CHAPTER V

THE LANGUAGE MODEL EXEMPLIFIED
AND EXTENDED IN THE CLASSROOM
5.1 **The Classroom Data: An Introduction and Certain Clarifications**

At the outset of this chapter, I would like to state that the description of classes from the two-year teaching project is not meant to be a practicalisation of principles derived from the language and syllabus model set up. That is, it is not as though the theoretical side of the curriculum was articulated first and then the classes conceived and taught in the light of these principles. The discussion on theoretic issues and consequent model making that has been gone into so far, does not have the status of a curriculum manual which would seek a one-to-one (or near one-to-one) correspondence between the principles therein and what happens in the classroom. This short preamble to this chapter, is necessary as a reminder of the way this curriculum project developed. (For further details on this see the Introduction.)

A second matter closely connected to this first one, pertains to the status of the classroom data that I am about to discuss. I have certain definite points to make about languaging, syllabus-making and their particular possible manifestations inside a language classroom. I make them
with materials I prepared and took into classes that I taught. The 'lessons' are meant to aid an illustrative discussion about these specific points. Hence, details about the origins of the project, matters of materials preparation, an evaluation of the project etc., though important matters in themselves are not entered into in this thesis at all. 'Lessons' for such illustrative discussions are picked out randomly from the two years of teaching, the only criterion for the picking out being how best each one lesson illustrates a particular point being made.²

I shall however, present in a few brief words the overall conception and execution of the project in order to contextualise the lessons to be discussed. Before I do this, a brief account of what I intend demonstrating through the analysis, seems in order. They are as follows:

(1) The question of creating an atmosphere where self-choice in experience and meaning could take place; in this connection I propose to discuss the issues involved here and show how they are met when teaching has to be undertaken.

(2) How much of meaning-seeking as I postulate it can happen? Can the 'lessons' illustrate, a) interaction (of the moment); b) the range - i.e., the pragmatic, mathetic, poetic - in meaning creation; c) the notions of negotiation and exploitation.
An important question related to points 2a-2c above is the question of the 'difference' that I claim for my classroom interaction in terms of meaning-making seen mainly as an effort at creating a 'new world' even while imbibing the old one and heavily influenced by it, and as such meaning-making resulting in the creation of unique meanings.

(3) a) A language as communication or languaging as interactive creation syllabus being a 'line of intention' and consequently the emergence of objectives, content and methodology in the classroom; b) the project as an illustration of the notion of a syllabus of interactive creation of the moment.

In this way the analysis and data is meant to support and extend in their illustration, some of the points I have made in the first four chapters (the emphasis being mostly on the first three chapters and more especially on the third).

Now, for a few brief and necessary details about the teaching project: The project was carried out as a two-year experiment in English teaching in a primary school in Hyderabad in the State of Andhra Pradesh in South India. The project team consisted of one teacher and two observers in the first year and one teacher and one observer in the second year. The observers took extensive field notes and
were occasionally supported by a tape-recorder. The teacher herself kept a detailed diary. Besides these, almost everyday after a class there was a brief 'exchange of notes' among the teacher and the observers, the results of which were incorporated into the teacher's notes. The description of lessons below are all taken from the teacher's and observer's notes.

The class chosen for the project in the first year was the IV Standard in the primary school. This same class was followed into the V Standard for the second year's teaching. In the State of Andhra Pradesh, English as subject is first introduced in the curriculum in the V Standard. But in the particular school where the project was taught, it began in IV Standard itself. The learners at this stage had already had three years of schooling (not including the kindergarten) with the language of instruction as Telugu (the regional language, and the mother tongue of at least 97 to 98% of the students in the school) and also with Telugu as one of the subjects in the curriculum. In this, the fourth year of their schooling, English is introduced as subject in the curriculum, and continues to be one until the learners leave school, i.e., after the X standard, with Telugu as the medium of instruction throughout. After leaving school, the majority of the learners, whether they go into professional,
technical or undergraduate arts and science colleges, go into English medium colleges, where English continues also to be a subject in the curriculum.

This being an average, state-government-affiliated school, it had no facilities beyond the basic ones like a classroom, desks and chairs, and a blackboard and chalk. It consisted of fifty-two boys and girls, aged 10/11. (This number came down to forty-nine in the second year.) This school was chosen, among other reasons, for its typicality as to medium of instruction, class size and the general administrative and scholastic atmosphere. With these details put away, then, I shall now turn to the analysis proper.

**Section I**

5.2 **Framework for Viewing the Lessons: Classroom as an Organic World (Range of Experiences)**

The general framework for analysing the classes and deriving certain insights regarding them can be articulated by forging a link between this chapter and the third, where I arrive at different summings-up of certain attitudes to languaging and syllabus-making to draw implications for a language classroom.

There have already been indications (there) that the recommended language acquisition atmosphere for the classroom is that of an organic 'natural' world - where there are
experiences and human beings who react to or interact with these experiences; interaction however does not involve and result in imbibing whatsoever experiences are around - but in creating a personal 'core' of experience or reality. All human endeavour as meaning-making, a mainstay argument in this thesis obviously asks for the classroom to be treated as such a 'world' with (more experienced) adult caretaker and (a) (less experienced) non-adult(s). It is to be noted that it is not a transplantation of the 'outside' world - as more natural - into the classroom, somehow considered less natural if not downright artificial, that is asked for here. More, the classroom itself is regarded as a 'natural' and 'normal' situation in life where human beings (teachers and learners) come together for a few hours a day for a few days in a week for a few weeks in a ... and so on ... in all, spend together (in interaction) a large chunk of their lives.

The first overall condition for a look at the classes, this attitude to classroom life and roles for teachers and learners therein, makes the classroom a normal life situation and conversely the home a naturally educative situation. It is at this point that there is a framework implication that the caretaker/teacher has to adopt a lead-from-behind policy and let the child-learner attempt meaning making.
5.2.1 **Experiences in an Organic World: Some Problems and Solutions**

Yet there were problems here. In explaining and expanding upon these problems I shall simultaneously be discussing connotational significances of terms and procedures that any (language) classroom could encounter.

I do not claim to be inviting or even discovering new concepts here. I, however, do claim that clarity of the kind I am trying to achieve in the next few pages on apparently routine procedures in syllabus-making and teaching becomes crucial for my thesis on meaning-making as it manifests itself in the classroom. In a mother caretaker-child relationship - i.e., in an 'educative' setting such as that, 1) the child since she is growing up has not formed too many concepts or has not been exposed to many basic experiences; 2) the everyday routines (of the business of living) introduce sufficient experiences (adequate that is, for at least the minimum growth expected of a child), automatically without any efforts for their having to be set up by either the mother or the child.

In a setting like a school - apparently - we have - 1. a fairly-grown up child (in a secondary school set-up such as mine that we encounter); 2. a) compared to the world outside, this seems a 'restricted' barren world as far as
'natural' possibilities in terms of experience are concerned; b) on the other hand, the argument also could be that experiences at school are different and more 'rich', in a sense, more advanced.

What emerges here is, 1) more 'doctoring' or conscious attention to experiences through introduction of experiences (and hence mediated experiences) are needed in schools - this provides for 'advanced' interests - for the child whose basic growth is seen as accomplished. 2) School experiences do not have the spontaneity that home experiences have, because of this 'mediation' or deliberate introduction.

I would like to counter this argument with the following assertions: 1. Doctoring or conscious introduction could be present even in a home environment - the other caretaker could want to 'educate' the child. Thus the force of basic growth and advanced interest argument to differentiate homes from schools is weakened. But only weakened; this will be picked up below. 2. The lack of spontaneity in school experiences could point to the following claim or assumption: in some ways home experiences are more pure or direct experiences. I would like to question this assumption and submit, that there is nothing like experiences being pure or unmediated.
The base for interaction, i.e., experiences can be in two forms - they could be notions, concepts which are mostly conventionalised or mediated experiences. Or the base could be 'pure' experiences (like pebbles lying on the beach; or rain falling from the sky ...). Yet such experiences even in a home environment lie outside the normal routines of living for the child; and instead of waiting for the child at some stage to stumble upon these to pursue meanings out of them, and creating meanings or a world view, the mother-caretaker does deliberately introduce them to the child. These usually are apart (and as extra) from the pragmatic/social and affective experiences - and are more of an intellectual or mathetic kind.

In such introductions I see mediation or interpretation. It is only in the (re)creation or (re)interpretation of the interpreted experiences that the freedom to create exists for the child-learner whether in a home environment or school environment. (The choice about the (interpreted albeit) experiences could be the learner's in either (home or school) situation. More of this below.) Both environments then, have to provide experiences deliberately.

What does make for one actual difference though is the adult/child difference. For a 'minimum' growth the affective-intellectual-social experiences (an integrated 'world') in
and around a home seem sufficient. Even a richer home environment can be provided by a sensitive caretaker through a manipulation of what is easily available in and around the routine physical environment. It is after a certain stage that experiences to engage the curiosity of a child towards growth have to be outside the usual physically limited environment. And this is when an 'institutionalised', 'formal' school comes in. A school though, is not an artificial setting just because it brings in more opportunities within a physically reachable/accessible environment. This does make a deliberate introduction of a world more obvious, which could be called artificial but which is not; as I have tried to point out.

The difference does not lie in this 'artificiality' but in another factor. The more advanced/growth and less basic the needs are the more formalised the experiences for the learners to interact with. (This is where I pick up as valuable the advanced-growth-argument; as not getting cancelled, but only weakened; see p. 8 above.)

In that sense school experiences, since an extensive 'physical' world cannot be brought in, are more mediated or more formalised. This is the important point for me. That though no experience whether at home or at school is
unmediated, the ones at school seem more mediated. In other words there are degrees of mediation. The artificiality of schools because of their mediated/introduced experiences thus stands cancelled out.

Yet in one sense, the school does become artificial — this is remediable, though. The cause as I see it for this artificiality is the bias towards intellectual/mathetic experiences (which are always highly formalised experiences). What makes for artificiality here is the lack of 'wholeness' about the types of experiences in school. While the home, as I have already mentioned, has a variety of experiences, social, affective and intellectual, a school seems to tip heavily on the side of intellectual experiences.

Before I indicate how in my classroom these ideas were used, I would like to make one point.

**Inevitability of Formalisation of Experiences**

I see as inevitable that learners are exposed not to pristine pure experiences (without, so to say the taint of history). For one, in their deliberate foregrounding of certain experiences by caretaking adults, in these choices themselves they are pre-interpreted, they show a bias. And furthermore, experiences are to a large extent verbally
conveyed (see Vygotsky, 1962 briefly quoted in Chapter II) and in that they have to be conventionalised, pre-interpreted and mediated. Even if they are not verbalised, yet in any mode of presentation (see Chapters I and II - experiences to be thought of have to be contained in a symbolic medium), interpretation comes in. 4

But what keeps this pre-interpreted biased experiences open for creativity is allowing for interaction or creative construction or personal world/experiences or meanings out of these (pre)interpreted ones.

For this allowing for to happen certain important attitudes and actions have to be adopted. It is in this that the notion of formalisation as inevitable due to the fact of symbolic mediation and the distinction I have set up about degrees of formalisation in experiences helps.

Some clarification on these two here.

Degrees of Formalisation - Features of Less Formalised and More Formalised Experiences

The more formalised experiences are generally verbal, and come via more definite, precise and pointed language (see Footnote 4 - Here I definitely am talking about mathetic/intellectual experiences) when non-verbal, they come in discursive drawings, i.e., in the form of maps, scales, etc.
Such experiences affording less scope for differential meaning-focussing and differential outcomes, are more connected with tasks, i.e., as the experience is set up so the meaning-focussing and later meanings come in automatically. Also the meaning arrived at correspondingly is contained in the same precise language as the initial experience base. While the less formalised experiences come in more metaphoric analogic language (stories for instance) and modes like pictures which are line drawings or are not 'formalised' or stylised themselves and hence are amenable to 'interpretations'. Such experiences also give more scope for differential outcomes and so are not strongly related to the task or the type of meaning that can be the focus - in other words, they lend easily to any kind of meaning-seeking within the mathetic-poetic range. As in the former type this latter when they result in differential unique meanings, are contained in less precise language, less conventionalised types of diagrams, etc.

Creativity within Formalised Experiences

Now how do all these help in allowing for creative creation in a classroom (and a home)?

At the outset itself, I consider it essential that though only pre-interpreted experiences are available, there be as many of them as possible for the learners to choose from. Secondly, not only in the next state of interaction, i.e.,
when the learner has to focus on an aspect of these experiences, i.e., whether he/she wants to 'receive' (in itself a relative term for me) or create (degree of it - pragmatic creation, less of the personal, to mathetic-poetic creations where there is more of the personal) but in the experience setting up stage itself it would be helpful if there was a variety in experiences in terms of degrees of formalisation. More formalised (conventionalised experience) as base (the first step in interaction) (mostly) affords scope for only pragmatic/social meaning-seeking or at the most mathetic meaning-seeking which is at the more pragmatic end of the cline, rather than the poetic end. That is, all these meaning-seekings end up in creating common meaning outcomes (less incorporation of the personal and less negotiation) though the last would have more of the personal since there would be more negotiation and hence through this differentiability or uniqueness of the path to the created (albeit common) meaning. While the less formalised experiences offer a choice for the learner to any position in the meaning-seeking cline, choices in degree of personal investment, negotiation or exploitation. The position on the cline is the learner's choice.

Since in one sense, such more formalised experiences are already there in social routines and are inevitable (inevitably leading to strongly pragmatic meaning focussing - less
negotiation and faster and more ready arrival at common meanings) less formalisation of experiences are possible and needed only in the deliberately introduced non-routine area - viz., the intellectual experiences. And within the intellectual experiences I recommend that degrees of formalisation be manipulated, so that two kinds of mathetic meaning-seeking can be generated if the learner so chooses: one with more negotiation than pragmatic meaning-seeking but yet ultimately arrival at one meaning; the other with much more negotiation than even the first and which would move towards exploitation and 'end' in diverse meanings.

Formalisation of Experiences, Creativity within Formalisation etc. - A Summing-Up

Thus the quality of the initial experiences as the base for interaction in terms of formalisation within the caretaker-set up afford 1) choices in experiences: a. more formalised, b. less formalised. 2) a. If the choice is for a more formalised one, along with its task or meaning-seeking, then the choice of meaning-focus is restricted automatically to a more pragmatic or mathetic meaning seeking moving (in the latter case) more toward the pragmatic side. b. If the choice is for a less formalised experience then, the choices at meaning focus are potentially plural, in that they will, along with i) pragmatic, and ii) (towards pragmatic) mathetic meanings, would also crucially include, iii) mathetic
(towards poetic) meaning seeking. 3) a. If the choice is for more formalised experience then the fact of being aware of the formalisation dimension of experiences, keeps the possibility of leaving the choice of chalking out 'personal' plural paths open for learners - thus enhancing negotiation. b. If the choice is less formalised, this plurality of paths along with plurality of outcomes is not a problem. The points I have made here can be summed up in the following figure: (continued in the next page)
Fig. 21. Choices at various levels of interaction/meaning-making

Level 1-a: Experiences

- Experiences
  - more formalised (social/pragmatic area)
  - 'Intellectual'
  - less formalised (stories, games etc)

Level 1-b: Meaning-seeking

- Pragmatic meaning-seeking
  - 'problem-solving' ("logical meaning-seeking")
  - Poetic (open-ended) meaning-seeking

Level 2: Methodology (steps/paths)

- Less innovative
  - 'personal', 'diverse', 'configuration strategies/ways to a solution'
  - Personal, diverse of configurations strategies
  - More innovative

Level 3: Outcomes

- Less innovative
  - (mostly) 'one' meaning outcome
  - 'diverse', 'personal', 'outcomes'
  - More innovative
5.3 **Classroom as an Organic World in Terms of Experiences - An Application of Notions**

Let me now see how all these notions find parallels in my language classroom. The parallels I seek have to do with the following points:

a) experiences having to be 'integrated wholes' (social, affective and intellectual);

b) social and in some senses affective experiences as being inherent in pragmatic social routines, and not needing to be set up deliberately; and the setting up to be done mainly in the mathetic/intellectual areas;

c) my acceptance of formalisation of experiences, with the distinction between more formalised and less formalised ones.

5.3.1 **Range in Experiences**

The question of experiences in a language classroom for me had to be an integrated world to be brought inside for learners and teachers to interact with. The integrated world as I mentioned earlier can be roughly divided into an affective world, a social world, and an intellectual world. (I would like to point out here, that I am aware that this is an arbitrary kind of categorisation of experiences. This is however, meant only to be a rough and ready kind of division with the overlaps recognised, though this kind of arbitrariness here, does not indicate this overtly.)

When it comes to the social side of experiences (and to quite an extent affective experiences) and interaction therein,
a school is as obviously rich in them as any 'home' environment without any need for a deliberate introduction of such experiences at all. Thus, the fact that the teacher and the learner(s) came into contact for forty minutes for five days in a week for the length of two (academic) years gave interesting scope for the development of a social relationship. This factor was exploited to the full in the classroom project; the learners' interest in carrying on a social relationship with the teacher, and the teacher's own (unequal to be certain) interest in fifty other human beings, displayed now and then in genuine conversations about life inside and outside the classroom and the school, was seen as a fruitful opportunity for using language for socialising. This might sound at this point like a somewhat forced kind of socialising; on the contrary, just the acceptance of such possibilities as natural and legitimate led to genuine socialising, however sporadic, throughout the two years. Again, the teacher's management of the classroom and the learners for a considerable chunk of their school life was seen as a parallel to the caretaker-child pragmatic interaction. Even in terms of intellectual and other levels of affective experiences (see below) the classroom and the school provided topics for engagement for the learners and the teacher. School discipline, rowdyism, segregation of boys and girls, harmful
teasing and beating, were topics constantly thrown up by the school community, and they were picked up and seriously looked at. Learners were invited to analyse their own motives for the way they acted, and freely express their opinions on whichever topic they chose.

5.3.2 Intellectual Experiences: Certain Sub-Divisions

The deliberate introduction of experiences then had or have (whether in the school or the home environment) to deal mainly with what we call the intellectual areas. It is here, that the physical mobility and ability of coverage of a human being can be restrictive of a rich quantum of experiences (see arguments above).

For intellectual experiences besides the school community topics mentioned above, the conventional divisions in the form of disciplines like Physical and Biological Sciences, Mathematics, History, Geography, Civics, etc., could be chosen and this is exactly what was done as I intend to show below.

When choosing intellectual experiences there was seen to be an elusive/unarticulatable difference between topics from Science, Mathematics, Geography etc., and topics like stories, poems, games, miscellaneous experiences like making
paper baskets etc. Since they do seem to have affective elements (e.g., stories) and a good deal of aesthetic appeal I shall call them 'additional', affective, aesthetic experiences (triple 'a' experiences from now onwards). So I shall further divide intellectual topics into 'intellectual, minus affective' and 'intellectual, triple 'a''. As such 'triple 'a'' experiences, then, very broadly, stories, poems and games were chosen. 6

5.3.3 Meaning-Focus in Chosen Areas of Experience

So teacher control inside the classroom is in setting up experiences. Control at the next level of meaning-focus depended upon the kind of experience worked upon - more formalised or less formalised. In the former case the task of meaning-exploration or meaning-focussing automatically became the kind where there is an attempt to 'retrieve' one common meaning. These were as already mentioned the problem-solving tasks. Thus there was an automatic control by the teacher at this level also. And in the later case, i.e., when the experience which was worked upon happened to be less formalised experiences - they afforded a choice at the level of meaning-exploration or task (see figure, p. 358) and in the choice also afforded better scope for open-ended free-wheeling type of meaning-exploration or tasks. In this latter, there would be a low readiness to 'agree' and more negotiation/exploitation. In the former, however extensive
the negotiation in the end meanings are 'retrieved' within
the constraints of the 'logical' framework set up by the
experience itself; (or by a desire to 'communicate' the
individualistic meaning and so a self-introduction of the
interlocutor factor; see p. 231, Chapter IV). In the
latter, in the end still an entirely felicitous meaning
might not be retrieved, yet having made the effort remains
satisfying.

I will at this stage, seek a connection with an important
line of argument I have been developing from the IV Chapter.
This connection sought, is a continuation of the discussion
of the notions of 'meaning pre-occupation' talked about in
the context of problem-solving tasks in another teaching
project, viz., the CTP which I claim there, becomes structured
meaning-retrieval (pp. 230-235 Chapter IV) and my own discussion
above on the provision of reinterpreted formalised experiences
and even within that degrees of formalisations.

I also intend to show how since problem-solving tasks
are seen conceptually as a type of mathetic meaning-explo-
ration and forming such an integral part of a scheme of a
cline of meaning-making which in itself is a derivation
from an extensively worked-out view of languaging as inter-
action - meaning creation of the moment, such tasks go
beyond meaning-retrieval and show a markedly qualitative
difference from any other problem solving tasks (such as
e.g., the one already briefly discussed as part of CTP) in contexts of language teaching elsewhere. This difference mainly resides in a readiness for the (logical) constriction not occurring even when the experience (and task) happen to be a formalised type of experience (i.e., mathetic, intellectual minus affective) and the problem-solving kind of task. Thus attitudinally regarding what could be called meaning-retrieval as *meaning exploration* (allowing for so to say, 'discovery') I claim makes for a qualitatively different kind of communication, i.e., being 'open' even in a constricted task to different outcomes, a consequent of a paradigmatic commitment, most of the time did not lead to different solutions, yet that they could occur left it open for such break-throughs (see description of task of categorisation e.g. 7, p. 294, below).

And in this preparedness I was allowing as per my paradigmatic commitment, for unique conceptualisation. (See also Chapter VI, where I pick up implications of this for syllabus making.)

5.4 *A Dimension of an Organic World: The Relationship Between Caretaker and Learner*

The next dimension of creating a suitable atmosphere of language acquisition, has to do with the roles of the teacher-caretaker and the school-learner. I resort here to a reference to the figure in Chapter III (p. 197) which
indicated the weight of learner influence against teacher influence in the meaning-making enterprise. The teacher is advised there to take a lead-from-behind policy since it is the learner who is building up a world for him/himself. If the teacher influence comes in the form of introducing experiences with (certain times) the attendant type of meaning-seeking also, where does the learner come in here at all?

Such 'controls' I have already indicated are made necessary by the pragmatics of interaction. The letout from such control and apparent teacher manipulation however is the belief in the over-riding and creative influence of the immediate classroom situation (including the teacher and the learners) a paradigm requirement, pervasive of languaging, and syllabus-making where learner autonomy in choosing experiences and meanings comes in. This would allow for an abandonment of the structured plan and make for learners own choices in terms of experiences (social intellectual and affective) and own task-meaning pursuit choice within one's chosen experience type.

In a teaching situation this language model logically makes for an enacted syllabus. Thus if interaction i.e., the process is the goal, the content of interaction (experiences and tasks) the methodology (the strategies
used for arrival at an outcome) and the objectives (the meaning outcome) are all created by the learner. I shall deal with this more extensively at the end of this chapter and in Chapter VI.

5.5 **Section I - A Summing-Up**

In this first section of the chapter then, I have discussed as I promised to in the beginning, self-choice in experiences, tasks etc., in all, the several dimensions of interaction, and the pragmatics involved in this. In this, I tried to show that classrooms are no different from natural situations of meaning-making. A discussion on kinds of experiences, tasks, strategies etc., formed an important part of this section.

This was however, only an introduction to the classroom, to attitudes that formed the bases of the teaching. The actual happening of learner choices, are illustrated in Part II below.

Now I propose to go on to the second task I have set myself in this chapter, viz., an analysis of the tasks or lessons to illustrate interaction as a whole, and more particularly meaning-seeking along the pragmatic-mathetic cline. In the course of this discussion I shall also be clarifying through lessons the notions of negotiation and exploitation as they have figured in my model.
SECTION II

5.6 An Introduction to Section II: Classroom Pragmatics-Tasks, Task Cycles and Task Sequences

As a starting point to this section I will briefly talk about one concession (if it can be called that) to classroom pragmatics - the necessity to keep up a continuity or sequentiality of experiences and work upon them over days in the daily business of work in the English classroom. Such a continuity in a classroom has to emerge in the form of divisions into lessons and units. The way this got realised in this particular teaching project, happened to be somewhat unique and related to the kind of 'content' of the classroom, the experiences and the tasks.

Thus, one particular experience-field and the task-type attached to it, would stretch over four to six classes (on an average) until the learners had exhausted for the moment their interest in it, (or in other words 'task-fatigue' set in). This constituted a task-cycle.
Then on to the next field of experience and task type associated with that field of experience, and so on and on. But the first area of experience was returned to at a later point, with a task similar to the previous one accompanying it. This would go on for a few classes until 'task fatigue' set in once again in this particular cycle. Thus one experience-field with its associated task-type (covering a task cycle of a few consequent classes) interspersed in the course, was referred to as a task-sequence.

This kind of change of experience-field with its associated task-type was necessary for two reasons:

1. as planned substitutes for the naturally occurring 'fatigue' with an area of experience;
2. as a way of covering as many experience fields and task-types as possible.

The concept of difficulty-grading occurred naturally - as the information in a particular field grew, it generated contemplation of more complex ideas and concepts. An illustration would explain both the concepts of sequences of this sort and their natural grading.

E.g.1, I - beg, to I - end*

A theme like 'finding out about directions' and applying them to maps incorporated in a task cycle and a task sequence looked like the following. The first task cycle (of three

---

* I roughly indicate at what point in the two years of teaching each example cited from now onwards occurred, in the following way: E.g.1, I/II (indication of the year) beg./mid./end (beginning, middle or end).
classes) introduced the four major directions (north, south, east and west) in relation to the classroom and set the learners the job of drawing maps of classrooms according to oral or written instructions. For instance, for one map the instructions were:

"Class V-C has five windows, in the east. The blackboard is near the north wall. The door leading to the classroom is in the south. There are several pictures on the west wall."

The next cycle in the same theme after an intervening four other different-themed cycles went on to set problems one step ahead, incorporating the knowledge of the four directions from the previous cycle. In this second cycle of the theme the problems had to do with written instructions about various classrooms, introducing a new dimension viz., the shape of the classroom (e.g., "Class III-B is in the shape of a rectangle."), and matching these instructions with the relevant map. The learners also went on to draw their own maps and write out keys for them (e.g., "Classroom VI-B: shape: square; North wall: a calendar" etc). The next cycle after a gap of several other lessons, returned to this theme, and went on to use the directions and key for the map concepts, to geographical maps. The fourth cycle concentrated on subtler distinctions such as the northeast, and southwest, and used them to draw more complex maps. (These tasks, it should be
obvious, belong to the categorisation, 'intellectual, minus affective' experience, problem-solving tasks.)

5.7 Illustrations of Meaning Seeking Through Descriptions of Lessons - A Plan for Discussion

Now let us go on to a more detailed examination of 'lessons' in the project and the meaning-seeking through language that they generated; the last aspect being one of the two major concerns of this part.

First I will discuss two problem-solving tasks: I shall follow these up with two open-ended tasks. The instances of negotiation for meaning are meant to be self-evident in the discussion section of each of the examples. However, where necessary, I come in with a few extra comments directed towards what is perceived as significant about the negotiation involved.

The verbal interaction that is described below in all the examples was carried on in English at all times by the teacher; and English, gestures and occasional Telugu on the part of the learners. In fact, Telugu was used only as a very last resort. However 'non-accurate' their English, learners tried to communicate only in English; this was their own preference, though. There was absolutely no indication from the teacher either to use or not use either
of the languages. However, the learners were aware that the teacher and the observers came from an institute called the Central Institute of English and Foreign Languages, next door to the school where the language of everyday communication was English. They also knew, that though their teacher could speak their mother tongue, i.e., Telugu, the observers could not.

While we are on the subject of the language used by teacher and learners, I have to explain that the kind of analysis I will be doing below is not in any way a 'conversation analysis' of strategies of negotiation and exploitation or interaction as a whole. (As for example, the kind that Sacks (1972), Garfinkel (1972) and other ethnomethodologists engage in.) Neither is my analysis of the type done by classroom observation analysts (neither the Mehan (1979) type of ethnomethodological analysis, nor the Flanders (1970) Fanselow (1977) kind, nor the Allwright (1983), Seliger (1983) and Long (1983) variety). I use the collected data to illustrate my language and syllabus model in a concrete and specific way. In this, without going into linguistic details I, most of the time, summarise tasks or lessons with occasional presentation of a verbatim report, to draw attention in discussions to the attitudes fostered, the enthusiastic engagement of learners in individualistic meaning pursuits the richness of the classes as a whole in terms of activities that the learners engaged in and so on.
Such a goal of substantiation and extension of principles in my argued for language and syllabus model seems adequately achieved through discussions of summaries.9

5.7.1 Problem-Solving Tasks

1. The Calendar Task

E.G. 2. I-yr-end (Problem Solving)

Description: For this class, the teacher handed over calendars of the year (1982) to all the learners. After some phatic questions such as: How many months are there in a year - What day and date is today - What year and month etc., the teacher explained the actual task based upon the calendar. This was solving of oral puzzles such as:

"My birthday was in the first month of the year. It was on a Friday. But the date was not the 1st. The date had only one number in it. When was my birthday?"

The learners were to write the answer, (the date) on the blank sheet of paper provided by the teacher.

Discussion: As mentioned earlier, this is a task which engages the learners in retrieving one definite meaning. Automaticity or mechanical manipulation is avoided by keeping the punch line varied in every puzzle. Though all puzzles for a solution depend upon 'homing-in' upon the answer by
elimination - such as the first month, January - (which has thirty-one days) a Friday - five possibilities; not the 1st - so four possibilities. One number in it - three of the four possibilities eliminated. The elimination game could never become automatic (see argument above about retaining an element of 'discovery' for oneself - I hope to show more convincing support for this argument later below.)

Look at the following puzzle for instance:

"Rama's birthday is in a month which begins with an 'A'. But it is not in August ..."

or a little more difficult one like:

"Lalitha's birthday is in a month which starts with the letter J. It is on a first Friday."

When invited to articulate how the correct answer was arrived at, one learner explained the method that she followed: "First month of the year, Miss ... January Miss ..." etc. And another learner, the teacher noticed while going round the class, would work in the number of the month, thus: ---/1/82 with the date blank waiting for the clue that would give him the answer for it. None of these methods were however formalised and held as examples for the class. Each learner's job was also to find a way to 'find' the solution.
There were other learners who 'formed opinions' as soon as the first clue was out. E.g. "Lalitha's birthday is in a month which starts with a J." Immediately some learners put in July.

Yet when the teacher saw this, she did not stop the learner and 'admonish' her to wait for other clues - when the other clue emerged, the learner went through the elaborate process of rubbing out her 'hasty' answer and replacing it with whatever the other clues indicated.

Over a period of time, in such puzzling out tasks for some of the learners, this method became a deliberate trial and error method. In subsequent puzzling out the answer tasks they used this method of forming an initial answer with a first few clues but they learnt to infuse a certain amount of tentativeness into it; to treat it as rough work as they called it. They also were treating it as a hypothesis which was being tested against the other clues. If the hypothesis proved a successful guess and stood the test of the forthcoming clues - well and good - they finished the puzzle before the others, which was very satisfying. If it had to be changed, it had been worth a try anyway. 10
Thus the learners were seen to be doing the negotiation with language to make the text mean (unravel its one meaning). This is the approximation to a common meaning - where the 'compromise' (yielding of one's individual seeking) is more on the learner's part - but a willing compromise, this, since the 'rules of the game' (the 'logical structuring' mentioned above in Chapter IV, see p. 231) ask for it. This 'establishment' of one correct answer is the feature of the problem solving task. But apart from this I would like to show that the teacher strived to allow freedom in the strategies for getting at the right answer. At least in encouraging uniqueness there, the negotiation, the configuration of negotiative strategies for each learner becomes his/her own and 'personal' within the 'common' and this is given space. More of a discussion of this feature later. Let us look at another example of this kind.

2. Map-Reading

E.g. 3, II-yr-mid

Description: Each learner was given a blank sheet of paper. One student was asked to come to the front of the class and draw what was called 'direction lines' on the blackboard. After the learner did this correctly, it looked like the following:
Next the teacher drew the map of an imaginary town and drew trees - a church, a lake and a school and questions about the map were written near the map. Children were asked to answer the questions. After a few maps and questions of this sort had been worked through, the teacher wrote descriptions such as:

"Town 'X' has a school in the North. In the South there is a river. There are two forests around the town. One is in the west of the town and one to the south west."

"In town 'Y' there is a church. It is in the north east of the town. To the south of the church is a lake. In the west there are houses. To the south east of the houses there is a temple."

The children after reading these descriptions of imaginary towns drew maps and drew trees, school etc., in the appropriate directions.

**Discussion:** This task needed a lot of imagination on the part of learners though with the direction lines initially, it looked like a simple filling in appropriate slots in the imaginary town. e.g.
But since this method was not offered to the learners they were not this 'systematic' and did not produce fascimiles of each other's 'answers'.

This was not so apparent in the first kind of task as it was in the second kind, when they produced their own maps. In the first kind though they did tend to generally stick to the four major directions of north (N), south (S), east (E) and west (W) unless the map in question had something sharply to the north – west like e.g.

the answer to "Where is Forest A" was given as "in the north."
Yet strangely, in the second kind of task, descriptions were interpreted in different ways. For instance, NE or SW did not sharply stick to NE or SW.

Similarly, when the 'text' read: to the south of the church is a lake

A continuation of this task would have been a 'discussion' about these variations, a comparison of maps etc. (which did not happen).

The point I am trying to make is, that though this task could be one which seeks 'precision' about the directions, (i.e., retrieval of the exact meaning of north, north west etc.), there were variations and the final result was looked at in terms of each learner's adaptation of the meanings. If NW had been more of N rather than east, the next step of "'X' is to the south of ..." in relation to that was
judged in the context of what had gone into the first step. Compared to this, if another learner's interpretation had been more to the east, and not north and the second statement interpreted in the light of that, that was accepted as correct in that context. Thus as answers to "A is to the north west - to the south of A is B",

both these diagrams were accepted.

Only when in certain cases where there were other statements such as "There is C in the south", that the learner had to 'think it over' again. In both, the answers for instance have to adjust their first two positions to accommodate C.
Thus the 'method' of deriving the connotations of the directions was allowed to vary. There was no 'master plan' of the teacher's against which learners' work was measured.

A constant going around and showing interest on the part of the teacher to individuals and groups (in case of this becoming a group task) would have 'articulated' the existence and legitimacy of variation for the learners. In this particular task though this did not happen (for various administrative reasons like holidays intruding and so on this task got disrupted and stopped at the point where they produced different maps), this was the direction in which the task was proceeding.

A brief note about this task on 'maps', which as can be seen belongs to the category of problem solving tasks. In a problem solving task such as this, the 'experience base' is 'more formalised' and the connection between experience and task-type quite strong and 'determined'. As such, the points of interest in my example here would be, the path to the 'correct' answer (and an assumption of a 'master plan'). Or, as it actually happened here, the striving to have personal connotations for 'given' experiences, (such as notions underlying terms like 'north east', 'north west' etc.).
We are still in a discussion of problem-solving tasks. Before I make further points about this, let us look at two tasks of the open-ended variety, which I claim belong to the more 'poetic' side of the cline and the strategies used therein as being exploitation strategies, i.e., the degree of negotiation in capturing meanings is very high since the attempt indicates a readiness less to conform to 'given' meanings and more inclination not to give up unique personal quests. Information on what such tasks look like set against the two that have gone before would make my discussion about these two kinds clearer.

5.7.2 Open-Ended Tasks

1. Symbols and Meanings

E.g. 4 I-yr-beg. (open-ended task); E.g. 5 II-yr-beg. (open-ended task)

Description: Here I shall describe three 'lessons' which were part of the theme-cycle on symbols and meanings and were interspersed (as indicated above) over a period of time in the two years' teaching. In the first lesson (I-yr beg.) the learners were given three sheets of pictures with six pictures in each sheet. Four of the pictures had captions which were indications of the message that the symbol contained. E.g. the picture of a traffic signal such as: 
was captioned explanatorily as: "There is a speed-breaker nearby"
Another like the following:

was captioned simply, "No smoking". Children were asked to think of captions for the pictures without captions.

In the next lesson there were two fresh sheets of pictures with more details worked into the picture.

Learners were divided into five groups, with around seven to eight students in each group, and each group was asked to say five things about each picture. No criteria or clues whatever were given. After a couple of pictures were
thus described aloud, the groups were seen warming up to the and task, were asked to write in their descriptions about each picture in columns:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PIC. 1</th>
<th>PIC. 2</th>
<th>PIC. 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. black clouds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. dark night</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. moon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. circle moon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion: In the first lesson as the teacher explained the task pointing to the first pictures and making them see that it meant "There is a school nearby" - the learners very quickly went to the picture with the caption "No smoking" and half read and half guessed: No smoking, no smoking please. Do not smoke cigarettes etc., while the actual words below the picture said "No smoking". The teacher accepted all the captions saying that though the actual caption underneath was only one of them - all the others provided by them could easily fit the picture as well. This seemed to set the mood for the actual task when the groups had to think of captions for the other pictures. So when there was a picture with a girl holding a finger against her lips, the groups when asked to come out with captions looked for answers such as: Do not talk;
Silence (please); Girls, do not talk; No talking children; Do not shout, children.

In another instance, when there was the picture of a boy swimming and a huge cross, against it, one group suggested "No Danger". This was unacceptable to another group. When asked for their reason, a boy from that group said that since there was swimming and a cross against it - it could mean 'no swimming' and so mean actually 'danger' rather than 'no danger'. Then the boy who had suggested 'No danger', for his group justified his answer by saying what he actually meant was no swimming ... it is dangerous. 12

This lesson obviously moves away from the kind of retrieval of the correct answer that a puzzle demands and allows scope for pursuit of more 'personal' meanings.

The next few lessons (at a later date) in this series demonstrate this more positively. Here the picture offered for description though worked out in detail provided scope for free interpretations. When the learners came out with 'descriptions' in the beginning they were stark, such as, clouds, moon, woman, child, etc. Slowly one group introduced black clouds (since most of the 'information' in the picture seemed to that group to have been exhausted by the other groups - this group decided to introduce a
new dimension to the descriptions). The other groups in the next round caught on to this, and came out with black night, white moon etc., until one group was 'provoked' to vary the 'boredom' introduced by colour and so introduced round/circle moon miss - and yet another group: baby crying etc. ... There were eight pictures to go, but the groups kept coming back to the same picture.

At one point one group went quite beyond the picture (of the night moon and the woman and the baby) to say something about the context of the picture: baby crying no food miss. This however, was greeted with protests from some 'aggressive' groups, as well as sheepish grins from more 'tolerant' ones. The former insisted that there be a 'rule' that only what exists visibly in the picture should be described. The teacher accepted both the viewpoints tentatively, and did not extend active support to either, leaving the groups to sort it out.

This to me seems the choice of meaning pursuit that I have been talking about. An experience such as this (a task - stimulant in the form of pictures and instructions: "think of anything you can, connected with this picture and I shall put it in the column") gives/leaves the choice of the kind of meaning pursuit to be attempted to the learner
herself. Some chose to be constricted by the experience stimulus, some did not choose to be. Contrast this with the task on maps. The main feature, there was a strong reliance on the task itself. The learners were made to converge on to the task to the mode of expression therein. Thus the experience base when 'formalised' demands a deference to it (see my discussion on maps above). The other type of task encouraged a movement away from the task, into speculating about ways of finding ways of 'inventing' an answer; and in the invention showing the difficulty of pinpointing the invented answer with language - the more you try to capture an idea the farther it escapes. Before I look at another task which was again a task which allowed the learner instead of converging on to the task stimulus, the choice of going beyond the stated experience itself to seek divergent meanings, I would like to comment upon the element of teacher control within the classroom. Learner choices I have been pointing out till now, indicate that here is one level of control removed and the learner on his/her way to getting 'trained' to make choices.

Once such a climate for one kind of choices was established, the next step of asking for choices in the experience-type also followed automatically. But this is anticipating. I shall come to that soon in my discussion about syllabus creation.
2. **Colours and Meanings**

**E.g.6: II-beg. (open-ended)**

**Description:** This was another task in the theme-cycle of symbols and meanings. A set of pictures was given and captions solicited. After descriptions and some kind of an agreement on the theme of the pictures, students were led into talking about the themes, and what colours one could associate with each of them.

**Discussion:** This was a task which involved a lot of teacher talk. Talking about evocation of colours, the teacher first took up the example of the Hindu festival of 'Holi'. (The learners were familiar with this festival, when there is a lot of dancing and splashing of coloured powder among friends and relatives.) The association of colours, especially the colours of pink, green and violet, with the festival is unmistakeable in an Indian community. But in talking about this, the teacher also said, that though 'Holi' could evoke these colours, another colour that sprang more readily to the mind (for the teacher), was dazzling white, since customarily people wore white during this festival on which the splashed colours stood out starkly. The children were amused by this. But they soon caught on to the idea. With a little prodding there was a discussion
about 'red' and 'danger', and also red and stop in the traffic signals and the rail flag. There was a brief discussion about other familiar feelings and colours:

Teacher: When we say night ...
Student: (after a bit of hesitation) Black, miss ...
T: What about frightened?
SS: (after a bit of hesitation) Black, miss
T: Why?
SS: Black night miss.
T: Yes, black and night, but didn't I say 'frightened'?
SS: Yes, night miss ghosts ... (They were trying to associate frightened with darkness, night and ghosts)

Next the teacher went on to ask about the feeling of happiness. This was a bit difficult. Even the teacher could not come out with a 'pat' colour. Some girls tentatively suggested 'yellow'. Teacher said 'white', but again not quite satisfactory. So, after a few more attempts, it was left alone. After this the worksheets themselves were looked into:

(For a picture of night with moon and stars):

SS: Moon miss.
T: Yes ... this is the moon and also ...
SS: Stars miss.
SS: Night white miss.
T: White? I thought we said black.
SS: Moon ... light ...
SS: No miss ... black moon black night ...

(The attempt here was to say that this picture is associated with white since there is the moon which makes it look like the day; but another learner came in at this point to say that, through there is the moon, still it is night and so black.)

(For the picture of the sun shining upon a garden):
SS: Yellow ... sun rise ...
SS: No, red (says in Telugu: dazzling red)
T: Red? You mean it is that dazzling red when it is setting in the evening?
SS: Yes, miss, sun red.
SS: No, garden, miss ... blue red yellow white ...
SS: Violet ...
SS: Green ...
SS: Green? Garden? Green?
SS: Green ...
T: Why not? Green is the colour of leaves and you do have leaves in the garden, don't you?
SS: No miss ... Garden, flower ... no green ... red ...
(For the picture of a boy in white clothes)

SS: Boy, white ... clean
SS: No, black miss
T: (since there was nothing in the picture to indicate black) Why black?
SS: This is Laxman miss (Laxman was a very dark boy in the class)
SS: Black and white miss (pointing to his white clothes). Black and white miss (pointing to white teeth of the grinning Laxman).

The picture of a hospital bed with a man, nurses and a doctor (representing sickness), and the picture of a sad woman were rejected outright.

The analysis here is not in terms of the strategies used to bring in expression to personal meanings or an analysis of the expressed meanings themselves for the simple reason that there is not much clarity about the variation in strategies, a consequence of its rudimentariness; and due to the same fact of infant attempts the meanings are not entirely captured. It is, still, I maintain, a step towards 'poetic' meaning-seeking (if this does not sound too presumptuous) in that there is 'self-consciousness' about language use. And the value of any kind of attempt (however rudimentary) to give clear expression to personal meanings by the teacher as well as the learner is considerable.
in terms of the development of a certain attitude to language and its use in learners. That the meanings were not entirely captured is part of the value of the task.

5.7.3 Problem Solving and Open-Tasks - The Difference Between Negotiation and Exploitation: A Brief Argument

What I have tried to indicate here is that the open-ended tasks offered more scope at such prolonged negotiation which in my terminology since it moves towards the 'poetic' meaning-seeking of the cline would be exploitation. And use of exploitation strategies to me is the revealing of the inherent creative nature of language use and meaning making. Hence the more encouragement for such meaning seeking exists, the more the habit at realising the creativity of language use - thus language would be wielded most effectively as a tool. More examples of this will further clarify this feature of exploitation or extended negotiation - a struggle with languaging/meaning-making to achieve personal meanings realised to the full the dynamism of underlying meanings.

Coming back to the consequences of my position in relation to what I call problem-solving tasks, which tend to veer towards apparently the more 'fixed' meanings I have already stated that my position about exploration of meanings which result in plurality of meanings and hence a dynamic code (as against a static code) makes me believe in the showing up of this even in problem-solving tasks or less poetic meaning pursuits.
But when I go on to the next few examples I shall deal with two points simultaneously.

1. For one, the lessons discussed act as exemplifications of extended negotiation veering towards exploitation, the latter being an attempt to strike out on one's own for personal meanings which results in striving to 'bend' language or finding ways to get the meaning intended.

2. They will also clarify my position about problem-solving tasks which definitely afford negotiation but little of exploitation, which tend to be pre-determined due to their tie-up with formalised experiences, and which end in singular unitary meaning outcomes; and which due to all these, do not afford learners scope for interaction as I define it.

I have already stated that the major aim in the deliberate setting up of experiences was to see to it that mathetic-poetic meaning pursuits were engaged in and prolonged negotiation and also exploitation were attempted by learners in this engagement. (Pragmatic meaning-seeking and 'brief' negotiations in that effort, having been adequately covered by the normal socialising inherent in the classroom community).

A big chunk of such experiences however could not help being 'formalised'. (These formed the base for problem-solving tasks.) Yet even these formalised experiences through
certain devices could be made to offer the learner more of personal meaning-exploration, i.e., poetic meanings and exploitative strategies employed towards it. The motivation for and part manifestation of these devices is in certain attitudes to languaging - considering all languaging acts as meaning-seeking or exploration acts and hence potentially realisable in diverse meanings resulting simultaneously in a dynamic code. Even when the realised meaning of a meaning-making/languaging act is apparently unitary and 'common' (which makes for the meaning exploration to be one aimed at a unitary convergent meaning) in the 'path' to the meaning (incorporated in the final meaning/code) there could be diversity and uniqueness. Thus this principle anticipates diversity and individuality even in acts of this sort which look like more meaning-retrieval. (This, incidentally, is what makes interaction in the classroom different for me. All these have been stated several times and in several ways.)

5.7.4 The Differences - Clarification of Notions and Movement of Problem-Solving Towards Open Ended

Now how did these attitudes get extended and clarified in the teaching itself?

In the first place, as we have already seen, it asked for a conceptualisation of experiences along the degrees of formalisation lines, and manifested itself in the attempt to
include in a major way less formalised experiences which resulted in open meaning-seekings and (half expressed, rudimentary) resultant unique meanings.

And next even within the more formalised experiences, a loosening of the rigidity of problem-solving tasks associated with them, to make them move towards open-endedness was undertaken. This showed in the project in very distinct ways. (See teacher attitude to 'answers' in the 'map' task cited above.) Let us look at a few more examples from the classroom to understand these ways.

**Task on Categorisation**

**E.g.7: 1-Yr.beg.**

**Description:** A list of twenty or more words with pictures was distributed to the learners and they were asked to put them into groups. They were to select the categories and if possible give headings to the groups they had made, and later justify the grouping if called upon to do so. The pictures had been selected to afford broadly four groups. The pictures and words that were meant to go into each group were: a tap, a river, and a well; cup and saucer, a glass, a plate, and a spoon; a tree, a flower and a leaf; and finally, a temple, a mosque, and a church.
But when the learners came out with the categorisation, there were not only differences in the number of groups that they had thought up (sometimes three and sometimes five) but also the words in the categories had a wide variety. Thus, for example, one learner had put together, a cup and saucer, a glass, a well and a tap; a river, a flower, a tree and a leaf; a plate and spoon; a church, a temple and a mosque. And another learner had come out with, a flower and a leaf in one category; a tree and a river and a temple together; and a church and a mosque together; a well and a tap together; cup and saucer and a glass together; and as fifth group, a spoon and a plate together. When asked for justifications their answers showed a variety not quite expected in the beginning of the task. The first learner above said, that he had put together a cup and saucer, a glass, a tap and a well together since all of them have to do with water. But a river, was seen by him to go with 'nature' objects such as a tree, a flower and a leaf. With the second learner, the temple went with a river and a tree; (association of the 'locale' of a temple) while a leaf and flower, as smaller parts of a larger object went together; and since a tree had already gone into a more 'satisfactory' category, it would not come here. Note the ease with which learners, left on their own, juggle around and speculate with 'combinations' to give expression to their conceptualisation.
There was also another interesting occurrence here: When the teacher 'peeked' into learners' books, to observe the way they were working, she noticed that they were adopting interestingly different strategies here: some counted the numbers of pictures and then the words they had put into groups to check that he/she had exhausted all the pictures and words and categorised them. Another learner took one overall look at all the pictures and words, thought of a heading for a category, fitted those pictures and words into it, thought of another possible heading and category, fitted in some more words and so on. She also juggled around with pictures to see which heading a picture would best fit under. Another learner drew definitely four groups and somehow tried to fit in all the pictures only within four groups. Yet another took up the first picture, thought of a heading first, went through all the pictures to collect words for this heading; after exhausting this, she went on to the next second picture (if this had not been appropriated to the first heading already) and thought of a heading for it, and once again went through all the pictures to gather members for this second heading. Halfway through this process she realised that she had to keep note of the pictures already categorised in some efficient way. So she started ticking the pictures which had been put into one group or other. This variation in methodologies to a possible singular outcome is an important point in terms of minimising the consequences of 'formalisation' (in broadening possibilities for investment of the personal in interaction) of
experiences. But at this stage I shall not pick on this. I shall just point out, how good an illustration of individualistic choices at the three levels of meaning-seeking, method and outcomes this ended up as:

The significant fact is that what was initially thought to be a formalised experience with the associated problem-solving task (which would by all expectations lead to one common answer) became an example of choices and a high degree of personal investment at all levels of the interaction.

Let me look at the variation in answers themselves. What was thought of as a straight one meaning outcome task ended up as plural meaning-outcomes. The learners showed that they had different unique conceptualisations which made them find other meanings than those thought of by a 'trained' mind
such as that of the teacher. The teacher realised that this had happened due to a 'loose set of directions'. (For instance the instructions could have been tightened up if they had been: "Divide the pictures into four categories" or "Here are four headings for the pictures on the sheet; put them under these headings"). But this was not sought to be remedied. This was a way to encourage originality to keep the task open-ended.

This had happened unintentionally, but soon latched on to by the teacher as highly productive in terms of creativity. (More significantly, the learners themselves used such 'tentative' instructions consciously when they wanted to play around with plural outcomes later on in the project. I shall come to this below.)

Later such 'loose instructions' became a conscious technique used by the teacher to make learners go for diverse meanings naturally - to give vent to their uniqueness. This was minimising/lessening the formalisation involved in a commonly highly formalised experience base (of a task) such as e.g., a map reading experience. Such minimising of formalisation, through loose instructions though not executed with much finesse, can be seen in the already quoted example of the map-reading task above.
Task on Designs - Problem-Solving to Open-Ended (contd.)

Here, however, is another 'better' example of this at a later date, done with much more consciousness of the value of this phenomenon by both learners and teacher.

E.g. 2. II-mid: (Problem-Solving Moving Towards Open-Ended)

Description: The class involved drawing designs according to instructions on the blackboard and later in worksheets. One typical instruction text was:

"Draw: a small circle; a big square around the circle; four semi-circles on the four sides of the square; four slanting lines in between the semi-circles."

The design that was meant to emerge from these instructions was:

![Design Diagram]

Discussion: In the various instructions for designs one important factor was recognised to be the size of the circles, squares, etc., that had to be drawn. The three sizes of 'small', 'medium-sized', and 'big' had to be interpreted in
some kind of systematic way if the designs were to turn out symmetrical. For instance, the learners soon saw that their designs would turn out to be distorted if they had not seen that their medium-sized circle was medium-sized in relation not only to the small and big circles, but also to the small and big rectangles and the other shapes that they were instructed to use in the same design. And next in interpreting semi-circles in designs, the children produced different kinds of designs. A comparison amongst themselves showed to them that there were different interpretations to "draw four semi-circles on the four sides of the square." For instance, at least three designs were possible from the first set of instructions cited above:

1.

2.

3.

(not quite symmetrical)

Similarly symmetry and asymmetry and innovative differences were perceived in the interpretation of "draw four slanting lines between the semi-circles."

1.

2.

(not symmetrical)
In the beginning when the learners finished their design according to the instruction, and compared them with several other designs and found them to be different, they were puzzled. But each expecting her/his answer to be the right one, approached the teacher's 'master design'. Only one or two had got the same design as the teacher's. This was greeted with dismay at first; until the teacher asked each one of them why they thought that they had gone 'wrong' according to themselves. They then read the instructions through and demonstrated to the teacher that they had indeed followed the instructions. Then, with a little bit of discussion of this sort, it was evident to them that their design was not 'wrong' in any way, only different. This led to a renewed interest in looking at all the other 'different' designs, produced from the same set of instructions. After this, they started trying out their own interpretations of the instructions with more confidence; all they looked for in their designs now, was symmetry; and then they came up to the teacher to justify their design with the instruction and show in what way they interpreted something like 'slanting' lines in comparison with one of their friends, or how they had exploited a slightly less 'accurate' set of instructions like: "draw slanting lines between the circles".
The learners in fact now sought for different answers. How different and unique they could be became the challenge. For one thing, the teacher was using consciously not too tight instructions; and in the same process, it was being conveyed to the learners that it was such imprecise instructions that they were (and should be) taking advantage of.

The same task was carried forward (by choice and by the 'interesting' turn that had been given to the task by learners wanting to accept the challenge of unique designs) and it was their turn to give instructions for the designs they produced. The learners started devising ways to make the design as explicit as possible through their instructions ... (and not allow for the let outs that the teacher's instructions had allowed). The first problem they encountered was one of beginning. For a design like the following for instance, some of them began from the outer small circles and tried to go inwards.
Later, a few of them gave that up, and realised perhaps it would be easier to go from the square outwards. Others after the instruction to draw the square and the circle around it, went on to the slanting lines, but did not know the word for 'corners'; but even those who knew the word, felt that they could not call the position 'corners' - somehow circle and corners did not seem to go together, nor did 'sides'.

After in this way giving instructions for teacher drawn designs and later their own designs they exchanged their instructions with others in the class; or tried out their instructions on others in the class. When their instructions produced different designs, once again after their first reaction of 'wrong' they were willing to listen to the reason from the others for their interpretations. Some enthusiastic ones tried to refine their instructions, so that it would not leave room for such interpretations; others just accepted the new designs.

Learner's responses here, indicate how they were exploiting in one sense the phenomenon of 'loose instructions' with a full realisation of its implications.

An interesting possibility here was (although this possibility was not explored, since task-fatigue had set in by then) a chain of tasks consisting of instructions to
interpretation into design, to a new set of instruction from the design to an interpretation of that, to another new set of instructions and so on. This would have produced some very interesting work in language negotiation.

Again, what I would like to say here is that a formalised experience like instructions for a design (with problem-solving meaning seeking, or task, i.e., questing for one correct design, resulting in achieving one outcome - the correct design) by a particular technique, was converted into a lesson highly productive in terms of interaction.

'Designs' as an Open-Ended Task

Let me examine this task now, as an example of an open-ended task where more exploitation (i.e., attempt at conveying somehow relatively highly personal meanings) occurred.

To draw from my earlier postulation of degrees of negotiation (associated with social/pragmatic and the other types of meaning-pursuits in the cline) in social interactions the need to negotiate much is not there since it is not really necessary to know the exact (personal) meaning. So vague gestures and other inexact uses of words are accepted by the interlocutors. As long as some kind of communication had taken place, the need for anything totally particular (or individualistic) is not sought. The point in this kind of languaging, is to
'get along' - and so arrive at a 'common' meaning without undue fuss. In the problem-solving kind, we have been looking at, the motivation is in solving or getting at the 'right' answer. The highlighting is of the exactness of the meaning (see p. 231, Chapter IV) that should be unearthed but not the exactness of 'personal' meanings - it is the approximation to a 'logical' pre-existent answer (inherent in the 'text' itself) that is sought. Though the potentiality of the text could be and is (as always) for divergence, this is not the focus. In the third kind, (the open-ended tasks we have been talking about) exactness of message is sought; yet what is highlighted is the difficulty of unearthing it. This is best demonstrated by this task on 'designs' (which I would like to recall, started as a problem-solving kind of task). Any instruction can be challenged and interpreted differently with justification, and this leads to a refinement of the message, which is again challenged. This is seen as fostering a certain healthy attitude towards the notion of one right or wrong solution and a confidence in self-choice, and innovation; and the use of the 'interstices' in language which make new (personal) solutions possible. (Though making the one (personal to each learner) solution not quite conveyable). In the design task the idea that was picked up by the learners themselves as a lesson extension was due to
a realisation that there are several ways of doing the task of drawing designs.

Thus the meaning-design arrived at might be 'common' to all the learners. But the way they approached it was different and this methodology was taken up by them and used as instructions for teacher given designs later.

A Building up of Techniques for More Open-Endedness

The feature of plural approaches to a common-end was, as I have pointed out (in the calendar task and in the categorisation task) constantly held up for the variations therein to attract and impress upon learners' notice (through invitations to articulate the approaches). This did have a remarkable effect on learners - in that they consciously started looking for giving any of their responses to experiences (whatever kind) a new personal 'twist' initially in the method they used to arrive at a goal and later in wanting to think of a new goal itself (see e.g., 'aelophile' below). I shall pick up this behaviour consequence in learners later in more detail.

But coming to the design task itself, here we can see that the learners had unconsciously used this urge to articulate their differences and uniqueness - in wanting to give instructions. And this articulation of new ways to a task - already
incorporated as (deliberately) 'loose instructions' in the
designs task by the teacher thanks to other tasks (like the
task on categorization cited above), was again picked up as
task base for learners; task bases which could provide
numerous possibilities for relatively 'plural outcomes' for
the learners, from a formalised experience itself. Let me
explain.

If the learners are invited to give instructions (i.e.,
giving instructions instead of following 'loose instructions'
being the task) they would incorporate their 'experience' in
the approach to a goal as the instructions; and their
approaches having been different in this way - for the task
asking for instructions they could provide plural outcomes
(in the form of a variety of instruction-sets).

As a technique for keeping problem-solving tasks 'open'
this worked beautifully. See the following example:

Bingo - Another Example

E.g. 9 - II-yr-mid (problem-solving to open-ended)

Description: Students were given a blank sheet of paper each.
Next they were given instructions to draw grids with twenty
squares. Thus:
The teacher next wrote thirty-five words, phrases and sentences on the blackboard. She asked learners to 'choose' any twenty from the list, and write them down in each square in their grid in any order they liked. Some of the words were: ten fingers; once upon a time; Kikki, the parrot (the name of a character in a story); blackboard; Vijayalakshmi; and Jaya (names of girls in the class).

Next as teacher called out clues for the words or sentences the game of Bingo was played. The clues were always in one sentence, and they ranged from very general ones like: 'The name of a girl in the class' (which would include two or three words), or very specific ones, like: "She was a bird, and a friend of Jumbo the elephant and Hiss the snake" (which could mean only Kikki, the parrot).

This gave the idea for the teacher to use this technique of clue-making to extend a puzzling-out task into an open-ended one.

In the next class the class was divided into eight groups and the Bingo cards prepared as in the previous class with choices from a different list of words, phrases and sentences.
Next, instead of playing the game, the learners were asked to write down the clues for all the words and phrases.

The learners in each group set about finding clues which as the teacher went around the groups noticed, varied considerably, not only as to generality (which would make the solution for a clue two or more words/phrases) but also within the specific clues, the aspect of the words or phrase that was picked out. This was exactly what was anticipated.

The idea here was to pool in the clues, sort them out, and make the groups themselves choose one of their members to act as the Bingo-master and play the game. This however did not happen, since the next few days happened to be holidays, and when the learners returned they had lost interest in this.

What can be seen here, once again is the striving for variety - more of the inclusion of what each learner wanted to be included, and the experience and task giving scope for it.

I will not say anything further about this example, since it speaks for itself.

The Mazes - Problem-solving Modified

I shall now look at the third way in which problem-solving tasks were modified. I have already mentioned that in the indication over several tasks that there existed different
approaches to the solution albeit one common solution, through soliciting from learners articulation of methodology, the learners were motivated to consciously look for diversification first in methodology, and later even in outcomes. This was the next technique then. There was a general move to prove their originality and later capture them in a verbal articulation (not always quite successful). Let us look at an example here:

**E.g.10- II-yr-end** (problem-solving to open-ended)

**Description:** Five different kinds of mazes were left in five piles in the front of the classroom and the learners asked to choose their own maze and work through them. At the end of it those who had reached 'home' were asked to write out the 'key' to the maze; e.g. I crossing: turn left; II crossing: go straight on etc. The task was meant to end here.

**Discussion:** The task led to an interest in learners making their own mazes and providing keys to them. Next, when the teacher put up the key for a new maze intending to distribute a rather difficult maze, the learners decided to try their hand at drawing their own maze to the key instead of going to the teacher's original maze. (Thus they converted the task into the following instructions to create a maze.)
(By then, the enthusiasm for creating mazes had caught on.)

The one key on the blackboard produced different-shaped mazes with a range in complexity; instead of just two choices at a crossing, many of them went on to put in three or more choices at times.

Note how learners had caught on to making a set of instructions yield to their unique meaning. Thus the instruction could say III turning: turn left. But it did not say how many choices in which directions, there were. And learners 'saw' this, and took advantage of this for a 'new' plural-outcome-maze.

This initiated a comparison of mazes among the learners, and a lively interest in finding out where each maze had differed. The next step was an exchange of ideas between the learners and the teacher as to the different techniques of maze-making; tracing out the right path first, and then going on to create the diversions; or letting the diversions occur simultaneously as the right route and so on. Next, they decided to have two or three different 'right' routes in a maze, and produced two or three different keys.

Most of the time the children worked in groups or pairs. This was once again their choice. And as the teacher moved around the classroom she kept up a probing discussion about
what they were doing. Children's contributions came in the form of: No, miss, here go left, miss ... (okay but then where would the 'dead end' come?) - Mmmm ... here miss ...(oh, then you will have to block that out, won't you?) or (but the key says straight here ...) No, miss ... and at this point rejects the key; or inserts another bit to the key. Thus, initially the task involved:

1. a. Find a way 'home' for a given maze.
   b. Find the way home with the help of the key given.
2. Write the key for a given maze (after finding the way).
3. Make a puzzle/maze (the kind that you have been exposed to, was the implication).

All these/problem-solving kind of tasks where the solution expected was a unitary and common one.

Instead of

However, finding a way with the key, (at the point of the learners doing 1(b) above), the learners 'decided' that they would rather treat the key as instructions for drawing a maze. This was a change in the outcome, the proposal for different outcome. Yet the maze-outcome that emerged itself was not a unitary and common outcome. They turned out different kinds of mazes, of different shapes and with different branches. In this first conversion, then, it is the technique of loose-instructions operating.
The next problem-solving task of "write the key," as we saw, became writing two or three different keys for the different kinds of puzzles they had made, and so again, in such keys different and plural outcomes emerged. This is the technique of the variety in instructions becoming the outcome for a task, instead of being the experience-base for the task (see above e.g., on Bingo).

And finally, the spontaneous discussion of different methods of making puzzles is the articulation of different approaches/techniques which motivated learners to seek open-ended plural meanings even in problem-solving tasks (see above again).

In all, even though conventional puzzles (one answer), ways to originality (ways of introducing the personal) were regularly adopted by learners.

5.7.5 Problem-Solving Tasks - Varieties and Degrees of Movement Towards Open-Endedness

What I have been trying to show is that there were uncompromisingly problem-solving puzzling out solutions tasks such as the Calendar task. Even within this the way the learners worked, contributed to diversification and uniqueness.
In other experiences like puzzling-out the path for a maze or drawing maps, though the same kind of 'rigidity' could exist, it was always pushed as much as possible to yield flexibility, via the method, in the outcome and so on.

Thus they became by virtue of such pushing, open-ended tasks, almost to the same extent as the tasks which started out as open-ended - in the less formalised experience-base such as 'stories' (see e.g., sec. 4.2 below, pp. 328-329) 'pictures to be talked about' (e.g. 5, p. 281, above).

So whenever there was a task of the problem-solving kind the classroom nurtured an atmosphere when the learners automatically looked for plurality, either of outcomes or at least of methodology. Even in what I have called the uncompromisingly problem-solving kinds, the learners were not allowed to fall into a methodological systematicity to the extent of it becoming automatic, by quick changes in the format of the problem (see calendar task above) or the problem itself and so on.

5.7.6 The Effect of Encouragement of Meaning-Exploration in Learners - A Brief Point

This, perhaps, seen from a certain perspective, looked as though the learners were never given a chance to feel a sense of 'achievement' or fulfilment, a job accomplished
without much ado. The teaching, as it progressed, did throw up this issue. What was observed was that soon the learners got around not just to cope with this, but reacting much more positively than mere coping, by themselves looking for ways of converting tasks into such personal meaning explorations (see the task on mazes especially).

Yet there were three broad kinds of learners (with allowances for overlaps in that learners did not fall into one of these kinds pat) here:

1. those who did want most of the time an approved one way and an approved answer;
2. those who liked different ways of doing things, yet in the end wanted an approved answer;
3. those who adventurously wanted different ways always and different outcomes.

This however, only strengthens my thesis about the cline of meaning seeking.

5.7.7 Meaning-Exploration - A Few More Exciting Instances

I shall not claim that all the classes in the project were such 'exciting' bits of evidence for plural meaning-exploration of the same order. Such a claim could not support
my thesis at all. On the contrary, since I have already argued for a cline in communication/languaging and classroom interaction and syllabus making.

However, what was important was that such meaning-exploration did occur often enough if not in complete lessons, at least in sparks in the middle of a lesson which would apparently for all outward appearances looked like routine work. Here are a few examples.

The Aelophile

E.g. 11 II-end:

Description and Discussion: As a part of a larger task, the following diagram was given to the learners.
After labelling the parts, the learners with the help of the teacher, were tracing the path of the steam rising from the pot through the hollow handles and to the iron ball and out through the nozzles of the spherical ball; in the process the steam making the ball go round. One student at this point held up the class by saying that this cannot happen. He came up to the blackboard and traced the path of the steam differently, as coming out through the lid and moving the lid and not the spherical ball. At this point he paused for a moment, and then said perhaps the teacher would be right, if the lid was really tight and did not allow any steam to escape.

I will come back to a discussion of this a little later.

Let us look at another example now.

**Parts of Vehicle**

The task quoted here (e.g., 12 II-yr-mid) was part of a series of tasks about comparison between a human body and animal and bird bodies and 'advantages' of each. Later there was a discussion of the different parts of different kinds of vehicles (a cart, a horse drawn 'jutka', a cycle, a scooter, a bus, a car and an aeroplane) and their advantages and disadvantages. Many learners, asked to make a choice, opted for a cycle. Even with money they felt that car was too expensive; the problem was one of obtaining petrol. But a car had the advantage of protection against the weather (strangely this is what
interested them more than even the speed or capacity to travel long distances). There was a discussion of overcoming this disadvantage in a cycle. A cyclerickshaw was discussed in this connection; but most of them found it clumsy, and so the discussion on 'design' went on with ideas (some of them quite 'wild') thrown around.

**Big/Small**

Look at another example (e.g. 13 I-yr-beg). This was part of a task about groups assigning words/objects into one of the four boxes as below:

```
+-----+-----+-----+-----+
|  S & L |  S & H |  H & B |  B & L |
+-----+-----+-----+-----+
|  light | heavy |      |      |
|  small |      |      |      |
+-----+-----+-----+-----+
```

The learners in the course of the class, had already realised that what is small usually is light and what is big usually heavy.

So the real challenge for their innovative capacity they felt would be in the ability to think of objects to go into the big and light and small and heavy boxes. At this point, as a first step towards imaginative thinking here, they reviewed the criteria for heaviness and bigness that they had
already agreed upon. They reiterated and modified criteria and finally agreed that the big and light box will be filled only if they slightly modified their criteria and decided to have the bigness criterion as bigger than the surface of the teacher's table. The criterion for heaviness they decided to retain (the criterion being any thing that they could not lift).

As soon as such criteria establishment was over, one group came out with the suggestion of 'newspaper' and 'sari' to be put into the big and light box. But when 'newspaper' was suggested by one of the groups, there was disagreement about it being 'big and light' by the others. The group which had suggested this thought for a while, and came out with 'open newspaper' (as against a 'folded one'). After a while one group came out with 'heavy stone' and 'light stone'. The others felt that there was something 'tricky' here. They laughed and told the group to think of something else. The group argued that after all a 'heavy stone' is a 'heavy' stone. But the others vetoed this once again, this time by simply rushing to the board and adding 'heavy' to several words like 'cat', 'dog' and so on. (This incidentally was an extremely effective way of showing protest and cause for the protest). At this point the teacher intervened and (in a much less colourful way) explained why the groups were objecting to 'heavy stone' and 'light stone'. The group which had
initiated the word, withdrew, though still muttering. But later, when the word, 'bucket' was introduced as 'small and heavy' some children demanded that it be put in the 'small and light' box. But, soon the group with the word said it was an 'iron' bucket. Still it was insisted that the word belonged to the 'small and light' category, as even though an 'iron bucket' might be heavier than a 'plastic bucket' still it was light enough to be lifted by them. This led on to other groups coming out with: 'plastic bucket with water' (so heavy and small); and 'iron bucket with lots of stones' (thus making doubly sure that it was heavy, so it went into the 'small and heavy' box); and 'empty iron bucket' and so on. Another interesting attempt at getting a new word and justifying it was when one learner said: "Hundred miles, miss, road heavy big ..." The others of course, scoffed at this. But, undaunted, he murmured, 'road' and went back to his seat to draw his own boxes and put in the word in his paper.

5.7.8 'Exploration' Involved in Open-Ended Tasks - A Brief Value Assessment

There is no denying the value of such discussions in any classroom; but the question is how are they fruitful in the light of languaging as meaning making? In a task which has scope for different possible solutions (like an 'iron bucket'
example above) the attempt is not just at meaning innovation; but meaning innovation constituted in language. Without an attempt at clarification through language, not only is the meaning not constituted for the learners, but also stating it or attempting to state it makes them pay careful attention to language features of constitution, which is the act of negotiation or exploitation as I have called it. In that carefully produced meaning/text is the realisation that the meaning has yet not been captured (i.e., the personal has to a certain/large extent been sacrificed) so another attempt which is a 'working upon' the produced text-meaning itself with more attention to the act of creation is made; this second attempt is not yet satisfactory and so further attempts are called for.

It is only certain kinds of experiences (which I have already quoted and shown them to be associated with open-ended tasks), and certain kinds of techniques used towards other experiences, which stimulate such meaning seeking which are the most rewarding in terms of such maintainance of dynamism of meaning.

In the example above where the learner came out and said that the sphere cannot move, in his disagreement he was trying to get at his own meaning—and when asked to explain tried to do just that; and, in having said it, realised not only what he said was correct— but that it had also a solution, i.e., in having a tight lid and preventing the steam from escaping.
To sum up this part, I took Fig. 4-7 in Chapter III as the best starting point to illustrate my language model through actual lessons. According to my thesis, since the basic tenet in language use is at all times code creation, which makes the 'code' a living dynamic construct - this leaves language teaching with the job of highlighting this feature of language-wielding through the creation of an atmosphere which encourages autonomy in meaning-seeking and the move to create at every moment of use.

Most of the lessons in the class were geared towards mathetic meaning seekings since this kind of meaning-seeking was considered to reveal the nature of languaging most and hence the most useful or productive for the goal of refining language capacity. Yet other types of meaning-seeking such as pragmatic ones were not ignored. They however got automatically incorporated into the lessons in the socialising done in the classroom and the pragmatics of classroom management. (Most of the atmosphere creation was towards enabling mathetic meaning seekings, not only because they offered opportunities for practice in negotiation and exploitation to the maximum extent ... but also because, a natural dose of experiences which enabled motivated pragmatic meaning seekings or willingness
to build a common meaning-meeting-point was seen to be available in the two aspects of normal socialising and pragmatics of classroom management prevalent in the classrooms.)

What has been illustrated so far is this mathetic meaning-seeking (which were interactive activities of creation of the moment) through negotiative or exploitative strategies in the form of lessons of problem-solving (puzzles) or open-ended explorations; the distinct features of such explorations and the reiteration of a language-philosophy which made for the interaction of a particular sort, formed points of discussion.

From here, it is a natural step into Sec. III. The purpose of this part is to illustrate the way this kind of interaction, or in my parlance, meaning-exploration (and creation) of the moment makes for learner-autonomy and the predominance of the moment in choice of experiences and choice of what is to be focussed on within the area of experience, the strategies used to achieve outcomes and finally the outcomes themselves. In all, how a syllabus got constructed.

The illustration of syllabus creation though, need not be in the form of more examples of lessons. My job in this section will be to explicitly draw attention to such syllabus features where learner autonomy operated in the lessons that I have already described.
At the outset, I would like to state that I am at this stage still talking about the syllabus creation in a classroom situation where the language model of interactive creation operates. This asks for all the components of a syllabus, i.e., the objectives, the content and the methodology to be the creation of the moment by the interacting learner.

The teacher, we have already noted went into the classroom with a tentative plan which contained an experience-area and the tasks associated with this. In a rough way, she also had an idea of the meaning she expected to emerge (one meaning out of a puzzle or a few divergent meanings out of an 'open-ended' task). In the same way, she also knew what method or strategy/process could be employed to get the meaning.

Along with all these, she could have also tentatively pre-decided that the experiences (tasks and steps to reach the outcomes of the task too?) would be presented by her to the class through written text to be put up on the blackboard, for the whole class, etc. These are pedagogic decisions she could make. (This term 'pedagogic' affords an important dimension to the discussion of methodology in the curriculum, as I propose to show below.)
Thus, she might be said to have had content (experiences and task), objectives (outcomes) and methodology (the strategies plus pedagogic methodology) for the classroom chalked out in a rough way. Yet since the interactive creation model suggested personal choices of the moment, these content, methodology and objectives were to be a matter of choice of the specific learners (to recall the lead-from-behind policy to be followed by the caretaker-teacher in languaging or meaning explorations).

This language as interactive creation made for a crucial difference in the way that the syllabus components were treated, as I shall show below.

5.9.1 Learner Choices - Experiences

For all this to happen the major question is the availability of experiences for learners (and teachers) to make a suitable choice for their classroom; so that they can go ahead with interacting with them (i.e., engage in meaning-explorations) to create plural, personal, dynamic, meaning cores.

Let us look at how this problem was met, and what happened, as a consequence of this.

The necessity of deliberately introducing experiences with a mind to 'coverage' has already been argued for. The end was however, to slowly build up an experience store for the
learners to choose from. In the initial stages, the problem was how to make experiences so varied in one classroom that an individual choice would occur. Linearity, in other words, was the problem to overcome. When the learners could perceive only the experience-type (in the form of a task) the question of making choices did not arise - they simply did not exist.

Experiences could be built up only over a period of time - the classroom world had to be created first, for the learner to look around and pick his/her choice of the world. Building up a store of experiences, over time, though did seem to have effects. Towards the middle of the first year itself learners started to express their choice in their voting for a story instead of a puzzle (not surprising) or 'work' (as anything which was not a story or a game was called), instead of a story. But mostly it was a majority choice which of course included the teacher's vote.

This choice of the majority is a bit unfortunate; ideally, it should have been a case of availability of choices for each learner. This steam-rolling over individual wishes through majority decisions, however, was attempted to be off-set by frequent group activities (where since the groups are allowed to choose their work, the majority opinion minimises generalisation, by providing more chances for an accommodation
of individual wishes). An incidental, though important point here is, that group-work thus is a necessary result of an overall paradigm, rather than just a trick in the teacher's bag of teaching techniques.

In rare instances, at the individual level, a learner did pick up a previous task which had interested him/her and continue with it. Another instance of this, in a more positive and decisive way occurred in one of the classes where the teacher had decided to talk about 'cities in India' for the task of note-taking later. The teacher began the class with a casual, "What shall we talk about today?" The children spontaneously voted for, "Our class miss ... English Class VI-A". Some others wanted to talk about 'tigers' (the subject of a story in one of the previous classes which had been a great favourite). The teacher again took the majority opinion here, and chose the topic accordingly and abandoned her original plans for the theme. The teacher's rhetorical question about the theme, which was just meant to be a phatic communication as a starter for the class, was converted into a genuine invitation by the learners who had become totally accustomed to making personal individualistic choices. And the genuineness of motive behind the training made the teacher give up her original plans willingly. Though these were stray incidents, the atmosphere of willingness to negotiate for topics on the part of the teacher and the learners became distinctly tangible as the project progressed.
5.9.2 Task-Type or Focussed Upon Meanings

The task-type itself was the next point of choice. Will it be a problem-solving effort in which case the meanings sought were of one kind, or a 'free-wheeling open-ended' effort? As mentioned before, the choice of the experience type itself to a large extent determined the kinds of meaning even that would be the focus of attention. Yet, here there were surprises. One of them has already been quoted above when the task on categorisation which was an experience associated with a convergent problem-solving meaning-pursuit was converted by the learners into a non-convergent one, in terms of plural outcomes. Let us look at a couple of more examples.

A picture cartoon story was distributed to each learner. The teacher read the story while the learners either looked at the pictures or turned the pages and generally listened to the story. At the end of it the teacher let the class do whatever they wanted to do with the story for the rest of the class. Some asked for a re-reading of the story, and this was done. After this, the learners just found pleasure in handling the booklet and turning the pages over, just looking at the pictures. Some learners were keen on showing the teacher that they could read bits of the story
by themselves. After demonstrating this, they went on to circle the words/sentences that they had successfully read and went on to more 'difficult' words and sentences. (This task of circling had been done in one of the other story-reading sessions.) A few others wanted to talk about the story and wonder why a certain character in the story did what she did. One or two of them were tracing the pictures in the story and colouring them and a few others were trying to write a different end to the story (once again the idea picked up from a different class of story-reading). One learner walked up to the teacher and asked for 'meanings' of sentences which he could read yet not totally understand. Thus one of the meanings he sought was the one for 'more' and 'much'.

These are clear instances of the learner deciding what kind of meaning, divergent or convergent meaning he or she would go for. The ones who went for the reading and grammar clarifications in the story, clearly were doing the 'puzzling out' kind of task, where there is one definite way of reading to be mastered, or one definite meaning of a word that has to be retrieved. This is the aspect of the experience that had caught their attention. On the other hand, those who wanted to end the story in a different way were going in for more divergent kinds of meanings. The experience had been differently focussed for meanings by these different learners.
What I have set out to show here, in the choice of experience, and later in the choice of meaning (and language and the manner of working at a lesson to be looked into below) each class, and within each class each learner derives a syllabus statement (with objectives, content and method) which is an individually interpreted version of the original plan, a 'line of intention', a starter, rather than a complete blueprint (more about this plan below).

5.9.3 Methodology

Recalling the third component of a syllabus other choices to be made within the classroom have to do with the methodology. Thus once the experience had been selected the questions of what kind of an activity would accompany this was a choice of the classroom.

A Conceptual Distinction (Micro and Macro Methodologies)

At this point I would like to bring in a brief clarification about 'methodology' which is necessitated by the nature of my thesis on interactive creation which emerges on the one hand as communication or languaging as interactive creation, and on the other, as syllabus-making per se, as interactive creation.
When I now discuss methodology I will confine myself to the steps in the activity of meaning-exploration that each learner as a languaging human being engaged in. I intend to show later how this kind of 'method' followed by learners (in their capacity as languaging/meaning-seeking individuals) interacted with choices in classroom or pedagogic methodology - such as teacher-talking and all the learners listening, teacher putting up a text on the blackboard and individuals reading, or reacting orally, to the number of repetitions of a problem by the teacher, decisions about group-work or individual work etc. (For ease of reference I shall call the first kind the micro-methodology, and the second kind macro-methodology) and ultimately, it was the choices in micro-methodology which over-rode or decided finally the choices in the other. I shall come back to this issue more extensively later, in Chapter VI.

The Emergence of Choices in Micro-Methodology

Now, let me cite a few illustrations of the emergence of some of the micro-methodology here. In the designs task described above, we saw how each learner had his/her own way of doing the task. (Also see e.g., on mazes above.) This was more evident in the 'categorization' task already mentioned.
One learner when doing the task drew up several columns in the beginning itself. Later, trying to put the list of words into separate categories, she realised that she did not need one or two of the columns she had already drawn. And after a careful re-checking of the words to see that that was indeed the case, she rubbed out the extra columns. Again, even in assigning words to columns, some learners followed their individual methods. Some took up one word and looked for other possible words which could belong to this class and put them together, first, before picking on the next word. Others just went along with the original order in which the words were listed and put them into categories as they went along. Some learners had interesting ways of checking the completion of their work. They counted the words in their categories and tallied them with the words in the worksheet. None of these methods was 'taught' or recommended by the teacher as the one right one. All were allowed to emerge as learners wanted them to emerge.

Sometimes in a task certain steps of arriving at an answer were either added to on the spur of the moment, or, though originally planned, skipped. An instance of the latter was the following in a 'map-reading' task cycle: the teacher had come prepared to show the difference between statements like: Delhi is in the northwest; Madras is in the south east; Bombay is in the west etc., in relation to a map of India and statements like: Hyderabad is to the north-west of Madras; Nagpur is
to the northwest of Hyderabad etc. But when in the class itself it was evident that the 'mood' of the learners favoured a puzzling-out of the difference between these two types of statements, in their own way, with their own 'methodologies' and a working-out of solutions by trial and error, it was left as such, and the particular 'easy method' of getting at the answer, worked out elaborately by the teacher was given up.

The Emergence of Choices in Macro-Methodology

Let us now go on to macro-methodology.

I shall deal with a few instances when learner decisions on micro-methodology influenced the macro. This particular fact of micro's influence over the macro, and their impicational consequences are not as simple as they look here. Yet they are too far-reaching to deal here with any amount of adequacy. I intend to take that up for an extensive discussion in the next chapter. I shall now confine myself to a brief illustration of certain learner decisions about the macro-methodology itself which followed their micro-decisions.

These decisions had to do with questions such as, whether the activity for a task or meaning-seeking would be as a whole class or smaller group activity or individual activity. There were times when learners would refuse to get into groups; since they would perceive a task as an individual task. On the other hand, on certain occasions activities started as individual
work, would in a natural way tend towards small clusters (see the task on 'designs'). In other cases, a class started as individual work, had to suddenly shift to the teacher and the whole class, as there were points to be clarified. These could not have been foreseen and planned for, as the problems in need of such clarification were ones that arose in that immediate circumstances, and an on-the-spot decision had to be taken by the teacher and accepted by the learners. So, when such occasions, arose the teacher moving around the class helping with individual work would have to suddenly go to the top of the class and draw the attention of the class as a whole to a particular intermediary task. At the completion of this automatically the whole composition of the class would break once again into its individual learner components and individual work.

Other methodological regulations done by the learners in this category, had to do with the following: whether they read a text first and then set to work; or whether an example was needed and if so, how much of it was needed and so on. Thus with the 'designs' task, to recall the example cited above, the learners kept going back and forth, soliciting teacher's assistance or doing things on their own.

The mode of interaction was once again governed by the immediate classroom demands, more than by pre-planning. Many
times when oral instructions were planned children showed that they would rather read and write that day for that particular task. Or when the teacher started putting things on the blackboard for the class to read, when the situation seemed to favour oral work, it was immediately shifted to that mode accordingly. Or when it was obvious that oral work needed support from written work, though it might not have been 'planned', it was accommodated. These choices were not whimsical choices made by either students who took advantage of a very lenient teacher, or caused by a teacher who had not been far-sighted enough in the planning. Such shifts for instance, the perception of written text on the blackboard as more helpful to solve a problem by the learner, and the teacher's agreeing with that, were generated by the unique chemistry of each individual class (which included learners and teacher's mood to be sure, but also many other features besides). Hence they were not plannable, but needed on-the-spot decisions. It is only after such on-the-spot decisions are accepted as more than just stray exceptions to the rule, that it is evident how much of teaching is a matter of making decisions inside each classroom. It is more than a gesture towards flexibility that is in need in such enacted syllabuses.
An interesting case in point was when again during the 'categorization' task one learner quickly put words into categories orally and, after doing that, refused to do it all over again in writing in his notebook. While the work was planned for writing and most learners were happy to do this, this particular learner showed that the work demanded another medium for him and after using it, indicated that to repeat the task in another medium just because the original plan asked for this, would be meaningless for him. It was fortunate that the flexibility of the plan allowed for this: since anxieties, such as that a particular language ability might not be learned because a particular aspect of the method planned was not followed, had no scope in this kind of syllabus emergence, there was no insistence that the student (re) do the task according to what was planned for him. Confidence was placed in the learner's ability to choose the other mode (viz., writing) when it would be a meaningful one for him in another task. 16

I will not discuss the outcomes themselves, the objectives emerging from the immediate classroom, at any length here. It is obvious from the above illustrations about content and method that whatever came out as meanings (plural) or outcomes were the constituted objectives of the classroom. (See Chapter VI, Section on Objectives in connection with evaluation.)
5.10 Syllabus Creation - An 'Analogical' Application of the Model of Meaning-Making

I shall end this discussion on the enacted syllabus with just one illustration from the classroom which in the light of the interactive creation operating in syllabus making end (as against the interactive creation from the languaging end) shows what a 'lesson' when seeking 'metaphoricity' (or creation) in syllabus (statement) making looks like.

To recall what was said about this in Chapter III, we saw in section 3.13 to section 3.15 there (see figure 16 there) how when interactive creation applied analogically to syllabuses would shift the focus from syllabus implementation to syllabus making in the classroom, from a core to the process. The interlocutors in the syllabus creation of the moment would be the teachers and the learners in the classroom. I also said that when unique personal syllabus statements are sought by classrooms (i.e., by teachers and learners) then in that effort, the strategies used 'break' from the linearity imposed by the classroom structure manifested in what goes by the term 'lesson'. The outcomes in the form of the syllabus (statement) for the classroom ultimately is a deviance from the ones in the other classrooms the other schools and so on. (See Chapter III, the figure in the section on Syllabuses there).
This is the general lay-out speculation upon what a uniqueness expressive (non-conforming/divergent) classroom might veer towards.

5.10.1 A Discursive Syllabus/Classroom and a 'Poetic'/Metaphoric Classroom - A Conceptualisation

What I propose to argue now is, that in this context of divergent syllabus making efforts also, the language model of meaning-making which asks for interactive creation at all levels - in content, method and objectives comes to dictate the extent of this 'creation' involved in classrooms. (I shall be dealing with this 'influence' aspect further in Chapter VI)

At this point it is sufficient to say that as per the language model, the given (as far as it is possible) is kept away from the learner in the need to keep her seeing the creation involved in meaning-making and the voluntariness involved in common meaning creation. Due to this, the syllabus interpretation for the teacher to work on is only in terms of experiences in all cases; and due to the impossibility of bringing in only experiences which are totally 'uninterpreted', the interpretation for the teacher could be the closely associated tasks involved in certain more formalised experiences in some cases. The other areas of a plan, such as path to the meaning outcome, and the outcomes themselves or, not for the teacher to pre-determine. Thus the syllabus as a plan is potentially divergent or non-conformist in the normal run of our scheme itself.
And it is only within this already 'non-conformist' (ideology-oriented) paradigm is conformity or even (a higher degree of) non-conformity allowed. Conformity could be here, the learners choose experiences within the teacher-given experiences (as far as possible less formalised) which would be common over other classes in the school - and other schools in the district and so on.

When it comes to the very next level of task choice itself there might be a choice and the diversity begins to occur. (We have to remember that this is still a 'discursive' conformist class in my model.)

As to the strategies (the configuration of strategies might be in terms of negotiation rather than exploitation strategies - but even there different configurations make for the possibility of plurality and uniqueness) my model specifically asks for them to be left to the learner choice.

While the conforming class itself looks so non-conforming, as to the metaphoric non-conforming class it should be different to a higher degree, starting from learner choices (individual learner in a classroom at that) in the field of experiences themselves, highly varied tasks, strategies, and outcomes. It might look somewhat like the following:
I show in the following example a classroom veering more towards non-conformity to a general syllabus, more prone to express its uniqueness, and also indicate how they could have been even more of a poetic meaning-seeking or less of it and hence more of a discursive classroom and consequently a poetic mathetic or pragmatic meaning-seeking in the syllabus creation.

The task with the mazes cited in Section II above, for instance, in the 'plan' common to all the classrooms in a
school and all schools following a model of creative interpretation contain the experience (i.e., the mazes) with its associated task type (reaching 'home' and writing in the 'key'; a problem-solving meaning pursuit associated with the formalised experience, viz., a puzzle/or a maze). The plan also will provide five different kinds of mazes, to enable learner choice. It will, however not specify the other components, such as strategies for finding the solution, or even specifying the outcome, in the one right path to 'home'. In a tentative way the plan might spell out as a gesture to the pragmatic necessity of the classroom, the macro-methodology - in the form of recommendation for the task to be 'presented' by the teacher to whole class and oral and written work as the main modes of interaction.

Now, as the teacher picks up the task she knows initially that her class has the freedom to choose other experiences than that of the maze (e.g., they could opt for a story or even ask for 'work' as anything other than a story or a game was referred to).

So the first step, making for a unique metaphoric syllabus, through a metaphoric classroom, lies here - the fifty-eighth lesson of the course might be 'mazes' or 'stories' or 'kinds of vehicles'.
Once however, the mazes have been agreed upon, the teacher might go on with the next step of arranging the piles of mazes and giving oral explanation and instructions to the whole class. So far, at the experience choice level, and the meaning-pursuit i.e., puzzled-out meaning level, the textbook plan is being adhered to. As to the macro-method she might begin with the original, teacher to whole class method, but again potentially this method is changeable. The teacher will be aware that she is free to switch to group-work, or just to distribute the different mazes to different ability groups as she perceives them, or, if she thinks her class is relatively homogeneous and likes to work together, to decide upon a sequential presentation of the mazes. The micro-methodology is totally dependent on the learners, and this will have a definite say in the above macro ones. They will be personal to the learners and predictable across classrooms or learners within the same classroom.

The plan would end here.

This much in fact happened in this lesson as already described above. The teacher went ahead with her original plan because it seemed to suit her and her class, yet fully aware of the plan's potential flexibility. And, as anticipated, the 'lesson' did take a different route; the task instead of ending with 'finding the way out' of the planned
mazes extended into another activity, midway (even before all the mazes had been tried out). The learners after fifteen minutes of the planned work decided to make their own mazes a task not suggested by the original plan. So in one way, though it looked like the meaning-pursued by the class adhered to what the plan might have suggested, it in fact was discarded in the learners choosing as more relevant the task involving techniques of maze-making. (By making this choice of an open-ended meaning pursuit this class then changed the course of what might be the content of the planned syllabus, at the meaning-making level, and helped create its own content, and so at least one new element to the syllabus.) There is every possibility of another class sticking to the finding the way out of a maze task. This is not a matter of less creativity or less enterprise from the teacher or her class. A class which does not want anything to do with maze-making might want to look for more complex mazes and show an interest in solving more complex problems. It is only a matter of difference of detail in non-conformity. Or this particular 'lesson' in this Class (let us call it Class B), would be a discursive class (a fair enough choice) and the next class the learners strike out on their own to make for a metaphoric class. 17

Coming back to what actually happened in the example of this lesson in the project, while doing the task, the learners decided at certain points to cluster into groups and work out the problem through a group-enterprise. At other times
learners got into pairs and carried on a dialogue - among themselves; and there were also instances of a few wanting to work out everything by themselves. These decisions about interaction, methodological configurations were made by every student on his/her own in the classroom as the class progressed, without any kind of consistency or systematicity that could be taken up and incorporated into the methodology (macro) component of the plan.

What was left of the plan then at the end in such a situation? Except for the experience-type itself, every other feature of the plan (content and method) were dictated by the meaning-making effort inside the particular classroom, in this particular class.

As soon as a class thus expresses and establishes its uniqueness in the meaning-seeking interactive creation act - the syllabus of this classroom becomes a highly non-conforming 'personal', metaphoric one.

5.11 Conclusion

I shall end this chapter here with the following summing-up:

This chapter has been an illustration of a certain philosophy of language through lessons in a language classroom.
The illustrations focussed on two overarching areas - languaging and syllabus-making. Thus the lesson clarify through action the idea of language used as a tool on the one hand - the activity of meaning-making and on the other, illustrates the argument that meaning-making also works as a pervasive paradigm for several (all) activities and manifests itself in the activity of syllabus-making.

The status of the classroom data is important here. They are not implementational evidence of principles or theoretical stands. Rather they are meant to refine thinking; add to what has been verbally argued for.

In the illustrations I have scrupulously kept away from discussing implication for dissemination of these ideas, about languaging and syllabus-making.

This to me seems a problem which has to be tackled on its own and extensively. Such extensive discussion is definitely not within the scope of this study. This study is aimed at clarifying ideas about language treated as meaning exploration/capacity. The classroom data is used only towards achieving that aim. (See Introduction and Conclusion in this Thesis.)

However, tentatively, I shall indicate the direction that certain aspects of dissemination could take. This shall be the work of the short VI and final chapter.
NOTES

1. I could point out here that such a priori setting up of curriculum manual type instructions goes totally against the grain of what I have been painstakingly arguing for up to now.

2. I do indicate, however, when each lesson occurred in the project. See discussion of lessons.

3. See Chapter III, where language acquisition models are briefly discussed, and Chapter II in Rama Devi (1985).

4. This mediation or formalisation it should be remembered happens in all areas (social, affective and intellectual). Hence any experience (social, affective or intellectual) is basically re-interpretable.

Mostly, however, the social experiences do not for 'practical' reasons allow for such negotiation or (re)interpretation since (if we recall the pragmatic mathetic cline in Fig. 7 in Chapter III) the whole point of the negotiation for meaning making there is for social convergence, and the goal is not so much capturing of personal individualistic meanings where divergence should be pre-dominant. Due to the minimal negotiation caused by pragmatic meaning seeking the social experiences are apparently 'imbibed' or 'taken in' as they are. (See the parallels in communicative competence and analytic competence in Bruner and discussion of this in Chapter II).

Hence the quality of more formalisation in social experiences is accepted more easily. Assuming that social behaviour at home (and in classrooms) takes care of the need to provide formalised experiences, the arguments and the recommendation put forth below can be taken up for basically the intellectual experiences.
5. Whether in the mother-caretaker situation or the teacher-caretaker one, as the experiences are set-up other aspects of the meaning-making endeavour such as meaning-focussing and kind of meaning exploration (pragmatic or mathetic or whichever position on the cline) and the associated strategies (negotiation or exploitation) and the meaning outcome (pragmatic common or poetic individualistic meaning) follow.

6. I am aware that this is again another highly arbitrary kind of division. Why cannot History come under the 'intellectual triple 'a'' is a question for discussion. But such category assignment was not meant to be the subject of such fine controversies; as a rough and ready kind of division which would help in a practical way for ensuring coverage of experiences, and a starting point for their setting up, this was considered useful. The hunch about these differences, nevertheless, seem justified later as we look at the classroom lesson. There it is recalled that the 'intellectual triple 'a'' experiences (relatively) easily afforded themselves for open-ended free-wheeling meaning-seekings, i.e., mathetic meaning-seeking which moves towards the poetic rather than the pragmatic while the 'intellectual minus affective' in meaning-seekings seemed to veer towards the pragmatic forms (from now on referred to as problem-solving tasks) (see below, the illustration of tasks.)

7. I would like to draw attention to an interesting consistency in the model here. You touch any part of the entire scheme it has to fall into the model which engenders the cline of interaction that I have proposed. Let us look at the discussion about experiences which forms this first section in this chapter. 'Experiences' (interpreted)
(can also be called meanings or received meanings), lead to tasks (meaning pursuits, basis for interaction); and end in EXPERIENCE OUTCOMES (meanings for the learner personally interpreted). 'Experiences (are equivalent to) core alright, but 'built-up' core. So these pre-interpreted, 'given' experiences or notions or meanings, are inherently composed of degrees of definiteness, with their underlying dynamism. Also in more definitely fixed ones the distance between meanings and meaning pursuits is very narrow to the extent of being almost invisible. See the 'formulas' (the pre-associated schemas and strategies) of Widdowson, referred to in Chapter II. This is language code implementation for meaning; i.e., when very definitely fixed notions are 'given' they are given to be taken. They are accompanied by transmission kind of handing over. The law of implementation of a plan - execution and intention being equated. This is what I have been calling the ideology of unitariness. One code one meaning for all, static knowledge. When, however, there is a realisation that this is only a matter of degrees the attempt to break the two i.e., interpreted formulas (experience) and the variability possible due to the uniqueness of the immediate situation (task) happens. Thus the experience can have different interpretations, the problem can have many solutions, the code is dynamic and prone to change. The point is that the attempt at separating itself is possible not in an effort to undo interpretation totally (the burden of history) from experience (by attempting to go to pristine pure first experiences), but by holding it 'loosely' by expecting changes and re-interpretation.

The parallels I attempt can be put in a diagram:
8. These terms, task-cycle, task-sequence, and task fatigue, are borrowed from N.S. Prabhu (1980, 1981 and 1983).

9. Lack of data certainly is not the reason for this. As already mentioned there were two observers taking field notes on almost every class and the teacher's own pre-class and post-class notes were scrupulously maintained. (For an analysis of the classroom data collected on the lines of classrooms observation studies, incorporating verbatim reports of the classroom lessons, in the project, see R. Mathew (1986).) The reason, then, was that Linguistic Analysis did not seem quite relevant to my purposes.
further

10. For discussion of such tasks, see Rama Devi (1985).

11. This is part of a task sequence; so in previous task cycles the meanings of the symbolic sketches (i.e., trees for forest for example) and the mode of answering, i.e., in the north, to the north etc., had been derived/established.

12. Most of this was in Telugu. Yet in the classes in the beginning, as this one happened to be, the teacher's attempt was more to develop this urge to meaning-make; the use of language and particular language, e.g. English was to follow automatically. This did prove to be justified, as interactive efforts at meaning-making in later lessons show.

13. The learners had in one way made a choice in the focussing of the experience - which aspect they were interested in. Thus this discussion here is also a good illustration of learners getting trained to make their own choices about interaction, and in that producing their own syllabus of the moment.

14. See below in Section 5.10.1 how the different possibilities of individual choices at several levels contributes to the richness and 'expressivity' of uniqueness of a specific classroom.

15. Though, strictly speaking, 'planning' at the methodology/strategies stage was almost always left alone.

16. It would be interesting to follow up this for implications for teaching the four skills of listening, speaking, reading and writing in traditional language teaching syllabuses. (See Chapter III, Note 13, and also discussion of Widdowson in this context.)
17. If it is only a matter of exchanges of this sort both Class A and Class B would not only be unique syllabuses but also in the proportion of discursive to metaphoric classes, metaphoric syllabuses to the same extent/degree. But if Class B, most of the time had discursive classes, and few metaphoric classes, the syllabus itself would be more of a discursive type. Nevertheless, as I pointed out earlier, even a doubly discursive class following my language model will not have the high amount of generality or commonality that another syllabus not operating with the interactive creation syllabus model will have. The model of creative-construction sees to it that even if several classrooms (let us say in the same school) agree to establish 'common' syllabuses (see the parallel in pragmatic meaning pursuits in languaging) by keeping the experiences (base for interaction) with all their degrees of formalisation stable, yet by the principles of meaning-making - this is only an agreement - a voluntary conformity. Underlying this is the flux or change in task-type, strategies influencing macro-methodology and possibly outcomes. More of this in the next Chapter.