

DRAMA, DESIRE AND SCHOOLING: drives to learning in creative and expressive school subjects

Anton Franks

Abstract

Desire is an unfamiliar and neglected concept in education and schooling. This paper makes an argument for the need to consider desire as a drive to learning in schools.

In parallel with both Freud and Piaget, Vygotsky draws connections between play in children, fantasy and imagination in adolescence and, in adulthood, the making and enjoyment of the arts. In each case, the force, or drive towards creativity is seen as an expression of desire.

With the emergence of arts-oriented subjects in the curricula of mass schooling, adolescents are encouraged to draw resources from the internalised worlds of fantasy and imagination and to materialise these in the social production of various cultural forms, where the resources of production are held as much *between* the group of students as within their individual and internal worlds of fantasy and imagination.

This paper focuses particularly on the secondary school curriculum, taking a piece of improvised drama as evidence and analysing it from a Vygotskian perspective. Firstly, how, in these kinds of activity, might educationalists gain insights into the individual and social drives towards learning and development and, secondly, what resources from the socio-cultural environment are utilised and transformed? Major themes to emerge will be the productive and dynamic set of tensions which are exposed between the desire of the individual and the processes of social production, between the drive of desire and structuring principles of particular cultural forms and, finally, between the force of desire and the institutional constraints of schooling.

DRAMA, DESIRE AND SCHOOLING: drives to learning in creative and expressive school subjects

I.

This paper is an exploration of the concept of desire in education. What I want to consider is the role of desire as an affective force, or drive, to development and learning. To take account of the role of desire in learning is not an entirely new departure in educational studies. This exploration is therefore conducted against a background of previous work, mainly within the fields of gender and cultural studies in education. Such work has had a psychoanalytical emphasis to it, concentrating on how young people develop their 'identity' in terms of gender, sexuality and race in relation to the verbal, visual and dramatised texts they engage with in the course of everyday life and schooling.¹ My interest here is particularly fixed on the 'performative' end of this spectrum of activity, specifically on how adolescents engage with dramatic texts circulating in wider culture and bring these into drama classrooms, drawing on these resources to make their own dramatic texts. These 'performances' can be seen, at least in part, as expressions of desire.

The approach taken here is guided and focused by the work of Vygotsky who, in his theoretical writing (1978, 1986 & 1994), identifies desire as the driving principle at work when children are moved to engage in imaginative play, and, in later phases of development, the ways in which desire drives fantasy, imagination and creativity in adolescence. What is attractive in Vygotsky's developmental theories, especially in relation to dramatic mode of learning, is the stress he placed on the role of 'socially oriented' action in development. This orientation, the importance of the role of the

social environment as the medium or culture in which the individual grows and develops, marks the difference of a Vygotskian approach from the essentialising and individuating tendencies of psychoanalytical perspectives.

Clearly, within the context of wider social and cultural history and development since the time that Vygotsky was writing, there have been rapid and massive changes in the institutions, structures and processes of education. Much of the recent work on desire in education has registered the need to account for the radical social and cultural developments of the late twentieth century. Up till now, analyses of the role of desire in learning have tended to focus on the ways that desire and ‘objects of desire’ are represented in texts, and how the position of the readers or viewers can be ‘read-off’ from an examination of the text. Alongside interpretative readings of texts, learners are frequently engaged in discussions and interviews as a way of revealing their ‘responses’ to certain texts. Relatively little attention has been directed towards the productivity of the learner — that is, how, in relation to, or in response to, sets of social interactions, representations, texts, or her own desires, she might ‘act’ to create her own texts.

It might be appropriate, then, against this background of social and cultural transformation, to return to Vygotsky’s work in order to explore, apply and elaborate the way he uses the concept of desire. There are three distinct but interrelated dimensions to this enquiry that I shall develop in turn through the paper: first, a recognition and restatement of the necessity of examining the role and function of desire in education; second, an elaboration of the concept of desire as a theoretical tool with which it might be possible to describe and analyse activities of learning in classrooms; third, a consideration of the ways that desire can be applied as a pedagogical tool, that is, to engage directly with the processes of teaching and learning.

The first part of the argument is in defence of desire as a concept worthy of exploration when looking at processes of learning. It comes about because, in the domain of schooling, it appears that the affective aspects of learning and development are all too easily overlooked, or relegated to a position of limited relevance. There is, furthermore, a tendency to de-couple affective aspects of learning from physical and cognitive development. This facet of the argument, therefore, asserts the physicality of learners, an assertion which refuses and refutes the dichotomy of mind and body. In a brief survey of the contemporary ‘landscape’ of education, we note how the curricula of mass schooling have maintained spaces for the expressive activity in the classroom. How are these activities to be viewed and understood? Is expression in the classroom, including the expression of desire, to be seen as ‘play’, or as ‘work’? How much is ‘expressivity’ about the broad and balanced development of the individual, and how much can it be viewed as the learning of specific disciplinary skills and knowledge to be applied in the world outside the classroom? In approaching these problems, a Vygotskian formulation of desire has to be elaborated and defined beside, or against, current and prevalent discourses in education, especially at a level of policy. Although this is a mainly theoretical argument about drama and development, the strongly social and physical aspects of dramatic activity demand that theory is related to some specific, concrete example of practice. So, after I have outlined the theoretical framework, I shall, in the fourth section of this piece, present an example of classroom practice in the form of a brief narrative.

In developing the argument I shall hope to direct attention towards sets of dynamic and productive tensions, tensions which pull in several directions at the same time — this is to say that they are *polyvalent*. These tensions are seen to be arranged in a three-sided interaction, or *triadic* relation: first, between the desire of the individual and the social rules and drives of the group; second, between the force of desire and the structuring principles of particular cultural formations (including ways of

knowing, forms of knowledge, and forms of communication and representation); third, the tensions between the ‘outward’ force of desire and structural, or institutional constraints of schooling. Seen in this way, the path of development is not a linear, or incremental route, but rather proceeds as a *series of oscillations* between individual and internal drives and the constraints imposed by social, cultural and political structures.

The end purpose of this line of thought, I hope, is to move towards a model, or an outline of analysis and practice which is drawn in the main from Vygotsky’s work on the connections between play in children, fantasy and imagination in adolescence and, in adulthood, the making and enjoyment of the arts. At each level of development, the force, or drive towards expression and creativity is desire. There is arguably a need for a pedagogical framework that includes a notion of how teachers might engage productively with the drive and force of desire to enhance learning.

II.

Is there space for thinking about desire in the context of education and schooling? In the UK, it is an age of the politically formulated, legislated and enforced national curriculum where the loudest talk is about the form and content of the curriculum and, only recently has attention turned to matters of pedagogy. Even here, though, there appears to be an undue bias towards the teaching element of the teaching/learning couplet. On the whole, educational policy-makers have tended to be mostly preoccupied with the content of what ought to be taught (and what left out), the balance and weighting of subjects, how knowledge should be tested, how progress is best measured and so forth. At the level of policy, pedagogy has tended to be discussed in terms of rigidly polarised categories — ‘traditional’, ‘whole class instruction’, for example, against new, ‘progressive’, ‘child-centred’ and ‘mixed

ability' methods of teaching and learning. In the debate around curriculum policy, little attention is directed towards how students learn.²

It is not appropriate within the frame of this exploration to engage directly with these issues, except to point out that what has emerged, despite all the political shifting and trading, is that subject areas such as English, Art and Music have retained a (de)limited right to place a continued emphasis on creative expression. Although subject areas are more tightly circumscribed, and the field of operation has been inscribed in legislation, there is still room for thinking and speaking of desire when we contemplate the learning processes associated with improvising drama and devising plays, reading and making stories, drawing images and the sculpting of three-dimensional forms, or the appreciation and composition of music, and so forth.³ It strikes me that, given that there is space for creativity on the curriculum, we need to examine the role of the learner in these areas and to consider the nature of the creative energy which leads to the production of these forms of expression. An examination of these issues cannot be adequately dealt with from within an educational discourse in which arguments are endlessly revolved around the polar axes of 'traditional' versus 'progressive' pedagogy.

If there is a space for desire in schooling and education, then, it is a problematic and tense space. Desire is a 'charged' and 'sexy' term which sits strangely in relation to schools as institutions, for example, or a legislated curriculum. Desire has the sense of an extreme, passionate state of being, which threatens to be unpredictable and difficult to control.

In wanting to view students as agents of their own learning and producers of meaningful, cultural forms, we should also take note of the ways in which these actions are limited and constrained within the structures of power and the disciplinary

rule systems of the institution of schooling. In *Discipline and Punish*, Michel Foucault (1977) draws attention to the way the institution of mass schooling positions learners as objectified, corporeal figures within disciplinary structures. At the same time, schooling makes students subject to, and subjects of, a disciplinary discourse. Pierre Bourdieu (1991) has written about the ways in which the education system acts in specific ways to position learners within a ‘symbolic order’ and ‘cultural economy’ which legitimises certain cultural forms and patterns of behaviour, dispositions of the body which Bourdieu refers to as *habitus*. Although Foucault and Bourdieu take different approaches to the problem of social order, what they hold in common is the sense in which the structure of social relations of power are realised in social institutions, such as schools, and in the way they view the circulation and legitimation of certain cultural forms. These social and cultural structures of power contain, constrain, subject and subordinate learners. Viewed in this light, the school could be seen to function in ways that curtail and suppress extreme states of the person rather than allow them to be expressed and to reach towards fulfilment. Furthermore, the terms which currently mark boundaries of educational discourse, such as ‘standards’, ‘management’, ‘leadership’, ‘discipline’ and so forth, establish a context in which it is difficult to speak in terms of ‘drives to learning’, or ‘desire’ in individuals and groups of students.

If we take a moment to consider how drives to learning are currently defined in the domain of schooling and education, I would suggest that it is more customary to describe them in terms of ‘needs’, ‘interests’ and ‘motivation’. These are a more sanitised and less charged form of words than desire — more appropriate, perhaps, to the institutional and institutionalised functions of schools and schooling. ‘Interest’ would seem to convey the sense that a student, or a group of students perceives something of *value* outside themselves.⁴ The ‘object of interest’ has to coincide or intersect with a personal set of values derived from particular social and cultural

positions and affiliations. Interest becomes, by this definition, something which is rational, consciously realised, and made material in instrumental action. The term ‘motivation’ describes the dynamic process towards the realisation of an interest, a need, or a desire — it does not describe the source of the energy which gives rise to movement. The concept of ‘need’ is of a different order, however, if we put institutional needs to one side for a moment (these are imperative needs, such as the compulsion to attend school, for there to be discipline in schools and so forth). Let us take the notion of ‘need’ to refer to the needs of children — especially those needs which spring from *within* an individual or social group engaged in creative activity. In developmental terms, derived from Vygotsky, ‘needs’ can be described as the motive (force) for action and a leading factor in development (1978: page 92). This order of needs moves towards the notion of desire. By naming desire as the motive force for learning, then, we are able to take into account more than conscious realisation of purpose as the force which drives learning.

Alongside subjects like English, Music and Art, however, Drama is widely seen as providing space on the curriculum for school students to ‘express’ themselves; students are encouraged to draw on their experience, knowledge and perceptions of the world and to represent this experience in the various cultural forms. Drama is a form and medium which draws on the ‘expressive potential’ of the whole body of the student, organised socially with the bodies of other students and engaged, together, in the creation and animation of dramatic forms. Teachers and educationalists involved in the ‘arts disciplines’ in schools, are used to talking and writing about the implications of the ‘emotional’, the ‘expressive’ and the ‘affective’ as forces in learning. But, with the exception of those explicitly concerned with studying the formation of gendered, sexual and racial identities, the prevalent discursive practice is to talk of the arts as a ‘channel’ and ‘harness’ of emotion. Again, desire might seem to be something too wild and uncontrollable, too much linked with sexuality, perhaps, and therefore potentially disruptive and destructive of the order of schooling.

There are several reasons why I want to hold onto the concept of desire in education and schooling. In the first place, within the context of schooling, desire is best understood as a motive force, one of the drives (amongst others) which moves us through learning experiences. My argument really starts from this idea: the concept of desire cannot be conceived as a fixed point, but as a dynamic force. Second, desire is a form of psycho-physical energy strongly associated with play, imagination and fantasy, and thus with learning and development, particularly in areas of the curriculum which allow for 'creative expression'. Vygotsky's work in particular has pointed to the profound relationship that exists between the force of desire, the activity of play and fantasy, and the development of imagination and creativity. Third, desire is not something that can be conceived of as an entirely abstract notion, detached from material bodies, corporeality, or remote from action in the world. On the contrary, desire is a psychic and affective force which is given evidence of expression in concrete, corporeal activity, such as play and drama. This is to emphasise that (all) learning takes place in and between learners, all of whom have very real, material and different bodies, acting together in the domain of the material, social, cultural and economic world.

In the following section, I shall, in the first instance, move forward by formulating a short, working definition of desire taken from a few related sources. Next, there will be a brief sketch of a developmental framework derived from Vygotsky's work. There are particular (but not exclusive or exhaustive) sources for this theoretical frame taken from two of his articles: 'The Role of Play in Development' (1978: pages 92 to 104) and 'Imagination and Creativity of the Adolescent' (1994: pages 265 to 288).

These writings represent a perspective on the continuities of development from the involvement of the pre-school child in imaginative play through to the imaginative

and creative life of the adolescent. I am particularly focused here on the adolescent end of the developmental continuum. But — taking good account of Vygotsky's assertion that “different genetic forms coexist in thinking, just as different rock formations coexist in the earth's crust” and that “developmentally late forms coexist in behaviour with younger formations” (1986: page 140) — we ought to maintain an interest in the ‘route of development’ from early childhood through to adolescence.

III.

There is another difficulty in using the term ‘desire’ because of the way it is defined, or positioned differently in relation to different discourses on the formation of mind. It is not my intention here to enter into a detailed argument about how Vygotsky's perspective differed from Freud's, but it is necessary to locate my particular use of the term ‘desire’. From a psychoanalytic viewpoint, drawing (in a very broad sweep) from Freud through to Lacan, there is a tendency to define desire as a universal and essential urge, arising from within the individual and directed ‘outwards’ towards the social environment. It is explained in reference to a ‘grand narrative’ of psychic development, drawing heavily on metaphors and imagery from classical mythology, the Œdipus myth being the best-known example. The definition used here tends more towards a view of desire as a force arising out of the ‘tense’ interaction between the genetic, biological *and* social, cultural factors which affect development.⁵ In short, the line of thought adopted here bends towards the socio-cultural view of development and inclines less towards a psychoanalytic account of desire. Having said this, however, it has to be acknowledged that any discussion of psychological processes and development cannot avoid the influence of Freud. Writing in critique of Piaget and Freud in *Thought and Language* (1989; pages 13 to 57), for example, there is a sense that in ‘speaking back’ to the argument about the essential autism and egocentricity of the young child, Vygotsky is bound to build on, or elaborate a theory which refers to principles laid down by Freud.⁶

In a similar spirit, I make an initial approach to a definition of desire from within a Freudian frame of analysis.⁷ From this perspective, desire operates in the gap between the expression of needs and their deferral, and it is the tension generated in this gap between the expression of desire and the impossibility of fulfilment that leads to the formulation of wishes (Freud). The force of desire then leads to ‘acts’ of fantasy and imagination in which desire achieves satisfaction, or closure, but this sense of closure is inherently unstable and provisional (Lacan). Desire, then, is the motive force which energises a succession of acts, made manifest in play, or in ‘creative’ or ‘artistic’ representations such as music, poetry and drama. Each ‘creative act’, however, ultimately fails to satisfy desire (Walkerdine, 1984, citing Rose: page 181).

Why should there be this constant dynamic process? From a Freudian perspective, the desire to repeat is driven from the need within the individual to achieve mastery of a situation, even unpleasant circumstances such as a visit to the dentist. For Freud, though, the “manifestations of a compulsion to repeat...exhibit to a high degree an instinctual character” (1974; page 29). This places a strong emphasis on a ‘natural’, ‘essential’ and ‘idealistic’ approach to development.

In comparison, a Vygotskian, socio-cultural perspective on the role of desire as a dynamic, energising principle, might emphasise three factors. First, desire is always directed towards others, and otherness — in other words, its dynamic and orientation tend towards the social. In the social domain, people, behaviours, encounters, contexts are constantly shifting, made and re-made, and therefore, even though there are identifiable continuities and structures in social life, they are structures of social processes rather than structures of static, social objects. In its pre-eminently social orientation, desire is always shifting because social relations and social distances are

always changing. Second, desire tends to lead us to fix on forms, objects and artefacts in surrounding culture. These forms provide us with model structures with which we interact and give a material shape to our desires. Third, inasmuch as it springs from within individuals, desire is in constant flux because people develop, learn, grow. A desire made manifest and expressed at a particular stage of one's life is likely to be re-worked, or passed over at a later stage of development. The energising principle, desire, draws its power from the tense interaction between the developing, socially oriented individual in the shifting context of the social and cultural environment.

In his article 'The Role of Play in Development' (1978), Vygotsky observes a change in the behaviour of pre-school children which marks a new stage of development. His argument follows the line that the tendency in very young children is to desire the things that fulfil their immediate needs — food and affectionate physical contact are obvious examples. A new stage of development is marked by the appearance of desires that cannot be immediately gratified. There is then a tension which develops in the child between the force of the desire and the awareness of the fact she cannot have the desired thing, so "to resolve this tension, the pre-school child enters an imaginary, illusory world in which the unrealisable desires can be realised, and this world is what we call play" (1978: page 93).

Vygotsky cautions, however, that the force of this desire cannot be equated with the simple pursuit of pleasure, or pleasurable sensations.⁸ It is the beginning, Vygotsky claims, of the psychological process referred to as 'imagination' which is said to have its origins in action. So, the move is from desire (the driving force) to play (the physical and mental activity) in which we seek the fulfilment of desire, to imagination (an aspect of conscious mental activity and development). In developing this line of argument to apply to later stages of development, Vygotsky ends the

paragraph with the assertion that “imagination in adolescents and school children is play without action” (1978: page 93).

When coming to consider the nature of creativity and imagination in adolescence, Vygotsky makes the point that adolescent desire is channelled in the private, psychic domain of fantasy (1994: page 282 and 283). In adolescence unrealisable desires are realised in the internal domains of fantasy and imagination and are manifested in the increased tendency towards daydreaming (1994: page 273).

As conceptual thought develops through childhood into adolescence, fantasy and imagination are progressively liberated from a reliance on concrete, eidetic images, stored in memory and drawn from the social and cultural environment (1994: page 273). The crucial point in the development of imagination is where fantasy meets the structuring principles of conceptual thought. The interaction between the inner force of desire and the structuring principles of the concept accounts for the creativity we particularly associate with adolescence (1994: pages 282 and 283). The point that Vygotsky is at pains to make is that, first, there is an integral relationship between social and cultural activity and thought; second, there is interaction between the development of abstract and concrete thinking in adolescence; and, third, these factors, in dialectical relation, promote both the development of higher mental processes (conceptual thought) and are made concrete in creative activity (1994: page 282).

What fixes my interest at this stage of the argument is that he insists that adolescent fantasy occurs in “the intimate realm of his [*sic.*] experience, normally hidden from other people, and thus becomes an exclusively *subjective* [my emphasis] form of thinking, thinking exclusively for oneself”, and, “A child makes no attempt to hide his play, but an adolescent conceals his fantasies and safeguards them from other people’s eyes.” (1994: page 284) In secondary school Drama classrooms (in Music

and Art as well) we expect adolescents to engage in a public form of play, exposing their ‘expressions of desire’ to the evaluative gaze of teachers and peers. Here we pick up a strand of an argument about historical, cultural conditions that promote changes in the institution and cultural environment of schooling. These changes force a re-examination and re-evaluation of the concept of personal development and learning in so-called creative and expressive school subjects and return us to the problem of the place of desire as a drive to learning.

The implication of Vygotsky’s argument is that the creative production of cultural forms and artefacts is, at the age of adolescence, driven by an essentially subjective force, from within the individual. Resources for creative production are drawn from external, material, social and cultural life and are ‘processed’ in internal, invisible and psychic domains. It appears that there is a qualitative change between early childhood and adolescence in the way that imagination, fantasy and thought operate in relation to the social and cultural environment. A small child in play works with concrete imagery, taken from the immediate, material environment. Because of the development of conceptual thought processes, the adolescent is released from a complete reliance on concrete imagery. The corollary is, therefore, that adolescent fantasy operates exclusively in private, psychic spaces. However, if the cultural conditions change — specifically, if, in the schooling of adolescents, we permit adolescents to ‘play through’ their imaginings and fantasies in improvised drama — then we need an updated and elaborated conception of the ways in which fantasy and imagination are realised in public, social and cultural spaces. Improvised drama in the classroom can be seen — to quote the theatrical theorist and practitioner, Augusto Boal — as the “*concretisation*” of desire, and “*to desire becomes a thing*” (1995: page 24).

There is a material and dialectical argument here about how policy structures interact with, in this instance, the interpretative structures of developmental theory to affect

concrete social relations and practices in classrooms: curriculum development through history, and how this is implemented by teachers in classrooms, both affects and is affected by theories of development. In studies of wider cultural domains outside schooling, in the study of mass media and so-called 'sub-cultural' phenomena, desire is 'out of the closet'.⁹ Even though, in practice, we might encourage the expression of desire in the classroom, little time has been spent in developing a theoretical approach, examining the effects of this on learning.

IV.

This example from a Drama lesson is taken from my detailed notes when observing a teacher in training. The lesson took place in Spring 1993 at a boys' school in a culturally mixed, predominantly working (and non-working) class area of South London. It is selected because, although it was a very short piece of drama, it gives good evidence of the ways that adolescents are capable of using their bodies (including their brains) to create, in neat simplicity, a complex and sophisticated dramatic representation. This representation is expressive of much that is drawn from social and cultural domains and, at the same time, it gives good evidence of their subjective concerns and individual desires. In talking with the student teacher after the lesson, I used the example of the drama created by these boys to illustrate how learners can teach teachers what teachers (including myself) ought to know. In their activity, clear evidence is presented for speculation about drives to learning, the kinds of learning taking place and so forth.

This lesson was about journeys, ways of travelling, the ability to use movement creatively, to develop characters and cohesive narrative structures. These were the teacher's aims as they were set down on the page of the teaching-practice file I looked at whilst waiting for the end of registration. Boys (all boys) arrived, in school uniform but diverse in physiology and cultural background, friendly and energetic, a

class of twelve- and thirteen-year-olds, ushered in at speed and arriving in a circle of chairs as if conjured into the space. The previous week they had set out on the journey, deciding where they would be going and how they would travel. This week they were to begin by making a frozen picture of a vehicle out of their bodies.

Most of them went at this as if it were the most natural thing in the world to make vehicles out of their bodies. They planned and negotiated, jockeying for position to insert their ideas. Then they got up and tried it out, arranging torsos, intertwining arms and legs first one way and then another until they were satisfied. I want to focus on the boys who were the Harley Davidson. It was a remarkable vehicle with a story to tell. There were, it should be said, other remarkable forms of human transport: there was the helicopter, the time machine (or was it a raft, or perhaps a paddle-steamer?) and finally, there was something that might have been a hovercraft. All of them have instructive stories woven around their making. But it was the Harley that spoke loudest to me, viewing the scene from the position of privileged observer.

The Harley (in case you do not know) is a large and powerful type of motorbike, glittering with chrome and machismo, adorned with elongated front forks and high-ride handlebars. At either end of their machine, two boys kneeled down, tucking their heads under to touch their knees to make the fat tyres. One stood behind the front wheel with his arms stretched out to the side and up from his shoulders, like cow-horns (the high handlebars), and legs astride to make the front forks. Between the 'forks' poked the head of the body of the bike, the chrome-plated 'engine' and wide, stepped pillion seat, which was made by a boy crouched on all-fours and arching his back. Astride him sat the proud owner, grinning expansively and clutching the 'handlebars', revving the 'throttle' from time to time. When the teacher asked the image to move, the Harley glided spontaneously and majestically across the floor of

the Drama room, with the “Vroom, Vroom” growl of the engine harmonised by its makers.

The teacher commented, praised and questioned. The observer, the teacher-trainer wrote it all down as it happened. Now they had all got their vehicles and they had worked well. Yes, the faces show it, they are pleased with themselves, even the group that didn't quite know whether it was a hovercraft or not. But then, announces the teacher, disaster strikes. What disaster? What happened to the vehicles? What happened to the travellers? Where are they?

The Harley gang re-groups itself and discusses the disaster. Just a few minutes later, the rider marches up to the teacher-trainer (eyes peeled, pen poised, clip-board ready) to offer him a privileged preview of their disaster. Proud owner mounts his elegantly assembled machine, riding high, but only for a moment. In slowed action, the wheels roll off in different directions (it had taken them a minute or two to work out the exact choreography of this manoeuvre), the forks and handlebars collapse. The body of the bike dissolves and creeps discreetly offstage, as our attention is diverted towards the shock of the proud owner, now sadly dispossessed and crestfallen. He wonders (aloud) what he will do in the middle of this desert (so that is where they are, notes the observer) without his Harley. From behind the scene of devastation, the boy who played the engine re-appears, prancing along on tiptoes, transformed into something which, judging by the flowing arm movements, either flies or swims. The Harley rider comments that he is relieved to see the UN coming to his assistance, and asks if the UN is qualified to repair motorbikes. The UN stops flying/swimming and, in deliberately mimed action, he removes his imaginary metal helmet and sets about repairing the Harley. In a few seconds the task is complete, leaving the Harley rider to wonder aloud how he could ever repay the UN for his assistance. He is informed that the UN accepts Access. “I only have Barclaycard,” moans the rider.

“That’s all right sir, all cards accepted.” The UN whisks away the offered card, swipes it through some invisible device attached to his invisible belt and, after handing back the card and replacing his ‘helmet’, he flies/swims away to resume his former role as the engine. The huge bike, like any true Harley should, throbs into life and glides off. A polished and witty performance completed in about two minutes. To reinforce their point, the boys re-create, re-present this scene in, if anything, a more polished form when it comes their turn to show the work to the rest of the class.

V.

In her article ‘Some Day My Prince Will Come’, Valerie Walkerdine (1984) states—

It is the *relation* between the representations at the level of fantasy and the production of meanings through which desire is understood and into which desire is invested which is important. [my emphasis] (page 176)

Her interest in this study is on the relation between representation and the formation of gendered identity. The focus is on the texts (girls’ comics) from which, by theoretical extrapolation, an analytical account of the reader’s position and their active engagement with textual resources is produced. Walkerdine stresses the notion that reading is a process of active engagement with texts. Encounters with forms of representations, she argues here, are as much ‘real’ and material encounters as social interactions between people (page 164). The evidence of girls’ desire is found represented in, for example, the books and comics they choose to read. In later work, Walkerdine (1990) extends this into an examination of the interaction between desire, fantasy and “regimes of representation”.¹⁰ The focus of her attention is on the domestic interactions and practices of everyday life. The mode of her analysis moves to the point of intersection between what she calls the “forwards” movement of historical moments and the “backwards” movement which traces a route into the psychic domains of the unconscious (1990: page 197).

Working with the evidence of improvised drama, however, the focus is switched to the productive activity of students and analysis of the textual resources for their productivity is interpreted from their concrete, dramatic action. My interests partly coincide with Walkerdine's in that there is an attempt here to understand the force of desire in terms of its *relation* to dramatic representation and the production of meaning. My focus, though, is not on the domestic enactments and interactions of everyday life, but on the dramatic representations that the students select and shape in a space (the drama lesson) reserved for social acts of 'creative expression' — acts which, by their nature, demand audience and interpretation.

In drama the 'matrix' of relations is expanded to account for oscillating relations of power and social distance along three intersecting axes: the relation of the individual student/actor to the group of student/actors; the relation between the representational resources of the individual and the group to the forms of representation circulating in wider culture; and finally, the relation between dramatic activity as an individual and group expression of desire, to the institutional structures of schooling. The method of analysis necessitates adopting an interpretative frame, thus, to support the Vygotskian framework I have outlined above, I will also be drawing on social semiotic approaches.¹¹ It is particularly appropriate to adopt a social semiotic frame of analysis alongside Vygotsky's socio-cultural theory because of the emphasis it gives to the analysis of the making of diverse signs and meanings in a social context. This chimes with the priority that Vygotsky gives to the making of meaning and signs in the development of mind.

In looking at the relations between the individual actors and the social actors (this is to use the term 'actors' in a double sense, in that they are, simultaneously, both social and dramatic actors) in the Harley group, we are looking at 'micro-social processes'. There are two sets of relations here. The first is the internal set of relations, between

the individual actors who constitute the group. The second is in the relation of the group as a social entity to the structures in the wider social context — the group to the rest of the class, the learners to the teacher (and the observer), the class to the school, the school to the wider community and so forth. This is not to make the case that these sets of relations are independent of each other. On the contrary, following a trend current in sociology it can be said that interpersonal relations are saturated and imbued with features of wider social structures, and *vice versa*.¹² The split is made here for purely analytical purposes.

Considering the work of this group of boys, the first point of note is the ease and rapidity with which they appeared to enter the activity. They entered into a spontaneous form of action that developed through distinct stages: talk, do, show, re-do and show again. Given space in the lesson to be creative and develop their own work, they *wanted* to take the opportunity. This is not always the case, of course — children do not always want to do what the teacher asks of them. But in this case, with the minimum of instruction, these boys enthusiastically set about the work. This was clear in the way that they grouped themselves in space: first, for the sharing of their initial ideas, they moved their chairs into a huddle, defining for themselves a ‘semi-enclosed’ location for face-to-face interaction.¹³ Rapidly, however (for they were not given very much time by the teacher), they moved into ‘trying-out’ their ideas of how to make a vehicle. This ‘trying-out’ was not exactly a rehearsal, it was more a part of the devising process in which ideas were spontaneously and materially realised in embodied action. It was, by now, much more than ‘face-to-face’ interaction — it was ‘body-to-body’ interaction.

Here, I would argue that there is a very basic, even simple force at work, the desire for physical proximity and contact. The need for physical, social contact persists through life and has various meanings. For these boys, in their early adolescence,

physical contact between peers tends to be problematic and is often characterised in particular modes; namely, physical games and sporting activity (curricular and extra-curricular), wrestling and playful aggression (break-times and out of school), 'real' aggression and violence (break-times and out of school).

The drama lesson provided an opportunity for a different context and mode of physical contact, however, and it resulted in a form of activity that might be placed somewhere on a continuum between the concrete, mimetic aspect of imaginative play in pre-school children, and the more 'abstract', symbolic forms of representation which resemble dance.¹⁴ There was, as I mentioned, the need for careful choreography, first in the positioning of the parts of the motorcycle, and then in making it move through space. Much of this looked as if it was not very comfortable work, the overriding pleasure was, it seemed, in the construction of a simple, but clever and elegant representation of the Harley. The first dimension of desire given evidence in this example of classroom drama, then, is the need, the wish, the desire for social and physical contact, contact that is for the purpose of collaborative, imaginative expression.

In building their dramatic motorcycle, the boys had to exchange and negotiate ideas. Part of this, it has been observed, took place in verbal discourse, but a lot of negotiation happened in the physical devising process, through which words *precede* action, *accompany* action and *proceed* from action. It has to be acknowledged that, at any given point of time, or perhaps throughout the whole lesson, there is not likely to be an equality of input from each member of the group and there are bound to be inequalities of power, and dynamics of power relations within the group. Some student/actors will, at different points, tend to lead, or dominate the process, while others will mainly follow through with suggestions, or will be directed to act in particular roles. In certain situations, the relations of power might be so unequal

within a particular small group, or a whole class, that the flow of ideas and action is inhibited to the point of inertia. The Harley group, however, were (pardon the pun) driven. From my notes and recollection, it was the boys playing the rider and the engine (who also played the UN) who took the lead role in the devising process. On the whole, the boys playing the part of the wheels contributed fewer ideas, but overall, it was clear that the group was able to ‘work well together’.

This is significant when considering the ways that desire energised the work of the group. If desire operates as the catalyst of fantasy in the gap between the expression of a wish and its fulfilment, we have to ask whether it matters to know about the ‘ownership’ of the fantasy that led to the creation of a material, ‘embodied’ Harley Davidson. The question has to be asked because of the emphasis that is commonly placed on identifying school work (whether it be Maths or Art) that has been produced by *individual* students, the creative output of a single brain and body. Part of the reason I chose to look at the Harley group in the first place is because of the clarity and definition of the image which this group realised in their collective ‘play’. But whose idea was it, one, two, or all? Was there common consent amongst the group that this was a good idea, or were most dragged along in a strong directional current flowing from one person’s idea?

It is, of course, difficult to know these things, even with a detailed video-recording of the devising process. Much of the ability of the group to communicate with each other and negotiate the priority of ideas is likely to be laid down in the social relationships that are formed in the flow of their social lives, both in and out of school. The modes and forms of their communication are embedded within a shared context — an outside observer may not find it easy to trace the nuances in the flow of communication between them.

Seen from the most constructive viewpoint, the inequalities within the group allow for interactions which exploit the potential for development in each person, the potential that Vygotsky refers to as the “zone of proximal development” (1989; especially pages 187 to 196). In short, there need to be differences between members of a group in order for something to be created. For creative group-work to be successful, certain members need the power to take definite action and to make interventions in order for the zone of proximal development to be activated. Within the terms of this enquiry, I would want to argue that the negotiation and articulation of the desires within the group toward creative action provide the energy, impetus and direction through the zones of potential development.

So far, I have been arguing that the force of desire in this dramatic activity is socially oriented at the levels of physical contact and ideational contact and, further, that these two levels are inextricably linked together with the development of thought processes and action. There is another dimension to this activity that ought not to be ignored, which is that the end goal was to present the Harley Davidson story to an audience.

In a chapter of their book about Bakhtin, Gary Saul Morson and Caryl Emerson (1990) make connections between Bakhtin’s and Vygotsky’s theories of mind (pages 172 to 230). In particular, they draw on the work (at the time, not translated into English) ‘Author and hero in aesthetic activity’ and provide us with an analytical triad which might be useful for my purposes here. In refusing an opposition between fantasy, dreams and art, Bakhtin elaborated these three categories of function for this range of activity: ‘I-for-myself’ (looking from the inside out), ‘I-for-another’ (how I see others and others see me) and ‘other-for-me’ (how others appear to myself). When discussing Bakhtin’s view of the relationship between play and art, the authors note that —

While children are in the midst of a game, it is a real experience for them, something innerly experienced, imagined but not given as an image. But play

may approach art when an “actively contemplating” outside spectator begins to admire it. As long as a spectator watches, we have the kernel of a dramatic aesthetic event. (Morson & Emerson, 1990: page 189)¹⁵

By this definition, the work of the Harley Davidson group has more than “the kernel of a dramatic aesthetic event”; it is art. What makes it art is that, from the outset, the boys knew that they would have to present it to others. These others included not only their classmates and their teacher, it also included me, the privileged observer who was allowed a preview of their work. The point being made here is that they were more than willing to show their Harley, and their play about the Harley, to others. They took positive pleasure and pride in the showing. In the process, they worked through the functions of doing for themselves as individuals, doing it for others, and finally, when they showed to me and then to the rest of the class, they became the others showing to me. It was the tensions in negotiating between their different fantasies and imaginations which gave power to produce the image, and the tensions between ‘I-for-myself’ and ‘I-for-others’ which gave the impetus to perform. Their desire was to do something together, to make something other than themselves and, finally, to show it to others.

The second layer of analysis concerns the relation between the actor/students, their activity and the forms of representation that they chose to engage with, forms which they used from surrounding cultural domains. I shall divide these into two categories, again, mainly for analytical purposes: first, I shall look at particular choices of dramatic symbol, which I shall refer to as ‘figures’; second, I shall look at generic features of the ways they organised the dramatic text, which will be referred to as ‘forms’.

There were three main figures in this that I want to draw attention to in this short presentation — first, the Harley Davidson itself, which occupied a pre-eminent

position in the piece; second, the motorcycle's rider, who revved the throttle and bemoaned the fate of his broken bike; third, the figure of the UN, who came swimming or flying over the desert to the rescue of the rider.

In my narrative of the lesson, I mentioned that some of the groups of students had created forms and varieties of vehicle which were not very easy for an observer to 'read'. The Harley, on the other hand, was clearly 'drawn' with definite outlines and a clear way of moving. This is not surprising as a Harley Davidson is a motorcycle with clearly defined characteristics — it is large, powerful, chrome-plated and so forth. It is worth risking the speculation that, for these twelve and thirteen year-old boys, the figure of this vehicle carried heavy symbolic value and it clearly represented an 'object of desire'. The desire invested and understood in the figure of the Harley (to refer back to the quotation from Walkerdine) is the desire for wealth, for power, for freedom (of the road, as in the classic 'road-movie' *Easy Rider*) and, not least, a very masculine commodity and image.¹⁶ The area surrounding the school was not wealthy, nor mono-cultural, yet the Harley represents a symbolic figure of desire which they could hold in common. At their age and from their backgrounds, however, the Harley was something they could only have in their fantasies, unless, that is, they are given the chance to 'make' one. In reaching towards this powerful figure, the Harley Davidson, they achieved more than a moment of satisfaction for themselves in 'owning' such a machine. As if by magic, the group conjured up the figure of the Harley *from* their collective imaginations and *with* the collective of their bodies.

The figure of the rider epitomises notions of control and ownership of a powerful figure in (a particularly) masculine culture. The boys, including the rider, vocalised the noisy throb of the Harley's engine, as the rider 'twisted the throttle'. The posture of the rider, upright, with arms and legs akimbo, astride his powerful 'motorcycle'

and reaching up to the ‘horns’ of the ‘handlebars’, is a posture representing ownership, power and dominance.

As the Harley disintegrates, the rider changes to adopt a limp and bemused posture — his power melts away as his symbol of power ‘hits a rock’. Into this momentary lapse of order and control, swims or flies the figure of the UN. His curious motions can be interpreted, first, as a textual marker, signalling a transition between scenes, in a similar manner to the way a ‘cross-fade’ technique sometimes marks the boundaries between one scene and another in film and television. Second, his gestures evoked a certain mystical quality, signifying power of a different order from that of the Harley’s rider. This was the figure of the omniscient and omnipresent, multi-national, ‘peace-keeping’ and ‘peace-making’ organisation. This was the UN, which, after the ‘Gulf War’, Somalia and the former Yugoslavia, appeared to be at the centre of trouble wherever and whenever it happened in the world. This was a figure, then, of a ‘superhero’ (which had, incidentally, recently appeared on television advertisements for credit cards) who could act in an almost super-human capacity to help people out of trouble. Even as a kind of super ‘vehicle-breakdown service’ in the middle of a desert. This help was offered at a cost, it transpired, and the powerful status of both the rider and the UN was further supported by the flourishing of imaginary credit cards.

If you detect a slightly ironical edge to the way I write about this, it is to make a serious point. The boys’ portrayal of these powerful figures was not without ambiguity. Part of the pleasure derived from this activity was not only about the symbolic value of power intrinsic to the motorcycle, the rider and the UN, figures of the adult world and out of reach to these students, it was also partly about their power as actor/students to make a parody and burlesque out of portraying these figures. The desire for mastery can, in this instance, provide a power to debunk, albeit within a limited sphere of influence.

This leads us to focus for a while on the ways in which the children engaged with particular textual forms. Drawing on Vygotsky, work by Carol Fox (1988 & 1989) looking at children as readers and makers of stories, and by Gemma Moss (1989) in the area of girls as readers and writers of romance fiction, has shown how the forms and structures of stories give a potential framework for development, functioning in a similar way to the ‘zone of proximal development’. The work of Smagorinsky, who looks at how adolescent girls make a response to literature through the form of dance, is also relevant here. These studies emphasise not only the formative functions of engaging with various textual forms and modes of representation, they also ascribe significance to the *affective* aspects of the engagement.¹⁷ There is both pleasure and learning in being able to manipulate these media to one’s own purposes, and to invest them with a desirable content.

In the Harley scene, we can identify three predominant textual forms. First, I have already referred to the performance as having the form of a kind of mimetic dance. The main feature of this is the way in which the Harley was, first, constructed, and then animated. It was even able to lean into corners, as one has to do on a real motorcycle. There was, furthermore, a balletic quality in the way that the figure of the UN moved through space. Second, the form of the television advertisement was clearly discernible in the way that the whole dramatic text was put together. The scene lasted no more than three minutes, and switched rapidly between scenes in an episodic mode; the tone and content of the piece showed, as I have discussed, a tendency towards humour and parody in the style of an advert. Finally, the UN sequence made specific reference to, if not direct quotation of an advertisement for credit cards. Third, in the wake of a recent history of television news reports from the ‘Gulf War’ and other troubled locations, often against a background of arid, desert-

like landscape, one can detect something of the structuring influence of both the form and content of television reportage.

Like the move towards the representation of powerful figures, there is a sense of compulsion, pleasure and mastery in the way that this group appropriated, combined and transformed various powerful textual forms from the wider cultural environment. Whatever their innermost desires and fantasies were as individuals, it was desire (not mere interest, or motivation) that acted as the driving force, moving them through layers of interaction between the individual and the group, and between the group and figures and forms from the wider cultural environment. The collective expression of desire for social contact, for objects like the Harley Davidson, a symbol of power and masculinity, to experience (through modes of play and parody) the adult roles of the motorcycle owner and the UN, these desires became more than the pursuit of pleasure or instant gratification. It can be seen as an expression of an adolescent desire for being other than who or what you are, in another place from where you are. The predominant drive operating here is a complex desire — not just to *understand* the cultural forms and social forces which surround them as a purely ‘cognitive’ or cerebral process — rather, a form of understanding which is as much *felt* as an affective force, in and through their bodies. Through this *corporeal* form of understanding, students perhaps achieve some sense of mastery (however fleeting) over the forms and forces which surround them and threaten to hold them subject and powerless to act.

Moving towards the conclusion of this exploration, there is a need to gather together the implications of the argument for pedagogical thought and practice. It is in this section that I shall return to the issues which arise from the relation between this form of creative activity and institutional structures of schooling. Earlier, I discussed aspects of curriculum policy which have had a bearing on this argument and I shall revisit issues of policy only briefly. It is simply to observe that room for creative and expressive subjects on the curriculum is still there in the UK, but it is shrinking.

There is some irony in the fact that, as we seek to 'raise standards' by looking towards more rigid and 'traditional' curriculum structures, operated in countries like Taiwan, the Taiwanese are looking towards countries like the UK in order to learn how to expand the conception and application of creativity on their curriculum.¹⁸

Following this point, there is an argument about the ways in which the culture of schooling, especially as it is manifested in the structure of the curriculum and the way it is taught, has reciprocal effects on development and learning. You will remember the point that interested me in Vygotsky's argument about the private fantasy life of the adolescent. In permitting forms of adolescent play, in drama classrooms, for instance, we find that private desire as a drive to fantasy now has a public face. In Drama, Music, Art and English, we encourage students to explore their expressions of desire in a social context, to experiment and develop expertise in using a variety of cultural forms. Often we ask them to direct their work towards an audience of their peers, teachers and, sometimes, more public audiences.

In order for this to happen, however, students have to feel secure in their creative work, and this is the responsibility of teachers. There are two important dimensions to this in relation to making lessons safe places for the expression of desire. In the first place, students have to be clear in the choices they make of appropriate forms to express particular contents. In order for this to happen, they have to be aware of the ways that knowledge and feeling are organised in different cultural formations and different kinds of texts, and to examine how these are valued by different sections of the population. Second, the students' experience of the school day can be quite episodic. In different subjects, there are different 'rhythms' and rituals to the lesson structure, different expectations of work and behaviour, different student groupings and so forth. This is to say that the disciplinary structure of lessons, to use the term in its broadest sense, like the drama lesson I have described, has to be clear and

consistent in the eyes of students before they are likely to want to engage in creative work. To create, or change the culture of a classroom to the point at which adolescents engage in this form of dramatic activity means that one has to be persistent and consistent over time. We have also to pay attention (as most teachers do) to the ways in which groups of students are constituted in order to ensure that there is some sort of equilibrium of power relations between the members of a small group, or the members of a class.

Finally, in encouraging this kind of creative activity in classrooms, we get a chance to look at the force of desire in the light of day. Desire becomes more than a force which drives fantasy, imagination and creativity. In the social environment of the classroom, it encourages adolescents to represent their fantasy and imagination in forms of cultural action. To do this not only allows us a glimpse of cultural futures, perhaps, it also raises desire to consciousness, for reflection and analysis. In times when there is a lot of talk about the deleterious effects on behaviour arising from the portrayal of violence and sex on television and film,¹⁹ it is worth asking questions about how it is possible to know what effects these cultural forms of representation have on the development of young people, beneficial or deleterious, unless we preserve some space for them to express themselves.

Anton Franks ©

Institute of Education, University of London

August 1996

Notes

1. See, for example, Henriques *et al* (1984); Walkerdine (1984 & 1990); Christian-Smith (ed.) (1993); Dyson (1993).
2. At the time of writing, the most recent evidence of the way that policy-makers in the UK view the subject of pedagogy was given in a lecture by Anthea Millett (Chief Executive of the Teacher Training Agency) 'Pedagogy — the last corner of the secret garden' 15 July 1996, King's College

London. Her message was that it is more the ability to deploy teaching methods, not so much an understanding of learning processes, which will “raise standards of achievement in our schools.”

3. See, for example, Department for Education (1995) *English in the National Curriculum*, HMSO: page 17, “Pupils should be given opportunities to participate in a wide range of drama activities, including role-play, and the performance of scripted and *unscripted* plays.” [my emphasis]; and, page 23, “[Pupils] should be encouraged to write: for aesthetic and imaginative purposes...”

4. Here I am particularly engaging with ideas put forward by (friend and colleague) Gunther Kress in such articles as ‘Representational resources and the production of subjectivity’ (1995a) and ‘Writing and learning to write’ (1995b). In this work, Kress places emphasis on the role of *interest* in motivating children towards literacy and the development of resources of representation.

5. Juliet Mitchell (1974) gives a pre-eminently social dynamic of desire towards otherness in her feminist reading of psychoanalysis — “Desire is therefore always a question of significant interrelationship, desire is always the desire of the other...Desire can thus be recognized but never satisfied, for, as the desire for what the other desires, it necessitates the wish to *be* the other one, or not to be different from the other one...” (page 396).

6. Vygotsky’s opening remarks on the relation between play and pleasure in ‘The Role of Play in Development’ (1978: pages 92 and 93), for example, seem to bear some similarity with Freud’s exploration of the same relation in the opening sections of *Beyond the Pleasure Principle* (1974: pages 1 to 10). Reflecting on the (now famous) example of the “*fort* and *da*” game, Freud writes, “At the outset [the child] was in a passive situation — he was overpowered by the experience; but, by repeating it, unpleasurable though it was, as a game, he took on an active part” (page 10).

7. Here I am drawing on a clear, synoptic definition made by Walkerdine (1984); especially pages 176 to 182.

8. See again Freud, *Beyond the Pleasure Principle* (1974); page 8 and 29.

9. See, for example, Willis (1977 & 1990).

10. Especially Chapter 5, pages 42 to 45 and Chapter 19, ‘Video replay: families, films and fantasy’, pages 173 to 204.

11. Particularly, Hodge and Kress (1993), Kress and van Leeuwen (1996), Threadgold (1993), Franks (1995 & 1996).

12. See, for example the work of Bourdieu (1991 & 1993), and Giddens (1984). Their work on ‘micro-social’ processes at the borders of sociology and social psychology, as well as Kendon’s work (see immediately below), owes a substantial debt to the pioneering work of Erving Goffman.

13. A formation that Adam Kendon, in *Conducting Interaction* (1990), drawing on the terminology of ‘context analysis’, refers to as an “F-formation”.

14. Smagorinsky and Coppock (1994) have done some analytical work, from a Vygotskian perspective, on students' response to literature through dance.
15. Drawn from Bakhtin 'Author and hero in aesthetic activity'; pages 67 to 68. Moroson and Emerson's own translation (not published separately).
16. Dyson (1993) makes similar points about adolescent identification with the US baseball star, Michael Jordan. Like many top athletes, Jordan is particularly associated with promoting a range of products — training shoes which bear his name. The 'high performance' figure of the athlete represents the body beautiful, the body powerful, masculinity and sexuality, commodity and ownership.
17. The terminology and classification of *affect*, as used, for example, in the term "affective force", is relatively new to my thinking and writing around desire — although, clearly, the notion of affect is embedded in desire. The concept of affect, as I use it throughout this piece, has been articulated and elaborated in discussions with Peter Knapp, a Visiting Fellow at the Institute of Education, University of London between April and June 1996 from Sydney Technical University. Here I am particularly drawing on one of the papers her presented — 'Virtual Grammar: Writing as Affect/Effect' (mimeo).
18. I have personal experience of this as, in spring 1993, I went to Taiwan to contribute to a conference on story-telling for elementary school teachers. See Franks (1994) 'Stories, Drama and Learning' in *Drama the Journal of National Drama* for the substance of the keynote address I gave there.
19. See, for example, Michael Barber (Dean of New Initiatives at the University of London Institute of Education and education adviser to the Labour Party), *Times Educational Supplement*, 5 July 1996 who expounds a (rather simple and simplistic) causal connection between the viewing of frenetic breakfast television programmes by school students and, subsequently, their difficult classroom behaviour.

References

- BOAL, A. (1995) *Rainbow of Desire* (London, Routledge)
- BOURDIEU, P. (1993) *The Field of Cultural Production* (Cambridge, Polity Press)
- BOURDIEU, P. (1991) *Language & Symbolic Power* (Cambridge, Polity Press)
- CHRISTIAN-SMITH, L. (ed.) (1993) *Texts of Desire: essays on fiction, femininity and schooling* (London, Taylor & Francis)
- DEPARTMENT for EDUCATION (1995) *English in the National Curriculum* (London, HMSO)

- DYSON, M. (1993) 'Be Like Mike?: Michael Jordan and the Pedagogy of Desire' in *Cultural Studies* Volume 7 Number 1, January 1993 (London, Routledge): pp. 64-72
- FOUCAULT, M. (1977) *Discipline and Punish* (Harmondsworth, Penguin)
- FOX, C. (1988) 'Poppies Will Make them Grant', in *Language and Literacy in the Primary School*, Meek. M. & Mills C. (eds) (London and Brighton, the Falmer Press)
- FOX, C. (1989) 'Children Thinking Through Story', in *English in Education*, Vol. 23, No. 2.
- FRANKS, A. (1996) 'Drama Education, the Body and Representation (or, the Mystery of the Missing Bodies)' in *Research in Drama Education* Volume 1 Number 1 (Abingdon, Carfax)
- FRANKS, A. (1995) 'The Body as a Form of Representation' in *Social Semiotics* Volume 5 Number 1 1995
- FRANKS, A. (1993) 'Drama, Stories and Learning' in *DRAMA The Journal of National Drama* Volume 2 Number 3 Summer 1994
- FREUD, S. (1974) *Beyond the Pleasure Principle* (London, The Hogarth Press)
- GIDDENS, A. (1984) *The Constitution of Society* (Berkeley & Los Angeles, University of California Press)
- HENRIQUES, J. W. HOLLOWAY, C. URWIN, C. VENN and V. WALKERDINE (1984) *Changing the Subject: Psychology, Social Regulation and Subjectivity* (London, Routledge, Kegan and Paul)
- HODGE R. & G. KRESS (1993) *Social Semiotics* (Ithaca NY, Cornell University Press)
- KENDON, A. (1990) *Conducting Interaction* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press)
- KNAPP, P. (1996) 'Virtual Grammar: Writing as Affect/Effect' (mimeo)
- KRESS, G.R. (1995a) Representational resources and the production of subjectivity, in M. COULTHARD (Ed) *Texts and Practices* (London, Routledge).
- KRESS, G.R. (1995b) Writing and learning to write, in D. OLSON & N. TORRANCE *The Handbook of Human Development in Education: New Models of Learning, Teaching and Schooling* (Oxford, Blackwell)
- KRESS, G. and T. van LEEUWEN (1996) *Reading Images: A Grammar of Visual Design* (London, Routledge)
- MORSON, G.S. and C. EMERSON (1990) *MIKHAIL BAKHTIN Creation of a Prosaics* (Stanford Ca., Stanford University Press)
- MOSS, G. (1989) *Un/Popular Fictions* (London, Virago)
- MITCHELL, J (1974) *Psychoanalysis and Feminism* (Harmondsworth, Penguin)
- SMAGORINSKY, P. & J. COPPOCK (1994) 'The Reader, the Text, the Context: An Exploration of a Choreographed Response to Literature' (mimeo) (paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, April 1994, New Orleans)

THREADGOLD, T. (1993) 'Performing Genres: Violence, the Making of Protected Subjects, and the Discourses of Critical Literacy and radical Pedagogy' in *Changing English* Volume 1 Number 1 (Department of English Media and Drama, Institute of Education University of London): pages 2-31

VYGOTSKY, L.S. (1994) *The Vygotsky Reader* R. van der VEER & J. VALSINER (eds) (Oxford, Blackwell)

VYGOTSKY, L.S. (1978) *Mind in Society* M. COLE, V. JOHN-STEINER, S. SCRIBNER & E. SOUBERMAN (eds) (Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press)

VYGOTSKY, L.S. (1986) *Thought and Language*. A. Kozulin (trans. & ed) (Cambridge Mass., MIT Press)

WALKERDINE, V. (1990) *Schoolgirl Fictions* (London, Verso)

WALKERDINE, V. (1984) 'Some Day My Prince Will Come' in A. McROBBIE & M. NIVA (eds) (1984) *Gender and Generation* (Basingstoke, Macmillan Youth Questions): pages 162 to 184

WILLIS, P. (1990) *Common Culture* (Buckingham, Open University Press)

WILLIS, P. (1978) *Learning to Labour* (Gower)