barnet och dess naturgivna förmåga att kunna sjunga och utöva musik (Bjørkvold, 1991, 1998). Med Davidson och Scripps (1989) ord är den ett uttryck för *mognadsperspektivet* ("the maturational view").

I kontrast till detta står studier med ansatser som betonar kontextens betydelse för musikalisk utveckling. Här kan vi bland annat finna studier med ett sociokulturellt perspektiv på lärande och utveckling (jfr. Barrett, 2005, 2006; Folkestad, 2012; Hultberg, 2000, 2007, 2009; K. Johansson, 2012; Wallerstedt, Pramling & Säljö, 2013). Med ett fokus på kontextuella villkor för

kunskap följer också ofta ett intresse för språkliga och dialogiska aspekter av situerat lärande (jfr. Ericsson & Lindgren, 2010; Lindgren, 2013, Young, 2009). I motsats till föreställningen om att musik inte kan eller bör verbaliseras menar de senare forskarna att verbalisering är en viktig förutsättning för just musikaliskt lärande i klassrummen (Pramling, 2009; Wallerstedt, 2013; Wallerstedt et al., 2013). Men det är inte endast det verbala språket som på senare tid vunnit uppmärksamhet. Det går även att urskilja en ökad förståelse för andra typer av språkande inom social interaktion. Exempelvis visar Linge (2013), Mizener (2008), Vernersson (2013) och Wallerstedt & Pramling (2009) hur kroppsliga gester integreras i musikpedagogiska situationer.

FORSKNING OM UNDERVISNING OCH SKOLPRAKTIK

I kapitel 3 belyser jag frågeställningar som är centrala för diskussioner om undervisning i skolans praktik. Det är diskurser och ordningar på detta område som sätts under luppen. Den första delen (3.1) redogör för aspekter på dialogisk undervisning, enligt tidigare forskning. Nästföljande del (3.2) går in på forskning om aktuella diskurser i skolforskning. Avslutningsvis görs en summering av kapitlet (3.3).

Utbildningsvetenskaplig forskning har på senare tid börjat föreslå ett dialogiskt synsätt på undervisning, med fokus på socialt och/eller kulturellt lärande (Alexander, 2008; Aspelin, 2005, 2006, 2010, 2012, 2013, 2014; Aspelin & Persson, 2011; Bingham & Sidorkin, 2004; Biesta, 2005, 2009b; Bergqvist, 2010; Lilja, 2013; Littleton & Howe, 2010; Littleton & Mercer, 2013; Lyle, 2008; Nerland, 2004, 2007; Sawyer, 2004, 2006; Säljö, 2000, 2005, 2011a; Wells, 2007; Wennergren, 2007). I avsnitt 3.1 går jag igenom hur dessa tänkare ser på dialogens roll i utbildning, exempelvis i klassrummets praktik. Bruner (1996) för en kritisk och intressant diskussion kring "intersubjektiv pedagogik", eller snarare varför den har uteblivit alltför länge i skoldebatten. Kanske kan det liknas vid fiskarna i vattnet som inte noterar vattnet just för att de är så självklart inneslutna i detta, resonerar han. Just så som lärare är inbegripna i en social praktik (undervisning) där mötet mellan lärare och elever är så överskuggande centralt för det avsedda lärandet. Lärare ställer sig frågan hur de ska möta sina elever så att givande kunskapsutbyte kan ske, medan elever på motsvarande vis funderar på vad läraren vill. Enligt Bruner är detta ett klassiskt filosofiskt problem (jfr. Bengtsson, 2004). Med Aspelin (1999a, b, 2006) ser han också skolindividers emotioner som framträdande aspekter

av utbildningstillvaron. Ett kulturpsykologiskt perspektiv bör inte bortse från emotionernas betydelse för identitetsbaserat lärande, enligt Bruner (jfr. Connery, 2010; M. Johansson, 2002, 2011; John-Steiner et al., 2010; Linell, 2010b; Smagorinsky, 2011, 2013; Valsiner, 2000b; Vygotsky, 1925/1971, 1994).

Skoldiskurser är tematiken i 3.2 som visar vilka diskurser och vilken/ vilka kulturer som anses vara typiska för det institutionella livet i skolan. Hur social ordning reproduceras via den sociala konstruktionen av en pedagogisk diskurs är något Bernstein (1990) skriver om. Han visar också hur det tänkbara (traditionella) respektive det hittills otänkbara (nytänkande) reproduceras, produceras och legitimeras inom formell utbildning. I detta avsnitt tar jag också upp den skriftspråkliga kultur som präglat skolans praktik, och vad den för med sig med avseende på lärande. Gee (2012), Säljö (2000, 2005), Mehan (1979) och Ericsson och Lindgren (2010) är några av de skolforskare som berörs. Gee (ibid.) och Ericsson och Lindgren (ibid.) fokuserar bland annat på kreativitet och musik i relation till de samtalsformer och normer som utmärker retorisk praxis i klassrummen. En diskurs jag uppehåller mig vid i sammanhanget är den nu aktuella nyliberala diskurs som accentuerar instrumentella honnörsord som effektivitet, individuellt ansvar, linjär kunskapsproduktion; det målstyrda och det mätbara i utbildningssystemen (Aspelin, 2012; Aspelin & Persson, 2011; Bergqvist, 2010, 2012; Biesta, 2005, 2009a; Liedman, 2011; Lindgren, 2006, 2013; Pring, 2004; Varkøy, 2003, 2012).

ATT TEORETISERA LÄRANDE OCH KOMMUNIKATION

Kapitel 4 behandlar de teoretiska resonemang och begrepp som är centrala för studien. Med hjälp av dessa perspektiveras mitt empiriska material i senare avsnitt. För tydlighetens skull görs den teoretiska genomgången i tre led. I avsnitt 4.1 presenteras ett sociokulturellt perspektiv på lärande. I 4.2 introduceras det metateoretiska ramverket i avhandlingen (dialogteori) och i 4.3 mejslar jag ut några av de koncept som har sina rötter i föregående dialogteori.

Med en sociokulturell blick förstås undervisning och institutionellt lärande och sociala praktiker (jfr. Säljö, 2000, 2005). Den sociala konstruktionen av kunskapsbildning sätts på så vis i centrum för analys (Mercer, 1995). Likaså blir den delade, kollektiva kunskapen hos människor viktig att belysa. Språklig praxis inom olika etablerade uttrycksformer är också intressanta för en sociokulturell pedagog, inte minst för att språket speglar kulturella värden

och konventioner. Denna studie fördjupar sig i lärande på *den mikrogenetiska analysnivån*. Det innebär att den tar fasta på det lärande som uttrycks i den mellanmänskliga interaktionen, utan att förbise de bakomliggande kunskapsformer som antytts: de kulturella och samhälleliga värden som har skapats över tid och blivit till institutionella rutiner, aktiviteter, värderingar och traditioner. Innan jag lämnar det sociokulturella perspektivets övergripande principer bör nämnas att det också betonar det kontext och den situation där lärandet äger rum. Det situerade lärandet (Lave & Wenger, 1991) blir därför en fruktbar utgångspunkt för denna ansats.

Då vi interagerar med varandra i uttalade eller outtalade pedagogiska syften tar vi hjälp av varandra och av kulturella resurser. Med tanke på den kopplingen till språklig kunskap som nämnts ovan är semiotiska resurser av särskilt intresse. I föreliggande avhandling tränger jag in i hur symboliska resurser som tal, skrift, gester och bilder används och tolkas av de unga samtalsaktörerna då de hjälper varandra att lära sig sjunga sånger. Det är under dessa aktivitetsbaserade samhandlingar som semiotiska resurser sätts i rörelse. Ett för avhandlingen centralt begrepp i sammanhanget är *semiotisk mediering*: hur representationella teckensystem tillägnas via medierande redskap av olika slag (Linell, 2009; Säljö, 2005; Wells, 2007; Wertsch, 1998). En underliggande tankegång här är att mediering perspektiverar världen för oss. Vi står inte i en omedelbar relation till kunskap utan snarare i en medierad relation där kulturella redskap och resurser bidrar till både förståelse och mening. På så vis kan de sägas vara tankeredskap (jfr. Vygotsky & Luria, 1994, som introducerade begreppet *stödjande tecken*, "auxiliary signs"). Ett annat framträdande begrepp inom detta perspektiv är *appropriering*, det vill säga den process genom vilken vi *lär oss* bemästra de redskap som tas i bruk (Linell, 2009; Säljö, 2000, 2005; Wertsch, 1998). Som Vygotskij (med engelsk stavning: *Vygotsky*) (1925/1971), Säljö (2005) och Miller (2011) understryker, är det lärande meningsskapandet i interaktion med kulturella redskap som artefakter och symboler inte frikopplat från användarens intentioner. Tvärtom kan dessa avgöra vilken typ av lärande och meningsskapande som erbjuds. Både Vygotskij och Miller tar upp kniven som exempel. Vygotsky (1925/1971) klargör här skillnaden mellan kirurgens meningsskapande med kniven i sin hand och hur det barn gör som av någon anledning fått tag på en kniv, exempelvis i lek.

På ett filosofiskt plan problematiserar den sociokulturella ansatsen den cartesianska dualism som lagt grund för de uppsplittrade föreställningarna mellan kropp och själ, individ och kollektiv, det yttre och det inre, etc. (Linell,

2009; Veresov, 1998; Vygotsky, 1925/1971). I avsnitt 4.2 diskuteras ytterligare en filosofisk implikation, denna gång en dialogfilosofisk sådan. Avsnittet inleds med Rommetveits (2008) ord om det nytänkande med ett konsekvent dialogiskt paradigm, som han ställer mot ett monologistiskt. Därefter redogörs för Linells (2009) djupgående arbete på temat. Här lyfts bl.a. begreppet *dubbel dialogicitet* upp ("double dialogicality") – ett nyckelbegrepp för den dialogicitet som står i centrum för ett sociokulturellt perspektiv. I korthet innebär den dubbla dialogiciteten att varje interaktion är både situerad och situationsöverskridande. Med situerad interaktion åsyftas det som händer "där-och-då" (se Linell, 2011a, s. 128). Det betyder att samtalsaktörer för en dialog på två plan i analytiskt avseende, det vill säga inte endast med varandra i den lokala kontexten. I dialoger förhåller sig även de berörda personerna till existerande sociokulturella praktiker som finns implicit närvarande, till exempel meningsskapande institutionella regler och konventioner. Ett annat sätt att uttrycka det är att tala om en dialog som å ena sidan orienterar sig mot *situationen* i den direkta mellanmänskliga interaktionen, och å andra sidan mot den mer situationsöverskridande *kulturella* traditionen.

Den mellanmänskliga orienteringen mot den Andra ("other-orientation") är också en dialogisk utgångspunkt att ha i bakhuvudet inför de resonemang som följer i avhandlingen. Vi orienterar oss mot varandra på olika vis. Jag talar om dessa i termer av intersubjektivitet och alteritet, det vill säga ett förhållningssätt som inbegriper samförstånd och konsensus i någon mening (intersubjektivitet) och ett som i flera avseenden innebär motsatsen (alteritet). I sammanhanget argumenterar jag för att både intersubjektivitet och alteritet är av betydelse för pedagogisk analys av dialogteoretiskt slag. Utifrån ett pedagogiskt intresse är det också viktigt att analysera förståelse som en socialt responsiv företeelse, snarare än ett mentalt inneslutet och strikt individuellt, kognitivt tillstånd. Här förs begreppet *responsiv förståelse* ("responsive understanding") in (jfr. Bakhtin, 1986; Linell, 1998, 2009; Mäkitalo, 2011; Wells, 2007, s. 255). Avslutningsvis diskuteras hur *tillit*, och bristande tillit, finns närvarande i de dialogiska sammanhangen.

De analytiska koncept som berörs i avsnitt 4.3 är *diskurs, kommunikativa verksamhetstyper, kommunikativa projekt, kommunikativa genrer* och *topiker* (Linell, 1998, 2009, 2010a, 2011a). Dessa begrepp används sedan i den verksamhetsanalys ("activity analysis") som görs utifrån mina deltagares kommunikativa och musikaliska organisering. Vid kommunikativa verksamhetstyper, som till exempel arbetsintervjuer eller klassrumslektioner, definieras situationen av samtalsaktörerna så att den motsvarar en specifik

verksamhetstyp ("communicative activity type", CAT). En sådan ramas in av kulturspecifika rutiner, normer, regler, syften, värden och konventioner som bland annat medför en viss typ av språkbruk. Det dialogiska deltagandet i en kommunikativ verksamhetstyp är högst situationsbunden. Att analysera verksamhetstyper av kommunikativt slag innebär att reflektera kring mesonivån som länkar interaktionsordning till institutionsordning, och mikrostrukturer till makrostrukturer.

DESIGN OCH METODOLOGI

I kapitel 5 redovisas både metod och metodologiska implikationer. Det är uppdelat i två avsnitt. Inledningsvis redogörs för forskningsdesignen och de olika överväganden som gjorts i samband med denna (5.1). Här inryms även en beskrivning av de barn som deltar och de specifika förutsättningar som utgör studiens inramning. Med avstamp i denna beskrivning för jag sedan upp metoddiskussionen på en metanivå där metodologiska implikationer diskuteras (5.2). Olika metodologiska överväganden betänks också utifrån dessa.

Studien är en explorativ närstudie som utforskar hur fyra barn, 9 och 10 år gamla (två pojkar och två flickor), arbetar tillsammans parvis med uppgiften att lära varandra sjunga sånger utan vuxennärvaro. Barnen kallas i denna studie för Michael, Diana, Paul och Amy. De var ombedda att antingen instruera sin jämnåriga kamrat eller att vara den som blir instruerad. De flesta (tre av fyra deltagare) valde att få prova på båda rollerna, det vill säga att vara den som har en expertroll och kan den tilltänkta sången på förhand, eller att vara den som inte känner till den sång som ska läras. På så vis antogs att det fanns möjligheter till utmaningar 'in action' av musikaliskt, pedagogiskt och kommunikativt slag. Instruktionen till dem från min sida var att de fick instruera som de ville och att det inte fanns några rätt eller fel här i mina ögon. Jag förklarade också att det inte var deras enskilda musikaliska insatser som skulle värderas utan snarare hur de tog sig an uppgiften tillsammans i sina par. De fick veta att jag var intresserad av hur de gör när de ska sjunga och lära sig musik på detta utmanande vis.

Deras fem olika aktiviteter videodokumenterades, transkriberades och analyserades. Så gjordes även efterföljande gruppsamtal med mig och de två barnen som nyss hade deltagit i huvuduppgiften att ägna sig åt sång. Den analysmetod som tillämpas är utarbetad av Linell (1998, 2009, 2010a, 2011a) och är en diskursanalytisk och sociokulturell aktivitetsanalys där den sociala

interaktionen analyseras i relation till deras kommunikativa organisering i sin helhet. Analysen bygger på detaljerade transkriptioner av samtal. I denna studie ligger fokus på tal i kombination med andra uttryckssätt. Därför noterade jag även ansiktsuttryck och andra kroppsliga gester samt pågående aktiviteter och handlingar.

Från början hade jag tänkt mig att vi skulle iscensätta aktiviteterna i en skolmiljö, men deltagarna önskade att få fortsätta att genomföra studien där vi samlades första gången hemma hos mig. Empiriproduktionen ägde rum i halva vardagsrummet som avgränsas av en bokhylla. På den ställdes en videokamera som dokumenterade det som hände i rummet när jag hade lämnat det. Till barnens förfogande fanns ett bord, soffa, pall, piano, bärbar dator, papper, pennor och kritor m.m. De barn som skulle instruera tog även med sig sångtexter till inspelningstillfällena. Dessa tillfällen föregicks av en gemensam träff där barnen och jag fick lära känna varandra och prata igenom projektet. Jag hade också haft en träff med ett barn i taget och en av deras föräldrar där jag informerat om projektet, fått informerat samtycke till stånd och frågat barnet om vad hon eller han ville bidra och inte bidra med i sammanhanget. Här fick de barn som skulle ha expertrollen som instruktörer också börja fundera på vilka sånger/låtar de ville välja. Ett väsentligt kriterium för låtval var att deras tilltänkta partners i aktiviteten inte skulle känna till låten. Detta kollade vi upp i god tid innan genomförandet av inspelningarna. Valen föll till sist på låten "Dagny", visan "Myggan Hubert" och visan "Kom Julia vi gå".

Angående urval kan sägas att barnen kommer från samma skola i ett relativt litet samhälle i Sverige. Urvalet har inte gjorts med avseende på klasaspekter, etnicitet men möjligen kön i den bemärkelsen att jag ville ha med både flickor och pojkar. Med ett urval på endast fyra barn, och med karaktären av en fallstudie, dras inga analytiska slutsatser med avseende på dessa kategorier. Villiga och nyfikna barn fick anmäla sitt intresse via en musiklärare som jag samarbetade med. Endast ett barn hade erfarenhet av musikundervisning utanför skolan (i detta fall instrumentalundervisning). Alla hade deltagit i obligatoriska musiklektioner under skoltid.

Vetenskapsrådets (2004, 2011) etiska riktlinjer tillämpas. I avsnitt 5.1.5 problematiseras etiska dilemman och jag ger här en närmare bild av etiska implikationer av relevans för denna avhandling. I metodologidelen diskuteras videodokumentation som metod. Här kommer jag också in på metodologiska aspekter som rör samtalsanalys. Vidare väcks här frågan om vilken analytisk ingång som lämpar sig bäst för mitt teoretiska ramverk. Den sammanflätade

relationen mellan metodologi och teori är något jag understryker. För den sociokulturella utgångspunkt jag har valt i denna studie finns anledning att värna om en analysmetod som fångar upp sociala dimensioner och kontext på olika plan (både mikro- och mesonivån). Att endast analysera den strikt interpersonella kontexten skulle reducera den sociokulturella analysnivå som jag är ute efter i detta arbete.

VERKSAMHETSANALYS

Kapitel 6 är det första resultatkapitlet. Det tecknar en bild av hur de studerade barnen organiserade sina aktiviteter kommunikativt utifrån de givna förutsättningarna. Här låter jag mig vägledas av begrepp och resonemang från avsnitt 4.2 och 4.3, med andra ord av teoretiska koncept som kan återföras på Linells texter om samtalsanalys med aktivitetsteoretisk och sociokulturell blick (Linell, 1998, 2009, 2010a, 2011a, 2014).

Verksamhetsanalysen av det empiriska materialet pekar på att deltagarna orienterar sig mot varandra och mot en definition av situationen och den kommunikativa verksamhetstypen som en institutionell pedagogisk praktik. Barnen organiserar de situerade pedagogiska dialogerna så att de på ett flertal punkter överensstämmer med lektionsundervisning, närmare bestämt prototypiska musiklektioner. Det betyder bland annat att de strukturerade sina samtal på ett mycket agendabundet och målinriktat vis, med återkommande rutiner, metoder och aktivitetsfaser. De uppvisade också en konsekvens i den formella samtalsstilen som skiljer sig betydligt från det vardagliga sättet att samtala. Endast överraskningar, som då datorn inte fungerade som väntat, förmådde rubba den disciplinerade och fokuserade samtalsstil som rådde. Då trädde barnen tillfälligt ur sina respektive roller som lärare och elev, och vid de oväntade avbrotten förekom fniss och skratt samt en tydlig kamratanda som kommunikativ genre. Det innebar att den asymmetriska interaktionsordning som annars präglade aktiviteterna så systematiskt bröts för ett ögonblick.

Barnen var dock mycket snabba i att hitta tillbaka till sina förhandsgivna roller så snart de praktiska problemen blivit lösta. Inte en enda gång valde de att avbryta för att ringa telefonsamtal, gå på toaletten, dricka vatten eller annat. Inte heller frångick paren det pedagogiska samtalsfokuset en enda gång under de tre timmar som finns inspelade. Exempelvis kom de aldrig in på samtalsämnen som rörde deras fritid, deras gemensamma vänner eller

inte ens något explicit om deras gemensamma skola. Deras samtal var med andra ord utpräglat fokala och homogena med avseende på samtalsinnehåll (topiker), det vill säga impregnerade av en huvudtopik (fokuset på att tala om det avsedda lärandet av sången). Det är ett intressant resultat med tanke på att det är barn som utan omedelbar vuxenkontroll, och utifrån instruktionen att de får utforma uppdraget precis som de vill, väljer att disciplinera sig på ett sådant strikt vis genom en längre stund och med en mycket krävande organisatorisk och pedagogisk utmaning.

Aktiviteterna strukturerades upp på liknande vis genom samtliga fem sessioner (de inspelade aktiviteter som utgör mitt empiriska huvudmaterial). Fasstrukturen består av en återkommande huvudaktivitet: sångmomentet där barnet i elevrollen sjöng själv eller med stöd av pedagogen. Runt detta byggdes aktiviteterna upp av subaktiviteter som även de inföll på ett regelbundet och rutinartat vis. En framträdande subaktivitet är det utvärderande momentet efter elevens sång. Då tog pedagogerna chansen att värdera sånginsatsen och komma med förbättringsförslag i kombination med metoder som möjliggjorde framsteg i enlighet med pedagogens normer. Kritik var således vanligt förekommande, men i stort sett aldrig i form av ett isolerat dialogiskt bidrag. Det var så kallad konstruktiv kritik som framfördes; kritiskt värderande påståenden som följdes upp så att förbättringar blev möjliga i efterföljande episoder. Evaluativa dialoger av detta systematiska slag är något som präglar en skoltillvaro snarare än vardagslivet (Cazden, 1988; Mehan, 1979; Säljö, 2000). Intressant är också att barnen i elevrollen alltid accepterade kritik från den pedagogiska ledaren. På så vis avslöjas den underliggande, asymmetriska normen att det var fullt legitimt av pedagogen att ta dessa värdeladdade och utmanande initiativ, samtidigt som det förväntades att den som tog emot kritiken skulle kunna hantera detta och kämpa vidare mot målet att förbättra sig enligt de krav som ställdes. Däremot fanns en demokratisk diskurs inbäddad som innebar att eleven ibland vågade ta initiativ till diskussioner och reflektioner kring de insatser som kritiserades, utan att detta fick negativa reaktioner från läraren. Detta ligger också i linje med senmodern, svensk skolkonvention (Bergqvist & Säljö, 2004).

Av teoretisk relevans i ljuset av de empiriska resultaten är begreppet *dubbel dialogicitet* (se avsnittet "Att teoretisera lärande och kommunikation"). I en situation där det inte finns inarbetade rutiner och normer för hur barnen ska gå tillväga med sin uppgift blir gemensamma erfarenheter av kulturellt slag avgörande. Barnen väljer att definiera sina pedagogiska situationer så att det blir möjligt att låna strukturerande resurser från deras erfarenheter av

institutionellt lärande. Vid denna kommunikativa verksamhetstyp finns en delad kunskap om samtalsstil, pedagogiska strategier och konventioner. Då deltagarna i denna studie väljer att använda sig av denna kollektiva kunskapsrepertoar blir ett smidigt och fruktbart undervisande och lärande uppenbarligen möjligt (jfr. Linell, 2014). Ett annat sätt att formulera detta resultat är att de unga deltagarna orienterar sig både mot den interpersonella situationen och den situationsöverskridande kontexten. Med det blir den sociokulturella principen om det ömsesidiga beroendet mellan handling och aktivitet ("act-activity interdependence") både relevant och intressant.

Under rubriken "Sex topikala teman och sekvenstyper" (6.3) redogörs för de agendabundna topiker som återkom systematiskt under samtliga dialogiska aktiviteter. Sex huvudteman med avseende på samtalsinnehåll var framträdande. Dessa var också kopplade till formeringen av sekvenstyper. De senare har att göra med hur samtalsepisoderna gestaltar sig formmässigt. I 6.3.1 tränger jag in i hur instruktiva musikaliska inräkningar ser ut i sina sammanhang. Inräkning var en återkommande musikpedagogisk procedur som kan förstås som en subaktivitet av subsidiär natur, det vill säga har en understödjande funktion till huvudaktiviteten som består av själva sjungandet. En viktig distinktion som görs utifrån det empiriska materialet är vad som händer kring pedagogens verbala instruktioner med inräkning, till skillnad från verbala instruktioner utan inräkningen. Inräkningen visar sig inte enbart vara en musikaliskt betingad konvention. Den har även en organisatorisk betydelse i den meningen att sedvanlig inräkning (till tre) underlättar koordinationen av den snabba övergången mellan olika aktivitetsfaser. Deltagarna uppfattar alltså inräkning som handlingsorienterade signalord inför hastigt genomförda aktivitetsskiften där det gäller att inom en oerhört kort tidsperiod hinna koordinera sina handlingar så att sjungandet kan börja samtidigt och med precision.

Det topikala tema som beskrivs i 6.3.2 har berörts ovan: evaluativa dialoger i samband med elevens sångprestationer, och hur kritik levereras och tas emot av partnern. Jag har urskiljt tre övergripande kategorier som rör barnens pedagogiska utvärderingar. Dessa är uttryck för *uppskattning/gillande*, *kritik och korrigering* och *elevinitierad utvärdering*. Vidare görs i 6.3.3 en genomgång av de olika förhandlingar som äger rum i samband med deltagarnas sångframföranden. Jag fortsätter därefter i 6.3.4 med att illustrera hur sekvenstyperna gestaltar sig vid dialoger kring oförutsedda händelser. Det är intressant att såväl analysen av transkriptionerna runt dessa episoder som gruppsamtalet med barnen efteråt pekar på att plötsliga bekymmer med en

dator som krånglar förändrade situationen markant, om än högst temporärt. Amy tar i den sistnämnda samtalsformen på eget initiativ upp denna typ av situation med mig och berättar att "de roliga va när de blev lite krånglit" (Eng. *the fun thing was when we had trouble with it*).

En betydande del av mitt datamaterial kretsar kring barnens explicita samtal om pedagogiska metoder/strategier och den pedagogiska användningen av artefakter (se 6.3.5). I centrum står ett flertal topikala sekvenser om sångtextanvändning och annan skriftspråksanvändning, ofta länkade till frågan om memorering som lärprocess. Från de unga pedagogernas sida tog man ofta initiativ till samtalsepisoder om instruktionernas roll. Utifrån dessa empiriska fynd kan man hävda att topikaliseringar är ett viktigt led i den sociala konstruktionen av pedagogiskt meningsskapande. Det visade sig också att de instruerande barnen skapar utrymme för att få tala om användningen av kulturella redskap även om adressaten inte tyckte sig behöva denna sortens utvikning (se diskussionen om kommunikativ formalitet i 6.2).

Kapitlet avslutas av ett avsnitt som handlar om hur deltagarna valde att avrunda sina möten i aktiviteterna. Deras avslut präglades av demokratiska dialoger i vilka en kort förhandling ägde rum innan ledaren (läraren) tog beslutet om att ropa på mig för att de ansåg sig vara färdiga med sin uppgift.

UNDERVISNING MED KULTURELLA REDSKAP

Kapitel 7 är det andra av två resultatkapitel som uppehåller sig vid beskrivande analyser av barnens sociala interaktion i samband med undervisning och lärande i sång/musik. Här utforskar jag hur deltagarna skapar mening med hjälp av medierande redskap av olika slag, det vill säga kulturella redskap som är diskursiva och/eller visuella, och/eller materialiserade i form av artefakter.

Diskursiva redskap kan tillskrivas en betydande funktion hos de studerade barnen. Det är framförallt skriftlig symbolik som får betydelse i de kommunikativa situationerna. Nedskriven sångtext eller andra slag av notationer refereras till som "hjälpmedel" av en flicka som använder denna typ av representation extra flitigt. Den nedskrivna texten skrevs både på datorn och för hand på papper. Som jag illustrerar i avsnitt 7.1 får diskursiva redskap sin pedagogiska betydelse först när barnen talar och gestikulerar kring dem, då de sätter dem i rörelse. Metakommunikation är således viktig i sammanhanget, och likaså förkroppsligade gester med händer och armar. Jag återkommer till detta. I sammanhanget noteras att barnen konsekvent uttrycker ett pedagogiskt ideal: att

explicitgöra redskapens roll för lärandet i början av aktiviteterna för att gradvis tona ned redskapens roll mot slutet då pedagogerna förväntar sig att eleven ska uppvisa ett mer självständigt lärande – utan påtaglig hjälp av medierande redskap. Min poäng är att barnen i själva verket är lika redskapsberoende mot slutet men att lärandet, approprieringen, nu gör sig gällande med hjälp av mer subtila, och mindre synliga, redskap som exempelvis hastiga, diskreta nickningar på kritiska musikaliska ställen under elevens sång, eller andra förkroppsligade tecken. På så vis förskjuts barnens praktik från en *materialiserad* till en *förkroppsligad*: från artefakter och inskriptioner som får stor och uttalad plats, till i huvudsak små subtila kroppsgester hos den som undervisar.

Om mediering, medierande redskap och appropriering kan sägas att kulturella redskap är centrala vid scaffolding; den guidning som sker i interaktionen av pedagogen när medierande redskap ska tolkas och förstås. Exempelvis tas en gosedjurshund som befann sig i soffan i bruk då Paul ville underlätta Michaels melodiska lärande. Hunden kunde inte bidra till någon tonal produktion men däremot kunde den med Pauls demonstrativa styrning bli ett visualiserande redskap för den aktuella melodins rytmisering. Deltagarna använde sig av både traditionell mediering (att till exempel skriva med en penna) eller som i Pauls fall av okonventionell, innovativ mediering. Medierande resurser av betydelse för instruktion och undervisning var också den röstanvändning som tillämpades. Genom ett detaljerat transkriptionsförfarande upptäckte jag en systematik i barnens sätt att tala, med avseende på röstvolym och organiseringen av det temporala i det sagda. Dessa subtila medieringsformer benämns *röstmediering*. Ett exempel på ett intressant resultat här är att de ofta sänker rösten eller talar snabbare i syfte att belysa det objekt eller den artefakt som står i centrum för samtalsämnet. Det visar hur komplext och differentierat barns språkande kan vara. Pedagogiska dialoger är mycket sammansatta och multisemiotiska, inte minst när det expressiva musikspråket står på spel som hos dessa barn.

Som redan nämnts hade kroppsliga gester stor betydelse som komplement vid verbala instruktioner. Semiotisk mediering sker både verbalt och icke-verbalt, i enlighet med analysen i detta kapitel. Det är oftast kombinationen av den verbala och icke-verbala medieringen som skapar den funktionella meningen i de budskap som yttras. Fyra huvudtyper av sådan funktionell mening har identifierats: *transitoriska gester, understrykande gester, deiktiska gester* och *emotiva gester*. Transitoriska gester ("transitional gestures") har betydelse för aktivitetsskiften, och för övergången mellan olika språksystem. Understrykande gester ("emphatic gestures") har en eftertrycklig

funktion genom deras demonstrativa betoningar på specifika ord eller omtalade objekt. Exempelvis markeras uppmaningen om att *stanna* (med avseende på den musikaliska frasen) med en illustrativ handgest som återfinns på bild i avsnitt 7.5.2. Det är Paul som förtydligar sin instruktion inför Michael: "å sen måste man stanna" (Eng. *an' then one have to stop*). Deiktiska gester har en utpekande funktion som också riktar sig mot något påtalat objekt och som vanligen sätts i rörelse i samband med ordvalen "här" och "där". Till exempel väljer Diana att komplettera sitt riktade yttrande "de här" med sitt pekfinger som förflyttar sig längs med en sångtextrad på datorskärmen medan hon uttalar sina ord. Det är här Amy som förväntas uppmärksamma ett kritiskt ställe i sången med avseende på tempot. Slutligen tas de emotiva gesternas roll hos barnen upp. De tycks fylla en socialpsykologisk funktion och rör ansiktsuttryck i denna studie. Genom Michaels och Pauls leenden förmildras känsliga budskap som rör inlärarens prestationer. Omvänt, när barnen vill förstärka uppmuntrande ord i emotionellt känsliga situationer, är det mycket vanligt att leenden används som kommunikativ gest. Vanligt är också användningen av emotiva gester utan ord. De kan exempelvis fungera som minimal men ordlös respons.

SLUTSATSER

Kapitel 8, det avslutande kapitlet, sammanfattar de empiriska resultat som tidigare beskrivits. Resultaten diskuteras också i relation till tidigare forskning om undervisning och lärande, skoldiskurser, kommunikation, sång och musikpedagogik. Kapitlet avrundas med en summering av presenterade resultat med teoretisk relevans, för att sedan mynna ut i en avslutande reflektion om didaktiska, teoretiska och metodologiska implikationer av dessa.

Syftet med avhandlingen var att utforska barnens perspektiv på musikaliskt lärande och instruktion, så som de uttrycks i deras iscensatta sociala interaktioner. Jag har vidare argumenterat för en analytisk utgångspunkt som inte tar fasta på unga människors musikaliska misstag. Istället undersöks vilka kunskapsideal som kommer till uttryck när deltagarna får språka med varandra på egen hand. Ett intresse för hur barn språkar i nya pedagogiska situationer har också väglett de forskningsfrågor som formulerades inledningsvis:

- Hur lär barn varandra att sjunga sånger genom social interaktion?
- Vilken roll har kulturen för deras gemensamma aktivitet?

De slutsatser som punktas upp summariskt i avsnitt 8.4.1 är följande:

- *Den dubbla dialogiciteten* (Linell, 1998, 2009, 2011a, 2014, cf. Kullenberg, 2014b) är signifikant mot bakgrund av hur deltagarna organiserade sina pedagogiska aktiviteter. Det innebär att de orienterade sig mot varandra interpersonellt och sekventiellt i det situerade lärandet, men även mot en situationsöverskridande dimension: den kommunikativa verksamhetstypen. Den sistnämnda punkten gäller hur deltagarna uppfattar den övergripande situationen. I samtliga sångaktiviteter organiserade barnen aktiviteterna genom att låna gemensamma, kulturella resurser från välkända institutionella praktiker i skolan. Deras samtalsstilar, interaktionsordningar, aktivitetsstruktur, rutiner, metoder och kunskapsideal föll på så vis i stora drag tillbaka på prototypisk lektionsundervisning i det senmoderna svenska klassrummet. Ett exempel är att deltagarna skapade en skoltypisk *uppgiftskultur* (Ericsson & Lindgren, 2010), det vill säga uppgifter och procedurer som krävde instruktioner, regler och inte minst skriftspråk.
- Semiotiska resurser producerades inte enbart symboliskt i ord. De förkroppsligades även auditivt genom röstanvändning och temporalitet (t.ex rytm och tempo) i yttranden. Detta benämns *röstmediering* och tycks ha betydelse för budskapen i pedagogisk kommunikation.
- Barnen använde kulturella redskap både konventionellt och nytänkande. Redskapsanvändning var också ett centralt inslag i barnens intensiva "scaffolding" (instruktören/lärarens pedagogiska guidning av eleven).
- I samband med ovan nämnda redskapsanvändning kunde en distinktion urskiljas utifrån barnens uttryckta kunskapsideal: att lära sig en sång vs att kunna en sång. Den förstnämnda processen – att lära sig en sång – innefattade för dem att de använde konkreta artefakter på ett demonstrativt vis, med ackompanjerande verbala explicitgöranden. I kontrast till denna process står deras syn på vad det mer slutgiltiga musikaliska kunnandet innebär. Medan det i det förra fallet handlade om att överbetona redskapens roll handlar det nu om att underbetona den. Därför används mindre synliga, och mer subtila, medieringsformer i denna fas av deras undervisning. Nu står förkroppsligade redskap i centrum, det vill säga gester och mimik.
- *Stödjande tecken* ("auxiliary signs") var vanligt förekommande som tankeredskap under problemlösande situationer, exempelvis då problemlösaren 'tänkte högt'.

- Barnen i elevrollen arbetade hårt och repetitivt med att lära sig memorera med hjälp av skriftspråket. Den nedskrivna sångtexten stod i centrum och detta hänger ihop med att de generellt strävade efter att reproducera instruktörens sångdemonstrationer så korrekt som möjligt. Musiken bröts ned i mindre element för hanterbarhetens skull och den upplevelsebaserade sidan av musik lyftes inte fram i deras dialoger.

- Kroppsliga gester spelade en viktig roll i det musikaliska lärandet, oftast i kombination med verbala instruktioner men även som pedagogiskt stöd under elevens sjungande. På så vis var kroppsliga gester centrala visualiserande (medierande) resurser både för barnens undervisning och för deras musicerande. Fyra huvudtyper av gester identifierades utifrån deras pedagogiska funktioner: *transitoriska gester, understrykande gester, deiktiska gester* och *emotiva gester*.

- En socialpsykologisk dimension stod också på spel i barnens dialogiska möten. För att kunna och våga genomföra kritiska moment av känslig natur, som till exempel att ge och ta explicit kritik i samband med sånginsatser, lades också stor vikt vid uppmuntran och hänsyn gentemot varandra. Frågan om tillit är därför relevant att diskutera i samband med de resultat som har socialpsykologisk relevans. De gester som betecknats som emotiva (ansiktsuttryck som leenden eller missnöjesminer) är intressanta i denna diskussion. Det visade sig att leenden uttrycks i både uppmuntrande och modifierande syfte. Det sistnämnda antydde en tydlig spänning mellan det sagda och det uppvisade ansiktsuttrycket. Exempelvis log några av barnen i elevrollen medan de vågade berätta om sina tillkortakommanden.

I mitt allra sista avsnitt om konsekvenser och implikationer av studien (8.4.2) frågar jag mig hur barnens akademiska och institutionella språkbruk kan relateras till kreativitet. Det målinriktade, rationella och formella sätt som barnen samtalar och undervisar på får konsekvenser för den typ av kunskap som genereras. Barnen uppvisar tillsammans en effektivitet och en tålmodighet som ger mycket fruktbara resultat i enlighet med det avsedda lärandet. Alla barnen lär sig det avsedda med hjälp av lärarens/instruktörens livaktiga engagemang och de tar sina uppgifter på mycket stort allvar. På ett metodologiskt plan tror jag att detta speglar den delaktighet de fick genom forskningens design där de fick vara med och utforma projektet i vissa delar. Å andra sidan väcks frågan vilken sorts musikaliskt lärande som skulle konstrueras om barnen utförde sin undervisning under mer informella omständigheter.

Skulle ett mindre målorienterat sätt att sjunga och lära innebära ett annat sätt att språka? Jämför Gee (2012) som tar upp frågan om kreativitet och undervisning utifrån ett resonemang om språkets roll (avsnitt 3.2 i föreliggande avhandling). Även Sawyer (2004, 2006) berör frågan om social interaktion, improvisatorisk kommunikation och kreativ pedagogik (jfr. Bjørkvold, 1991, som också eftersöker entusiasm och sociala improvisationsförmågor hos musiklärare). Frågan om kontextens och språkets villkor för barns kreativa lärande är en fråga att undersöka vidare i framtida forskning. Likaså känns det angeläget att gå vidare med att utforska *kommunikativa verksamhetstyper* (Linell, 1998, 2009, 2010a, 2011a) och deras betydelse för olika slag av lärande.

References

Åberg, M., Mäkitalo, Å. & Säljö, R. (2010). Knowing and arguing in a panel debate. Speaker roles and responsivity to others. In K. Littleton & C. Howe (Eds.). *Educational Dialogues: Understanding and promoting productive interaction* (pp. 13–31). London/New York: Routledge.

Alerby, E. & Ferm, C. (2005). Learning Music: Embodied Experience in the Life-World. *Philosophy of Music Education Review*, 13(2), 177–185.

Alexander, R. (2008). *Towards dialogic teaching: rethinking classroom talk.* (4. ed.) Cambridge: Dialogos.

Arminen, I. (2005). *Institutional Interaction: Studies of talk at work.* Aldershot: Ashgate.

Aspelin, J. (1999a). *Klassrummets mikrovärld* (Doktorsavhandling). Eslöv: Lunds Universitet.

Aspelin, J. (1999b). *Banden mellan oss: ett socialpsykologiskt perspektiv på lärare-elev-relationen.* Eslöv: B. Östlings bokförl. Symposion.

Aspelin, J. (2005). *Den mellanmänskliga vägen: Martin Bubers relationsfilosofi som pedagogisk vägvisning.* Eslöv: B. Östlings bokförlag Symposion.

Aspelin, J. (2006). Beneath the surface of classroom interaction: Reflections on the microworld of education. *Social Psychology of Education*, 9, 227–244.

Aspelin, J. (2010) What really matters is 'between': Understanding the focal point of education from an inter-human perspective. *Education Inquiry*, 1(2), 127–136.

Aspelin, J. (2012). How do relationships influence student achievement? Understanding student performance from a general, social psychological standpoint. *International Studies in Sociology of Education*, 22(1), 41–56.

Aspelin, J. (2013). *Var* är relationell specialpedagogik? I J. Aspelin (Red.). *Relationell specialpedagogik: i teori och praktik* (ss. 179–189). Kristianstad: Kristianstad University Press.

Aspelin, J. (2014). Beyond individualised teaching: A relational construction of pedagogical attitude. *Education Inquiry,* 5(2), 243–255.

Aspelin, J. & Persson, S. (2011). *Om relationell pedagogik*. Malmö: Gleerup.

Asplund, J. (1987). *Det sociala livets elementära former*. Göteborg: Korpen.

Baker-Sennett, J. & Matusov, E. (1997). School "performance": Improvisational processes in development and education. In R.K. Sawyer (Ed.). *Creativity in performance* (pp. 197–212). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Bakhtin, M.M. (1986). *Speech genres and other late essays*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.

Bamford, A. (2009). *The wow factor: global research compendium on the impact of the arts education.* (2. ed.) Münster: Waxmann.

Barrett, M.S. (2005). Representation, cognition, and communication: Invented notation in children's musical communication. In D. Miell, R. MacDonald & D. J. Hargreaves (Eds.), *Musical communication* (pp. 117–142). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Barrett, M.S. (2006). Inventing songs, inventing worlds: The 'genesis' of creative thought and activity in young children's lives. *International Journal of Early Years Education*, 14, 201–220.

Bavelas, J.B. & Chovil, N. (2000). Visible acts of meaning: An integrated message model of language in face-to-face dialogue. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 19(2), 163–194.

Bengtsson, J. (2001). *Sammanflätningar: Husserls och Merleau-Pontys fenomenologi.* Göteborg: Daidalos.

Bengtsson, J. (2004). Försök till en ontologisk förståelse av undervisning. I J. Bengtsson (Red.). *Utmaningar i filosofisk pedagogik* (ss. 17–39). Lund: Studentlitteratur.

Bergqvist, K. (1990). *Doing schoolwork: Task premisses and joint activity in the comprehensive classroom* (Doktorsavhandling). Linköping: Univ. Linköping.

Bergqvist, K. (2001a). Skolarbete som interaktion. I S. Lindblad & F. Sahlström. (Red.). *Interaktion i pedagogiska sammanhang*. Stockholm: Liber.

Bergqvist, K. (2001b). Discourse and classroom practices: Reflectivity and responsibility in learning and instruction. *Nordisk pedagogik,* 21(2), 82–91.

Bergqvist, K. (2010). "Think of how you can know that you have reached your goals": Reflection as self-control in late-modern schooling. *Nordic Studies in Education*, 30, 137–149.

Bergqvist, K. (2012). "Own work" in primary school – A teaching and learning practice in the context of administration and control. *Education Inquiry*, 3(2), 283–296.

Bergkvist, K. & Säljö, R. (2004). Learning to plan: A study of reflexivity and discipline in modern pedagogy. In J.V.D. Linden & P. Renshaw (Eds.). *Dialogic learning* (pp. 109–124). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer.

Bernstein, B. (1990). *Class, codes and control, Vol. 4, The structuring of pedagogic discourse.* London: Routledge.

Biesta, G. (2005). Against learning: Reclaiming a language for education in an age of learning. *Nordisk pedagogik*, 25, 54–66.

Biesta, G. (2009a). Good education in an age of measurement: on the need to reconnect with the question of purpose in education. *Springer Science,* 21, 33–46.

Biesta, G. (2009b). Witnessing deconstruction of education: why quasi-transcendentalism matters. *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, 43(3), 391–404.

Biesta, G. (2011). Philosophy, Exposure, and Children: How to Resist the Instrumentalisation of Philosophy in Education. *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, 45(2), 305–319.

Bingham, C.W. & Sidorkin, A.M. (2004). The pedagogy of relation: An introduction. In C.W. Bingham & A.M. Sidorkin (Eds.). *No education without relation*. New York: P. Lang.

Bjørkvold, J. (1991). *Den musiska människan: barnet, sången och lekfullheten genom livets faser.* Stockholm: Runa.

Bjørkvold, J. (1998). *Sköldpaddans sång.* Hässelby: Runa.

Borgström Källén, C. (2014). *När musik gör skillnad: genus och genrepraktiker i samspel* (Doktorsavhandling). Göteborg: Högskolan för scen och musik, Göteborgs universitet.

Brand, E. (2000). Children's Mental Musical Organisations as Highlighted by Their Singing Errors. *Psychology of Music*, 28, 62–80.

Bruner, J. S. (1990). *Acts of meaning.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bruner, J. (1996). *The culture of education*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bruner, J. (2006*). In Search of Pedagogy, Volume 1: The Selected Works of Jerome Bruner*. NY: Routledge.

Bunting, L. & Lindström, B. (2013). Framing English learning at the intersection of school and out-of-school practices. *Journal of International Scientific Publications: Language, Individual & Society*, 7(1), 205–221.

Burnard, P. (2012). *Musical creativities in practice.* New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Bygdéus, P. (2012). *Uttryck genom handling: medierande verktyg i körledararbete med barn och unga* (Licentiatuppsats). Lund: Musikhögskolan i Malmö, Lunds universitet.

Calais, G.J. (2008). Microgenetic Analysis of Learning: Measuring Change as It Occurs. *National forum of applied educational research journal,* 21(3), 1–7.

Carlgren, I., Klette, K., Myrdal, S., Schnack, K. & Simola, H. (2006). Nordic teaching practices: from individualised teaching to the teaching of individuals. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, 50(3), 301–326.

Catterall, J.S. (2002). *Critical Links: Learning in the Arts and Student Social and Academic Development.* Arts Education Partnership website: http://www.aep-arts.org.

Cazden, C.B. (1988). *Classroom discourse: the language of teaching and learning.* Portsmouth: Heinemann.

Chen-Hafteck, L. (1999). Discussing Text-Melody Relationship in Children's Song-Learning and Singing: A Cantonese-Speaking Perspective. *Psychology of Music*, 27, 55–70.

Chovil, N. (1991). Social determinants of facial displays. *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior*, 15(3), 141–154.

Cohen, L., Manion, L. & Morrison, K. (2011). *Research methods in education.* (7. ed.) Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon, England: Routledge.

Cole, M. (1996). *Cultural psychology: A once and future discipline.* Cambridge: The Bellknap Press of Harvard University Press.

Connery, M.C. (2010). The Historical Significance of Vygotsky's Psychology of Art. In M.C. Connery., V. John-Steiner & A. Marjanovic-Shane (Eds.). (2010). *Vygotsky and creativity: a cultural-historical approach to play, meaning making, and the arts* (pp. 17–26). New York: Peter Lang.

Cornejo, C. (2008). Intersubjectivity as Co-phenomenology: From the Holism of Meaning to the Being-in-the-world-with-others. *Integrative Psychological and Behavioral Science,* 42(2), 171–178.

Crossley, N. (1996) *Intersubjectivity: The fabric of social becoming.* London: Sage Publications.

Dahlbäck, K. (2011). *Musik och språk i samverkan* (Licentiatuppsats). Göteborg: Göteborgs Universitet.

Daneš, F. (2004). Universality vs. Culture-Specificity of Emotion. In E. Weigand (Ed.). *Emotion in dialogic interaction: advances in the complex* (pp. 23–32). Amsterdam: John Benjamin Pub.

Davidson, L. & Scripp, L. (1989). Education and development in music from a cognitive perspective. In Hargreaves, D. J. (Ed.). *Children and the Arts.* Philadelphia: Open University Press.

Derrida, J. (1981). *Positions.* London: Athlone.

Dockett, S., Einarsdottir, J. & Perry, B. (2009). Researching with children: ethical tensions. *Journal of Early Childhood Research*, 7, 283–298.

Drew, P. & Heritage, J. (1992). *Talk at work.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dysthe, O. (1996). *Det flerstämmiga klassrummet: att skriva och samtala för att lära.* Lund: Studentlitteratur.

Eco, U. (2001). *Experiences in translation.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Ericsson, C. (2007). From Guided Exhibition to Shopping and Preoccupied Assimilation. In G. Folkestad (Ed.). *A Decade of Research in Music Education.* Malmö: Malmö Academy of Music, Lund University.

Ericsson, C. & Lindgren, M. (2010). *Musikrummet i blickfånget: Vardagskultur, identitet, styrning och kunskapsbildning.* Halmstad: Högskolan i Halmstad.

Evaldsson, A.-C. & Corsaro, W.A. (1998). Play and Games in the Peer Cultures of Preschool and Preadolescent Children: An interpretative Appraoch. *Childhood*, 5(4), 377–402.

Evensen, L.S. (2014). Trust in Educational Discourse: A Risky Undertaking. In P. Linell & I. Marková (Eds.). *Dialogical approaches to trust in communication.* Charlotte, N.C.: Information Age Publishing.

Falthin, A. (2011). *Musik som nav i skolredovisningar* (Licentiatuppsats). Stockholm: Kungl. Musikhögskolan.

Falthin, P. (2011). *Goodbye Reason Hello Rhyme: A Study of Meaning Making and the Concept Development Process in Music Education* (Licentiatuppsats). Stockholm: Kungl. Musikhögskolan.

Ferm Thorgersen, C. (2009). Ömsesidig nyfikenhet och respekt: en fenomeno-
logisk didaktik med utgångspunkt för musikundervisning i grund-
skolans lägre åldrar. I *Nordisk musikkpedagogisk forskning. Årbok 11*
(ss. 167–184). Oslo: Norges musikkhögskole.

Fiske, H.E. (1992). Experimental Research. In A.E. Kemp (Ed.). *Some Ap-
proaches to Research in Music Education*. Huddersfield: ISME Research
Comission, England.

Flowers, P. J. (1984). Attention to Elements of Music and Effect of Instruc-
tion in Vocabulary on Written Descriptions of Music by Children and
Undergraduates. *Psychology of Music.* 12(17), 17–24.

Flowers, P.J. & Dunne-Sousa, D. (1990). Pitch-Pattern Accuracy, Tonality,
and Vocal Range in Preschool Children's Singing. *Journal of Research
in Music Education*, 38(2), 102–114.

Folkestad, G. (2006). Formal and informal learning situations or practices vs
formal and informal ways of learning. *British journal of music education*,
23(2), 135–145.

Folkestad, G. (2007). Here, There and Everywhere. In G. Folkestad (Ed.).
A Decade of Research in Music Education (pp. 7–25). Malmö: Malmö
Academy of Music, Lund University.

Folkestad, G. (2012). Digital tools and discourse in music: The ecology of
composition. In D.J. Hargreaves, D. Miell & R.A.R. MacDonald (Eds.).
*Musical imaginations: multidisciplinary perspectives on creativity, perfor-
mance and perception*. Oxford: Oxford Univ Press.

Frith, S. (2012). Creativity as a social fact. In D.J. Hargreaves, D. Miell & R.A.R.
MacDonald (Eds.). *Musical imaginations: multidisciplinary perspectives
on creativity, performance and perception*. Oxford: Oxford Univ Press.

Gee, J.P. (2012). *Social linguistics and literacies: ideology in discourses*. (4 ed.)
London: Routledge.

Gergen, K.J. (2009). *Relational being: beyond self and community*. Oxford:
Oxford University Press.

Goodwin, C. (1994). Professional vision. *American Anthropologist*, 96(3),
606–633.

Goodwin, C. (2000). Action and embodiment within situated human inter-
action. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 32, 1489–1522.

Green, L. (1988). *Music on deaf ears: musical meaning, ideology, education*.
Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Green, L. (2001). *How Popular Musicians Learn: A Way Ahead for Music
Education*. Aldershot: Ashgate.

Green, L. (2008). *Music, informal learning and the school: a new classroom pedagogy*. Aldershot: Ashgate.

Hardman, M. & Delafield, B. (2010). Philosophy for Children as dialogic teaching. In K. Littleton & C. Howe (Eds.). *Educational Dialogues: Understanding and promoting productive interaction* (pp. 149–164). London/New York: Routledge.

Hargreaves, D.J, MacDonald, R.A.R. & Miell, D. (2012). Explaining musical imaginations: Creativity, performance and perception. In D.J, Hargreaves, D., Miell & R.A.R., MacDonald. (Eds.). *Musical imaginations: multi-disciplinary perspectives on creativity, performance and perception.* Oxford: Oxford Univ Press.

Hargreaves, D.J. & North, A.C. (1997). The social psychology of music. In D.J. Hargreaves & A.C. North (Eds.). *The Social Psychology of Music* (pp. 1–21). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hattie, J. (2009). *Visible learning: a synthesis of over 800 meta-analyses relating to achievement.* NY: Routledge.

Heath, C. (1986). *Body movement and speech in medical interaction.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Heath, C. (2004). Analysing face-to-face interaction. Video, the visual and material. In D. Silverman (Ed.). *Qualitative Research: Theory, Method and Practice.* London: SAGE.

Heath, S. (1983). *Ways with Words: Language, life and work in communities and classrooms.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Heath, C., Hindmarsh, J. & Luff, P. (2010). *Video in qualitative research: analysing social interaction in everyday life.* Los Angeles: SAGE.

Heath, C. & Luff, P. (2000). *Technology in action.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Heiling, G. (2007). Play Well and Have Fun. In G. Folkestad (Ed.). *A Decade of Research in Music Education* (pp. 57–73). Malmö: Malmö Academy of Music, Lund University.

Hellman, A. (2014). Videodagbok som performativ agent: Synliggörande av komplexitet i en gymnasieelevs berättelse om arbete med media. I M. Lindgren., T. Häikiö & M. Johansson (Red.). *Texter om konstarter och lärande* (ss. 64–84). Göteborg: Art Monitor, Konstnärliga fakulteten, Göteborgs universitet.

Hellsten, H. (2013). Introduktion. I A.-K. Vernersson. *Ett o-herrans liv i rytmikens tjänst.* Malmö: Musikhögskolan i Malmö, Lunds universitet.

Herbert, A. (2010). *The pedagogy of creativity.* Abington, Oxon, England: Routledge.

Heritage, J. (1984). *Garfinkel and Ethnomethodology.* Oxford: Polity Press.

Heritage, J. (2004). Conversation Analysis and Institutional Talk. In D. Silverman (Ed.). *Qualitative Research: Theory, Method and Practice.* London: SAGE.

Hindmarsh, J. & Heath, C. (2003). Transcending the object in embodied interaction. In J. Coupland & R. Gwyn (Eds.). *Discourse, the body, and identity* (pp. 43–69). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Holmberg, Y. (2014). *Musikskap: musikstundens didaktik i förskolepraktiker* (Doktorsavhandling). Lund: Lunds universitet.

Hultberg, C. (2000). *The Printed Score as a Mediator of Musical Meaning: Approaches to Music Notation in Western Tonal Tradition* (Doctoral thesis). Lund: Lunds universitet.

Hultberg, C. (2007). The Printed Score as a Mediator of Musical Meaning. In G. Folkestad (Ed.). *A Decade of Research in Music Education* (pp. 75–88). Malmö: Malmö Academy of Music, Lund University.

Hultberg, C.K. (2009). En kulturpsykologisk modell av musikaliskt lärande genom musicerande. I F.V. Nielsen., S.G. Nielsen., S.E. Holgersen (Red.). *I Nordisk musikkpedagogisk forskning. Årbok* 11 (ss. 119-138). Oslo: Norges musikkhøgskole.

Ideland, J. (2011). *Spela leka eller låta bli: Guitar Hero som kommunikativ praktik för unga musiker* (Licentiatuppsats). Luleå: Luleå tekniska universitet.

Ivarsson, J. (2004). *Renderings & reasoning: studying artifacts in human knowing* (Doctoral thesis). Göteborg: Göteborgs universitet.

James, A., Jenks, C. & Prout, A. (1998). *Theorizing Childhood.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Jewitt, C. (2006). *Knowledge in context: Representations, Community and Culture.* London: Routledge.

Jorgensen, E.R. (2008). *Art of Teaching Music* [Elektronisk resurs]. Indiana University Press.

Johansson, K. (2012). Organ improvisation: Edition, extemporization, expansion, and instant composition. In D.J. Hargreaves, D. Miell & R.A.R. MacDonald (Eds.). *Musical imaginations: multidisciplinary perspectives on creativity, performance and perception.* Oxford: Oxford Univ Press.

Johansson, M. (2002). *Slöjdpraktik i skolan: hand, tanke, kommunikation och andra medierande redskap* (Doktorsavhandling). Göteborg: Göteborgs universitet.

Johansson, M. (2011). Vad och hur gör de?: att synliggöra lärande i grund-skolans slöjdpraktik via videoetnografi och mikroanalys. *Techne Journal*, 18(1), 33–47.

Johansson, T. & Lalander, P. (2013). *Vardagslivets socialpsykologi.* (2 uppl.) Stockholm: Liber.

John-Steiner, V., Connery, M.C. & Marjanovic-Shane, A. (2010). Dances with the Muses: An Cultural-Historical Approach To Play, Meaning Making and Creativity. In M.C. Connery, V. John-Steiner & A. Marjanovic-Shane (Eds.). *Vygotsky and creativity: a cultural-historical approach to play, meaning making, and the arts* (pp. 3–16). New York: Peter Lang.

Jovchelovitch, S. (2007). *Knowledge in context: representations, community and culture.* London: Routledge.

Kempe, A.-L. & West, T. (2001). *Interaktion och kunskapsutveckling: en studie av frivillig musikundervisning* (Doktorsavhandling av båda förf.). Stockholm: Kungl. Musikhögskolan, Univ. Stockholm.

Kozulin, A. (1990). *Vygotsky's psychology: a biography of ideas.* New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Kress, G., Jewitt, C., Ogborn, J. & Tsatsarelis, C. (2001). *Multimodal teaching and learning: The rethorics of the science classroom.* NY: Continuum.

Kullenberg, T. (2008). *Skapande möten – en studie i interaktionism och skapande i musik* (Magisteruppsats). Malmö: Malmö musikhögskola, Lunds universitet.

Kullenberg, T. (2014a). Barn som lär barn – med musikaliska och dialogiska förtecken. I M. Lindgren., T. Häikiö & M. Johansson (Red.). *Texter om konstarter och lärande* (ss. 85–106). Göteborg: Art Monitor, Konstnärliga fakulteten, Göteborgs universitet.

Kullenberg, T. (2014b). *"The double dialogicality" reflected in children's music teaching* (Refereegranskat konferenspaper). I NNMPF, Nordiskt nätverk i musikpedagogisk forskning, Stockholm, 2014.

Lagergren, A. (2012). *Barns musikkomponerande i tradition och förändring* (Doktorsavhandling). Göteborg: Göteborgs universitet.

Lagerlöf, P., Wallerstedt, C. & Pramling, N. (2013). Engaging children's partic-ipation in and around a new music technology through playful framing. *International Journal of Early Years Education*, 21(4), 325–355.

Lave, J. & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral partici-pation* Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Leijonhufvud, S. (2011). *Sångupplevelse – en klingande bekräftelse på min existens i världen: en fenomenologisk undersökning ur första-person-perspektiv* (Licentiatuppsats). Stockholm: Kungl. Musikhögskolan.

Lévinas, E. (1969). *Totality and infinity: an essay on exteriority*. Dordrecht: Kluver Academic.

Levinson, S. (1992). Activity types and language. In P. Drew & J. Heritage (Eds.). *Talk at Work* (pp. 66–100). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Liedman, S-E. (2011). *Hets!: en bok om skolan*. Stockholm: Bonnier.

Lilja, A. (2013). Body, Space and Time – and their Influences on Trustful Relationships in the Classroom. *Indo-Pacific Journal of Phenomenology*, 13, 1–10.

Lindblad, S. & Sahlström, F. (1999). Gamla mönster och nya gränser: Om ramfaktorer och klassrumsinteraktion. *Pedagogisk Forskning i Sverige*, 4(1), 73–92.

Lindgren, M. (2006). *Att skapa ordning för det estetiska i skolan: diskursiva positioneringar i samtal med lärare och skolledare* (Doktorsavhandling). Göteborg: Göteborgs universitet.

Lindgren, M. (2013). Kontext och diskurs som lärandets villkor. I A. Marner & H. Örtegren (Red.). *KLÄM: Konferenstexter om Lärande, Ämnesdidaktik och Mediebruk.* Umeå: Nationella nätverket för ämnesdidaktik, Umeå universitet.

Lindwall, O. (2008). *Lab work in science education: instruction, inscription, and the practical achievement of understanding* (Doctoral thesis). Linköping: Linköpings universitet.

Lindwall, O. & Lymer, G. (2011). Uses of "understand" in science education. *Journal of Pragmatics, 43*(2), 452–474.

Linell, P. (1998). *Approaching Dialogue: Talk, Interaction and Contexts in Dialogical Perspectives.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Linell, P. (2003). Dialogical Tensions: On Rommetveitian Themes of Minds, Meanings, Monologues, and Languages. *Mind, Culture, and Activity*, 10(3), 219–229.

Linell, P. (2009). *Rethinking language, mind and world dialogically: interactional and contextual theories of human sense-making.* Charlotte, NC. Information Age Publ.

Linell, P. (2010a). Communicative activity types as organisations in discourses and discourses in organisations. In S.-K. Tanskanen., M.-L. Helasvuo., M. Johansson & M. Raitaniemi (Eds.). *Discourses in Interaction.* Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Linell, P. (2010b). With Respect to Bakhtin: Some trends in contemporary dialogical theories. In K. Junefelt & P. Nordin (Eds.). *Proceedings from the Second International Interdisciplinary Conference. Perspectives and Limits of Dialogism in Mikhail Bakhtin* (pp. 18–32). Stockholm: Stockholm University.

Linell, P. (2011a). *Samtalskulturer. Kommunikativa verksamheter i samhället. Volym 1 och 2*. Linköping: Institutionen för kultur och kommunikation, Linköpings universitet.

Linell, P. (2011b). Tänkande, minnande och lärande i ett dialogiskt perspektiv: en epilog. I R. Säljö (Red.). *Lärande och minnande: som social praktik* (ss. 437–448). Stockholm: Norstedts förlag.

Linell, P. (2014). *A Dialogical Notebook: Afterthoughts after Rethinking*. Göteborg: Department of Education, Communication and Learning, Göteborg University. (e-publication: http://www.ipkl.gu.se/digitalAssets).

Linge, A. (2013). *Svängrum: för en kreativ musikpedagogik* (Doktorsavhandling). Malmö: Malmö högskola.

Littleton, K. & Howe, C. (2010). (Eds.). *Educational dialogues: understanding and promoting productive interaction*. London: Routledge.

Littleton, K. & Mercer, N. (2013). *Interthinking: Putting Talk to Work.* London: Routledge

Luckmann, T. (2002). On the methodology of (oral) genres. In P. Linell & K. Aronsson (Eds.). *Jagen och rösterna: Goffman, Viveka och samtalet* (pp. 319–337). Linköping: Department of Communication Studies.

Lyle, S. (2008). Dialogic Teaching: Discussing Theoretical Contexts and Reviewing Evidence from Classroom Practice, *Language and Education*, 22(3), 222–240.

Lymer, G., Ivarsson, J. & Lindwall, O. (2009). Contrasting the use of tools for presentation and critique: Some cases from architectural education. *Computer-Supported Collaborative Learning*, 4, 423–444.

Mäkitalo, Å. (2011). Appropriering genom argumentation. I R.Säljö (Red.). *Minnande och lärande som social praktik*. Stockholm: Norstedts.

Marková, I. (2003). *Dialogicality and social representations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mars, A. (2012). *Musikaliskt lärande i kulturmöte. En fallstudie av gambiska och svenska ungdomar i samspel* (Licentiatuppsats). Lund: Musikhögskolan i Malmö, Lunds universitet.

Mars, A., Saether, E. & Folkestad, G. (2014). Musical learning in a cross-cultural setting: a case studie of Gambian and Swedish adolescents in interaction. *Music Education Research, 2014*. (e-publication: http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14613808.2014.930120).

Mcbeth, D. (2011). Understanding understanding as an instructional matter. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43, 438–451.

McNeill, D. (1992). *Hand and mind: what gestures reveal about thought*. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press.

McPherson, G.E., Davidson, J.W. & Faulkner, R. (2012). *Music in our lives: rethinking musical ability, development and identity*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Mehan, H. (1979). "What time is it, Denise?" Asking known information questions in classroom discourse. *Theory into Practice*, 18(4), 285–294.

Melander, H. (2009). *Trajectories of Learning: Embodied Interaction in Change* (Doctoral thesis). Uppsala: Uppsala Studies in Education.

Melander, H. (2012). Transformations of knowledge within a peer group: Knowing and learning in interaction. *Learning, Culture and Social Interaction, Elsevier*, 1, 232–248.

Melander, H. & Sahlström, F. (2010). *Lärande i interaktion*. Stockholm: Liber.

Melander, H. & Sahlström, F. (2011). Process eller produkt? Om samtalsanalysens möjligheter att studera lärande i verkligheten. I R. Säljö (Red.). *Minnande och lärande som social praktik*. Stockholm: Norstedts.

Mercer, N. (1995). *The guided construction of knowledge: talk among teachers and learners*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Mercer, N. & Littleton, K. (2007). *Dialogue and the Development of Children's Thinking: a sociocultural approach*. London: Routledge.

Miller, R. (2011). *Vygotsky in perspective*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mizener, C.P. (1993). Attitudes of Children toward Singing and Choir Participation and Assessed Singing Skill. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 41(3), 233–245.

Mizener, C.P. (2008). Our Singing Children Developing Singing Accuracy. *General Music Today,* 21 (3), 18–24.

Morrow, W. & Richards, M. (1996). The Ethics of Social Research with Children: An Overview. *Children & Society*, 10(2), 90–105.

Nerland, M. (2004). *Instrumentalundervisning som kulturell praksis: en diskursorientert studie av hovedinstrumentundervisning i høyere musikkutdanning* (Doktorsavhandling). Oslo: Univ., Oslo.

Nerland, M. (2007). One-to-one teaching as cultural practice: two case studies from an academy of music. *Music Education Research*, 9(3), 399–416.

Nilsen, M. & Mäkitalo, Å. (2008). Chatt som samtalskultur – hur yrkesverksamma lär sig kommunicera i en webbaserad miljö. I H. Rystedt & R. Säljö (Red.). *Kunskap och människans redskap: teknik och lärande.* Lund: Studentlitteratur.

Nilsson, B. (2002). *"Jag kan göra hundra låtar": barns musikskapande med digitala verktyg* (Doktorsavhandling). Lund: Musikhögskolan i Malmö, Lunds universitet.

Nilsson, B. (2013). Den relationella musiken. I J. Aspelin (Red.). *Relationell specialpedagogik: i teori och praktik.* Kristianstad: Kristianstad University Press.

Nordström-Lytz, R. (2013). *Att möta den andra: det pedagogiska uppdraget i ljuset av Martin Bubers relationsfilosofi* (Doktorsavhandling). Vasa: Åbo akademi.

Olsson, B. (1993). *SÄMUS – musikutbildning i kulturpolitikens tjänst?: en studie om en musikutbildning på 1970-talet* (Doktorsavhandling). Göteborg: Göteborgs universitet.

Olsson, B. (1997). The social psychology of music education. In D.J. Hargreaves & A. C. North (Eds.). *The Social Psychology of Music* (pp. 290–305). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Olsson, B. (2014). Vad är grunden för musikaliskt lärande och bedömning? I M. Lindgren., T. Häikiö & M. Johansson (Red.). *Texter om konstarter och lärande* (ss. 132–161). Göteborg: Art Monitor, Konstnärliga fakulteten, Göteborgs universitet.

Parker, S. (2005). The biology of learning. In P. Jarvis & S. Parker (Eds.). *Human Learning: An holistic approach* (pp.16–31). London/New York: RoutledgeFalmer.

Peretz, I., Brattico, E., Järvenpää, M. & Tervaniemi, M. (2009). The amusic brain: in tune, out of key, and unaware. *Brain*, 132(5), 1277–1286.

Pio, F. (2009). Sanselighedspaedagogik og livsduelighed. Skolens vej mod en omvurdering af music som sanselig-aestetisk fag. *Nordisk musikkpedagogisk forskning. Årbok 11* (ss. 139–166). Oslo: Norges musikkhögskole.

Pio, F. & Varkøy, Ø. (2012). Reflection on Musical Experience as Existential Experience:

An Ontological Turn. *Philosophy of Music Education Review*, 20(2), 99–116.

Potter, J. (2011). Discursive Psychology and the Study of Naturally Occurring Talk. In D. Silverman (Ed.). *Qualitative research: issues of theory, method and practice* (pp. 187–207). (3. ed.) London: SAGE.

Pramling, N. (2006). *Minding metaphors: using figurative language in learning to represent.* (Doctoral thesis). Göteborg: Göteborgs universitet.

Pramling, N. (2009). External representation and the architecture of music: Children inventing and speaking about notations. *B.J. Music. Ed.*, 26(3), 273–291.

Pramling, N. & Wallerstedt, C. (2009). Making musical sense: The multimodal nature of clarifying musical listening. *Music Education Research*, 11, 135–151.

Pramling Samuelsson, I. & Pramling, N. (2009). Children's perspectives as 'touch downs' in time: assessing and developing children's understanding simultaneously. *Early Child Development and Care*, 179(2), 205–216.

Pramling Samuelsson, I., Asplund Carlsson, M., Olsson, B., Pramling, N. & Wallerstedt, C. (2009). The art of teaching children the arts: music, dance and poetry with children aged 2–8 years old. *International Journal of Early Years Education*, 17(2), 119–135.

Pramling Samuelsson, I. Asplund Carlsson, M., Olsson, B., Pramling, N. & Wallerstedt, C. (2011). *Konsten att lära barn estetik: en utvecklingspedagogisk studie av barns kunnande inom musik, poesi och dans.* (2. uppl.) Stockholm: Norstedt.

Pring, R. (2004). *Philosophy of educational research.* (2. ed.) London: Continuum.

Reddy, M.J. (1979). The conduit metaphor: A case of frame conflict in our language about language. In A. Ortony (Ed.). *Metaphor and Thought* (pp. 284–324). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rogoff, B. (1998). Cognition as a collaborative process. In D. Kuhn & R.S. Siegler (Eds.). *Handbook of child psychology: Vol. 2 Cognition, perception, and language* (pp.679–744). (5 ed.) New York: Wiley.

Rommetveit, R. (1974). *On message structure.* London: Academic Press.

Rommetveit, R. (1998). On divergent perspectives and controversial issues in studies of language and mind. In M. Janse & A. Verlinden (Eds.). *Productivity and creativity. Studies in General and Descriptive Linguistics in Honor of E.M. Uhlenbeck* (pp. 179–189). Berlin: Mouton deGruyter.

Rommetveit, R. (2008). *Språk, individuell psyke, og kulturellt kollektiv.* Oslo: Gyldendal Akademisk.

Säfström, C. (2005*). Skillnadens pedagogik: nya vägar inom den pedagogiska teorin*. Lund: Studentlitteratur.

Säljö, R. (1997). Talk as Data and Practice – a critical look at phenomenographic inquiry and the appeal to experience. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 16(2), 173–190.

Säljö, R. (1998). Thinking with and through artifacts: the role of psychological tools and physical artifacts in human learning and cognition. In D. Faulkner, K. Littleton & M. Woodhead (Eds.). *Learning relationships in the classroom* (pp. 54–66). London: Routledge.

Säljö, R. (2000). *Lärande i praktiken.* Stockholm: Prisma.

Säljö, R. (2005). *Lärande och kulturella redskap: om lärprocesser och det kollektiva minnet.* Stockholm: Nordstedts akademiska förlag.

Säljö, R. (2011a). Kontext och mänskliga samspel: Ett sociokulturellt perspektiv på lärande. *Utbildning & Demokrati,* 20(3), 67–82.

Säljö, R. (2011b). Att lära och minnas i vardagliga verksamheter. I R. Säljö (Red.). *Lärande och minnande som social praktik.* Stockholm: Norstedts förlag.

Sandberg Jurström, R. (2009). *Att ge form åt musikaliska gestaltningar: en socialsemiotisk studie av körledares multimodala kommunikation i kör* (Doktorsavhandling). Göteborg: Högskolan för scen och musik, Göteborgs universitet.

Sawyer, R.K. (2004). Creative Teaching: Collaborative Discussion as Disciplined Improvisation. *Educational Researcher*, 33(2), 12–20.

Sawyer, R.K. (2006). Group creativity: musical performance and collaboration. *Psychology of Music*, 34, 148.

Schegloff, E. (2014). Emanuel A. Schegloff´s Home Page. From the date 2014-01-03: http://www.sscnet.ucla.edu/soc/faculty/schegloff/

Schellenberg, E.G., Nakata, T., Hunter, P.G. & Tamato, S. (2007). Exposure to music and cognitive performance: tests of children and adults. *Psychology of Music,* 135(1), 5–19.

Schoultz, J., Säljö, R. & Wyndhamn, J. (2001a). Conceptual knowledge in talk and text: What does it take to understand a science question? *Instructional Science*, 29, 213–236.

Schoultz, J., Säljö, R. & Wyndhamn, J. (2001b). Heavenly Talk: Discourse, artifacts, and children's understanding of elementary astronomy. *Human Development*, 44, 103–118.

Schwarz, B., Dreyfus, T. & Hershkowitz, R. (2009). Introduction. In B. Schwarz, T. Dreyfus & R. Hershkowitz (Eds.). *Transformation of knowledge through classroom interaction.* Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.

Skolverket (2005). *Nationella utvärderingen av grundskolan 2003 (NU-03): musik.* Stockholm: Skolverket.

Skolverket. (2009). *Vad påverkar resultaten i svensk grundskola?* [What influences the results of the Swedish elementary school?, in Swedish]. Stockholm: Skolverket.

Smagorinsky, P. (2011). Vygotsky's Stage Theory: The Psychology of Art and the Actor under the Direction of *Perezhivanie*. *Mind, Culture, and Activity*, 18(4), 319–341.

Smagorinsky, P. (2013). What does Vygotsky Provide for the 21st-Century Language Arts Teacher? *Language Arts,* 90(3), 192–204.

Söderman, J. & Folkestad, G. (2004). How hip-hop musicians learn: strategies in informal creative music making. *Music Education Research*, 6(3), 313–326.

Sommer, D. (2005). *Barndomspsykologi: utveckling i en förändrad värld.* (2 ed.) Hässelby: Runa.

Sorjonen, M. & Peräkylä, A. (2012). Introduction. In M. Sorjonen & A. Peräkylä (Eds.) *Emotion in interaction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sundin, B. (1963). *Barns musikaliska skapande.* Stockholm: Liber.

Sundin, B. (1978). *Barns musikaliska utveckling.* (1. uppl.) Lund: LiberLäromedel.

Sundin, B. (1995). *Barns musikaliska utveckling.* (3 ed.) Stockholm: Liber utbildning.

Sundin, B. (2007). Musical Creativity in the First Six Years. In G. Folkestad (Ed.). *A Decade of Research in Music Education* (pp. 27–46). Malmö: Malmö Academy of Music, Lund University.

Szabo, M. (2001). Children's inaccurate singing: Selected contributing factors. *General Music Today*, 14, 4–10.

Tharp, R.G. & Gallimore, R. (1990). Teaching mind in society: Teaching, schooling, and literate discourse. In L.C. Moll (Ed.). *Vygotsky and education: instructional implications and applications of sociohistorical psychology.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Todd, S. (2008). *Att lära av den andre: Levinas, psykoanalys och etiska möjligheter i undervisning och utbildning.* (1. uppl.) Lund: Studentlitteratur.

Valsiner, J. (1997). *Culture and the development of children's actions: a theory of human development.* (2. ed.) New York: Wiley.

Valsiner, J. (2000). *Culture and human development: an introduction*. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: SAGE.

Valsiner, J. & Veer, R.V.D. (2000). *The social mind: construction of the idea*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.

Varkøy, Ø. (2003). *Musikk – strategi og lykke: Bidrag til musikkpedagogisk grunnlagstenkning.* Oslo: J.W. Cappelens Forlag.

Varkøy, Ø. (2009). The role of music in music education research: Reflections on musical experience. *Nordisk musikkpedagogisk forskning. Årbok 11*, 33–48.

Varkøy, Ø. (2012). Om nytte og onytte: En innledning. I Ø. Varkøy (Red.). *Om nytte og unytte*. Oslo: Abstrakt forlag.

Vass, E., Littleton, K., Miell, D. & Jones, A. (2008). The discourse of collaborative creative writing: Peer collaboration as a context for mutual inspiration. *Thinking Skills and Creativity*, 3(3), 192–202.

Veresov, N. (1998). *Vygotsky before Vygotsky: the path to the cultural-historical theory of human consciousness (1917–1927): historical and methodological analysis* (Doctoral thesis). Oulu: Univ. Oulu.

Vernersson, A.-K. (2013). *Ett o-herrans liv i Rytmikens tjänst – att utveckla och forma en musikpedagogik*. Malmö: Musikhögskolan i Malmö, Lunds universitet.

Vetenskapsrådet. (2004). *Forskningsetiska principer*. Vetenskapsrådet: Elanders Gotab.

Vetenskapsrådet (2011). *God forskningssed*. Stockholm: Vetenskapsrådet.

Vygotskij, L. (1999). *Tänkande och språk*. Göteborg: Daidalos. (Originaltext publicerad 1934).

Vygotsky, L. (1971). *Psychology of Art*. London: The MIT Press. (Original work published 1925).

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. (Original works published 1930–1934).

Vygotsky, L. (1986). *Thought and language*. Edited by Kozulin. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press. (Original work published 1934).

Vygotsky, L. (1994). The problem of the environment. In R.V.D. Veer & J. Valsiner (Eds.). *The Vygotsky reader*. Oxford/Cambridge: Blackwell.

Vygotsky, L. (2004). Imagination and Creativity in Childhood. *Journal of Russian and East European Psychology,* 42(1), 7–97. (Original work published 1930).

Vygotsky, L. & Luria, A. (1994). Tool and Symbol in Child Development. In R.V.D. Veer & J. Valsiner (Eds.). *The Vyotsky reader* (pp. 57–72). Oxford, England: Blackwell.

Wallerstedt, C. (2010). *Att peka ut det osynliga i rörelse. En didaktisk studie av taktart i musik* (Doktorsavhandling). Göteborg: Högskolan för scen och musik, Göteborgs universitet.

Wallerstedt, C. (2013). 'Here comes the sausage': an empirical study of children's verbal communication during a collaborative music-making activity, *Music Education Research*, 15(4), 421–434.

Wallerstedt, C., Pramling, N. & Säljö, R. (2013). Learning to discern and account: The trajectory of a listening skill in an institutional setting. *Psychology of Music*, 0(0), 1–20.

Weigand, E. (2004). Emotions: The simple and the complex. In E. Weigand (Ed.). *Emotion in dialogic interaction: advances in the complex* (pp. 3–22). Amsterdam: John Benjamin Pub.

Welch, G.F. & McPherson, G. (2012). Introduction and Commentary: Music Education and the Role of Muisc in People's Lives. In G. McPherson & G.F. Welch (Eds.). *The Oxford handbook of music education, Vol. 1* (pp. 5–20). New York: Oxford University Press.

Wells, C.G. (1999). *Dialogic inquiry: towards a sociocultural practice and theory of education.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wells, G. (2007). Semiotic Mediation, Dialogue and the Construction of Knowledge. *Human Development*, 50(5), 244–274.

Wennergren, A. (2007). *Dialogkompetens i skolans vardag: en aktionsforskningsstudie i hörselklassmiljö* (Doktorsavhandling). Luleå: Luleå tekniska högskola.

Wertsch, J. (1990). Dialogue and dialogism in a socio-cultural approach to mind. In Marková & K. Foppa (Eds.). *The dynamics of dialogue.* (pp. 62–82). New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Wertsch, J. V. (1991) *Voice of the Mind: A Sociocultural Approach to Mediated Action*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.

Wertsch, J.V. (1998). *Mind as action.* New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Winch, C. (1998). *The philosophy of human learning.* London: Routledge.

Wood, D., Bruner, J.S. & Ross, G. (1976). The Role of Tutoring in Problem Solving. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 19(2), 89–100.

Wright, M.V. (2000). *Vad eller vem?: en pedagogisk rekonstruktion av G. H. Meads teori om människors intersubjektivitet* (Doktorsavhandling). Göteborg: Daidalos.

Young, S. (2009). *Music 3–5* [Elektronisk resurs]. London: Routledge/Nursery World.

Zandén, O. (2010). *Samtal om samspel: kvalitetsuppfattningar i musiklärares dialoger om ensemblespel på gymnasiet* (Doktorsavhandling). Göteborg: Högskolan för scen och musik, Göteborgs universitet.

Zittoun, T. (2014). Trusting for Learning. In P. Linell & I. Marková (Eds.). *Dialogical approaches to trust in communication*. Charlotte, N.C.: Information Age Publishing.

Appendix

Table of Excerpts

AD:123-129   MM MEN DE E JÄTTEBRA ANNARS   s. 144-145
MM BUT IT´S REALLY GOOD OTHERWISE

AD:139-143   ALLSÅ INTE DUNK DUNK   s. 181-182
WELL NOT LIKE THUMP THUMP

AD:189-199   DUMMA DATOR   s. 124-125
STUPID COMPUTER

AD:205-211   OM DU VILL FOTSÄTTA SJUNGA SÅ SÄG TILL   s. 137-138
IF YOU WANT TO CARRY ON SINGING THEN TELL ME

AD:210-216   VA VA DE NU DÅ   s. 156-157
WHAT'S UP NOW THEN

AD:223-239   SÅ VI FOTSÄTTER   s. 138-140
RIGHT LET'S CARRY ON

AD:227-232   OM IFALL ATT VI FOTSÄTTER   s. 146
IN CASE WE CARRY ON

AD:264-268   DU KAN DEN HELT UTANTILL   s. 140
YOU KNOW IT COMPLETELY OFF BY HEART

AP:65-69   ETT TVÅ TRE   s. 168
ONE TWO THREE

AP:76-82   ETT TVÅ TRE   s. 111
ONE TWO THREE

AP:87-95   JA MEN DE GÖR INGET   s. 119-120
YEAH BUT IT DOESN´T MATTER

AP:102-105   DE E JÄTTELÄTT ME DEJ MEN   s. 118
IT´S REALLY EASY WITH YOU BUT

AP:115-118   DE E JÄTTEBRA DE E BARA   s. 117
IT´S REALLY GOOD IT'S JUST

AP:130-135   JA TAPPADE BORT MEJ ☺   s. 121
I LOST MY PLACE ☺

AP:197-199   ETT TVÅ TRE   s. 168-169
ONE TWO THREE

DA:18-52   MEN JA KAN INTE SKRIVA   s. 129-132
BUT I CAN´T WRITE

DA:46-58   OKEJ ETT TVÅ   s. 109-111
OKAY ONE TWO

DA:63-66   DÅ SKA DE VA ETT STRECK HÄR   s. 148-149
THEN THERE SHOULD BE A LINE HERE

DA:75-79   RÄTT SÅ BRA FAKTISKT ☺   s. 189
QUITE GOOD AKCHULLY ☺

DA:91-95   DU MÅSTE FÖLJA ME LITE   s. 179
YOU MUST FOLLOW A BIT HERE

DA:121-124   DE HÄR   s. 184-185
THESE

DA:137-146   SÅ ATT DU LIKSOM SJUNGER SÅHÄR   s. 161-162
SO THAT YOU LIKE SING LIKE THIS

DA:174-176   MM NU KAN DU DEN JÄTTEBRA ☺   s. 116
MM NOW YOU KNOW THIS ONE REALLY GOOD ☺

DA:178-183   OH SHIT   s. 151
OH HECK

DA:180-182   ETT TVÅ TRE   s. 112
ONE TWO THREE

DA:219-221   JA ☺ DU KAN DEN JÄTTEBRA   s. 191
YEAH ☺ YOU KNOW IT REALLY WELL

DP:6-15   "FÖRRÄN LILLA DAGNY KOM TILL STAN"   s. 158-159

              "'TIL LITTLE DAGNY CAME TO TOWN"

DP:22-34   EH ☺ JA TYCKER DU TAR LITE FÖR LÅNGA MENINGAR   s. 190-191

              EH ☺ I THINK YOU TAKE A BIT TOO LONG SENTENCES

DP:62-68   JA KAN SKRIVA TEXTEN TILL DEJ   s. 133-134

              I CAN WRITE THE WORDS FOR YOU

DP:84-88   ETT TVÅ TRE   s. 169-170

              ONE TWO THREE

DP:87-128   VI MÅSTE TRÄNA LITE MER   s. 98-103

              WE MUST PRACTISE A BIT MORE

DP:89-97   TRALL DILL DILL   s. 163-164

              TRALL DILL DILL

DP:94-97   JA SÅ VA DE   s. 188-189

              YEAH THAT'S RIGHT

DP:155-160   DE E ALLTID LITE SMÅ DETALJER MAN GLÖMMER ☺ s. 187-188

              THERE'S ALWAYS A FEW LITTLE DETAILS YOU FORGET ☺

DP:278-282   Å SÅ FOTSÄTTER MAN ME DE   s. 157

              AN´ THEN YOU GO ON WITH THAT

PM:94-97   USCH ☺ DEN E JU SÅ SVÅR ☺   s. 186-187

              UCK ☺ WELL IT´S SO HARD ☺

PM:94-101   VILL DU ATT HUNDEN SKA KOMMA Å HJÄLPA DEJ NU s. 152-153

              DO YOU WANT THE DOG TO COME AN´ HELP YOU NOW

PM:110-114   MEN HUR KAN MAN VE-   s. 155

              BUT HOW CAN ONE KN-

PM:121-123   JA HAR SVÅRT ATT LÄRA MEJ SÅNT   s. 183-184

              I THINK IT'S HARD LEARNING THINGS LIKE THAT

PM:123-128   JA Å SÅ KAN VI JU TA DEN NÅGRA GÅNGER   s. 147
              YEAH AN´ THEN WE CAN GO THROUGH IT A FEW TIMES EH

PM:126-139   EN MENING FÖRST I TAGET   s. 172-173
              ONE SENTENCE AT A TIME

PM:142-144   Å SEN MÅSTE MAN STANNA   s. 180-181
              AN´ THEN ONE HAVE TO STOP

PM:146-153   VI KÖR DEN IGEN LITE   s. 123
              WE DO IT AGAIN EH

PM:152-162   NÄR DE E LITE MER INLEVELSE I LÅTEN SÅ KLARAR   s. 175-176
              DU DE
              WHEN THERE'S A BIT MORE FEELING IN THE SONG YOU´LL FIX IT

PM:288-301   MEN JA TROR INTE JA VILL FOTSÄTTA   s. 135-136
              BUT I DON´T THINK I WANT TO CARRY ON

TAD:20-22   RÄTT SÅ LÄTT NÄR MAN VÄL SÅG ALLSÅ   s. 143-144
              QUITE EASY WHEN YOU AKCHULLY SAW THEN

TDA:36-41   DE ROLIGA VA NÄR DE BLEV LITE KRÅNGLIT   s. 126
              THE FUN THING WAS WHEN WE HAD TROUBLE WITH IT

TPM:53-63   VÄLDIT KREATIV I SINA SÄTT ☺   s. 174-175
              REALLY CREATIVE IN HIS WAYS ☺

Information Letter

Avhandlingsarbete i musikpedagogik

Hej!

Tack för att du ställer upp och vill delta i den här undersökningen. Studien syftar till att undersöka hur barn samspelar och kommunicerar i samband med musikalisk kunskapsutveckling. Genomförandet går till så att barnen i studien parvis arbetar med att lära sig en sång. Här är det inte kvaliteten på musicerandet som är i fokus utan hur den musikaliska processen går till i en social situation. Barnen kommer att vara ensamma med varandra en stund och filmas av stationär kamera. Jag kommer också att samtala med barnen för att deras tankar och synpunkter ska kunna tas tillvara i studien.

Detta projekt granskas etiskt. Anonymitet garanteras och det kommer inte att framkomma uppgifter som kan avslöja barnets identitet. Jag tar också hänsyn till särskilda önskemål från barn och föräldrar, både när det gäller vad som ska skrivas och hur undersökningen bedrivs. Du har också rätt att avbryta ditt deltagande om så önskas.

Har du frågor är du välkommen att kontakta mig eller någon av mina handledare på telefon eller via e-post.

Ser fram emot samarbetet!
/Tina Kullenberg

e-post: tina.kullenberg@mhm.lu.se
mobil: 0703-25 42 07

Förälders godkännande
Jag godkänner att mitt barn deltar i studien som beskrivits ovan.

………………………………………………………………………………
Målsmans underskrift

Barnets godkännande
Jag godkänner villkoren för studien och vill delta i den.

………………………………………………………………………………
Barnets underskrift

ArtMonitor

Doctoral dissertations and licentiate theses published at the Faculty of Fine, Applied and Performing Arts, University of Gothenburg:

1. Monica Lindgren (Music Education)
Att skapa ordning för det estetiska i skolan. Diskursiva positioneringar i samtal med lärare och skolledare
ArtMonitor, diss. Göteborg, 2006
ISBN: 91-975911-1-4

2. Jeoung-Ah Kim (Design)
Paper-Composite Porcelain. Characterisation of Material Properties and Workability from a Ceramic Art Design Perspective
ArtMonitor, diss. Göteborg, 2006
ISBN: 91-975911-2-2

3. Kaja Tooming (Design)
Toward a Poetics of Fibre Art and Design. Aesthetic and Acoustic Qualities of Hand-tufted Materials in Interior Spatial Design
ArtMonitor, diss. Göteborg, 2007
ISBN: 978-91-975911-5-7

4. Vidar Vikören (Musical Performance and Interpretation)
Studier omkring artikulasjon i tysk romantisk orgelmusikk, 1800–1850.
Med et tillegg om registreringspraksis
ArtMonitor, diss. Göteborg, 2007
ISBN: 978-91-975911-6-4

5. Maria Bania (Musical Performance and Interpretation)
"Sweetenings" and "Babylonish Gabble": Flute Vibrato and Articulation of Fast Passages in the 18th and 19th centuries
ArtMonitor, diss. Göteborg, 2008
ISBN: 978-91-975911-7-1

6. Svein Erik Tandberg (Musical Performance and Interpretation)
Imagination, Form, Movement and Sound – Studies in Musical Improvisation
ArtMonitor, diss. Göteborg, 2008
ISBN: 978-91-975911-8-8

7. Mike Bode and Staffan Schmidt (Fine Arts)
Off the Grid
ArtMonitor, diss. Göteborg, 2008
ISBN: 978-91-977757-0-0

8. Otto von Busch (Design)
Fashion-Able: Hacktivism and Engaged Fashion Design
ArtMonitor, diss. Göteborg, 2008
ISBN: 978-91-977757-2-4

9. Magali Ljungar Chapelon (Digital Representation)
Actor-Spectator in a Virtual Reality Arts Play. Towards new artistic experiences in between illusion and reality in immersive virtual environments
ArtMonitor, diss. Göteborg, 2008
ISBN: 978-91-977757-1-7

10. Marie-Helene Zimmerman Nilsson (Music Education)
Musiklärares val av undervisningsinnehåll. En studie om musikundervisning i ensemble och gehörs- och musiklära inom gymnasieskolan
ArtMonitor, diss. Göteborg, 2009
ISBN: 978-91-977757-5-5

11. Bryndís Snæbjörnsdóttir (Fine Arts)
Spaces of Encounter: Art and Revision in Human-Animal Relations
ArtMonitor, diss. Göteborg, 2009
ISBN: 978-91-977757-6-2

12. Anders Tykesson (Musical Performance and Interpretation)
Musik som handling: Verkanalys, interpretation och musikalisk gestaltning. Med ett studium av Anders Eliassons Quartetto d'Archi
ArtMonitor, diss. Göteborg, 2009
ISBN: 978-91-977757-7-9

13. Harald Stenström (Musical Performance and Interpretation)
Free Ensemble Improvisation
ArtMonitor, diss. Göteborg, 2009
ISBN: 978-91-977757-8-6

14. Ragnhild Sandberg Jurström (Music Education)
Att ge form åt musikaliska gestaltningar. En socialsemiotisk studie av körledares multimodala kommunikation i kör
ArtMonitor, diss. Göteborg, 2009
ISBN: 978-91-977757-9-3

15. David Crawford (Digital Representation)
Art and the Real-time Archive: Relocation, Remix, Response
ArtMonitor, diss. Göteborg, 2009
ISBN: 978-91-977758-1-6

16. Kajsa G Eriksson (Design)
Concrete Fashion: Dress, Art, and Engagement in Public Space
ArtMonitor, diss. Göteborg, 2009
ISBN: 978-91-977758-4-7

17. Henric Benesch (Design)
Kroppar under träd – en miljö för konstnärlig forskning
ArtMonitor, diss. Göteborg, 2010
ISBN: 978-91-977758-6-1

18. Olle Zandén (Music Education)
Samtal om samspel. Kvalitetsuppfattningar i musiklärares dialoger om ensemble-spel på gymnasiet
ArtMonitor, diss. Göteborg, 2010
ISBN: 978-91-977758-7-8

19. Magnus Bärtås (Fine Arts)
You Told Me – work stories and video essays/verkberättelser och videoessäer
ArtMonitor, diss. Göteborg, 2010
ISBN: 978-91-977758-8-5

20. Sven Kristersson (Musical Performance and Interpretation)
Sångaren på den tomma spelplatsen – en poetik. Att gestalta Gilgamesheposet och sånger av John Dowland och Evert Taube
ArtMonitor, diss. Göteborg, 2010
ISBN: 978-91-977758-9-2

21. Cecilia Wallerstedt (Research on Arts Education)
Att peka ut det osynliga i rörelse. En didaktisk studie av taktart i musik
ArtMonitor, diss. Göteborg, 2010
ISBN: 978-91-978477-0-4

22. Cecilia Björck (Music Education)
Claiming Space: Discourses on Gender, Popular Music, and Social Change
ArtMonitor, diss. Göteborg, 2011
ISBN: 978-91-978477-1-1

23. Andreas Gedin (Fine Arts)
Jag hör röster överallt – Step by Step
ArtMonitor, diss. Göteborg, 2011
ISBN: 978-91-978477-2-8

24. Lars Wallsten (Photographic Representation)
Anteckningar om Spår
ArtMonitor, diss. Göteborg, 2011
ISBN: 978-91-978477-3-5

25. Elisabeth Belgrano (Performance in Theatre and Drama)
"Lasciatemi morire" o farò "La Finta Pazza": Embodying Vocal Nothingness on Stage in Italian and French 17th century Operatic Laments and Mad Scenes
ArtMonitor, diss. Göteborg, 2011
ISBN: 978-91-978477-4-2

26. Christian Wideberg (Research on Arts Education)
Ateljésamtalets utmaning – ett bildningsperspektiv
ArtMonitor, diss. Göteborg, 2011
ISBN: 978-91-978477-5-9

27. Katharina Dahlbäck (Research on Arts Education)
Musik och språk i samverkan. En aktionsforskningsstudie i årskurs 1
ArtMonitor, licentiate thesis. Göteborg, 2011
ISBN: 978-91-978477-6-6

28. Katharina Wetter Edman (Design)
Service design – a conceptualization of an emerging practice
ArtMonitor, licentiate thesis. Göteborg, 2011
ISBN: 978-91-978477-7-3

29. Tina Carlsson (Fine Arts)
the sky is blue
Kning Disk, diss. Göteborg, 2011
ISBN: 978-91-976667-2-5

30. Per Anders Nilsson (Musical Performance and Interpretation)
A Field of Possibilities: Designing and Playing Digital Musical Instruments
ArtMonitor, diss. Göteborg, 2011
ISBN: 978-91-977477-8-0

31. Katarina A Karlsson (Musical Performance and Interpretation)
Think'st thou to seduce me then? Impersonating female personas in songs by Thomas Campion (1567–1620)
ArtMonitor, diss. Göteborg, 2011
ISBN: 978-91-977477-9-7

32. Lena Dahlén (Performance in Theatre and Drama)
Jag går från läsning till gestaltning – beskrivningar ur en monologpraktik
Gidlunds förlag, diss. Göteborg, 2012
ISBN: 978-91-7844-840-1

33. Martín Ávila (Design)
Devices. On Hospitality, Hostility and Design
ArtMonitor, diss. Göteborg, 2012
ISBN: 978-91-979993-0-4

34. Anniqa Lagergren (Research on Arts Education)
Barns musikkomponerande i tradition och förändring
ArtMonitor, diss. Göteborg, 2012
ISBN: 978-91-979993-1-1

35. Ulrika Wänström Lindh (Design)
Light Shapes Spaces: Experience of Distribution of Light and Visual Spatial Boundaries
ArtMonitor, diss. Göteborg, 2012
ISBN: 978-91-979993-2-8

36. Sten Sandell (Musical Performance and Interpretation)
På insidan av tystnaden
ArtMonitor, diss. Göteborg, 2013
ISBN: 978-91-979993-3-5

37. Per Högberg (Musical Performance and Interpretation)
Orgelsång och psalmspel. Musikalisk gestaltning av församlingssång.
ArtMonitor, diss. Göteborg, 2013
ISBN: 978-91-979993-4-2

38. Fredrik Nyberg (Literary Composition, Poetry and Prose)
Hur låter dikten? Att bli ved II
Autor, diss. Göteborg, 2013
ISBN: 978-91-979948-2-8

39. Marco Muñoz (Digital Representation)
Infrafaces: Essays on the Artistic Interaction
ArtMonitor, diss. Göteborg, 2013
ISBN: 978-91-979993-5-9

40. Kim Hedås (Musical Performance and Interpretation)
Linjer. Musikens rörelser – komposition i förändring
ArtMonitor, diss. Göteborg, 2013
ISBN: 978-91-979993-6-6

41. Annika Hellman (Research on Arts Education)
Intermezzon i medieundervisningen – gymnasieelevers visuella röster och subjektspositioneringar
ArtMonitor, licentiatuppsats. Göteborg, 2013
ISBN: 978-91-979993-8-0

42. Marcus Jahnke (Design)
Meaning in the Making. An Experimental Study on Conveying the Innovation Potential of Design Practice to Non-designerly Companies
ArtMonitor, diss. Göteborg, 2013
ISBN: 978-91-979993-7-3

43. Anders Hultqvist (Musicology. Artistic track)
Komposition. Trädgården – som förgrenar sig. Några ingångar till en kompositorisk praktik
Skrifter från musikvetenskap nr. 102, diss. Göteborg 2013.
ISBN: 978-91-85974-19-1
Institutionen för kulturvetenskaper, Göteborgs universitet, i samverkan med Högskolan för scen och musik

44. Ulf Friberg (Performance in Theatre and Drama)
Den kapitalistiska skådespelaren – aktör eller leverantör?
Bokförlaget Korpen, diss. Göteborg 2014
ISBN: 978-91-7374-813-1

45. Katarina Wetter Edman (Design)
Design for Service: A framework for exploring designers' contribution as interpreter of users' experience
ArtMonitor, diss. Göteborg 2014
ISBN 978-91-979993-9-7

46. Niclas Östlind (Photography)
Performing History. Fotografi i Sverige 1970–2014
ArtMonitor, diss. Göteborg 2014
ISBN: 978-91-981712-0-4

47. Carina Borgström Källén (Research on Arts Education)
När musik gör skillnad – genus och genrepraktiker i samspel
ISBN: 978-91-981712-1-1 (printed version)
ISBN: 978-91-981712-2-8 (electronic version – pdf)
ArtMonitor, diss. Göteborg 2014

48. Tina Kullenberg (Research on Arts Education)
Signing and Singing – Children in Teaching Dialogues
ISBN: 978-91-981712-3-5 (printed version)
ISBN: 978-91-981712-4-2 (electronic version – pdf)
ArtMonitor, diss. Göteborg 2014

Distribution:

Avhandlingarna kan beställas genom samladeskrifter.se