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ABSTRACT

A classroom is a complex environment with numerous interactions happening simultaneously. Every articulation, even the smallest non-verbal body language, conveys meaning and a possibility of face threat. These face threats influence the learning environment, especially if they lead to shame. Hence, it is a rich investigation area for pragmatic analysis where face work is often discussed; however, the awareness of face work could be even more beneficial for the field of Pedagogy. This study opens up a new approach, adding the pragmatic lense to a pedagogic setting. To find out more about the phenomena of shame and how it is intertwined with face-threatening and face-saving acts, a synopsis of a profound literary research is provided by this paper which is not limited by one discipline only. Pedagogy and Pragmatics share common ground in concepts such as (self)image, perception and stigmatization. How these and other aspects discussed in both disciplines complement each other is also shown in the readings of eight vignettes. Vignettes are brief but rich texts which capture specific moments in the classroom. The findings of the research show that articulations of shame are strongly linked to face-threatening or face-saving strategies. The present study indicates that in contemporary times, the experience of shame is mostly seen as hostile and negative; however the ancient Greek and some findings in this study also show positive (side)effects of shame in the context of learning. Thus, this reveals that further interdisciplinary research would be beneficial to fully grasp the impact of face threats and shame in teaching and learning.
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1. **INTRODUCTION**

1.1 Research area, objectives and audience

In the initiating phase of this research, I was insecure on which emotions that influence learning I should focus; therefore, the found material covered a wide range of disciplines, including theories in Pedagogy and Pragmatics, Psychology, Sociology, etc. Even guidebooks for teachers and non-academic guidebooks for people interested in communication were valuable source materials. Interestingly, there seems to be considerable overlap and correlation with shame, embarrassment, stigma, betrayal of trust, face loss and face threat. Surprisingly, in Pedagogy the phenomena of shame due to face loss and face threat seemed to be discussed often but indirectly, hardly ever mentioning the term *face* per se. Therefore, this study focuses on how the phenomena of shame articulates itself in the experience of face loss as face-threat and how this can become a source of acute embarrassment not only to the person whose face is threatened but also to other interlocutors.

When studying the phenomena of face loss and face threat in more detail in a seminar of Pragmatics, it became even more clear to me how important face work and the recognition of its impact is for learning and teaching in the institutionalized frame of a classroom. Especially in this room, numerous expressions happen simultaneously, thus it is a place of particularly high risk for face threats – and, therefore, a rich investigation area for pragmatic analysis.

Not only pragmatists might be interested in this research, as it is first and foremost written by a teacher – and a lifelong learner – to others working in and learning daily from education. As our profession includes reading experiences which articulate themselves in verbal or non-verbal expressions, the application of the pragmatic lense to Pedagogy opened many new opportunities to read the experiences in the complex environment of the classroom. Thus, the literature review in theory and

---

1 Although further explorations will take place later in the paper, given how essential the term *face* is in the following pages, a brief definition is required for understanding. In this paper, *face* refers to more than just the physical face of a person, it refers to the person's identity and the "the positive social value a person effectively claims for himself[her] by the line others assume he[her] has taken" (Goffman 1967: 306) and once a person "takes on a self-image expressed through face he[her] will be expected to live up to [this line]" (ibid: 307). Goffman bases his definition and his pragmatic elaborations on Penelope Brown and Stephen C. Levinson.

2 Interlocutors is used for all the people present together with the person in the spotlight.
the application of the theory in practice by reading the vignettes should provide more context of how these phenomena influence the learning environment. Moreover, teachers should be aware of the complexity and the correlation between shame and face work. By recognizing the correlation, teachers might develop strategies that support the wellbeing of the students and their academic success. Obviously and unavoidably, this study will not provide the reader with a complete set of perfect strategies that work regardless of context, but it aims to provide a more detailed view and, therefore, a bigger picture of how the phenomena overlap, interact and influence the learning environment. In addition to supporting teachers and teachers-to-be, this study ideally is a springboard for further research in this interdisciplinary field; therefore, this study also encourages researchers in the field of Pedagogy and Pragmatics to continue combining these two disciplines.

1.2 Benefits of combining Pedagogy and Pragmatics

The idea of cooperativeness of communication is the frame of Pragmatics in general, as pragmatists believe the idea behind communication is that we want to communicate to cooperate. The same is true for Pedagogy: the teacher communicates because he/she wants to enrich the student's education; the learning process is based upon the cooperation between teacher and students. Thus, there are similar aspects of Pragmatics and in Pedagogy. As a subcategory of linguistics, the study of Pragmatics includes the use of language in human communication which is determined by conditions of society, and, therefore, also their social context, for instance, the social context of a classroom. Thus, the focus of this study lies in the "relationship between language use and social behavior" (Leech 2014: ix).

Readers of this paper should not be provided with stereotypical conclusions that make understanding complex situations easier; instead, readers will be challenged to see more of the complexity inherent in interactions than they were aware of before. This study does not aim to simplify but to broaden the reader's perspective and perception, just like researchers of vignettes "analyze vignettes neither after a pre-existing scheme nor do they want to generate comparable categories, generic and ultimate statements or leap to conclusions" (Schratz, Schwarz and Westfall-Greiter 2012: 38f). Or, in other words, it is just like traveling enriches the traveler's cultural
understanding but also makes them aware of cultural phenomena that occur in his or her country of origin: awareness of complexity instead of one-size-fits-all generalizations is, therefore, part of the objectives. Consequently, I hope to discover characteristics which enable a deeper understanding of the phenomena of shame. By limiting my approach not to one discipline only but by combining Pragmatics and Pedagogy, specific concepts might be analyzed that allow educators to foster the learning process of students more successfully.

As surely not every field can be covered, this study is only a springboard to increase the awareness of the complexity of experiences being articulated in the classroom through verbal and non-verbal communication in a spatial, temporal, corporal and relational manner. These are categories defined and also found in Linguistic as semantic fields: location, time, object and person. Just as these categorizations of articulations overlap in different disciplines, this study will overlap in the phenomena discussed and investigate them in the disciplines of Pedagogy and Pragmatics. It is, therefore, a truly interdisciplinary approach that takes multiple sides into account. In conclusion, unconventional thinking could be the takeaway message from this paper as approaching phenomena open-mindedly and interdisciplinarily is highly beneficial as it enables more depth and understanding overall.

1.3 Method and structure

Methodologically, the research area of this study is located in empirical qualitative Pedagogy for which the phenomenological approach of Merleau-Ponty and Meyer-Drawe is fundamental. As the phenomenological conceptions of learning emphasize the importance of experience, this paper includes numerous experiences to support the investigation. On the Pragmatic side, the discussion of the (im)politeness theory by the pragmatists and sociolinguists Brown and Levinson is highly relevant, including the elaboration of Goffman and others. This should lead to more understanding of how communication impacts the interlocutors' learning process and learning environment. As experience is seen as key to a further understanding of the phenomena, numerous recorded experiences of shame through face threatening in the academic setting have been included.
Through an interdisciplinary approach, the present paper includes a literary review in Pedagogy and Pragmatics in chapter two, which will not only focus on theory but other experiences in the classroom. After reading the numerous sources which are listed in the bibliography and summarizing the most important parts in the literature review of chapter 2, a terminology will be chosen from both fields. As this paper aims to promote a more interdisciplinary approach, the terminology portrays one of the many benefits in this regard: choosing the most suitable terminology from Pragmatics and Pedagogy. In chapter three, the theory is put into practice as the findings of the discussed phenomena in chapter two can be applied by reading eight vignettes out of the collected 85 lived learning experiences in the classrooms of middle schools by Schratz, Schwarz and Westfall-Greiter (2012) in Innsbruck, and Mairhofer (2014) in New Orleans. Furthermore, readings of other specialists are also reviewed in regards to the research topics to broaden the understanding of the phenomena in lived (learning) experiences. The approach when reading the vignettes is positive, descriptive and objective, avoiding judgemental criticism. Moreover, it should not be a know-it-all manner as the interlocutors observed might have reasons for his/her communicative behavior that is outside of the written records and we as an observer do not know all the influencing details of their relationship. Even when one of these teachers might not know the strategies applied, we, when reading this paper, have to assume that every utterance was used to the best of the teacher's knowledge and belief. Therefore, the readers of the vignettes can learn from the observed teachers. In combination with the literature review, this study should be an inspiration for other teachers about how cooperative communication is beneficial for the learning environment in a classroom. In conclusion, the results of this study will be summarized, limitations and further research will be discussed.
2. SYNOPTIS OF THE THEORY AND EXPERIENCES OF SHAME

2.1 "Shame on you!"

2.1.1 Shame and its negative connotations

One of the oldest origins of the term shame is found in Greek; although, its definition is surprising: in contrast to the contemporary understanding of the term, the Greeks also found positive attitudes of an emotion presently seen as exclusively hostile. In Greek, two categories are distinguished; on the one hand there is shame in the "bad sense", described as "disgrace, dishonor (aiskhyne)", and on the other hand there is shame in the "good sense", specified as "modesty, bashfulness (aidos)" (Harper 2001: web). The following chapter will investigate how these attributes influenced the contemporary use of the term shame in the English language.

The noun scamu, also secomu, was used in the meaning of a "feeling of guilt or disgrace" and it is derived, amongst others, from the Proto-Germanic skamo, Old Saxon skama and Old High German scama. From these roots, the contemporary noun Scham developed for German and shame for English; the phrase "to put (someone or something) to shame", for instance, already existed in the Mid-thirteenth century (Harper 2001: web). The Oxford Dictionary provides the following definitions of the noun shame:

1) A painful feeling of humiliation or distress caused by the consciousness of wrong or foolish behavior. E.g.: ‘No fictional account of human humiliation and shame can capture the frightening banality of the people’s treatment at these checkpoints.’

1.1) A loss of respect or esteem; dishonor. E.g.: ‘She would be ridiculed, not to mention the fact that she would bring great shame upon her family, for even being suspected of such things.’

1.2) A person, action, or situation that brings a loss of respect or honor. E.g.: ‘I was among them, marked with the shame of extra ‘handwriting’ lessons until I was 14.’

2) A regrettable or unfortunate situation or action. E.g.: ‘Either way, it would be a shame to miss this record.’ (Oxford Dictionary: web)

These definitions only portray shame as negatively connotated. A similar picture is found in the Cambridge and Merriam-Webster Dictionaries. Furthermore, the negative connotation is also clearly shown when synonyms are used to describe shame. For instance, the Cambridge Dictionary lists the two synonyms "guilt" and "misfortune"
and Merriam-Webster lists "ignominy" and "pity", next to the following definitions of shame as a noun:

1 a) a painful emotion caused by consciousness of guilt, shortcoming, or impropriety  
   b) the susceptibility to such emotion, e.g.: have you no shame?
2) a condition of humiliating disgrace or disrepute (IGNOMINY): 
   e.g.: the shame of being arrested
3 a) something that brings censure or reproach, also: something to be regretted (PITY): 
   e.g.: it's a shame you can't go
   b) a cause of feeling shame (Merriam-Webster: web, capitalizations in original)

Moreover, Merriam-Webster provides an even longer list of synonyms below these definitions, which clearly highlights the harmfulness of shame: "contriteness, contrition, guilt, penitence, regret, remorse, remorsefulness, repentance, rue, self-reproach" (Ibid: web). To compare and contrast, looking at two synonyms described in the Cambridge Dictionary shows similarities to those in Merriam-Webster. Firstly, shame is described in connection with the synonym "guilt", with the example sentence: "an uncomfortable feeling of guilt or of being ashamed because of your own or someone else’s bad behavior: He pointed out that society needed to restore a sense of shame about certain things" (Cambridge Dictionary: web). Secondly, the synonym "misfortune" is used as well and shame as misfortune is described as "an unlucky or disappointing situation". Two of the examples listed are: "What a shame that they left just before we arrived" and "Have some more vegetables – it would be a shame to waste them" (ibid: web).

In the hope of finding more positive connotations, idioms were investigated. "[S]hame on you" is translated to "you should feel ashamed of what you have done" by the Cambridge Dictionary, and other example sentences highlight the negativity even further, for instance: To "be ashamed, blush, feel shame; cause shame" is another well-known example (Oxford Dict: web). More example sentences highlight the negativity even further and also clearly assume that readers or listeners are aware of the concept of the noun shame: "He felt shame for his lies", "How could you be so rude? Have you no shame?" and "Her crimes brought shame upon her family" (Ibid: web). In the aforementioned examples, the concept of shame refers to inner feelings or judgment imposed from another person. To sum up, the definitions and synonyms of the noun shame are only viewed in a negative light in contemporary English, although there is a shame in a good and bad sense found in Greek.
2.1.2 Shame and its significance today

To include a variety of sources, the following two examples were found in TED talks and portray how important and influential the phenomena of shame is in contemporary times. Brené Brown has studied the phenomenon of shame for 16 years. In her TED talk she also includes the self in her personal definition of the term: to her, "shame is a focus on self" and she compares shame to guilt as well; however, the latter is "a focus on behavior" (2012: 13.32) as "[s]hame is 'I am bad.' Guilt is 'I did something bad.' [...] Guilt: 'I'm sorry, I made a mistake.' Shame: 'I'm sorry, I am a mistake" (2012: min 13.32).

Brown, therefore, appears to agree with shame being a hostile emotion but also sees the positive potential in shame and the vulnerability that comes with it. According to her, vulnerability is seen "as emotional risk, exposure, uncertainty. It fuels our daily lives. And [Brown has] come to the belief [...] to be vulnerable, to let ourselves be seen, to be honest" (ibid: min 03.47) is, however, not only negative as "vulnerability is the birthplace of innovation, creativity and change" (ibid: min 05.40). Apart from this side effect, she finds shame to be negative as she defines it as "an epidemic in our culture"; she advises us "to get out from underneath it — to find our way back to each other, we have to understand how it affects us and how it affects the way we're parenting, the way we're working, the way we're looking at each other." (ibid: min 18.04) According to her, "empathy is the antidote to shame" (ibid: min 18.55), whereas shame is seen as poisonous to our culture. Thus, Brown sees shame as an extremely hostile emotion that we have to fight but also considered positive side effects.

Another example is the experience of Monica Lewinsky. At the age of 22 in the year 1998, she was publicly humiliated in the mass media as she fell in love with her employer Bill Clinton, the then president of the United States of America. In her TED talk, she refers to

nearly two decades now [in which], we have slowly been sowing the seeds of shame and public humiliation in our cultural soil, both on- and offline. Gossip websites, paparazzi, reality programming, politics, news outlets and sometimes hackers all traffic in shame. It's led to desensitization and a permissive environment online which lends itself to trolling, invasion of privacy, and cyberbullying. This shift has created what Professor Nicolaus Mills calls a culture of humiliation. (Lewinsky 2015: min 13.51)
Her case and cases like the *Sony Pictures Cyber Hacking* for which "[t]he documents which received the most attention were private emails that had maximum public embarrassment value" (Lewinsky 2015: min 13.51) portray how shame is used for profit. "A marketplace has emerged where public humiliation is a commodity and shame is an industry. How is the money made? Clicks. The more shame, the more clicks. The more clicks, the more advertising dollars." (ibid: min 15.39) Thus, shame can not only threaten someone's face but also someone's life, especially if it reaches public humiliation on a global scale through today's mass media.

### 2.1.3 Shame and its connection to face loss

After a glimpse on the usage of shame in general, I wanted to investigate its role, especially in Pedagogy\(^3\) and Pragmatics. As this paper does not aim to narrow definitions down to a simple phrase, this chapter should widen the readers' horizon to what is associated with shame. In Pedagogy, similarly to the definitions above, the noun *shame* is described through various definitions and, therefore, is acknowledged as a complex term. For instance, Bibby agrees that "[s]hame, like fear, implies a complex of affective states" (2002: 705f). Werry and O'Gorman discuss the role of shame in Pedagogy where they provide a detailed definition; including the following selection: shame is defined as a "predominant effect at work in the learning process" and "a taut delicate thread drawn between two persons" but also a "powerful weapon; a mirror; a window" or "a state, linguistically mobile, fluid, contagious, dangerous, painful and alive". Apart from these definitions, there are substitutes and euphemisms that were uttered in pedagogical literature instead of using the noun *shame* or *embarrassment*, for instance, "It was an awkward moment for me" which includes "denial of inner feeling and projection of it onto the outer world" (Schef 1994: 43, italics in original). Ruhloff highlights the connotation of shame in the German figure of speech, here a word-for-word translation: "I wished the ground would open and swallow me up." (*Ich würde vor Scham am liebsten im Erdboden versinken*, transl\(^4\)). This figure of speech refers to a desire to disappear as the "attention [of the other interlocutors] is sidetracked from

---

\(^3\) As the discipline of Pedagogy naturally overlaps in the literary discourse with Sociology, Philosophy and Psychology, these disciplines might be included as well without always being named explicitly.

\(^4\) Quotes that were translated from German to English by the author of this paper will be marked by the abbreviation *transl* from this page onwards.
listening and speaking to seeing and being seen (Gesehenwerden)" (in Ricken, Roehr, Ruhloff and Schaller 2009: 54, transl). Bibby also includes perception in her definition:

[B]eing made to feel shame might come from an outside judgment but may also come from oneself—as a result of self-censorship, a presumption that a (real or imagined) observer is judging. Perceiving yourself in a negative way requires the internalization of some external reference—something to measure yourself against. (2002: 708)

Thus, being seen and the image of the speaker and hearer\(^5\) according to their perception will be important fields of research in this paper. Moreover, the importance of the Other — as an individual or social group — and their perception is discussed as well. In addition, the perception of the individual who feels ashamed, and the self-image that he/she wants to maintain, influences the feeling of shame. This is discussed in Pragmatics as well: in this discipline, one can find numerous correlations of the articulations of shame as a response to the experience of face-threatening acts. While face-threatening acts will be discussed in more detail later, an approach from the general use and understanding of the term face to an explanation of why face is essential to shame will be done first.

The term face originally entered Middle English via Old French [or "Anglo-French" according to Merriam-Webster] which again was based on the Latin term facies, meaning "form, appearance, face" (Oxford Dictionary: web) and as facia for "portrait"; the stem fac- of facere has a very broad meaning: "to make, do" (Merriam-Webster: web). The first known use of face in the meaning of "the front part of the head" is estimated in the 14th century and one century later, the verb with the meaning "to confront impudently" (Cambridge: web) is known to be coined. Apart from the very obvious definitions on face, such as "front part of a person's head from the forehead to the chin" (Oxford Dictionary: web), the phrases under the category verbs were more interesting to this paper, as "get out of someone's face" as to "stop harassing or annoying someone". The phrase "lose face" is contemporarily used as being "humiliated or com[ing] to be less highly respected" and on the contrary, "save face" was described as "[a]void humiliation" (Oxford Dictionary: web). Moreover, "the

\(^5\) In Pragmatics, the terms speaker and addressee (Levinson 2011: 176) are also used. As distinguishing between speaker and hearer/addressee can lead to misunderstandings as someone who speaks also listens and observes the (non)verbal communication of the other person present, the term interlocutor enables talking about the people involved in a conversation in a way, that they can be both speaker and hearer/addressee at the same time. Moreover, the roles of speaker and hearer/addressee can interchange rapidly anyways and a strict separation is not only impossible but also not wished. For instance, active listening includes (non)verbal utterances that are sent to an addressee at the same time the actual addressee is speaking. To label who of the interlocutors is more in focus, I will call him or her the person/student in the spotlight which also refers to an aspect about being on stage discussed later in the paper.
respect and honor of others" is expressed by the phrases lose face and save face: "[h]e thinks he would lose face if he admitted the mistake" and "[s]he tried to save face by inventing a story about being overseas at the time" (ibid: web). To sum up, mostly negative connotations were listed in the dictionary entries for expression including face, thus, there are two interesting hypotheses to be scrutinized:

Firstly, shame seems not to be directly linked to face threat or losing face in the English language — neither in the three dictionaries consulted, nor in the literary review for this paper in the academic fields of Pedagogy. However, there seems to be an indirect connection due to the definitions used describing each individual term and phrase, and in Pragmatics the awareness of the correlation of shame and face threat or losing face seems to be even stronger but, so far, there is only an indirect link as well. Secondly, the term shame is portrayed only negatively, except the division into a "good sense" and "bad sense" of shame in Greek, and side-effects such as vulnerability mentioned by Brown; but, this has not (yet) reached common usage in contemporary times. Therefore, the following research will dive deeper into Pedagogy and Pragmatics to find out how much shame and face correlate, especially in institutionalized education.

After a brief discussion of research on the terms shame and face in general, the following chapter will look into how the terms are used in particular in the context of institutionalized learning. Are shame and threatening or losing face directly correlated in the classroom? Is shame only depicted negatively?
2.2 Hostile emotions in the classroom

"Shame, it seemed to us, is an elephant in the classroom. [...] unspeakable yet noisily persistent." (Werry and O’Gorman, 2007: 217)

2.2.1 Shame in the pedagogical process

In literary research so far, shame has been portrayed mostly as a hostile emotion. Is this also true for the classroom setting? Werry and O’Gorman discuss „shame in the pedagogical process" in their essay and suggest that "shame, a quintessentially negative affect, makes tangible the contours of institutional and social power, while also revealing the corporeal and relational commitments to others that form the basis of both schooling and performance." (2007: 213)

According to Ruhloff, shame portrays a disruption of communication, a pause in communication, articulated through an uncomfortable silence. It is also an interruption of pedagogical processes as the focus is switched from the attention of listening and speaking to a more visual approach. The gaze and being seen is more dominant, which causes an awkward situation for both listener and speaker. Thus, it is interfering with the learning process. In Ruhloff’s opinion, this interference through shame will occur when education is assumed to be a linear perfection of a path from "not yet being to being". (von noch nicht Sein zum Sein, in Ricken, Roehr, Ruhloff and Schaller 2009: 54) Meyer-Drawe defines it as "induced through the deprivation of unity" (2004: 307). Before continuing the discussion about shame as a hostile emotion and the consequences that shame might cause, the reader's attention should be drawn back into considering that even though educators and students might only have good intentions in mind, hostile emotions will occur at some point which will subsequently influence the learning process.

Teachers work on multiple layers. From my own experience in the classroom, I understand that there is never just one thought on my mind. Here an example of lesson planning: What is the next concept according to the curriculum? How can I consider the learning types amongst my students? How can I engage the students through the competition without shaming the ones who struggle or who are shy? How much time should I plan for this exercise? How shall I phrase the comments underneath the essay I have corrected to give valuable feedback while also motivating them? Etc. These
thoughts do not yet include a classroom full of diverse teenagers - all with special needs as they are all individual people. "Teaching is not an easy task", agree Westfall-Greiter and Schwarz (2012: 127) as in the institutional context of a classroom, the teacher's "attempt [is] to use lesson time well, [while] teachers are often running against the clock when trying to manage the challenge of attending to the articulated calls of 25 children, not to mention the unarticulated ones" (ibid: 127) In this environment, it might be challenging to react in just the right way as a teacher if a student articulates being hurt, for instance through the hostile emotion of shame. And sometimes, this articulation can only be seen in small physical movements or not even that, as it might make the students silent or freeze. While recognition of physical articulations is important, and therefore discussed in chapter 2.6.1, it should be noted that each teacher may only be able to (re)act to his/her best intentions since they can only read the experiences and think the best of the person. Instead of judging, we can learn for ourselves to make a different choice if we are in the same situation; to be one step ahead when we can shape the student's learning experience. Numerous experiences shape the students' and the teachers' learning as well as learning shapes experiences. But what is learning? Definitions in Pedagogy state that learning is independent of the ringing of the school bell and what students are taught might differ from what they learn (cf. Schwarz 2013: 43f). To Meyer-Drawe

\textit{learning} is a notion that dates back to antiquity, to Aristotle and Plato, that has been linked to various metaphors. [...] Learning occurs when the old is gone and the new has not yet emerged. Gaining a new perspective necessarily results in losing an old one. This is no pleasant state. (2008, quoted by Vasileio sand Schwarz 2016: 42)

Recognizing learning as a state which does not have to be pleasant also provokes the question if shame might create situations in which the interlocutor(s) are not in a pleasant state but undergo a phase of learning. An old experience, perhaps a feeling of safety, is replaced with something new, perhaps a feeling of insecurity, or redirecting one's expectation? In addition, Meyer-Drawe defines learning as an experience (2008: 15) and clarifies that "[l]earning is always learning of something by someone and, as a process, comparable to awakening; it is active and passive at the same time." (2012, quoted by Vasileios and Schwarz 2016: 42, italics in original) Teachers provide tasks, but what is the task of a teacher? According to Schwarz and Schratz, a teacher should "initiate the learning process and accompany [the students] on the path" (2014: 117), but should teachers use shame as a tool for motivation to learn?
2.2.2 Shame as a tool

Shame might also not only be a side-effect but (un)intentionally be used as a tool or even a weapon. The following lived experience was made in New Zealand, around eighty years ago.

My maternal grandfather was a headmaster [...] in rural New Zealand in the thirties and forties, in two-roomed school-houses filled with the barefoot sons and daughters of colonist farmers and the impoverished Maori villagers they had dispossessed. [H]e would patrol the playground on the alert for children speaking the Maori language, forbidden by the Department of Education, and punished by my grandfather with a swift stroke of the cane across the palms of their hands. It was for their own good, he believed, to shame these students. (How perniciously central shame-as-a-weapon is, I am reminded, in the scene of Pedagogy.) The story haunts me: shame won’t stand still, it burns a line of flight across the decades, from subject to subject. Seventy years later, I struggle to learn Maori, to sound the language he silenced. (Werry and O’Gorman 2007: 225).

This rough era of brutal racism included horrific acts meant to erase the identities of the Maori. Students were told that a proficiency in the English language was key to academic success, and thus they were forced to abandon their mother tongue. If we compare this to our approach towards globalization and English as a lingua franca, our contemporary approach does not seem to differ much from the goals of, so-called "civilized" settlers who fought for western and imperial beliefs. The United Kingdom gained more global power through colonization, for which Christianity, Commerce and Civilization were essential. Although the grandfather of the narrator used brutal methods to punish the students' "misbehavior" in speaking their mother tongue instead of English, his actions might be rooted in an initially well-intended thought to support the student's academic success; however, the shame of having shamed them "still haunts" him and thus shows that he has done more harm than good.

Similar experiences are made on the other side of the world: Kenya. In a literary essay, Thiong’o, an award-winning writer and cultural scientist, recounts his own childhood, speaking his mother-tongue Gikuyü, a language with "suggestive power well beyond the immediate and lexical meaning [...] with [...] riddles, proverbs, transpositions of syllables, or through nonsensical but musically arranged words" (1986: 11). However, when Thiong’o went to a colonial school, the language of instruction and the language expected from him was "no longer the language of [his] culture" as after the "declaration of a state of emergency over Kenya in 1952, all schools
[were] run by patriotic nationalists" and placed under the colonial regime chaired by Englishmen and with it "English became the language, and all the others had to bow before it in deference" (ibid: 11, italics in original).

[O]ne of the most humiliating experiences was to be caught speaking Gikũyũ in the vicinity of the school. The culprit was given corporal punishment — three to five strokes of the cane on bare buttocks — or was made to carry a metal plate around the neck with inscriptions such as I AM STUPID or I AM A DONKEY. Sometimes the culprits were fined money they could hardly afford. (ibid: 11)

Enforcing the use of another language through physical punishment, penalty charges and/or public shaming — although only the latter directly refers to shame, the other two punitive actions are equally working through shame: while receiving strokes, the student might also feel embarrassed, which increases the psychological pain. Also, after strokes on the behind, one is publicly stigmatized as his physical movement shows that he has been punished, for instance, when he moves through the classroom or when he (cannot) sit(s) on a chair. Hence, the act of caning bare buttocks is designed to humiliate as well as hurt, it operates symbolically and physically.

In New Zealand, the headmaster's punishment of striking the students across the palms of their hands also seemed to be only one part of the method and the mental shame caused might be even more harmful — and, therefore, also more effective in colonialism's views than the physical pain. The shaming might have taken place in various ways: naming and shaming publicly, the shame of being seen as a misbehaving student in the eyes of an authority figure who the student's aim is to prove themselves to gain praise and affection, the look on the mother's face when she sees that her son "needed to be punished", the embarrassing explanation to the mother about what has happened, the laugh of fellow students, etc. The other students might be trying to be seen as better in the eyes of the authority figure and, therefore, ridicule the victim publicly or follow the role model of teachers and punish the "misbehaving" classmates as well, receiving praise in return. Or they might feel afraid or ashamed of being a companion of his feeling ashamed on someone else's behalf (fremdschämen). Either way, shame as a tool or even a weapon seemed extremely effective. This strategy was especially powerful given the attitude towards the English language in Kenya, where positive reinforcement was the other extreme as
any achievement in spoken or written English was highly rewarded; prizes, prestige, applause; the ticket to higher realms. English became the measure of intelligence and ability in the arts, the sciences and all the other branches of learning. English became the main determinant of a child's progress up the ladder of formal education. [...] All the papers were written in English. Nobody could pass the exam who failed the English language paper no matter how brilliantly he had done in the other subjects. [...] English was the official vehicle and the magic formula to colonial elitedom (ibid: 12, italics in original).

Thiong'o concludes that language in general "is both, a means of communication and a carrier of culture" (ibid: 13). Thus, it is also "the collective memory bank of a people's experience in history" (ibid: 15) and as such he stresses the importance of the usage of African mother tongues in every-day language use and in literature. It seems as if Thiong'o sees the key in pride and self-confidence instead of denigrating one's own mother tongue or being ashamed of it. Because if shame is used as a weapon, generations grow in denial of their own mother tongue and without literature in languages that can carry their own culture in a more authentic and intense manner.

The effectiveness of shame as a tool or weapon is demonstrated within the recollection of the previously introduced experience of the New Zealander. He is still "haunted" by this experience decades later and struggles to "sound the language [his grandfather has] silenced" (2007: 224). In "shame we relive those pasts as we remake them" (Probyn 2005: 162). Shame makes us relive the past in the present as the memory becomes more emotional, more personal and thus touching us more deeply.

I study Maori history so that I may hear in my research the voices the state closed its ears to. Just as the kin-legacy of shame is woven through my research, it shapes my teaching (postcolonial theatre, decolonizing historiography, and so on). [...] It feels like a kind of belonging in that scene of history, besides the ob/subjects of my analysis and my interest, but in ways that point me constantly to the gulf between their experience and mine, their shame, my grandfather’s shame, mine. Shame is a political and cultural inheritance that is also a genealogical one — my body is implicated in this work. (ibid: 225).

Although he struggles to study the language Maori, the strong memory of the shame experienced in his childhood might have motivated him to study Maori history; therefore, shame might also have initiated learning. Although the latter could be seen as a positive side-effect of shame, this is no justification for the shame caused. Despite the fact that both experiences were taken from places that are literally on the opposite side of the globe from each other, one can find similarities in regards to how shame is

---

6 For the comeback of the African mother tongue, texts should be written "in the language of the people" (ibid: 30) and, therefore, targeting the audience pleasantry and working class. In this regard, writers should "free [texts] from internal and external parasites" (ibid: 29) as the English language was treated like the most important of all languages, and instead proudly focussing on Africa's rich own culture and traditions in African languages such as Gĩkũyũ.
used as a weapon in colonial imperialism. In both experiences, shame is used as a political tool to westernize the colonies.

According to Werry and Gorman, the "fear of shame allows shame to be exponentially exploited as a weapon and shield against the shattering experience of still more shame" (2007: 220). For Tomkins, "shame is the most infectious of effects, leaping from subject to subject through a lightning rod of unwilled empathy" (quoted in Werry and Gorman 2007: 221). Thereby, shame is not only influencing the one individual who is in the spotlight but also the other interlocutors: "Seeing others shamed, we feel shame. Feeling shame, we react by shaming others. This is, of course, the quality that makes shame such a potent weapon in the arsenal of social control." (ibid: 221). The same train of thought is taken by Jennifer Jacquet, an assistant professor at the Department of Environmental Studies at New York University who persuasively argues that the solution to the limitations of guilt can be found in shame, retrofitted for the age of democracy and social media. She demonstrates how shaming can function as a nonviolent form of resistance that, in turn, challenges institutions, organizations, and even governments to actuate large-scale change. She argues that when applied in the right way, the right quantity, and at the right time, shame has the capacity to keep us from failing other species in life's fabric and, ultimately, ourselves. (Jaquet 2005: web)

The author Taleb Nassim reacted to the arguments of Jacquet claiming "shaming is society's natural stabilizer" which is "ignored in modernity, particularly in the virtual world" (ibid: web). Jaquet discusses how shame can be used as a tool to "change behaviour" (2015: chapter 6: min 5.05). She states that guilt is an even easier to use tool than shaming, as "guilt does not need an audience to enforce the norm" and thus also highlights how vital an audience is for shaming if it is used as a "punishment [for] norm enforcement" (2015: chapter 5: min 7.00). As a result, shame could be used in society instead of physical punishment as "shame is more powerful than guilt, [and thus] it can be used better to establish new norms and it can be more powerful to enforcing norms" (Jaquet 2015: chapter 5, min 8.20). However, "shaming, like any tool, is on its own amoral and can be used to any end, good or evil" (ibid: chapter 6, min 3.13). Therefore, Jaquet sees a positive side in using shame as a tool to "moderate behavior", for instance, to avoid eating tuna to protect dolphins (Jaquet 2015: chapter 2, min 2.20 left). Unfortunately, a more detailed analysis in other disciplines would go

---

7 There surely are many more examples of experiencing shame. Although considering history in this extent seems to lead the reader away from the discussion of pedagogical phenomena and applying the pragmatic lens, I see it more as an enriching eye-opener to how important the phenomenon of shame is to our society in the past, present and future.
beyond the scope of this discussion, but the reader is encouraged to find more historically significant examples of when shame was used as a tool or even a weapon. Thus, we will instead return to the influence of shame in the classroom, since this should be the main context for this paper.

2.2.3 Shame is influenced by perception

There is a spatial connection between the speaker and the person who receives or experiences the utterances; however, the space of the speaker and the space of a listener or receiver is a different one, thus, pedagogical occurrences are coined by "socially structured rooms" (Schratz, Schwarz and Westfall-Greiter 2011: quoted in Schwarz 2017: 31). In addition, it is important to distinguish between the perspective of someone who learns and the perspective of someone who teaches for which Schratz, Schwarz and Westfall-Greiter have introduced the German neologisms lernseits and lehrseits. The latter, the perspective of someone who teaches, includes "individuals, curricula and questions how to learn", whereas on the other hand, the perspective of someone who learns, deals mostly with the "risk of identities with plans for life who have to answer questions for these life plans" (Schratz, Schwarz and Westfall-Greiter 2017: 1). From the perspective of someone who learns, the topics dealt with in the specific subjects are less in focus but more about how people "grow into the world" (ibid: 1). This makes us wonder, what is at risk if face is threatened? And although the two sides might understand each other, are they being understood? Is understanding not only one way of perceiving, reading, interpreting the other's expressions?

"[P]erception is itself social action and where both perception and communication begin and end is not easily identified." (Schratz 1995: 15). Interlocutors, in general, face the challenge of seeing the invisible, hearing the unspoken. Teachers in particular face the challenge of knowing when their communication influences the student, what the students communicate indirectly or do not dare to communicate at all due to shame etc. While there are numerous factors that play into the teacher's every-day communication, the challenge increases tremendously as there is not only one individual as an interlocutor but maybe a cohort of 15 or even 30 students in one classroom, being influenced differently by a single utterance of the teacher or the teacher's reaction to a student's utterance. Pedagogical tact is another of the numerous
characteristics of teachers’ every-day challenge. The complexity of this list displays the complexity of communication as the list could be continued endlessly. How should we then start to describe or even understand the interlocutors' perception?

If we depart from Waldenfeld's view, we should first consider that in our perception, the gaze (Blick) always perceives "something as something in its significant difference" (1992: 30, transl, italics not in original). Waldenfeld's comment was echoed by Vasileios and Schwarz:

As educators, we always perceive something as something, act like someone, analyze something as something, read something as something, see something as something and so on. The double structure of this “something” corresponds with phenomenological thinking. Our attention is never neutral or innocent; it is always directed. Perceiving students as creators of their own learning will shape the way we deal with them and may limit our perception of their potential. We must, therefore, consider both the what and how of the learning process, and make meaning of the space between teaching and learning. Students are part of the learning process, but they do not necessarily initiate it, and teachers cannot fully instruct it. (Vasileios and Schwarz 2016: 42, transl, italics not in original)

The pedagogues Vasileios and Schwarz thus recommend teachers to acknowledge the "space between teaching and learning" to better understand and support the learning process. They recommend teachers to add relevance to space between them and the students; and to be aware that the students are neither initiating their own learning process entirely on their own nor are the teachers able to entirely initiate this learning process (ibid: 2016: 42). According to Waldenfels, "between the affection and the response, [...] there is the transformation of the enduring to the responding self" (2002: 102), and in an experience of shame, this transformation can be seen when students react to what has been uttered by the teacher or the peers.

The aspects of shame discussed so far support the negative image of shame, which is also seen in the findings of Werry and O'Gorman in their pedagogical research where shame is characterized as "distinctly recognizable", causing "thorny moments of discomfort in the classroom" (2007: 213f). When these moments are perceived as "thorny", what happens in the space between the teacher and the student?

"Suddenly you notice that the other acts in a specific way not because he/she means to harm us but because he sees things from a different perspective" (Hengstenberg 2016: 40, transl). Thus, Hengstenberg points out that perception is ingrained in a social process. The phenomenology of perception is an attempt to describe the perceptual experience from a first-person perspective, from the point of view of the experience being described. When it comes to this, some of the founding
fathers of phenomenology, Edmund Husserl and Maurice Merleau-Ponty agree. Merleau-Ponty however departs from Husserl by "insisting that the purpose of a phenomenology of perception cannot be to describe how some property or capacity internally constitutes its relation to external objects" as this would imply "that the subject's own internal states or properties can be conceptually carved off from the wider context of situation and how it is embedded in the world" (quoted in Carman 2008: 36). Merleau-Ponty furthermore claims that "[p]erception is not a science of the world, it is not even an act, a deliberate taking up of a position; is the background from which all acts stand out, and is presupposed by them." (PP iii-v/i-xi7ix-xi quoted by Carman 2008: 37). When Goffman discusses stigma, he also refers to perceptibility 
"[s]ince it is through our sense of sight that the stigma of others most frequently becomes evident" (1963: 64, see chapter 2.6 of this paper). Thus, theories in Pedagogy and Pragmatics both agree on the importance of perceptiveness; furthermore, it is a vital aspect of face-saving practices:

If a person is to employ his repertoire of face-saving practices, obviously he must first become aware of the interpretations that others may have placed upon his acts and the interpretations that he ought perhaps to place upon theirs. In other words, he must exercise perceptiveness. (Goffman 1967: 310)

In that regard, according to Goffman, a person has "two points of view — a defensive orientation toward saving his own face and a protective orientation towards saving the other's face." (1967: 310). Both of these orientations seem to long for harmony as face-saving is preferred to face-threatening. Moreover, it also addresses the feeling of interlocutors towards the shaming of others: someone who experiences, for instance, public shaming of another person might be affected negatively and intrinsically long for the victim's face to be restored and the shaming to be ended. Although face-saving practices will either be primarily defensive or primarily protective, these two practices are expected to be taken place at the same time. "In trying to save the face of others, the person must choose a tactic that will not lead to loss of his own; in trying to save his own face, he must consider the loss of face that his action may entail for others" (Goffman 1967: 310). Already from this brief glimpse into face work in Pragmatics, one can see the complexity and, therefore, as well the need for further explanation. Especially the cooperative articulations of the interlocutors to honor face seem to be highly valuable not only for Pragmatics but also for Pedagogy. After having provided a glimpse why perception is important for face work, the pedagogical view on
perception by Schratz can enrich the understanding even further before we come back to face work again.

The benefit of including recorded experiences can also be seen here in the literary text about the fictional experiences of blind men. The Hindu fable explains aspects of perception "The Blind Men and the Elephant" demonstrates "that we each perceive objects and events differently, and having perceived them so we are likely to disagree about which direction we should go in search of what might seem the same quarry" (Schratz 1995: 16) but in the end "each of [the blind men] was partly in the right, / And all were in the wrong!" (Saxe 1930). The complete fable is attached in the appendix; this illustration provides a summary:

Illustration 2: The Blind Men and the Elephant.

Schratz asked colleagues all over the world about their knowledge of the fable. As a result, the responses showed that people have adapted it as a metaphorical example, for instance, the professor Yu-mei Wang from Oregon University, USA. She recalled a comparison of the fable's moral with scientific research:

One day, one of my classmates showed a picture of six blind men with an elephant. He said that quantitative research is like the six blind men. They [quantitative researchers] study only part of the elephant, but they generalize their result to the whole elephant. Qualitative researchers just study one small part (for example, one leg), they do not try to generalize. But I do not think it is true. Because qualitative researchers must be very careful in identifying the relevant population. If they decide to study one leg, they can only generalize to the other legs, not to other parts of the elephant [...] (Wang 1992, cited in Schratz 1995: 22)
Both texts, the fable and the response by Wang, point out how challenging it is to get the bigger picture of the whole object under investigation, here the elephant. Even to get the bigger picture of how perception can be defined seems to be a difficult task. Merleau-Ponty argues that "too often, philosophers and scientists have tried to characterize perception in terms that are both descriptively inadequate and explanatory inherent" (207 quoted by Cerbone 2008: 121). Merleau-Ponty seems to criticize overgeneralization giving the following explanation:

Such descriptions of experience tend to introduce notions — sensations, stimuli, judgments — that are not really present in our perceptual experience, and such explanations tend to appeal to processes that owe their sense to the prior workings of perception. [Therefore] we can never fill up, in the picture of the world, that gap which we ourselves are". (ibid: 121)

As researchers we might be tempted to, or forced to, chip away everything that does not fit in our study — how else should we limit our focus? Even with the best intentions, one can only have a specific angle when observing, also in this study. Therefore, it should be highlighted again that readers of this paper should not be provided with stereotypical conclusions that make understanding complex situations easier; instead, readers will be challenged to see more facets then they were aware before. The goal of this study is not to narrow down and simplify but to broaden the reader's perspective and perception.

In Pragmatics, perception is discussed as well; it is distinguished between "what the speaker means and what his words mean, [...] between utterance meaning and sentence or word meaning. What hearers are interested in, of course, is what the speaker means. Indeed, a hearer's interest in what the speaker means will often lead her to ignore the fact that his words mean something else" (Blakemore 1992: 5, italics in original). For better understanding, Blakemore provides the following example where "the speaker of (14) intends his utterance to be understood as a guess rather than as a claim does not mean that he expects the hearer to recover (15) rather than (16) as a description of his intentions."

(14) It's an owl.
(15) The speaker of (14) is guessing that it is an owl.
(16) The speaker of (14) is claiming that it is an owl. (ibid: 94)
Following this example, Blakemore states that "[t]o intend an utterance as a guess is to intend that the hearer recognizes that the speaker does not have conclusive evidence for the truth of the proposition expressed" and as a result "that he cannot be taken to be strongly committed to its factuality" (ibid: 1992:94). Therefore, the hearer's perception of the speaker's utterance decides how the proposition is understood.

In other words, understanding an utterance as a guess is not so much a matter of recovering a description of the speaker's intention to perform a particular part type of speech act as it is a matter of identifying the strength of the speaker's commitment to the truth of the proposition expressed. More generally, it is a matter of establishing how the utterance should be processed. Once again, if the hearer does recover a description of the speaker's intentions it is because she has already understood the utterance. In other words, while the higher-level description that the speaker is making a guess may be communicated, it doesn't have to be in order for the hearer to understand the utterance.⁸ (Blakemore 1992: 94).

To proceed on this assumption, we could generalize that our perception depends on our knowledge; for instance, the more we know about the interlocutors, the more pixels, the more detailed the image, the closer our perception comes to what the interlocutor might have wanted to express with his utterance. This thought is visualized by psychologist Legewie and Ehlers in the following illustration:

![Elephant in pixels](image)

Illustration 3: Elephant in pixels. In: Legewie and Ehler (1972):

---

⁸ Sperber and Wilson call acts like guessing (and warning) *non-communicated acts*. (ibid 1992: 94)
In this figure, the number of picture points determines the resolution. In computer-based image technology, information is defined in 0 and 1, as portrayed here in a pixel of white or black. The more pixels there are, the more units of knowledge, the better our image of the interlocutor's perception. In this example, the interlocutor is the elephant. In an example of communication in the classroom, the interlocutor could be a student. Even with a wealth of information about the student in our classroom, we are still an observer, we cannot be the student him or herself. Moreover, the student might not perceive himself like we do, the same as the elephant might never have thought about the look of his trunk or his general appearance the way the blind men did. The self-image might vary enormously. In the classroom, the student might have a totally different picture of him/herself as a student, might think about him/herself as a diligent student without the teacher being aware of this self-image. The teacher, on the other hand, might perceive the quiet behavior and the rare active participation as a lack of interest or absent-mindedness.

In this regard, Pragmatics offers numerous studies and theories on elements of speech which might be helpful to shape the teacher's attention to the matter with which utterances influence the space between. For instance, Goffman highlights that perception is a vital aspect of face-saving practices. He is claiming that "[i]f a person is to employ his repertoire of face-saving practices, obviously he must first become aware of the interpretations that others may have placed upon his acts and the interpretations that he ought perhaps to place upon theirs"; to put another way, the interlocutor "must exercise perceptiveness" (1967: 310). In that regard, according to Goffman, a person has "two points of view — a defensive orientation toward saving his own face and a protective orientation towards saving the other's face." (ibid: 310). Both of these orientations seem to long for harmony as face-saving is preferred to face-threatening. "In trying to save the face of others, the person must choose a tactic that will not lead to loss of his own; in trying to save his own face, he must consider the loss of face that his action may entail for others" (ibid: 310). Interlocutors in general, seem to face the challenge of seeing the invisible, hearing the unspoken. Teachers, in particular, seem to face the challenge of knowing how their communication influences the student, what the students communicate indirectly or does not dare to communicate at all because of shame.
2.3 Our (self)images are in danger

2.3.1 (Self)images define our face

To grasp the invisible between the interlocutors, the interlocutors rely on images to make the invisible visible and understandable. According to Meyer-Drawe, the general "process of visualization of knowledge" is also affecting the learning process positively (2010: 815, transl) and it is even "impossible to do without images in the process of education because our sensual perception with regard to ourselves always deserts us" (ibid: 807, transl). In this regard, it is not only important what is shown but also what is not shown:

Pictures gain their shape by showing or hiding something. The one aspect that is captured by our gaze is simultaneously covering other aspects. [...] Pictures show themselves and something, they evoke meaning in the material, open the possibility in reality, cause appearance and disappearance. (Meyer-Drawe: 808f, transl).

Images do not only influence our perception; images are also influenced by our perception: According to Meyer-Drawe, this process of visualization of knowledge (Anschaulichkeit eines Wissens) is also affecting the learning process positively (2010: 815, transl). Boehm refers to the same aspect, claiming that "due to the existence of significant things which are invisible, we are creating pictures" (2007, S. 114). The latter is also seen in metaphors which make abstract terms and situations more imaginable through concrete pictures and objects.

When pictures are discussed in education, one should keep in mind that "words and pictures [...] articulate our relation to the things by clothing a thought with words or put it in the picture" (Meyer-Drawe 2011: 158, transl). Moreover, pictures can normalize and coin our perception through inhabiting an imaginary space which is shared amongst those, who look at each other. Some aspects are put into the spotlight, others are left in the invisible. (cf. Merleau-Ponty 2004, S. 267, transl) According to Meyer-Drawe, education and images "[b]oth create and close spaces of evidence, open or block access to the unpredictable self, the unpredictable other and the unpredictable world. In a nutshell: pictures put us in the picture". (2010: 816) Waldenfels agrees that "[t]hrough images, something gains figurative importance, is made visible" (2008, S. 54, quoted by Meyer-Drawe 2010: 816, transl). This is of special importance in regards to
education, as pictures are essential for the learning process. Meyer-Drawe highlights that education (Bildung) and picture (Bild) have much in common which is not only seen in its word formation but also in the "sheer impossibility of doing without pictures in the educational process due to our inability to fully perceive ourselves" (2010: 816, transl). Schratz, Schwarz and Kiper add that "learning [is] understood as formative experience (bildende Erfahrung)" (2014: 51, transl).

In Pragmatics, Brown and Levinson also refer to the self-image of a person as face. The term was taken by Goffman who defines face as "the positive social value a person effectively claims for himself by the line others assume he has taken during a particular contact." (1967: 306). Brown and Levinson, therefore, define face as the public self-image that every member wants to claim for himself" (1987: 321). This line is "a pattern of verbal and nonverbal acts by which he [the participant] expresses his view of the situation and through this his evaluation of the participants, especially himself" (ibid: 306). Once a person "takes on a self-image expressed through face he will be expected to live up to [this line]" (ibid: 307) which is not only challenging per se but also under constant threat with every utterance addressed towards this (self)image.

2.3.2 Our face is at risk with every single utterance

As Watzlawick states, everything verbally or non-verbally conveyed utterance contains meaning: "[y]ou cannot not communicate" – with every remark, we portray something from us and this non-verbal communication is highly important for our communication in general. Not only can every utterance/expression⁹ be decoded in numerous ways by the hearer, but it also can convey various intentions of the speaker. Hence, in pragmatic terms, every utterance, however small, may influence the interlocutors who are expected to live up to the line they have drawn for themselves. Mey agrees as he states that "every engagement in conversation opens up the possibility of losing face" (Mey 205: 75). Thus, the learning environment in the classroom is at risk with every single utterance. Even a non-verbal utterance "can articulate in a faster and more precise way what is meant" than a verbally uttered sentence (Ehlers 2016: 175f). Therefore, "the surest way for a person to prevent threats to his face is to avoid contact" (Goffman 1967: 310). However, getting or remaining distant to others is

⁹ In Pragmatics the smallest meaningful unit is named utterance, in Pedagogy it is called expression.
paradoxically not a good way to secure face-saving, as especially a feeling of connectedness can assure face-saving acts. Independently, shame is conceptualized by Bibby as "emotional response and reaction to other people's criticism" (2002: 705). Especially when being exposed to other people's criticism, our identity is placed on our physical appearance and also portrayed through our physical reactions. In conclusion, the interlocutors are in a dilemma of the benefits and risks of exposing themselves.

The aspect of the fragile self-image is also discussed in a variety of fields. Engel, from the Munich Institute of Communication Therapy, analyzes the issue from a linguistic point of view and states that scornful utterances (verachtende Aussagen) can "break the image" (Bild) which we have from the other person. In the field of psychology, Hengstenberg agrees: "[t]he security, that the utterance is well-intended and that I am valued as a person besides all arguments, gets destroyed. Instead, the feeling of being deceived emerges." (Hengstenberg 2016: 34) To not attack someone's face, the speaker's own desires should be known and formulated in first-person I (Ich-Botschaft), for instance, "I feel hurt because I have not managed to do the task correctly" and not in the second-person you (ibid: 34). Gottman warns couples in his counseling from using one of the four strategies. First: Overgeneralization in critique as it leads to a global attack on the partner's personality and is articulated using "You always/never ...", for instance. Second: Using stubborn defense or defense through justification. Third: Contempt of the partner. Fourth: Applying stonewalling to establish a metaphorical wall or leave which only makes the other feel abandoned and rejected. All of the aforementioned four points overlap with threatening the other interlocutor's face. In addition, it is interesting that by "telling the other what is valued on his character" is simply appreciating and praising the positive face. (ibid 43). Although this is just a brief example on different approaches, one can see that the face work which is described by Goffman, Brown and Levinson play an important role not only in Pragmatics but also in advisories for daily communication.

In Pragmatics, Penelope Bown and Stephen Levinson created a concept in sociolinguistics that "is concerned with the actions people perform to maintain their face and that of the other people who they are interacting with" (Trudgill 2003: 92). Brown and Levinson refer to the self-image of a person as face. The noun derives from "the English folk term, [which] ties face up with notions of being embarrassed or humiliated, or 'losing face'. Thus, face is something that is emotionally invested, and
that can be lost, maintained, or enhanced, and must be constantly attended to in
interaction." (ibid 1987: 321f) The term was utilized by Goffman who defines face as
"the positive social value a person effectively claims for himself by the line others
assume he has taken during a particular contact." (1967: 306). Brown and Levinson,
therefore, define face as the public self-image that every member wants to claim for
himself" (1987: 321). When people then "make a face" in the meaning of "produc[ing] a
facial expression that shows dislike or some negative emotion, or [...] to be amusing"
(Oxford Dictionary: web), this public-self image of him- or herself is affected. This
reference to the "outward appearance" is also addressed by the idiom "to put a good
face on it" (Merriam-Webster: web).

The theories about face(-work) by Goffman, Brown and Levinson are often
discussed under the umbrella term (im)politeness30. Politeness is "a deeper phenomenon,
something that human communicators would find it hard to do without". (Leech 2014:
ix) In contemporary English, the term polite "often conveys the idea of superficial good
manners purely as a manner of form. If we say 'She was (just) being polite', we imply
that her polite behavior was superficial, perhaps even insincere. Likewise, the
expression 'polite applause' will almost certainly convey the impression that the
appreciation was not heartfelt." (Leech 2014: 7) However, the choice of terminology is
secondary on the characterization of the phenomenon being studied in this paper,
therefore the term will not be changed and the original terms of the politeness theory
will be used.

Politeness "can manifest itself in repetitive behavior, which is to a lesser or
greater degree ritualized" (Leech 2014: 7). An example is the ritual of applauding when
an artist leaves the stage: "the audience, by continuing to applaud without any
diminution, signals that it is not willing to let the soloist vanish from the scene like that.
Hence, when the applause continues and the soloist at last returns on the stage,
[he/]she enacts a ritual of yielding to the pressure of the audience. This may be

30 While an "enormous amount of recent research and publications has been undertaken in the general
area of cross-cultural Pragmatics — analyzing politeness from the point of view of contrasts and
similarities across languages and cultures" (Leech 2014: xii), this paper will not attempt a cross-cultural
approach. Instead, it will focus on experiences recorded in vignettes in Europe and North America
without highlighting cultural differences. Besides, it is implied throughout this paper that "underneath
their differences in culture, people everywhere are the same" (Goffman 1967: 319). Brown and Levinson,
"are assuming that the mutual knowledge of members' public self-image or face, and the social necessity
to orient oneself to it in interaction, are universal (Brown and and Levinson 1987: 322)
repeated a number of times before the audience feels it has 'given back enough value' to the performer and [his/]her performance." (Leech 2014: 7).

Other examples from personal human interaction are the ritual of repeated invitations and refusals, as in this example:
Stage (1): A invites B -------> B declines the invitation
Stage (2): A re-invites B -------> B declines again
Stage (3): A re-re-invites B --> B finally accepts." (Leech 2014: 7)

While the ritualized refusal occurs in many cultures, it may not only be about diminishing perceptions of excessive pride, but also a face-saving strategy to avoid negative emotions due to declining the invitation. Another possibility is a situation where time has passed between the different stages and that person B has realized that attending the event might be better than, for instance, staying at home. Or maybe someone else increased his interest, like the invitation of a person C who is attractive to person B. According to a method for cooperative conduct of negotiations developed in the 1980s at Harvard, the common aim should be to find solutions that trigger the most win-win situations (Portner 2016: 79). Thus, accepting the third time might be a win-win situation or an attempt to avoid shame. In this scenario, more information would be needed about the context but this example nevertheless shows, how complex the analysis can be. When the communication goes hostile, however, every single party simply attempts to get the biggest piece of the cake as "[t]he other is the enemy [therefore] [h]e should be defeated[,] [n]o matter how they feel" (Portner 2016: 79).

Part of the politeness theory are the aspects of perception and (self)image that were already mentioned on the previous pages of this paper. As face is seen as the (self)image which holds true by the line oneself establishes or others refer to, these (self)images are constantly tested. Once a person "takes on a self-image expressed through face he will be expected to live up to it." Depending on the society, this person will "be required to show self-respect, abjuring certain actions because they are above or beneath him". Just as he is expected to portray 'self-respect', so also is he expected to go to certain lengths to save the feelings and the face of others present, and he is expected to do this willingly and spontaneously because of emotional identification with the others and with their feelings. In consequence, he is disinclined to witness the defacement of others. The person who can witness another's humiliation and unfeelingly retain a cool countenance himself is said in our society to be "heartless", just as he who can unfeelingly participate in his own defacement is thought to be
"shameless". (Goffman 1967b: 308) To avoid hostile verbal and non-verbal articulations to threaten face and maybe cause shame, it is helpful for teachers to know more about face work that can affect the interlocutor’s physical and "symbolic face" in their “everyday interactions” (1987; quoted by Goldsmith 2007, 220) and is therefore highly valuable for the learning environment in a classroom.

2.3.3 We can lose a positive and a negative face

Preserving and defending someone’s face is only indirectly referenced in the literary research in Pedagogy only indirectly when discussing shame. Ruhloff, for instance, claims that the type of shame which is relevant in the pedagogical field is the feeling which is "caused by the examined person realizing that he fails to accomplish a reasonable synthesis" (2009: 54). If a student does not answer the teacher's question in accordance with the opinion of the teacher, the student does not hold up to his self-image and negative face of being a good student. As a result, self-defense through blaming others might follow: no time to study, it was not explained well enough by the teacher beforehand, the dog ate the handout, etc. For the student, the feeling of shame might be felt as rooted in failure and more understanding about face work might broaden the student's horizon about his or her own feelings and the learning process. In addition, enriching the teacher's knowledge about the dynamics of face work might increase the awareness of in-class communication tremendously as well.

In Pragmatics, Brown and Levinson categorize two different types of faces that can be threatened, such as "[a]cting cooperatively, people try to build up their interlocutors' positive faces while trying to avoid posting threats to their negative faces." In this regard, the negative face is defined as the interlocutors "desire for autonomy" which can be threatened by "undermining or failing to show respect for the degree of autonomy that is appropriate to [the interlocutor's] identity" (1987; quoted by Goldsmith 2007, 220-222). It is "the basic claim to territories, personal preserves" (Brown and Levinson 1987: 321) and "stresses a person's immunity from outside interference" (Mey 2005: 74) as it "has to do with maintaining one's freedom of actions and freedom of imposition by others" (Trudgill 2003: 92f). Considering again that we treat face as a "basic want every member knows what every other member desires, and which, in general, is in the interests of every member to partially satisfy", negative face
is the "want of every 'competent adult member' that his actions be unimpeded by others" (Brown and Levinson 1987: 322). The aspects of the negative face are also recognized in Psychology: Larsson points out that, after a quarrel, it is often realized that the reason for the dispute was rooted in "autonomy, participation in decision-making, care and mutual respect" (2012: 9, translated). This is not surprising as Brown and Levinson state that the negative face is known as what one usually understands with politeness, "[b]ut positive face, and its derivative forms of positive politeness, are less obvious." (Ibid: 322).

Positive face is "the positive consistent self-image or 'personality' (crucially including the desire that this self-image is appreciated and approved of) claimed by interactants" (1987: 321, brackets in original) due to the "desire for [the] approval of identity" which can be threatened by "undermining or failing to accept the identity being enacted" (Brown and Levinson, 1987; quoted by Goldsmith 2007, 220-222). The positive face, therefore, "has to do with presenting a good image of oneself and securing the approval of others" (Trudgill 2003: 92) and it even "includes the desire to be ratified, understood, approved of, liked or admired. [To fulfill this desire, one] requires of other interactants" (Ibid: 322). And these interactants, we call them interlocutors in this paper, share the basic concepts of face work considering that protecting face is a basic want. Proceeding from every interlocutor knowing about this want, it is in the general interest to protect face.

2.4 Why everyone in the classroom matters

2.4.1 Facial recognition (Gesichts(an)erkennung)

The insight into face work in Pragmatics partly overlaps with recognitions in Pedagogy. For instance, Pedagogy refers to us as social belongings, and the relation with others "cannot be without recognition (Anerkennung)" (Meyer-Drawe 1984: 19, transl by. H.). Several other scientists agree that "[r]ecognition is an anthropological basic need" (Honneth 1992, 1997, 2000; Straub 1999; Taylor 1993; Todorov 1996, quoted in Micus-Loos 2012: 303, transl). "Everyone needs recognition of the other, or it will hurt and 'dehumanize'" (Straub 1999, 73 quoted by Micus-Loos 2012: 320). Our social belonging, and our need for this belonging has an effect on and is affected by the
phenomena of shame. Thøgersen refers to Merleau-Ponty about "the philosophical tradition of phenomenology [which] can provide a source for reflections on emotionality which can disclose this kind of emotional atmosphere, that is constantly there – more or less articulated – and is part of determining our experience and expression, our relations with others" (2014: 20) - the "social atmosphere" of life (Merleau-Ponty 1966: 417).

In the classroom, the interlocutors should be aware of the significance of recognition, as we learn from others and are constructed through their eyes. Butler addresses recognition asking: "Who am I without you?" (2005: 39, transl) and comes to the conclusion that "[o]nly through persevering alterity, one perseveres his/her 'own' self" – another paradox which includes us "being admissible (anerkennbar)" at the same time as "questioning the norms through which we become admissible" (ibid:64). Ricken expands Buttlar's thought to a "double movement of submission and transgression" (Doppelbewegung von Unterwerfung und Überschreitung, 2009: 86, transl).

Within the context of school education, in particular, recognition is of great importance to the development of identity and self-confidence. Recognition of the other constitutes a special challenge in institutionalized educational relations because, on the one hand, the structures of these relations are asymmetrical and, on the other, the focus ought to be not only on an interpersonal event but, rather, it always has to include the reflection of the world as the other. (Micus-Loos 2012: 320)

At school, the interlocutors are in a special role as "pedagogical acting in its basic form is an act based on recognition (Anerkennungshandeln)" (Butler 2005: 87). Tomasello adds that "every act of pointing as a means of addressing others to something specifically other can be seen as an act based on recognition", and that this act of pointing is "an act of common attention towards something" (2006: 84 quoted in Ricken 2009: 88, transl). In the pedagogical triangle the what and why might therefore be as crucial as the how. "Thinking pedagogically would mean then, to understand oneself as requirement of others and their possible development" (Riecken 2009: 88-90). Kaete Meyer-Drawe also discusses the how and what as she sees the "essential question of teaching [in] how one can teach something to someone" (2012: 29). Biesta agrees, emphasizing that "learning is always learning of something from someone" (Biesta, 2009, 2012; Meyer-Drawe, 2008, 2015 cited in Vasileios and Schwarz 2016: 40). In the educational setting examined in this paper, the "from someone" refers to the teacher in the classroom. The teacher's point of view is even more complex (several of these rings overlap as there are multiple students, diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds, the curriculum, the teaching
environment, the teacher's own personal feelings, health, experiences etc.) In their publication, Schratz and Walker discuss "the need critically to reinstate subjectivity in the face of a decline in confidence in objectivity, the individuality of individual and society and the socially constructed nature of perception, self and action." (1995: 168f). To support their argumentation, the following illustration shows how consciousness and unconsciousness play a part in perceiving others.

Illustration 4: The socially constructed nature of perception
(Legewie and Ehlers 1972: 78 quoted in Schratz and Walker 1995: 171)

According to the Illustration by Legewie and Ehlers, certain aspects are more consciously perceived than others. In terms of face-saving and face-threatening acts, the perception of competence and identity might be critical as they correlate with the self-image of the person being observed and the person who is the observer. In terms of face-saving and face-threatening acts, the unconscious aspects, which are not seen or thought of at first glance, might be even more influential to the interlocutors' self-image. For instance, the perception of identity might be critical, as it correlates with the self-image of the person being observed and the person who is the observer. In the classroom, competence might often and obviously seen as key to protecting face, however when perceiving one speaker's competence, the listener might not take the speaker's beliefs and values into consideration. The speaker's beliefs and values, however, might hinder him/her to utter certain things which would prove his competence.
Shane and Lynd also address social aspects of recognition in their pedagogical work: Shane states that "[a]mong the emotional concomitants of shame discussed in the literature are 1) shock, 2) the fear of abandonment, and 3) feelings of isolation" (1980: 349). Lynd adds that "the experience of shame is itself isolating, alienating, and incommunicable" (1958: 67). Thus, independently from each other, Shane and Lynd indirectly mention partly similar aspects that are recognized in face work by Goffman and other pragmatists. Hence, the interlocutor's influence on the experience of face loss should be discussed as interlocutors increase or decrease shame as they save or threaten face.

But who are the interlocutors? For general communication, Johnstone labels the two roles as "speaker" and "passive decoders of the message". If the latter misunderstood the speaker, they have "not accurately reconstruct[ed] the speaker's intended meaning". In addition, "other participants are also always involved in shaping discourse". In Johnstone's definitions one might find an interdependency (Wechselwirkung) as not only the participants shape the interaction but also the "discourse shapes [the] participants". (2004: 129) The roles of speaker and hearer do not only change so rapidly but actually happen simultaneously, as the person who is listening also simultaneously reacts to the message in verbal or non-verbal communication. As this paper recognizes non-verbal utterances as an important part of the communication between the interlocutors and an important aspect for the perception of the other interlocutors, the terms listener and speaker are only used for specific situations to improve the reader friendliness. Otherwise, they will be referred to as interlocutors and the person in the spotlight.

There is no show without an audience. The audience in a classroom is/are teacher(s) and students, "divided into subgroups [...] with different social status [...] or political power" (Johnstone 2004: 130). "Thinking about power and community gives us a macroscopic view of how discourse participants both shape and are shaped by what goes on in discourse." Moreover, "interactants create and signal relationships with the propositions they give voice to and the people they interact with" (Johnstone 2004: 137). In the classroom, this means that '[t]eachers only exist because there are students, and vice versa. People create roles for one another and reinforce the difference between roles as they speak in ways their roles require" (Johnstone 2004: 141). For teachers, their role should ideally serve the students' and the teacher's own learning process, directly
or indirectly. The authority of the teacher's role might, for instance, creates a learning environment of respect and, therefore, influences the students' learning indirectly. Habermas recognizes fundamental basics of every-day interactions of human cooperation in communicative interaction. This cooperation functions due to the acceptance of "validity claims" (Geltungsansprüchen) and rules - a fundamental part of communication (1981, cited in Arelli 2002, 13f). These validity claims might remind pragmatists of the common ground in the interlocutors of a conversation. Even if the teacher's intentions were good, his/her communication within his role as a teacher could also influence the students' learning negatively. One of the many examples is when learning is hindered by shame, resulting in betrayed trust through face threatening. "Via the ways they talk and the ways they categorize their audiences, speakers assign roles or 'positions'' (Davies and Harre 1990: 34) to other participants; and via their interpretations and reactions, "audiences construct speakers" (Johnstone 2004: 142). "One of the many ways in which social identities and discourse roles can be indexed is via forms of address" (ibid: 140). In the discussed classroom settings, the students are addressed by their first name whilst the teachers are addressed by last name and title. "When people's roles vis-a-vis one another change, this can be indexed by shifts in how they address one another. [...] Every time a form of address is used, it helps create, change, or reaffirm a social relationship, in addition to indexing a set of conventional expectations." Therefore, the "title-plus-last-name formula [...] can be more or less conventional, but is always a potential signal of how the student imagines his or her relationship with the professor" (ibid: 141).

Another interesting aspect is the student's peer group(s). The latter is "a group of people that a person associates with and identifies with" (Trudgill 2003: 101). Trudgill further clarifies that many of the peer groups studied by sociolinguists "consist of teenage gangs or friendship groups, but any peer group to which speakers belong will be of importance for their linguistic behaviour, as discussed in sociolinguistic theories concerning acts of identity and social networks." (ibid: 101) As identity is related to the self-image that is protected by saving face, the peer group's line (Goffman, 1967: 306) may be understood by them or even be (partly) similar; thus, the peer group might in general know quite well how to save or threaten face, so this common ground has been established and would most likely not need clarification of when acts might become face-threatening and therefore emotions of shame might be caused.
As the classroom especially includes peers, the chance for experiencing face threats which cause shame might be high. The characteristics of shame that are, above others, acknowledged in Pedagogy might be fostered by the peer group. For instance, the previously discussed two characteristics of shame addressed by Shane: "the fear of abandonment" and "the feelings of isolation" (1980: 349, see previous beginning of this chapter), and "the experience of isolating [and] alienating" mentioned by Lynd (1958: 67). To avoid face threatening, one possibility of saving the self-image is poise, which is discussed in Pragmatics: Goffman states that face-work counteracts face-threatening utterances and that "poise is one important type of face-work, for through poise the person controls his embarrassment and hence the embarrassment that he and others might have over his embarrassment." (1963: 309) Furthermore, Larsson points out how closely shame, guilt and anger are interconnected and that these feelings are strongly linked to our judgements about what is right and wrong, what is appropriate and inappropriate (2012: 10f, highlights in original). In conclusion, to maintain someone's face in front of the audience seems to be a longing that is especially present in the classroom as peers are the interlocutors.

Obviously, the impact of the audience is not only recognized in Pedagogy and Pragmatics which is demonstrated by the following quotes. The prize-winning author Frances de Pontes Peebles remarks that "Fame is longing. Not yours, but the audience’s. A star is nothing more, nothing less, than the public face of private desire.” (web). To add the pragmatic lense, one could interpret that the audience is seeing their own desire fulfilled in the action of the person in the spotlight. Therefore, they might want to save the presenter's face as they identify with him or her or might want to threaten his or her face if it turns into jealousy. Interestingly, it is less likely that the interlocutors long to threaten someone's face but rather long for keeping the face safe or re-establishing the face. An explanation can be found in Grice's cooperative principle and other theories, discussed in detail in chapter 2.4.3. Werry and O’Gorman discuss "shame in the pedagogical process" on the "basis of both schooling and performance" (2007: 213). The pedagogues find that staged performances offer resources for analyzing shame as "dwelling on/in painful as well as joyful affect is the project and reward of art, and theatrical performance in particular is an extended, embodied, reflexive experiment in the making and unmaking of selves in the medium of affect" (Werry and O’Gorman 2007: 228).
Goffman also compares the theatre's stage with performances in real life as "[t]hose who conduct face to face interaction on a theatre's stage must meet the key requirement of real situations; they must expressively sustain a definition of the situation: but this they do in circumstances that have facilitated their developing of an apt terminology for the interactional tasks that all of us share." (1959: 255) However, "unlike ordinary life, nothing real or actual can happen to the performed characters" (ibid: 254). This argument of Goffman does not include that the performed characters depend on the performing actors, and the self-image, which the actors wear, depends on the attributes of the characters which are presented. Instead, actors on the stage of a theater might be protected through pretending to be the character and, therefore, potential face threats do not have to be taken personally as they might address the character played. However, there might be many more challenges involved. The idioms "to slip into a role", "to slip into one's clothes", "to put oneself in somebody's shoes" etc. all visualize how much empathy for and knowledge about the performed character is needed. Therefore, actors might even take the critique or face-threats which are acted on stage on a personal level. In addition, the audience might as well struggle with not dividing the acted and acting person into two separate people. This might be the reason why some actors are typecast, for instance always playing the villain, or even one specific character, for instance Romy Schneider, who did countless productions but struggled to get rid of the Sissy-image due to the four Sissy sequels in which she starred (Seydel: 124f). Moreover, an actor could simply take criticism personally, although the criticism is directed at the character's weakness, not the actor's weakness. Also, not only does the closeness between actor and character have a determining influence on face-saving, but also the closeness between actor and audience. The singer and actress Laura Branigan even claims, that "[w]hen you're on stage, the audience becomes your other half" (web). The significance of the audience is also stated in the following quote:

All the world's a stage
And all the men and women merely players;
They have their exits and their entrances;
(William Shakespeare in As You Like It)
Analyzing this citation of Shakespeare with the Pragmatic lense, several propositions are revealed of which two of them are discussed in detail: First, we are all observed by others, we are all on stage and, thus, we "cannot not communicate" (Watzlawick) and should be aware that every utterance, even the smallest non-verbal one, might influence us and/or an other interlocutor. Second, we are all playing a role, including our role as an audience. To sum up, there are two conclusions. First, every utterance is a potential face threat and we should be aware that we therewith influence our and the other interlocutors' faces simultaneously. Second, we are all playing a vital role in being part of the audience. The teacher should be aware that the audience is just as important as the student who is in the spotlight. For instance, when a student presents a book or answers the teacher's question in front of the class, the behavior and the mindset of the students listening and/or watching is influencing the face of the student in the spotlight profoundly. Hence, shame is social because face is social — but face has even more characteristics.

2.4.2 Face is social, public, situated and claimed

The social aspect of face was also declared by the pragmatists Brown and Levinson, as they summarize five characteristics of face: social, public, situated and claimed. Face is an "image or identity" influenced by "social attributes; therefore, face is social: Goffman agrees with this social aspect and further defines face as "the positive social value a person effectively claims for himself [or herself] by the line others assume he [or she] has taken during a particular contact". Therefore, it is important how well one interlocutor plays his role. This shows that face work "involves the actions of all the participants [for instance all the students and their teacher] and not just the [one] individual, whose face we are considering"; in conclusion, face is public. When the teacher's behavior challenges his role, he is in danger of losing face as face depends on the identity one has adopted: "Losing or saving face has to do with our ability to stay in character and behave in a way that fits expectations for our role." As a result, face is situated and therefore connected to our "ability to play roles". We claim face "when we enact the characteristics that go along with some line in interaction and when others act toward us in ways that sustain that image", therefore, face is claimed as well. (quoted in Goldsmith 2007: 220)
Independent from this theory, Jacquet conducted literary research and several experiments, and she found out that there are much more stress hormones released and shame expressed through the body when the participants of experiments are observed by others. She comes to the conclusion that "guilt is a private emotion and shame is a public emotion"; and even when guilt and shame are not easy to distinguish, both have public aspects as "what makes us feel guilty is still communicated through our community" (2015, chapter 2, 10:31 min left). The following experiment provides more evidence:

At the University of Los Angeles, students were given the task of holding a 5-minute speech while completing an arithmetic test while annoying music played. A loud alarm went off if the students did not answer in time. Some students completed the task alone, others in front of two stony-faced peers. Subjects were asked afterward, how they felt themselves while their cortisol was also tested afterwards. Compared to the students who performed alone, the students who performed in front of their peers showed more anxiety and had twice as much cortisol in their bloodstream. (2015: chapter 2, min. 9:29)

As a conclusion, Jaquet agrees that "the audience is crucial to the effect of shaming" (Jaquet 2015: chapter 6: min 5:05) Hence, shame was not only caused by being seen but also increased negative feelings and the stress level of the person who had to fulfill the task. This student wanted to protect his face and "sustain [the] image" (Brown and Levinson, 1987; quoted by Goldsmith 2007, 220) of the person he wants to represent in front of others. Jacquet distinguishes between embarrassment and shame. For shame, the "incidents were more public and more serious than those of embarrassment". Shame is felt when being watched by others and compared to others; therefore, with both, embarrassment and shame, "someone is watching but in the case of shame being seen matters more." (2015: chapter 2, min. 2:20) Jacquet provides more examples:

You might feel embarrassed for disregarding a norm of convention, not rightfully dressed for an event or if someone sees you with toilet paper stuck to your shoe, but you feel ashamed for something like cheating on an exam because you have failed according to a more visible standard. (Jaquet 2015: chapter 2, min. 2:39)

As a result, "[e]mbarrassment is more easily forgotten as it is linked to an isolated event, while shame, linked to one's identity, has staying power" (Jaquet 2015: chapter 2, min. 2:28). Thus, Jaquet indirectly refers to the picture of one's identity that needs to be protected in order to maintain the face. Goffman also discusses the coherence between "group alignment and ego identity" at length in his publication about stigma. He states that both types of identity, the group and the ego, "can be better understood by bracketing them together and contrasting them to what Erikson and others have called
"ego" or "felt" identity, namely the subjective sense of his own situation and his own continuity and character that an individual comes to obtain as a result of his various social experiences" (1963a: 105). According to Goffman, social and personal identity are thus intertwined, whereas the "ego identity is, first of all, a subjective, reflective matter that necessarily must be felt by the individual whose identity is at issue (ibid: 106). In conclusion, if a task seems too difficult for the student, it might indirectly spark a thought process that goes deeper than the level of difficulty of the task. The student might be dubious about his own identity and reflect on his ego identity and even recreate the image of himself. "[T]he individual constructs his image of himself out of the same materials from which others first construct a social and personal identification of him" (ibid: 106) and thus this picture might be under constant construction and in need of protection and defense.

If one of the interlocutors' roles is questioned straight away, not only their face but also the learning environment is threatened. Especially in learning situations, teachers and students "have to enact things to avoid threatening [face]"; thus, the "cooperative motivation to honor face" is of significant importance as this provides a "basis for [the] unspoken social contract [...]": I'll save your face and you save mine. Because face is social and public, you can’t maintain it by yourself — you have to have the cooperation of others" (ibid: 221). The awareness of these attitudes of shame help with creating a common ground for meta discussions in student counseling situations after, for instance, a bullying situation amongst students. Being aware of the significance of the audience might make a big difference when a teacher wants to increase a safer learning environment with less shame due to face loss and more trust and common cooperation to honor face.

2.4.3 Cooperative articulations to honor face

Considering how influential face-threatening acts are, one can see the need to avoid the disruptions in learning and the hostile emotions in the classroom. To actively prevent face threats, one needs to cooperate — and assume each other's cooperation — to maintain face in interactions. Fortunately, cooperative articulations to honour face are, in general, the case: everyone's face depends on everyone else's being maintained and people can be expected to defend their faces if threatened; thus, it is, in general, in
every participant's best interest to maintain each other's face (Brown and Levinson 1987: 322). Blakemore agrees: although "different people are interested in communication for different reasons, speakers and hearers attempt to save face" (1992: 3). It even is "the basis for communicative behavior" (Mey 2005: 74) as "[c]ommunication [...] requires people to cooperate" (ibid: 71). The British philosopher and linguist Paul Grice argues that "participants in a conversation normally cooperate with each other in order to produce a successful conversation, and that it is, therefore, legitimate for any participant to assume that any other participant is being cooperative." Every breach of this role is also a breach of this mutual agreement. In this regard, the established line is also essential:

Goffman claims that "the line taken by each participant is usually allowed to prevail, and each participant is allowed to carry off the role he appears to have chosen for himself. A state where everyone temporarily accepts everyone else's line is established. This kind of mutual acceptance seems to be a basic structural feature of interaction, especially the interaction of face-to-face talk. It is typically a "working" acceptance, not a "real" one since it tends to be based not on [the] agreement of candidly expressed heart-felt evaluations, but upon a willingness to give temporary lip service to judgments with which the participants do not really agree. (1967: 308)

This "working" acceptance also frames the learning environment and makes it safer to engage in trial and error. Even though a mutual agreement on face-saving might be established naturally, knowing and discussing this agreement with the students might help enormously, as Brown earlier suggested: "[w]e have to talk about shame" (2012: 10.12). In the setting of a classroom, "[p]edagogical actions include chances and risks which constantly have to be evaluated again as they, as well as their impact depend on the situation, the energetic state and contextual conditions" (Schwarz 2017: 26). Talking about this agreement would prevent "interruption of pedagogical processes" (Ricken, Roehr, Ruhloff and Schaller 2009: 54) in which the student can fully focus on learning. Moreover, it would "create a safe and supportive learning environment" (Anderson 2016: 26); especially since "students need to feel safe enough to take risks" as the student's "zone of proximal development is a place of emotional vulnerability”(ibid: 30-31). Brown even says that vulnerability is the "birthplace of creativity, innovation and change" (2012: 05.40). Thus, it might be that students are more willing to accept challenges outside of their comfort zone if they know that the classroom is a place where they can make mistakes and fail to then grow from the learning experience (Anderson 2016: 30-31) without being intimidated by shame due to face loss.
To round up with an example in a classroom, let us take a look at an urban school district in Eastern Iowa where Pratt found that collaborative teaching is especially challenging. One teacher (T1) enters another teacher’s (T2) “territory” where T2 has his own “routines and structures”. As discussed earlier, the classroom is a place where students can feel safe to take risks and fail in order to learn from their mistakes, but not too safe to allow for daydreaming or distracting others. The latter was a major factor of dissatisfaction of Thelma (T1). She claimed that she and her co-teacher (T2) did not share the same classroom management attitudes: To her, the students seemed constantly off-task which hindered the learning process and upset her; however, T2 was not only more relaxed about attention but also more experienced in age and years of teaching. In conclusion, T1 desired for approval of her identity as a valuable and competent teacher, therefore she longed for the honor of her positive face. Moreover, the disrespect from T2, who made her feel like she was “only in [her] first year of teaching” threatened her negative face as she desired appropriate autonomy where both are sharing a “parity of roles” (a need that was reflected in two more interviews by Pratt). Therefore, parity of roles indicates not only that “both teachers feel fulfilled and respected”, but also the faces of the teachers in collaboration are being respected and, therefore, their face saved.

It makes a big difference if interlocutors cooperate and thus save their own and the other interlocutor’s faces or if they threaten faces; hence, the interlocutor’s behavior can have a significant influence on the vulnerable image of the person in the spotlight and to which extent face is threatened or saved. In this regard, the recognition of the person in the spotlight and how they are perceived by the audience depends on the audience as well and especially in the setting of a classroom. According to Hengstenberg, listening is the most important skill in communication in general (2016: 34), and no matter if it is the teacher, the best friend, the peer group, the whole cohort etc. — listening will increase the recognition, conscious and unconscious perception and the attention towards the person in the spotlight. Listening will increase the knowledge about the other interlocutors, including the speaker, as discussed earlier. The more information one has about the other person’s (self)image, the more possibilities are available on how to save face. In addition, more information causes more empathy and thus more motivation to perform face-saving acts. To demonstrate
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the significance of listening, the following paragraphs will provide another look outside of the box of Pragmatics and Pedagogy. As this paper deals with lived experiences of children, the next pages will start with recommendations by counselors and then continue with the same thoughts which are revisited and echoed in children's literature. Although it might seem that children's literature is leading the discussion off topic, it actually leads deeper into the psychological and philosophical aspect of the discussion. Furthermore, it provides evidence of the general importance of the topics discussed in this chapter.

"It is a special skill to be able to talk to children in a way that they are listening, and to listen to them in a way that they are talking." (Gatterburg and Pieper 2016: 10, transl) The developmental psychologist and psychotherapist Heueck-Mauss states that listening is essential for good communication and recommends active listening in the communication with children: "It is vital that children experience to be listened to in an open way. Instead of immediately offering our opinion, interpretation and judgment" we should "first of all listen and pay attention to bodily and facial movements" (cited in Weingarten 2016: 96, transl). Moreover, she addresses perception as she recommends that we "activate all our perceptual senses – seeing, listening, feeling and thinking – and open ourselves for what the child has to say" (ibid: 96). Heueck-Mauss also highlights the importance of intuition and calls it "listening with the third ear" which can read what is between the lines spoken by the opponent we are facing; to her, guessing the emotions of the child and verbalizing them is the key for the child to narrate what has happened (ibid: 96, emphasis in original).

What the third ear is for Heueck-Mauss might be the heart for Antoine de Saint-Exupéry. Both visualize the abstract skill of listening in concrete body parts for better understanding of their readers. Antoine de Saint-Exupéry, French author and pilot, has published one of the most famous works of fiction — The little Prince. In this philosophical piece, the fox reveals to the little prince his "secret", a "very simple" secret: "we see best with our heart. The things that really matter are invisible to the eye". (2016: 136). While this line might have inspired numerous interpretations, to me it meant that someone has to listen with all his senses and truly care about the other person. Another fictional novel that is very well known in literature is Michael Ende's Momo. Similar to The Little Prince, it paints extraordinary characters and discusses philosophical issues in a language easy to grasp for their readers — if they read careful
enough to understand what is hidden between the lines. The protagonist Momo has become a vital part of the community thanks to her recognition, perception and attention to others. The following extract should allow the reader of this paper to dive into the plot and the description of the character Momo.

[Momo] became so important to them that they wondered how they had ever managed without her in the past. And the longer she stayed with them, the more indispensable she became - so indispensable, in fact, that their one fear was that she might someday move on. The result was that Momo received a stream of visitors. She was almost always to be seen with someone sitting beside her, talking earnestly, and those who needed her but couldn't come themselves would send for her instead. As for those who needed her but hadn't yet realized it, the others used to tell them, "Why not go and see Momo?" [...] Was Momo so incredibly bright that she always gave good advice, or found the right words to console people in need of consolation, or delivered fair and far-sighted opinions on their problems? [...] No, what Momo was better at than anyone else was listening. Anyone can listen, you may say — what's so special about that? — but you'd be wrong. Very few people know how to listen properly, and Momo's way of listening was quite unique. She listened in a way that made slow-witted people have flashes of inspiration. It wasn't that she actually said anything or asked questions that put such ideas into their heads. She simply sat there and listened with the utmost attention and sympathy, fixing them with her big, dark eyes, and they suddenly became aware of ideas whose existence they had never suspected. Momo could listen in such a way that worried and indecisive people knew their own minds from one moment to the next, or shy people felt suddenly confident and at ease, or downhearted people felt happy and hopeful. And if someone felt that his life had been an utter failure and that he himself was only one among millions of wholly unimportant people who could be replaced as easily as broken window panes, he would go and pour out his heart to Momo. And, even as he spoke, he would come to realize by some mysterious means that he was absolutely wrong; that there was only one person like himself in the whole world, and that, consequently, he mattered to the world in his own particular way. Such was Momo's talent for listening. (Ende translated by Brownjohn 2011, 9)

When people visited Momo, she would not talk about herself; instead, she was interested in what the visitors had to say about themselves. They were special to her but listening to them made it more clear than expressing it in words. Thanks to her "talent for listening", she found the key not only to her interlocutor's hearts but also to their own recognition and perception by showing honest interest to what they had to say. In more general terms, Momo did not put herself into the spotlight but the speaker and showed him or her that what they had to say was worth listening to with all her attention. Both novels and the other quotes mentioned above show that it is important to experience honest interest in what the person in the spotlight has to say. Moreover, it seems especially important to children in both children's novels The little Prince and Momo portray listening as an important skill. A good conversation needs good listeners or as English essayist William Hazlitt phrased it: "Silence is one great art of conversation" (2015: 1472).
2.5 Experiences of face loss in institutionalized learning

2.5.1 Not only students are ashamed when being tested

The following experiences in this chapter demonstrate how well Pedagogy and Pragmatics enrich each other. Tamara Bibby, the senior lecturer in King's College School of Education, conducted 40 unstructured and semi-structured interviews with primary teachers of inner-city schools in the United Kingdom. The interviewed teachers taught from nursery to year 6 and had a diverse experience, from two to twenty years of teaching. The teachers were asked to talk about their "personal histories with Mathematics", "what it is to be a teacher", "understandings of children learning Maths" etc. Afterward, the teachers were confronted with ten cards with mathematical problems which the teachers had to rank "in [a] perceived order of difficulty". They were asked for reasons of the ranking and to select one that was easy, one from the middle range and the one task which was most difficult and do the calculations. If asked, calculators, paper and pencils were given. (2002: 709f)

   Already in the first part of the interviews, Bibby collected indications of shame when teachers answered questions that regarded, for instance, their own experience with Mathematics. To name some examples: "lack of trust and self-doubt", "a fear of (imagined or real) criticism, ridicule or rejection by others" and "a strong sense that it is important to conform to internal and external expectations" (Ibid 710). Interestingly, these answers might remind the reader of this paper on the internal and external characteristics of shame when the definitions were analyzed. Giddens' claim that the "fear of the other person is important" (1991: 28) comes to mind as our level of shame seems to increase with the other person present. The latter is an indicator of face being social and claimed: the teachers were afraid that their own knowledge about Mathematics was insufficient and therefore they should not claim themselves to be regarded as an expert in this field. One participant mentioned the feeling about being taped: "I don't want anyone to see me doing this. The worrying thing [is] that it's going to be recorded but also doing [calculations] in front of you when I know that my own personal maths is not that brilliant." (Bibby 2002: 712) Through her study, Bibby came to the conclusion that one of the most present threats during the interviews was that the participants "allow[ed] someone to see [their] ineptitude and so open [themselves]
to ridicule" (Ibid: 714) and compares this threat to public humiliation of students in the Mathematics classroom. The following is a childhood memory of one participant:

[The teacher] said 'well, we'll have the maths expert come out now and show us what to do', so he'd seen me so - I wouldn't do that to any child - humiliate them ... but I had to go out and I remember this hush descending on the whole class and me all trembling and me - I must have said I can't do it - you know - I can't do it I don't understand it and - but I thought that was such a cruel thing and I've never forgotten that - what he's said 'the maths expert' you know - so sarcastic. (Ibid: 714)

In the experience, the teacher recalls her own memory and also reflects on her teaching strategies. Her face is threatened by the sarcastic identification of calling her a "maths expert". She does not see herself as such and instead perceives it as public humiliation. From a pragmatic point of view, the way the interviews were set up alone was a threat to the participant's face. They were in danger of losing their positive and negative face and, furthermore, if they refused to take part, this action would also have been a clear statement of insecurity in the field of specialization. In addition, the manner with which utterances are made is also revealing and can lead to more understanding of Pedagogy as well: in the study discussed currently, Bibby has also recognized this possibility when analyzing the statement of another teacher being interviewed: "I just kept thinking that I've got to do things quicker and then when I can't do it quickly, you feel like you can't do it." The change of the personal pronoun from first person to second person suggests "linguistic distancing of self from failure". Bibby further recognizes that such distancing could be problematic as teachers are "professionally obliged to engage with the subject". (2002: 714f) According to Bibby, "self-doubt and the search for reassurance was common in all interviews" and bodily articulations also expressed shame. One teacher, for instance, "made herself small, hunkering down behind the parapet" (Ibid: 711), demonstrated that she was "mentally absconding, shutting off" by doodling on the page (Ibid: 715). All of these are "coping strategy [using] a tactical self-denigration" (Ibid: 711) which are also seen by students in the classroom. This coping strategy can be compared to the face-saving strategies in Pragmatics. Furthermore, self-doubt was described as physically perceived "gut feelings" and "freezing in the face of panic" (Ibid: 712). Strategies for "[c]oping with feelings of shame" include knowing about "the need for distance, the right degree of connectedness, passing and disguise and verbal protection through self-denigration" (Bibby 2002: 714). Some of these aspects are also discussed in Pragmatics as face-saving strategies and will, therefore, be addressed later in this paper in chapter 2.7.3.
2.5.2 Public humiliation: face-threatening in front of the classroom

"The glare of publicity. Attention as punishment" Meyer-Drawe (2013: 55, transl) — public humiliation is brutal and an extreme example of face-threatening. If a student (S1) is publically humiliated by the teacher (T1) in front of the class, S1’s face is threatened. For instance, the utterance in an EAL course could be: “You still make so many mistakes in grammar. Are you stupid?” As face is social, S1’s identity of being a smart student is damaged in a public setting as other classmates are present. If the S1 appears to be the class clown, he might adopt the role given by the teacher and respond in a way a “stupid student” would respond, for instance: “Me stupid not. I speaks English very good and write even weller.”12 His hyperbole is a face-saving strategy as his peers will recognize the sarcasm. S1 has a “desire for approval of identity” (Brown and Levinson, 1987; quoted by Goldsmith 2007, 222.) and as his positive face is threatened, he wants to prove to the teacher that he is not “stupid” but knows very well how to play with grammatical structures in his second language. As the utterance by S1 might fail to show respect for T1, S1 might disrespect and, therefore, threaten T1’s negative face. Through “criticizing the hearer’s face” he saves his own but threatens the teacher’s face. If the student would have admitted to or even “apologized” for his joke, he would increase the threat of his own face; for instance by saying: “You are right, Miss. I am stupid. I am sorry. I will fail anyway and not bother you anymore.” Already as a reader of this paper, you might feel sympathy for S1. A loss of face is often accompanied with an embarrassed feeling — either the recipient feels embarrassed or the audience is sympathizing with the recipient who has lost his/her face. In conclusion, the complexity of communication raises the need for providing information to teachers to save not only their faces but also the positive learning environment for all the interlocutors.

The Interpersonal Behaviour Theory by Schulz von Thun (1958, 1992; quoted by Pratt, 2014, 2) refers to the interlocutor’s interactions and collaborations. Schulz bases his theory on three pillars: “inclusion, control, and openness”. The first pillar “encompasses how people associate with others, establish their identity, communicate whether someone is welcome, and make a commitment to the group”. These factors might address similar aspects than the face work theories by Brown and Levinson, for
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12 This is a situation from my own experience in November 2017 in an international school.
instance, that face is social and correlates with the desire for approval of identity. The second pillar also refers to social aspects as it approaches the “desire for control [which] describes how people balance making decisions, influence each other, and rely on others”; moreover, the “desire for control” could overlap with the “desire for autonomy” in regards to negative face. The latter might also play a role for the third pillar as it claims that “openness considers the level of privacy people desire in sharing thoughts and feelings”. When students become an "object of a disciplinary measure instead of conversational partners", the student who misbehaved is in the other interlocutor's center of attention but at the same time, he is invisible as "his own demands are simply overlooked" (Meyer-Drawe 2013: 57, transl)\(^\text{13}\).

When I, the author of this paper, think about a subject at school which I associate the most with shame, I have to think immediately of Mathematics. I had traumatic experiences in my childhood and remember anecdotes as if it were yesterday: standing in front of my cohort, I had to solve fractions and other mental arithmetics without using a calculator. The thought "I cannot calculate, I'll make a fool out of myself" was overshadowing all motivation in my mind and in a way stopped me from doing the actual calculations per se. Evidently, I failed this task. I thought to have caused my own public humiliation; according to the Mathematics teacher, this was primary Mathematics and I "should be ashamed". And I was terribly ashamed. Similar occasions followed. No matter how well I did when I was alone at home — with the teacher in the room and everyone staring at me, the fear of not being able to solve the equations was blocking me. Until this day, this Mathematical anxiety influences me as the phrase "I cannot calculate, I'll make a fool out of myself", crosses my mind even before I start calculating. This example shows that the public aspect increased my feeling of shame due to the enormous face threat and the pressure of failure blocked my possibility to focus on the task. In addition, every time the teacher called me out to do arithmetics, he might have thought to increase my motivation for studying calculations, but for me, it simply was public humiliation. I blushed, stuttered and felt like an idiot in front of everyone else. The teacher said: "And if I call you in the middle of the night you have to know immediately how much seven times six is." Sometimes, I thought I would have preferred this private call instead of this public humiliation and I did not retain a very positive image of this teacher.

\(^{13}\) This might be the case in vignette 61 analyzed in chapter 2.6.
Other memories of students who are now in their twenties and look at experiences of shame have been captured by Wolfe. In interviews, she asked students how they remember their school life. The 22-year old Anna reflects on the girl's school she has visited as follows.

Anna notes she engaged in school as a 'safe' place and felt that she belonged. Within this perpetual intra-action of becoming a schoolgirl, she regularly encountered feelings of shame, further explained as attachments to appropriate things, as she effectively felt discursive practices shaping her becoming. In this way, shame is performatively attached to things that forcefully direct and refract bodies, and is most productive in pain and inequity. Anna discusses her shameful intra-actions in mathematics class as: 'It didn’t feel very good and it would make me put myself down – but just downplay what I thought of things and I remember like in my mind I had quite a strong like label I guess that there were really smart people and I was just not one of them. [...] In Year 11, I was trying to do maths methods, and it was too hard, but I felt like it was so important that I did it and I was having quite a difficult time outside of school at that point, and the teacher said to me some people can afford to talk in class but you’re not one of them. And so kind of make jokes about – and she was very well meaning I’m sure but it was a bit of a sensitive time so I just hated being in there and just dropped out of that class.' (731f, emphasis added)

Anna starts her recollection of memories in a positive way calling school a "'safe' place and felt that she belonged". However, she ends with dropping out of the Mathematics class as she "hated being in there", and therefore "situates interest and enjoyment at school paradoxically with feelings of shame: 'Feeling of shame was very regular at school, which kind of contradicts a lot of the stuff I’m saying about feeling very safe"", said Anna (2017: 731). Wolfe elaborates the student's response further:

Anna performs the assertions spoken by the assumed 'well-meaning' teacher in this classroom intra-action as fundamental to self and of her own making, The teacher performs an agential cut stating 'you’re not one of them' and Anna adopts the performance. Anna does not hold the teacher responsible but links the cause of this directive to her own inherent lack. She does not reject the naming of herself but reiterates that it was ‘too hard’ and she ‘was having a difficult time’ and ‘dropped out’ as it was too shameful to persist. In her interview, she previously attested to her interest in mathematics but is shamed to the point that she ‘hated being in there’. To feel that one does not belong, to be excluded as not one of the ‘smart people’ in this hated classroom space ‘that didn’t feel very good’ is too much to bear, so Anna drops out. (ibid 732)

This illustrates that shame "arises from a failure to be recognized’ (Biddle, 1997, p. 227) and that comparing herself to other students, Anna struggled to believe in herself and her ability to learn as she felt to be "not one of the ‘smart people’”; thus, she stigmatizes herself. Goffman defines two phases in the learning process of the stigmatized person: "his learning the normal point of view and learning that he is disqualified according to it. Presumably, a next phase consists of his learning to cope with the way others treat
the kind of person he can be shown to be." (1963a: 80)\textsuperscript{14} As her self-image does not conform to the norm of a good-enough student in mathematics, she disqualifies herself and her coping mechanism is to drop out of class to avoid the feeling of shame due to the loss of her face as an interested, good student.

Amy is another participant of the same survey, who recalls a situation in her secondary school education in an English class. In the interview, she was asked if she "experienced either shame or humiliation" at school to which she gave the following answer:

"We were reading a poem and [the teacher] stood me up and she said ‘Do you know what an omnibus is?’ I’m 13 years old and I was like ‘No, I don’t know what an omnibus is.’ She’s like ‘Think about it’ and she just started yelling at me and she was ‘You need to tell me what an omnibus is’, like no, no, no. ‘Are you an idiot? Are you stupid?’ And I was just whoa; I was ‘Fuck you.’ And she was like ‘How dare you.’ She was just really shrill, that woman, but yeah, that public humiliation about being stupid was something that I was always really sensitive about anyway so that, you know, failing. So I just got really angry and screamed at her and got in trouble for that. But I felt like she was never punished; she was never punished for that. It was really unfair.’ (Wolfe 2017: 733, emphasis added)

Despite claiming not to know the answer, the student is forced further into the shameful situation and at its climax named an idiot in front of her classmates. Unlike Anna, Amy attempts to refuse not being good enough as she did not accept the given title of ‘idiot’ by her teacher. Butler and Athanasiou add that the student's expression of defense and anger does not reduce the hurt caused by the teacher’s performative naming and, indeed, makes it worse as it is seen as an assault on the teacher (2013: 110, quoted in Wolfe 2017: 733).

Amy’s attempts to rebuke the title of idiot fails as she ‘got into trouble’. Her attempted transgression of the material-discursive practices fails as both the teacher and the school construct her as unintelligible, as bad, and she is expelled from school. Amy is not displaying as the right sort of schoolgirl where ‘[t]he imperative to produce oneself through resourceful dilemmas relies not just on access to and control of symbolic resources, but also on knowing how [original emphasis] to display one’s subjectivity properly’ (Skeggs, 2005, p. 973), or in other words how to perform correctly as a schoolgirl. (Wolfe 2017: 733f)

According to Amy and her memory, there is a "shadow of injustice" that even affects her non-verbal communication as her "defiant voice falters, the tone vacillates, and she looks down as she again claims it was 'unfair'" (ibid 734). Wolfe concludes that "Amy was affected in a negative way, as much as compliant Anna, reducing her capacity for action to achieve success in the classroom." Both memories portray the experience of

\textsuperscript{14} The aspects of norm and stigma are discussed further in chapter 2.6.2 of this paper.
failure to be a successful student which results in face loss and shame which results in "stultification of the student, and, in Amy’s case, the devastating and long-lasting trauma of expulsion" (ibid 734). Wolfe's paper "highlights how entities in the classroom intra-act and productively constrain and limit bodies in the dis/ability to act, rather than assisting them to flourish". Furthermore, Wolfe concludes that

it is critical to recognize and illuminate ways that pedagogical collective experiences mediate shame in educational outcomes and how these practices become products of material inequality. This recognition may then allow an alternative interaction of positive non-prescriptive growth. (ibid 733)

Especially in extreme examples such as public humiliation, the trust between students and their teacher is severely damaged. Moreover, it damages the trust the learner has in him- or herself, the self-trust. In this regard, applying the pragmatic knowledge of face work will certainly support further investigation in this regard. Another interesting angle might be to look at it from the other perspective: how do teachers feel when they reflect on situations in which they have shamed students?

2.5.3 Feeling ashamed for shaming

The following example is narrated by a teacher of English literature who felt ashamed for shaming:

We are teaching a survey in dramatic literature, ironically enough, on the subject of satire and comedy. [...] As a chaser to a class spent teasing out Genet’s aesthetic strategies in The Blacks: A Clown Show, I play sections from Bamboozled, including the finale an excruciating, elegiac, fugue of images of black humiliation, black clowning, black exploitation from 60 years of film and television. Bamboozled is, of course, a film fundamentally concerned with the politics of theatrical shaming in mass media’s postmodern minstrelsy, revolving around the protagonist’s failed attempt to satirically shame the shameless, his white patrons and audience. Shame tragically rebounds on him: mortified at his unwitting complicity, he attempts suicide.

[S1] one of three students of color in a class of thirty-five, approaches me at break. He tells me that he is discomforted at seeing those images revived, aired, circulated in the context of the class. He knows the film well, but fears that the rest of the class, exposed to only these few minutes of it, might take the images lightly, may not understand the injury that subtends them. What is more, he says, he feels injured and implicated by the symbolic violence of this film. It leaves him shaken.

His not-quite-so-implicit suggestion is that I have been irresponsible. I acknowledge his feelings and express my regret that he feels pained in this way, and then I go on to defend my decision. His classmates had approached the clip with a great deal of sensitivity and seriousness in the discussion, I explain and had been well prepared for it by my framing and by the previous two class sessions leading up to the movie (that [S1] had, in fact, missed). We have a civil discussion about ways I might approach the material in the future, and about the inevitable discomfort, but a necessity, of grappling with such histories.
But as we speak, I feel as if I am standing on shifting sand. I feel pathetic, exposed, fraudulent. Did my pedagogical intentions appear so shallow, so misguided? What I experience is a profound shame - shame that I had unwittingly injured a student who I devoutly wanted to help and inspire, shame that my "gift" of critical wisdom should feel so worthless to him. I realize that it had honestly not occurred to me how viscerally [S1] might have experienced the shame of those images. What I feel is ...

my white body, the place from which I look
the space between my body and the body of my student
a social space, a space of history, a space of power ...

Outed. (Werry and Gorman 2007: 222f, format in original, S1 replaces A)

This example portrays a domino-effect of shaming: by showing sections of a film in class which include humiliation and shaming of African Americans, a student of color feels "injured and implicated by the symbolic violence of this film" (ibid: 222). The student approaches the teacher after the lesson and by sharing his own feelings with the teacher, the teacher feels "profound shame" because of having "unwittingly injured a student a student" by disregarding "how viscerally [the student] might have experienced the shame of those images" (ibid: 223). From a Pragmatics point of view, there is a lot of face work involved. To the student of color, watching others of the same skin color experiencing shame causes an emotional and personal feeling of shame. The shame comes from having a personal, cultural connection to those on the screen and thus it refers to their and his positive face. When the teacher explains that he "goes to defend [his] decision" in front of the student, he also defends his face. More precisely, he might defend his positive face of being a responsible teacher and his negative face of being able to make the right decisions on his own, for instance, while preparing this lesson. In addition, the experience tells a lot about shame. The summary above could be simplified in the following way: watching others experiencing shame, caused shame in a student, who - more or less - indirectly blamed the teacher for his experience of shame, therefore causing the teacher himself to feel shame." or something to this effect. Two conclusions can be drawn:

Firstly, shame is so hostile that even experiencing it second hand causes shame and blaming someone for the experience causes further shame. Thus, the takeaway message for readers of this paper might be, to avoid second-hand experiences of shame, such as screenings. Even though when the film approaches the topic from a critical and satirical point of view, and the teacher has included "two class sessions leading up to the movie", the outcome is more shame. And although the fact that the
student who approached the teacher afterward in the break missed the two lead-up sessions, it leaves the teacher deeply ashamed in the end.

Secondly, however, the section of the film seems to have fulfilled its purpose: the viewers should feel ashamed about what has happened. Hence, shame functioned as a tool to create a viewing experience that does not only narrate what had happened but also provokes deep feelings, it left the student "shaken" and created an everlasting memory in the teacher's life. While one can see the negative side of shame here, this negative side is also the positive side at the same time: shame added relevance; the experience of the characters shown in the film created an experience of the audience: something personal was felt as personal. Moreover, shame helped the student and the teacher to self-reflect and to engage in a one-on-one discussion about an important topic. And both, the student and the teacher, clearly had rich experiences and thus learned a lot. Learning was not hindered by shame, it actually was fostered by it. The teacher still reflects about this experience a long time afterward, and because of the intensity of the feelings experienced, he gained a profound level of self-reflection about his very own dealing with racism. He felt "a social space, a space of history, a space of power" between his "white body" and the colored body of his student; he felt "[o]uted" (ibid: 223). Feeling outed might be something that a student of color lives constantly with and, hence, constantly experiences shame which reminds him that he is "outed". Would this student have been the target audience? Was causing him shame worth it? Did the majority of white students experience similar emotions and learn from it?

Unfortunately, Werry and Gorman do not include neither more information to answer the questions, nor the following actions of the teacher. However, continuing the discussion might be highly beneficial for the students' learning experience if the teacher shared his experience with them. In this imagined scenario, the teacher would present himself as a lifelong learner who is willing to risks threatening his face in front of an audience of students who usually are not included in the process of lesson planning or lesson reflection. Thus, the teacher shows himself as a vulnerable and imperfect person who feels regret and shame. Opening up the discussion in this way requires enormous restraint and a healthy classroom environment. By threatening his own face, however, the learning environment might be tremendously enriched as now the topic of discussion is so personal. In this setting, the students might easily add to the face threat, for instance by agreeing, that the teacher made a
mistake. But, they might also protect the teacher's face. Even more enriching would be, if they reflected on their own feelings, their own identity in the matter of racism and being in an environment of mostly white and three colored students. How did the screening make them feel? If they experienced shame, why? Allowing an environment where students can reflect and share their reflections and feelings might increase their understanding of the topics in the film much more than only watching it from a safe distance without getting emotional.

The teacher's emotions were so strong that he explained to have experienced them as a "space between [his] body and the body of [his] student" and calls this space "social", "a space of history" and "a space of power". According to Schwarz, "[w]hen talking about the effectiveness of teaching and learning experiences, temporal, spatial, bodily and relational dimensions are significant" (Schwarz 2017: 26). While all the dimensions are significant and overlap, we are focusing on the bodily aspect in the following chapter.

2.6 Articulations and consequences of shame due to face loss

2.6.1 Corporeality (Leiblichkeit)

As every utterance could cause a threat to someone's face, the wish to simply avoid communication, at least in certain situations, or to physically hide, is reasonable, especially when every expression bears the potential to be a face threat and therefore causing feelings of shame. Goffman argues that through shame, the "individual understands his own attributes as something harmful and as something he or she would like to eschew" (1963: 16 transl). If the shameful situation cannot be avoided, one might have the feeling of being humiliated, as Shane states: "Shame is the feeling of being exposed and wanting to hide one’s nakedness" (Shane 1980: 348). Werry and O'Gorman elaborate further that shame is "the fear of exposure and judgment, withdrawal, the play of humility and authority, seeing and being seen (reddenning and being read), self-mortification, self-exposure, self-questioning, penance, and abjection." (2007: 217). To stick your head in the sand, therefore, is not only the quickest and most efficient solution to escape this exposure, but also a wish that everyone is familiar with. Who has never wished to just disappear to escape a shameful situation?
Paechter conducted studies in the field of Mathematics, which is "traditionally seen as an unemotional subject"; however, he offers examples in his research that shows how this subject can be "experienced in highly emotional ways" (2001: 53, quoted in Bibby 2002: 705). In these examples, students express articulations which portray anxiety of face loss and shame. They do avoid "volunteering or [are] even refusing to answer questions, reluctan[t] to explain oneself, recours[ing] to monosyllabic replies, and in written work, hiding working" (2001: 53, quoted in Bibby 2002: 708). Through physical articulations like these, shame can be witnessed. Of course, the physical presence of interlocutors plays a vital role in the experience of face loss and also provides the medium for the phenomena of shame to articulate itself, and hence being recognized by others. As we cannot read someone's mind, we can only observe and read the articulations we see in the body of the other interlocutor(s).

Thanks to Husserl, the German term Leiblichkeit became critical in the philosophy of phenomenology in the twentieth century. In English, corporeality might be the most accurate definition. Merleau-Ponty and Meyer-Drawe added valuable nuances (cf. Poeggeler 2009: 69) which are discussed partly in this paper. Before going into further detail about corporeality, the term phenomenology will be explained briefly. "The word phenomenon stems from Greek φαινόμενον (fainómenon) meaning the obvious, that which shows itself, emerges from itself" (Heidegger, 2006, p. 28ff cited in Vasileios and Schwarz 2016: 39). Amongst other definitions, Mattila and Silander see the phenomenon as "[a]n authentic object of observation" which is included in the phenomenon-based learning in Finland's new curriculum (2015 cited in Vasileios and Schwarz 2016: 36). The most interest aspect of this definition is the importance of observation as "[p]henomenon-based learning starts with observation of a phenomenon from different points of view" (ibid: 36). This focus on student observation portrays the relevance of experiencing and perceiving. According to Meyer-Drawe, "a phenomenological perspective on learning would use the complexity as a starting point" (2008 cited in Vasileios and Schwarz 2016: 39).

Phenomenological conceptions of learning emphasize making experiences, which is different from constructing knowledge. It gives credit to an element of uncertainty and the belief that neither teaching, nor learning can be fully instructed, and that the former does not necessarily result in the latter. Pedagogically and phenomenologically oriented approaches to teaching and learning regard both sides of the same coin as essentially social activities that reflect contemporary as well as historical dimensions of sociality. (Vasileios and Schwarz 2016: 41)
"Phenomenology urges us to resist the temptation to assimilate our experience to familiar categories in the service of a theory" (Carman 2008: 36). Thus, Meyer-Drawe sees the experience as "individual [...] corporeality" for which the eyes provide the visible and invisible that encounters us (Meyer-Drawe 2008, 26f). To be in the role of the observer or in the role of the observer influences the power play: "The one who sees has an advantage over the other person who is seen while hiding" (ibid: 27). Thus, not only is it our physical presence that is exposed to shame, but it is also medium through which our feelings are articulated. Hans-Uwe Rösner defines the body as the venue of the exercise of power (Schauplatz der Machtanwendung, 2012: 282). And if power is exercised, for instance through shaming, it is the body where our feelings show: "lowering the gaze, lowering the head or the avoidance of being looked at. The uncomfortable silence in situations, in which we are waiting if we belive expectations or not, and, subsequently, to be exposed to shaming. To blush or pale form shame" (Ruhloff in Ricken, Roehr, Ruhloff and Schaller 2009: 54, transl) Werry and O'Gorman list other articulations of shame: "the burn of a blush, plummeting in the belly, bow of a head, look away, gag on words, crumble within like ash." (2007: 218). If one feels shame, the face is "blushing with shame" (Goffman 1963a: 8) and "gets hot, but [the] heart starts shivering" (Rushdie, 1983: 38). Another, more detailed description of the experience:

[Shame] is the most intimate of feelings; it makes ourselves intimate to ourselves. The promiscuity of shame, heightened through its telling, broadens notions of what is personal and what is social. The body is key here because it generates and carries so much meaning and in ways that academics have not really attended to. We have tended to overly privilege the body’s cultural meanings and have not really tried to tell the psychosomatic body’s stories. (Probyn 2005: 41)

In conclusion, the boy as the venue of the exercise of power, and as the venue of articulation of shame, is a major factor when discussing shame. Jaquet also states that one way to tell the difference to read and recognize emotions is by emotional displays and thus we have to "watch the face and the body"; however, she distinguishes between shame and embarrassment, as already discussed in chapter 2.4.2:

In shame, the corners of the mouth are downturned, sometimes the lower lip is tucked between the teeth. The eyes are lowered, the body collapses, tilts forward and the shoulders fold in what seems an attempt to hide. In some cultures, people cover their face with their hands. (2015: chapter 2, min. 8:51) [Embarrassment instead is seen in] "smiling, nervous movements, the eyes wandering from side to side" whereas the "display of shame is a reaction of exposure" (2015: chapter 2, min. 8:17).
Moreover, shame and embarrassment can trigger "the blush [of shame which] cannot be faked", it is thus "an honest signal", which is also "not threatening to others. Already Darwin was interested in blushing, and his intuition was that it is innate and human." (2015: chapter 2, min. 7:45). According to Werry and O'Gorman, "[s]hame maps the way that the body is subjectified and in-habited" (2007: 219). Werry and O'Gorman provide an explanation of the term "in-habited" which is: "given a habitat, fitted, fitted in" (ibid: 219) which reminds us readers on the social component of shame which correlates with our social appearance: "Shame is an existential state which helps us to recognize a threat to our social being in much the same way that fear signals a threat to our physical selves" (1994: 28). Independently, shame is conceptualized by Bibby as "emotional response and reaction to other people's criticism" (2002: 705). Especially when being exposed to other people's criticism, our identity is placed on our physical appearance and also portrayed through our physical reactions. In the words of Butler, the "body can be understood as a phenomena that is seen publicly and is therefore exposed to sociological powers and formation, before it becomes the reason why the subject [the person] strives for recognition. (Butler 2010: 10 quoted in Hans-Uwe Rösner 2012: 383, transl). In conclusion, this understanding of the body brings a "new insight of the threat, helplessness, vulnerability, mutual dependence, being exposed, physical integrity, desiring, work, language and social belonging" (Butler 2010: S. 10, quoted by Hans-Uwe Rösner 2012: 384, transl).

Werry and O'Gorman recommend acknowledging shame, as "acknowledging shame recuperates the body, its ability to feel, even to feel unpleasant things and it recuperates the body in its relational fluidity, its capacity to affect other bodies, to register them". Thus, the student struggles not only visibly but also bodily, for instance, when ashamed the student "shifts in his chair, furrows his brow, won't meet [the teacher's] eye. When class is over [the student] remains seated. [...] He dwells in shame. The matrix is visible, he sees himself in it." (2007: 227). In conclusion, Werry and O'Gorman are against the negation of shame in schooling. At the same time although, they recognize that shame "also constantly publishes the body’s presence, makes it experientially palpable, affectively attendant" (ibid: 219). Although addressing shame might be a possible step towards dealing with it, the discussion on a meta-linguistic level might come with its own challenges as it could cause even more shame:
Even to speak about shame is shameful: it threatens to negate all good intentions, all the optimism and progressive energy we invest in teaching and learning, to stain the effort of Pedagogy with failure, guilt, and self-condemnation. And not surprisingly so. Shame is an effect associated in Pedagogy (as elsewhere in western culture) with precise failure, guilt, and self-condemnation, or worse with the condemnation, stigmatization, or blame of others. (Werry and O’Gorman 2007: 217, bold not in original).

Therefore, if shame is discussed in class, the other aspects related to shame might also be part of this discussion with students. To approach all these aspects in this paper is impossible, thus the following chapter starts in with the debate about (ab)norm(ality) which builds upon the social and public aspect of shame and the influence of interlocutors and leads in the debate about stigmatization.

2.6.2 Shame based on being abnormal and stigmatized

A student might be ashamed because of how his peers perceive him as being different to them — different from what is "normal" in their perception. Building upon the discussion so far, we know that the person in the spotlight might act "abnormal" if he is exceeding the "line" (Brown and Levinson 1987: 307) he has drawn for himself when creating his self-image or the "peer group’s line" (Goffman, 1967: 306). Thus, if the claimed expectations are not fulfilled, the face is threatened.

Another aspect of face discussed so far is that it is social. "Social norms" influence the perception and beliefs of what is seen as "normal" (Roesner 2012: 381, transl). Goffman addresses a similar issue through "social identity" and names the following example for clarification: "[w]hen a stranger comes into our presence, then, first appearances are likely to enable us to anticipate his category and attributes, his social identity." (1963a: 2, italics in original). And if there is a "failing, a shortcoming, a handicap" then this creates a "discrepancy between virtual and actual social identity" (ibid: 3). This social identity is categorizing in a stereotypical way and the people who are categorized are expected "not only [to] support a particular norm but also [to] realize it" (ibid: 6); this categorization can be called stigma.

When the term stigma was used first in ancient times, the Greek scholars marked "a blemished person, ritually polluted, to be avoided, especially in public places" (Goffman 1963a: 1). In contemporary usage, possessing a stigma means that he or she has "undesired differences from what we had anticipated" (ibid: 5). Goffman roughly categorizes three types of stigma at the beginning of his analysis: First, there are
"various physical deformities"; second, there are "blemishes of individual character perceived as weak will" such as "unnatural passions", "dishonesty", "alcoholism" etc.; and third, there are "tribal stigma of race, nation and religion" (ibid: 4). Although Goffman named these three different types of stigma at the beginning, in his conclusion he also argues that the phenomenon of stigma does not only affect these types only but stigma involves not so much a set of concrete individuals who can be separated into two piles, the stigmatized and the normal, as a pervasive two-role social process in which every individual participates in both roles, at least in some connections and in some phases of life. The normal and the stigmatized are not persons but rather perspectives. These are generated in social situations during mixed contacts by virtue of the unrealized norms that are likely to play upon the encounter. (ibid: 138, bold not in original)

Therefore, when discussing stigmatization, a classification in three types is less important than realizing that stigma relates to perspective and thus also to perception. Moreover, stigma might occur in forms that are not as obvious and more often than assumed and perspectives. In this regard, how others see themselves and how the person in the spotlight sees himself is an essential aspect of stigmatization. At the beginning of his monograph, Goffman introduces the separation of two groups: the "stigmatized" and "the normals"; the latter are the ones "who do not depart negatively from the particular expectations" (ibid: 5, italics in original)\(^5\). In a brutally honest way, it is described how the stigmatized do not fit the norm — a realization that the stigmatized learn to adapt to in a certain way. The "phase of learning" also differentiates the stigmatized from "normal" people: A stigmatized person goes through two initial phases of learning: "his learning the normal point of view and learning that he is disqualified according to it"; in a later phase, he learns how to "cope with the way others treat the kind of person he can be shown to be" and a still later phase is "learning to pass" (ibid: 80, Täuschen). Passing is, therefore, a face-saving strategy and will be discussed further in chapter 4.3 of this paper. Here, we now want to focus on another aspect clearly important in the definitions mentioned: how other interlocutors impact the face of one individual in general, and in particular the differentiation of stigmatized and "normal" people. The presence of the so-called "normals" is "likely to reinforce this split between self-demands and self" resulting in

\(^5\) As the term "normals" is a subject of controversial discussion, it should be discussed in detail and not used easily because what or who is "normal"? Defining people as "normal" or even "abnormal" causes feelings of discrimination, racism and marginalization. For the purpose of this paper, using the term as Goffman did works best, as it is claiming that people who are described as "normal" fit the norm more than others. To maintain awareness of the controversialness of this term, quotation marks will be used throughout the paper.
"self-hate and self-derogation" (ibid: 7) which are both threatening the positive image of face — Goffman thus also refers to the image of one's identity and characteristics discussed in earlier chapters. He highlights the public aspect of the image:

[I]t seems the case that the public image of an individual, that is, the image of him available to those who do not know him personally, will necessarily be somewhat different from the image he projects through direct dealings with those who know him personally. Where an individual has a public image, it seems to be constituted from a small selection of facts which may be true of him, which facts are inflated into a dramatic and newsworthy appearance, and then used as a full picture of him. In consequence, a special type of stigmatization can occur. (1963a: 7)

As a result, how a person is perceived by others is key to the image which is painted of him, especially when others draw conclusions due to an incident that is "dramatic and newsworthy" (ibid: 71). Therefore, if a person is known better by someone, his face is more likely to be protected as this person might know him better than to draw quick judgments according to a single incident. In the field of psychiatry, Perry, Gawel and Gibbon state that [t]he fear that others can disrespect a person because of something he shows means that he is always insecure in his contact with other people; and this insecurity arises, [...] from something which he knows he cannot fix (1956: 145). As a result, the importance of perception by others is highlighted. The stigmatized might face a situation which is especially challenging if they physically are close to "normals" as "[t]he very anticipation of such contacts can [...] lead normals and the stigmatized to arrange life so as to avoid themselves" (ibid: 12). The "stigmatized individual may find that [s]he feels unsure of how normals will identify with him and receive him" (Goffman 1963b: 13). Furthermore, a key aspect for Goffman is "the very notion of shameful differences [which] assume a similarity in regard to crucial beliefs, those regarding identity" (ibid: 131). Thus, stigmatization is related to face threats which might also cause shame. But also being ashamed can cause a stigma and further shame as Goffman states: "the shamed person is ashamed to be ashamed" (ibid: 130). "Shame becomes a central possibility, arising from the individual's perception of one of his own attributes as being a defiling thing to possess, and one he can readily see himself as not possessing." (1963a: 7)

Goffman further explains, that "[e]ven where an individual has quite abnormal feelings and beliefs, he is likely to have quite normal concerns and employ quite normal strategies in attempting to conceal these abnormalities from others" (ibid: 131). In addition, "[g]iven what the stigmatized individual may well face upon entering a
mixed social situation, he may anticipatorily respond by defensive cowering” (ibid: 17). Hiding from others or concealing what has caused the shame is a known face-saving strategy in Pragmatics. The face of an individual who is suffering stigmatization is already quite fragile; therefore, further face threat might easily damage the self-image even further. In conclusion, avoiding contact with others seems to be a plausible way of protection against face-threatening acts. Nevertheless, this might neither be possible in reality nor beneficial in the long run. Face-saving through hiding or creating distance to other interlocutors might not be as beneficial as building a better relationship to receive the position of a "unique person" (ibid: 56) or using other coping strategies.16

In the regards of face-saving strategies, it might help to understand that it might not only be the face of the stigmatized person which needs protection. Goffman argues that the face loss of a stigmatized person also influences the "normal" person's face negatively. For instance, "[i]n social situations with an individual known or perceived to have a stigma, we are likely, then, to employ categorizations that do not fit, and [the normals] are likely to experience uneasiness" (ibid: 19). As Goffman states that this "uneasiness" is also felt by "the normals", and as we have previously discussed that every interlocutor prefers faces to be saved rather than to be threatened, this could be beneficial for every person in the classroom, also the students who are likely to threaten someone's face. For instance, if one student bullies another one, the bully might try to protect his own face by threatening someone else's face, but overall he or she might also long for a learning environment where everyone's face is safe. Thus, the manner with which norms are established and discussion of the perception of normal or abnormal might be vital aspects when introducing face work to students and colleagues. Sometimes it seems as if norms cause more hostile emotions, whereas they actually should support the safety of the (learning) environment as norms also provide the common ground.

Butler questions forms of acceptance which are interwoven with "norms, practices and institutions" through which we judge about "worthiness and unworthiness or normality and abnormality of life forms" (2009: 327 quoted by Hans-Uwe Rösner 2012: 374, transl). In terms of experiencing shame through face threat, the "impact by norms of recognition at school and during lessons" and the "recognition through teachers and peers" (Reh und Rabenstein 2012: 227, transl) is

---

16 The discussion about face-saving strategies is continued in more detail in chapter 4.3.3.
highly significant, since losing face depends on the perception of the interlocutors: how they perceive the person in the spotlight and what is their perception of (ab)normal. Furthermore, Butler recognizes difficulties arising from Honneth's Recognition Theory (Annerkennungstheorie) as there is a "double truth": on the one hand, "we need norms to live well and to know in which direction we should head to change our social world"; on the other hand, "we are forced by norms in a brutal way so that we sometimes have to fight them". In this sense, normality has a double meaning:

[Normality is] referring to the aims and efforts worth achieving, the principles according to which we are constrained to act or communicate with each other, the commonly shared presuppositions from which we gain orientation to direct our actions in the right direction. On the other hand, normativity is referring to a process of normalization — the way how certain norms, ideas and ideals have control over our embodied life (Butler 2009: 328 quoted by Hans-Uwe Rösner 2012: 377, transl)

In conclusion, "[o]ne can say, then, that identity norms breed deviations of as well as conformance", Goffman states (1963a: 129). From a pragmatic perspective, the disobedience of a student towards a teacher can result in improving or threatening his face: through the eyes of the teacher, he might have worsened his positive face as an otherwise well-behaved student, but through the eyes of his peers, he might be perceived as popular and standing above the teacher. Face thus always depends on the point of view and the interlocutors. Sometimes face is threatened and saved at the same time but for two different purposes. An additional example from the perspective of Pedagogy is given by Krappmann and Oswald, who conducted a study in Germany. They investigated about ascriptions (Zuschreibungen) in peer groups and "how single individuals are ascribed certain position within the group of peers"; for instance, "the position of the 'normal' person or the 'popular' person" (1985 quoted in Reh und Rabenstein 2012: 227, transl). Breitenstein builds on Popitz by stating that it is part of the "job as a student" to be "recognized as a student — and if not one becomes sanctioned not to be recognized as a student" (Breidenstein 2006, Popitz 2006 quoted in Reh und Rabenstein 2012: 229, transl).
Adding the pragmatic lens, we can find similarities to the Brown and Levinson's theory of face being claimed: if the student has defined his line in the way that he perceives himself, and thus wants to be perceived, as a diligent student who behaves well and is academically successful, his positive face is threatened by an utterance which does not confirm his expectations. And thus, his face is threatened by not being perceived as he was expecting to; in conclusion, his face is threatened by the sanction of not being recognized as the type of student he wanted to be recognized for.

In this regard, Butler states that "recognition [...] is dependent from norms" (2003: 38 quoted in Reh und Rabenstein 2012: 229, transl) and, in a later essay, Butler defines that "norms are [...] the conditions under which recognition can take place"; and these "norms are basically a 'form of social power'" (2009: 84 quoted in Reh und Rabenstein 2012: 229 transl). Goffman also concluded that stigmatization might be used as a tool or even a weapon\(^{17}\), as he refers to the three groups of stigma and puts them into a possible context of using abnormality for change:

The stigmatization of those with a bad moral record clearly can function as a means of formal social control; the stigmatization of those in certain racial, religious, and ethnic groups has apparently functioned as a means of removing these minorities from various avenues of competition; and the devaluation of those with bodily disfigurement can perhaps be interpreted as contributing to a needed narrowing of courtship decisions.

How should stigma be managed? Goffman regards stigma management as a "general feature of society, a process occurring whenever there are identity norms" (ibid: 130). As a result, where there are identity norms there might be stigmatization. Although stigmatization is a social phenomenon that on its own has many facets, Goffman concludes that the "role of normal and the role of stigmatized" (ibid: 131) are sharing the same basis: "One can, therefore, suspect that the role of normal and the role of stigmatized are parts of the same complex, cuts from the same standard cloth (ibid: 130)". The following quote should close the chapter and simultaneously open it for further thoughts:

It is implied, then, that it is not to be different that one should look for understanding our differences, but the ordinary. The question of social norms is certainly central, but the concern might be less for uncommon deviations from the ordinary than for ordinary deviations from the common. (Goffman 1963a: 127)

---

\(^{17}\) Cf. chapter 2.2.2 of this paper.
2.7 How to include or exclude shame in learning

2.7.1 Positive (side)effects of shame

While the hostile effects of shame are well-known, there are also positive (side) effects. This chapter will summarize what has been discussed and add other aspects too. Already the ancient Greek have not only described shame as negatively but also positively connotated.

In contemporary use, some pedagogues also find positive (side) effects of shame; for instance, Werry and O’Gorman who claim that we should not "celebrate [shame] but recognize its fundamental role in the unmaking and making of our socialized selves and the connectivities, histories, and relations of force that constitute them. It is, ideally, to turn that role to progressive ends" (2007: 228). They indirectly talk about image and identity — thus about face. Werry and O’Gorman praise shame as it establishes an ambivalent distance into which the acknowledgment of both difference and injustice can enter, yet still recognizes the authenticity of the connection. Shame dwells in the inevitable contradictions between the ideal and the historical and enables us to inhabit them. But in turn, we have to agree to inhabit shame, to avow it. Art Pedagogy has a vital role in enabling us to recognize, name and navigate shame. (Werry and O’Gorman 2007: 223).

This is also true to Giddens as he sees possibilities towards the "ideal self" which lives the "way I want to be" (1991: 28). This could refer to shame acting as a positive motivational force to study more, trying harder, etc, a term introduced by Bibby. According to Bibby, "shame can act as a positive motivational force" (2002: 705, italics not in original). Wolfe summarizes that the shame causes a "motivation [which] is highly prized" within a wide array of educational research (Ames, 1992; Eccles and Roeser, 2011; Meyer and Turner, 2006; Pintrich, 2003; Schunk, Pintrich and Meece, 2008; Watt et al., 2012; Wentzel, 1997, 1999 cited by Wolfe 730). Shane even goes as far as describing that some "forms of learning [...] are a by-product of overcoming shame" (1980: 348) as learning has its roots in shame [because] the desire to know begins with the recognition and location of the source of one’s shame. The need to know grows from the realization that one does not know, that one is lacking, and that what is not known is something that one is capable of knowing and should know. Knowing in this sense makes one fuller, actualizes self, brings one closer to ego-ideal. (ibid: 349)

In addition, Shane sees the "recognition and acceptance of shame [as] healthy and potentially educative" (ibid 349) and claims that "the choice to learn develops in
cognitive shame." (ibid 350). But the positive aspects of shame are not only found on an individual side, but also on a social side as this motivation seems to be especially beneficial for social aspects and improving someone's "social identity" (Goffman 1963a: 2, italics in original), as shame "incorporates notions both of personal identity and relations to others, [t]here exists a potential for moving on from the lack that engenders shame, for repairing the social bound and (re)developing feelings of connectedness" (Ibid: 718). Sedgwick agrees and argues that shame might sparkle the "desire to repair the social bound becomes more powerful" (2003: 20). This positive potential is also highlighted by Troman and Woods as they speak of a "healing" process rather than an "experience of failure and shame" - the success being labeled by "strong degrees of self-determination" (2001: 57).

2.7.2 The importance of trust for (cognitive) shame and face work

Shane also addresses another aspect of shame, namely "cognitive shame [which] will help to free the reader from the almost universally immediate negative association with the word shame" (1980: 350, italics added). Shane claims that "an examination of cognitive shame provides opportunities for educators and students to cope more adequately with issues of trust, loneliness, and separation in classroom settings." Additionally, "overcoming cognitive shame can lead to learning, mastery, and competence". This realization of the fundamental role of shame in learning portrays how important a learning environment is where learners feel safe enough to admit the lack of knowledge.

The teacher must use his own failings as a means to establish a relationship, and as a method to provide tools for the child. By accepting the child’s inadequacies and providing him with a model for coping, the teacher facilitates the attainment of ego-ideal in his student. It may be only after the child is able to face cognitive shame as a healthy feeling that he can learn. [...] One may ask, how should a teacher deal with a child who brings to him his personal failure? [...] What a teacher tries to communicate to his charges is that denial or flight from cognitive inadequacy is not appropriate, and that the way to deal with cognitive shame is to explore and acquire, to master and become competent. Thus, the by-product of overcoming cognitive shame is learning. For the learner, the process begins in shame. The accompanying feelings of loneliness and isolation trigger the learning process. (ibid: 355, bold added)

As a result, the "exposure of cognitive shame is legitimate within the teacher role"; unfortunately, revealing the teacher's mistakes is too infrequently mentioned in the classroom as it "reveals the teacher's failure" (ibid: 352) and therefore threatens the teacher's positive face. "Yet failure is among the prominent aspects of teaching and
learning. Opportunities for handling the teacher’s cognitive shame are as numerous as the opportunities for handling the child’s personal cognitive shortcomings” (ibid: 353). As both of these opportunities lie in the hands of the teacher, Shane argues that this is partly the reason "why schools are so ineffective in fostering learning" (ibid: 353) and the better the teacher can "examine and deal with his own cognitive shame, he will be better able to facilitate the learning process in his students" (ibid: 351). In addition, an examination of cognitive shame provides the student with "specific tools, [and] it also can aid the teacher in feeling more comfortable with his own role, and thus facilitate the separation that is so fundamentally entrenched in the teacher-learner encounter" (ibid: 355). Due to including cognitive shame, the teacher supports the student to "help himself and also to cope with the exigencies of teaching." (ibid: 355) To accommodate students in experiencing shame,

"Insofar as cognitive shame is accompanied by fears of separation and isolation, the ability to reveal ignorance, personal failings, or inadequacies to another presupposes confidence in that person"; and for the students to open up in this way, the "[t]rust in the teacher is a function both of the perception of the teacher role and the person who occupies it" (ibid: 350). Etzioni claims, that "[o]nly when trust has been established with a person in his role, be it a therapist, teacher, or lover, is one willing to expose oneself" (1969: 28). The student must develop a "relationship with his teacher, based on trust. The teacher must be able to communicate to the child, in both word and deed, that it is alright that he does not know" (ibid 354). The institution itself is a place students go to because they should learn something; however, it paradoxically is also a "place where one shares with the teacher what one knows, and not what one does not know. The teacher asks a question and the child answers it." (ibid: 350) As a result, "the normative constraints of school place heavy demands on a child who wants to establish a relationship with his teacher based on trust. In this sense, finding a teacher to trust is very difficult" (ibid: 351), in particular as the teacher has a clear advantage as the expert in the field.
The following descriptions of the phenomenon of trust are based on the conclusions of Mairhofer's literary research and fieldwork of how a trustful learning environment influences the students' learning. Thanks to the interdisciplinary approach of this present study, Mairhofer's conclusions are extended not only by pedagogical but also linguistic analysis. For instance, out of her five facets of trust "how to trust, trustworthiness, confidence, basic trust and distrust" (2014: 48) overlap with the features of the face-saving and face-threatening strategies discussed in the politeness theory by Brown and Levinson, especially the three features of "trust, vulnerability, risk and interdependence". According to Mairhofer, "no role can work without the other one (eg.: teacher-parents, teacher-principal, teacher-student) and everybody remains vulnerable to one another since everybody depends on everybody. The relationship between people in various roles influences the perception of trust." (2014: 28).

In an urban school district in Eastern Iowa, Pratt found that in collaborative teaching it is especially challenging as T1 enters T2's "territory" when T2 has his own "routines and structures". As discussed earlier, the classroom is a place where students can feel safe but not too safe to allow daydreaming or distracting others. The latter was a major factor of dissatisfaction of Thelma (T1). She claimed that she and her co-teacher (T2) did not share the same classroom management attitudes: To her, the students seemed constantly off-task which hindered the learning process and upset her; however, T2 was not only more relaxed about attention but also more experienced in age and years of teaching. In conclusion, T1 desired approval of her identity as a valuable and competent teacher, therefore she longed for the honor of her positive face. Moreover, the disrespect from T2, who made her feel like she was "only in [her] first year of teaching" threatened her negative face as she desired appropriate autonomy where both are sharing a "parity of roles" (a need that was reflected in two more interviews by Pratt, 2014, 5-7.). Therefore, parity of roles indicates not only that both teachers feel fulfilled and respected, but also the faces of the teachers in collaboration are being respected and, therefore, their face saved. The example shows that trust is highly important for cooperation.

Arielli based his dissertation on the belief that mechanisms and dynamics of trust play a major role in cooperation, and that cooperation emerges from "mutual fulfilling of expectations" (gegenseitige Erfüllung von Erwartungen, 2005: 15) Lewinsky
advocates for more "compassion and empathy" (2015: 18:11) especially when we are surfing the web. She quotes the researcher Brené Brown: "Shame cannot survive empathy." (ibid: 18.29) who has also called "empathy [as] the antidote to shame" (Brown 2012: 18.55). In addition, Lewinsky already implements what Brown recommends for as Brown states that "[w]e have to talk about shame" and "if we're going to find our way back to each other, vulnerability is going to be that path. (Brown 2012: 19.19).

"We're pretty sure that the only people who don't experience shame are people who have no capacity for connection or empathy. Which means, yes, I have a little shame; no, I'm a sociopath. So I would opt for, yes, you have a little shame." (2012: 14:49)

Thus, one can conclude that everyone has a "little shame". Moreover, Lewinsky advises her audience to be an upstander instead of a bystander, for instance, to "post a positive comment of someone or report a [cyber] bullying situation" (2015: 18.29) to create a "more compassionate world" (ibid: 21.18). In this regard, a bystander might more likely turn into an upstander if the person in the spotlight is a unique person to him. Pragmatically speaking, the difference between a bystander and an upstander is that the latter will use face-saving strategies to protect the face of the person in the spotlight. His action might not only be helpful to the one person but also to a bigger group of people or all the interlocutors, as face threats trigger other face threats. Thus, saving one person's face might result in a more compassionate environment. As a result, if teachers and students are aware of face-saving strategies and can apply them in the classroom, it will improve the overall learning environment.

2.7.3 Face-saving strategies

Several strategies to save face can be found in the field of Pragmatics and although the term face or face work is hardly ever mentioned in the field of Pedagogy per se, aspects of face and face work are often found (in)directly in Pedagogy. The following pages compare the views of the different disciplines and discuss some face-saving strategies in detail. Moreover, pedagogical tact makes a big difference to the learning environment if face threats occur.
As experience is a vital part of this paper, we will start with the experience of a four-year-old student on his first day of school. The now grown-up shares his memories: "I wet myself and had to be taken home. I didn’t know where the toilet was, I didn’t know the Irish phrase that was required: ‘an bhfuil cead agam ...’" (Werry and O’Gorman 2007: 221). The adult reflects on his feelings, coming to the conclusion that he "was terrified of the teacher who would stitch us into obedient students, desperately learning to avoid shame" (ibid: 221). Tomkins reads his memory and responds that the student was "[h]iding from shame" (1995: 172 cited in Werry and O’Gorman 2007: 218).

In Pragmatics, hiding from shame is analyzed by Goffman: In an encounter where the face is threatened, the most obvious reaction might be to "hide or conceal his activity in some way" and thus also prevent difficulties for the other participants; on the other hand, if someone loses his face, the others may as well help to hide or conceal by "protectively turn[ing] away from him or his activity for a moment to give him time to assemble himself" (1967: 312) "to be brought back into line" (ibid: 313) which he has "established" before (ibid: 308). This "re-establishment of the expressive order (ibid: 313) is vital and can happen in various ways, for instance as a challenge in which the "participants call attention to the misconduct [...] and that the threatening event itself will have to be brought back into line", or the offering where "a participant, typically the offender, is given a chance to correct on the offense and re-establish the expressive order" (ibid 312f).

After the challenge and the offering have been made, [...] the person to whom that offering is made can accept it as [...] re-establishing the expressive order and the faces supported by this order. In the terminal move of the interchange, the forgiven person conveys a sign of gratitude to those who have given him the indulgence of forgiveness. The phases of the corrective process - challenge, offering, acceptance and thanks - provide a model for interpersonal ritual behavior, but a model that may be departed from in significant ways. (Goffman 1967: 313)

For example, the offended parties may give the offender a chance to initiate the offering on his own before a challenge is made and before they ratify the offense as an incident. This is a common courtesy, extended on the assumption that the recipient will introduce a self-challenge. Further, when the offended person accepts the corrective offering, the offender may suspect that this has been grudgingly done from tact, and so he may volunteer additional corrective offerings, not allowing the matter to rest until he has received a second or third acceptance of his repeated apology. (Ibid: 313)

Another example is the following, where an outsider happens to witness a performance that was not meant for him, for instance "a husband and wife in the midst of their daily bickering, when suddenly faced with a guest of brief acquaintance, will put aside their intimate quarrels and play out between themselves a relationship that is
almost as distant and friendly as the one played out for the sudden arrival" (Goffman 1959: 139). The performers have to shift abruptly to an act that fits their role in front of the intruder, perhaps they are hosting a dinner party and were disturbed in their intimate quarrel in the kitchen. Seldomly the shift of performance can be done smoothly enough to deceive the intruder completely, however, the intruder might also act cooperatively and leave the kitchen again or pretend that he has not noticed the quarrel and opts to talk about something unrelated to it. In the latter interaction, he too stepped into playing a role to save their face and avoid embarrassment. The intruder acted with tactful blindness, or tactful overlooking, which is "applied only to events that, if perceived at all, could be perceived and interpreted only as threats to face" (Goffman 1967: 311). In our example, the intruder acted as if he has not experienced the quarrel.

A more important, less spectacular kind of tactful overlooking is practiced when a person openly acknowledges an incident as an event that has occurred, but not as an event that contains a threatening expression. If he is not the one who is responsible for the incident, then his blindness will have to be supported by his willingness to seek a way of dealing with the matter, which leaves him dangerously dependent upon the cooperative forbearance of the others. (Ibid: 311)

In this role play, the interlocutors will be "treated respectfully during the performance [but] are gossiped about, caricatured, cursed, and criticized" (Goffman 1959: 170) outside of this performance. For instance, the intruder could roll his eyes when entering the room next to the kitchen and explain that the hosts are quarreling — an indirect face threat that turns the couple into an object of ridicule but increases the positive face of the intruder as he made a humorous comment and warned others from entering the "war-zone".

To play a certain role to save face might also require interlocutors to slightly adapt the situation, sometimes it requires to avoid certain aspects or even to tell lies. On the one hand, interlocutors who tell lies cannot be trusted, as Goffman states:

Those caught out in the act of telling barefaced lies not only lose face during the interaction but may have their face destroyed, for it is felt by many audiences that if an individual can once bring himself to tell such a lie, he ought never again to be fully trusted. (Goffman 1959: 62)

However, on the other hand, (white) lies are used on an everyday basis to save face of the speaker or the others, for instance: "[T]here are many "white lies", told by doctors, potential guests, and others, presumably to save the feelings of the audience that is lied to, and these kinds of untruths are not thought to be horrendous." (Goffman 1959: 62).
Such lies are saving face as they are meant to protect and not to defend. Especially when an individual is stigmatized, the "social or personal identity" is portrayed differently as "representation [is] aimed at proving one is not what one is" (Goffman 1963b: 62, "falsche Darstellung" des Selbst cf. Goffman 1963a: 82). Depending on the relationship between the interlocutors, not telling the truth protects the face of the person who is already stigmatized "in order to handle his personal identity"; thus it is helpful for the individual to "know to whom he owes much information and to whom he owes very little — even though in all cases he may be obliged to refrain from telling an 'outright' lie" (ibid: 64f).

The stigma and the effort to conceal it or remedy it become 'fixed' as part of personal identity. Hence our increased willingness to change improper behavior when wearing a mask, or when away from home; hence the willingness of some to publish revelatory material anonymously, or to make a public appearance before a small private audience, the assumption being that the disclosure will not be connected to them personally by the public at large.

Hiding the fragile face behind this mask might be protection; however, it also hinders that the relationship between the interlocutors is being strengthened. Thus, instead of fostering mutual understanding and support, which could contribute to become a unique person as Goffman also includes the aspect of "the public" (1963: 50) and "social identity" (ibid: 55) when discussing stigmatization, two aspects that are in liaison with face, see chapter 2.4.2 of this paper.

"The whole problem of managing stigma is influenced by the issue of whether or not the stigmatized person is known to us personally. To attempt to describe just what this influence is, however, requires the clear formulation of an additional concept, personal identity. It is well appreciated that in small, long-standing social circles, each member comes to be known to the others as a 'unique' person." (Goffman 1963a: 55f)

A person's social identity influences managing stigma as it makes a difference if the "stigmatized person is known to us personally" especially if the person is "a 'unique' person" to the "normals" (ibid: 55f). Goffman comes to the conclusion that

[given these several possibilities that fall between the extremes of complete secrecy on one hand and complete information on the other, it would seem that the problems people face who make a concerted and well-organized effort to pass are problems that wide ranges of persons face at some time or other. Because of the great rewards in being considered normal, almost all persons who are in a position to pass will do so on some occasion by intent. [...] A conflict between candor and seemliness will often be resolved in favor of the latter. (ibid: 74f)

The stigmatized person learns that everything he knows can become known to others, however, it can also be concealed through passing (Taeuschen, cf. ibid: 80). This too might be a strategy to save face as the person who passes suffers during the
"experience of exposure during face-to-face interaction, betrayed by the very weakness he is trying to hide, by the others present, or by impersonal circumstances" (ibid: 84). Similarly to the cooperative articulations to honour face, it is the goal the individual's objective to "reduce tension, that is, to make it easier for himself [who is stigmatized] and the others to withdraw covert attention from the stigma, and to sustain spontaneous involvement in the official content of the interaction." (ibid: 102). The means to withdraw attention from the stigma are similar to those employed in passing; Goffman calls this strategy covering — many stigmatized "who rarely try to pass, routinely try to cover" (ibid: 102). In this regard, cooperation seems key but one should not forget that this is challenging for both parties and that also the normals need support by the stigmatized. Thus, Goffman provides the following advice: "[w]hen the stigmatized person finds that normals have difficulty in ignoring his failing, he should try to help them and the social situation by consciously reduce tension" (ibid: 116). Moreover, through "cheerfully and unselfconsciously accept[ing] himself [and his stigma] as essentially the same as normals", the stigmatized can support the cooperation in communication and support an environment where both faces are saved, "while at the same time [the stigmatized] voluntarily withholds himself from those situations in which normals would find it difficult to give lip service to their similar acceptance of him" (ibid: 120). In summary, it can be stated that it is "a form of tacit cooperation between normals and the stigmatized" through which others are careful to respect his secret, pass lightly over its disclosure, or disattend evidence which prevents a secret from being made of it." (ibid: 130)

In conclusion, having a feeling for tactfulness does not only improve the cooperation and thus face-saving strategies of the interlocutors who are challenged with the situation of stigmatization but tactfulness might also improve the everyday conversation in the classroom. A feeling for tact is also needed for ensuring a safe learning environment where faces are saved instead of threatened.

It is as if face, by its very nature, can be saved only in a certain number of ways, and as if each social grouping must make its selections from this single matrix of possibilities. The members of every social circle may be expected to have some knowledge of face-work and some experience in this use. In our society, this kind of capacity is sometimes called tact, savoir-faire, diplomacy, or social skill. (Goffman 1967: 309, italics in original)

As face-threat can become "a source of acute embarrassment" to the person whose face is threatened and the other interlocutors near him/her, the social relationships and the
trust in his/her "self-image and face to the tact and good conduct of others" is tested (Goffman 1967: 19). Therefore, it "is no wonder that trouble is caused by a person who cannot be relied upon to play the face-saving game" (Ibid: 316). Part of the face-saving game is the adequate response to (un)articulated calls, a skill that seems especially valuable for teachers as "instruction can be planned, [but] the pedagogical call can be understood as an appeal that occurs in medias res, in the midst of an event in the pedagogical situation, and can at best be anticipated" (Westfall-Greiter and Schwarz 2012: 121f.). And especially "[t]his 'apparent' insecurity is actually the source of true security in the pedagogical relation". (ibid: 122) In this regard, Muth states that the "teacher is able to respond in the act of teaching and change direction if and when called upon to do so by the appeals of children"; this call can be made, 'through [the student's] questioning glance and their facial expression, through their objections, perhaps also through their lack of attention, virtually through the 'experience of the experience of the other'" (Muth 1962: 84). Moreover, Muth also claims that "often, the success of teaching occurs only when the teacher recognizes the opportunity of the moment and deviates from a planned route when he musters the courage to act pedagogically tactfully" (ibid: 85).

In conclusion, in the field of Pedagogy, face-saving strategies are mentioned indirectly without referring to face work per se; nevertheless, the findings are highly interesting, for instance, they include to hiding or concealing the reason for shame straight away, or to lying about certain aspects to hid the face behind a mask. This might, however, prevent the interlocutors from strengthening their relationship which influences the motivation for face-saving acts as someone who is an important person, or in Goffman's terms, a "unique person", will be approached with more empathy and thus less face threats. Moreover, interlocutors can also save face by tactful blindness or tactfully overlooking the acute source of shame. In addition, building up trust between the interlocutors and improving the recognizability of (un)articulated calls and its response might improve the feeling of safety in the learning environment of the classroom.

The last three subchapters of 4.3 aimed to show that this study is only a springboard for further investigations in how face-threatening acts can cause shame and how face-saving acts can improve the learning environment.
3. Application of the Research

3.1 Methodology

3.1.1 Terminology

After reading the numerous sources which are listed in the bibliography and summarizing the most important parts in the literature review of chapter 2, the following terminology will be used for applying the knowledge. As this paper aims to promote a more interdisciplinary approach, the following chapter portrays one of the many benefits in this regard: choosing the most suitable terminology from both disciplines. While it is understood that too much mixing of terms would confuse the reader and decrease the academic value, using one term for the section on Pragmatics and another for the section on Pedagogy diminishes the effectiveness of assimilation of both disciplines for common findings. As the following paragraphs discuss numerous terms, the ones highlighted in bold will be focused on in chapters 3 and 4.

When relating to a person as the speaker and hearer, it seems as if the person was split into fragments of actions: the person who speaks immediately is the speaker and as soon as pauses for a response, he is the listener. As these roles interchange so quickly, the following discussion will instead refer to interlocutors instead to acknowledge that a speaker is simultaneously also listening, or observing, others etc. If the focus of discussion lies on one person, he or she will be called a person, student or individual in the spotlight, whereas the interlocutors are then seen as the other people in the classroom. We, the readers of vignettes, can only read the articulations of the interlocutor's bodies and not read the interlocutor's minds. Thus, the term articulations refers to the understanding that feelings such as shame can only be read through the articulations of the body. A synonym of articulation is expression, but the term articulation is prefered. Every articulation can also be seen as an utterance, as one cannot not communicate; thus, the term utterance defines verbal and non-verbal expressions. In Pedagogy, expression is used more often; in Pragmatics utterance is more commonly used for the smallest meaningful unit. The pragmatic decision serves the purpose of paper and also avoids an indication of expressions being mostly known as verbal exchanges of communication; hence, the usage of utterance is preferred for this research. Some of the utterances discussed may threaten or save face – face is a term
defined by Penelope Brown and Stephen C. Levinson, and elaborated by Goffman. Their definition of the term face will be used for reading the following vignette, including their further distinctions in positive and negative face. Although the names of the latter might be misleading to the reader, the original terms will contribute best to the academic research.

While these terms are discussed in detail in chapter 2.3, the following lines provide an overview for the reader's convenience. Face is "the positive social value a person effectively claims for himself/herself by the line others assume he/she has taken" (Goffman 1967: 306) and once a person "takes on a self-image expressed through face he/she will be expected to live up to [this line]" (ibid: 307) to protect their positive and negative face: the latter, the negative face, shows the person's "desire for autonomy" (1987; quoted by Goldsmith 2007, 220-222) which "stresses a person's immunity from outside interference" (Mey 2005: 74) as it "has to do with maintaining one's freedom of actions and freedom of imposition by others" (Trudgill 2003: 92f). Positive face is "the positive consistent self-image or 'personality' (crucially including the desire that this self-image is appreciated and approved of) claimed by interactants" (1987: 321, brackets in original). The "desire for [the] approval of identity" can be threatened by "undermining or failing to accept the identity being enacted" (Brown and Levinson, 1987; quoted by Goldsmith 2007, 220-222). As a result, face reflects identity.

This social identity is categorized in a stereotypical manner and the people who are categorized as stigmatized "do depart negatively from the particular expectations" of the "normals" (ibid: 5, italics in original). The separation in two categories, the "normals" and the stigmatized, might help with simplifying the discussion about the interlocutors, although the two categories do not consist of "persons but rather perspectives" (Goffman: 1963a: 138). As mentioned earlier, naming someone "normal" is part of controversial discussions; and as a deeper discussion about the most appropriate term would go beyond the scope of this paper, Goffman's terms will be inherited but the term "normals" will be used with quotation marks throughout the paper to show its ambiguity.
3.1.2 Phenomenologically oriented vignette research

Similar to this research paper, an interdisciplinary approach was also important for the phenomenologically oriented vignette research: the project "Personal Educational Processes in Heterogeneous Groups", was based on "interdisciplinary research teams" (Schratz, Schwarz and Kiper 2014: 49, transl) and was spread out into a nationwide undertaking to accompany 48 students in 24 middle schools in the school year 2009/10 in Innsbruck, Austria (Schratz, Schwarz, Westfall-Greiter 2011: 25, transl). Another aspect that was highly important was experience. In cooperation with the Phenomenologically Oriented Vignette Research of the Leopold-Franzens University of Innsbruck, the researchers were "seeking to gain insight into educational processes and learning through the lived experiences of students in Austria's New Middle School (Neue Mittelschule)" (Westfall-Greiter and Schwarz 2012: 122, transl). In this regard, it was important to collect data through which "students would come into view as learners and experiencers" and the focus is on "how students experience different settings for studying, what is experienced and how they respond to the demanded requirements" (Schratz, Schwarz and Kiper 2014: 49, transl). While many outcomes of this study were enriching, the most interesting, with regard to the present paper, is the text type through which the data was collected: the vignette. Thanks to this text type, the phenomenologically oriented research of the Innsbrucker Schule in the field of Pedagogy became well-known (cf. ibid: 50). Inspired by the very same text type, Mairhofer (2014) collected vignettes in New Orleans, United States of America. Mairhofer recorded the experiences of two six-graders and read them under the particular angle of the phenomenon of trust, including "how to trust, trustworthiness, confidence, basic trust and distrust" (2014: 148).

New experiences are based upon the deviation of the past experiences which we already have gained (cf. Merleau-Ponty quoted by Waldenfels 2009: 24, transl). This approach towards experience has already been coined by Plato as well as Locke, the latter claiming that "all ideas arise from experience" (cited by Oelkers 1997 and Meyer-Drawe 2012: 23). Thanks to experiences, we learn (cf. Meyer-Drawe 2012: 15) and as experiencing "cannot be switched on or off" (ibid 16), we learn constantly. As we are reading the following vignettes, which are based upon a person's experience,

---

18 As experience is important to Schratz, Schwarz and Westfall-Greiter, the German term *Erfahrende* means "people who experience something" and is thus translated to *experiencers*.
we are co-experiencing their experience. In this complex thought process, one also has
to include that the writer of the vignette writes from a position of an observer about
what someone else has experienced.

The previously theory is applied in chapter 3.2 by reading eight protocols of lived
(learning) experiences that are collected in non-fictional texts, called *vignettes*. The lived
experiences captured are true to the original study by Schratz, Schwarz and
fields, classes of middle schools were accompanied through the *Phenomenologically
Oriented Vignette Research* of the Leopold-Franzens University of Innsbruck. The
collected vignettes can be described as "concise narrations which capture snippets of
scholastic experiences" (Max van Manen 1990: 35, transl). Thanks to their collection, we
can read these vignettes to gain more understanding of the phenomena of shame.
According to Schratz, "[t]heory should come out of 'practice' or at least, theory should
reflect the experiences of people, and not exist in itself; an abstract representation of
universal truth that is ahistorical and without context." (1995: 174) Therefore, this
special text type was chosen for the present paper.

### 3.1.3 Learning as an experience - learning from experiences

These vignettes can be "compared with a photograph" (Schratz, Schwarz and
Westfall-Greiter 2012: 34f, transl) since they illustrate "highs and lows, surprising and
formative occurrences, subtleties and nuances as well as [they are] portraying moments
in which learning is embodied" (Max van Manen 1990: 35, transl). Vignettes support to
see "what learners are experiencing, what irritates, what surprises, what makes them
question, what makes them wonder" (Schwarz and Schratz 2014: 120). Doing so, they
are "*in medias res* and are composed close to the student" (Meyer-Drawe 2012: 36) but
also these texts present themselves not in a neutral but in a "participating perspective"
as the researcher co-experiences the moment (Schwarz 2013: 42, transl) and thus the
subjectivity of the author of vignettes and the limitations of the present paper are also
taken into consideration. The author of vignettes is focused on

body language and the personification of the experienced: the cringe of a child, a blush, a play
with their hair, fidgeting, turning away, [...] the tone, with which an expression was uttered, the
way it was made audible. Is it shouting, whispering, muttering, stuttering or remaining silent?
[Also taken under considerations are] the line of a gaze, [...] between a thing and a person [...];
movements of a student or teacher in the classroom. Is it a scuffling, hesitating, sprinting or
strolling? (Meyer-Drawe 2012: 37)
The description above shows that vignettes are the ideal text type for discussing how shame is articulated through the body. Schratz, Schwarz and Kiper also praised the text type as "suitable instrument" to capture the "richness of experiences" and to "articulate them in a comprehensible way"; moreover, the text type vignette provides "a form that can become a resonance chamber in which learning experiences can be embodied, linger and co-vibrate" (2014: 51, transl).

As discussed in chapter 2.5, shame is also experienced by the teacher. Moments in teaching experiences are observed through the captured vignettes above which are worth sharing with other teachers or student teachers. These observations will be enriched by the theoretical findings discussed in chapter 2. Instead of being judgemental, the following chapters are an attempt to learn from the strategies used by the teachers observed to create a constructive approach to learning from the experience of others. As discussed above, this proceeds from the "assumption that the other can be understood" (Westfall-Greiter and Schwarz 2012: 121). The teacher is given the benefit of the doubt and his/her strategies are analyzed in a descriptive manner and every utterance is seen as meaningful. It is believed that the teacher has a reason for his/her attitude to address the student in this particular way and use certain strategies during instructions and unexpected situations.

"Reading the vignettes does not provoke answers in form of a concluding analysis and simply one interpretation; instead, they assimilate more a gesture which points at something which is therefore unveiled and in the different layers are seen" (Schratz, Schwarz and Kiper 2014: 51) Thus, depending on the way how vignettes are read and by whom, different aspects resurface (cf. ibid: 51). In regard to the research question, the following chapter 3.2 will discuss topics and tools that are connected with face work and shame. As this study focuses on the learning environment of a classroom, a closer look will be taken at the face-to-face interaction between student(s) and teacher(s). Hence, this research is not limited to a conversation analysis but it instead reaches further into forms of articulations that might not been as directly and easily recognized by an outsider. In this regard, it is imperative that the reader of this paper is aware that the experiences can only be defined in retrospect and that perception plays a vital role (see following chapter). Additionally, it is the observer's experience that is provided in the vignettes and, therefore, one can only assume what
the student(s) might have experienced. Instead of interpreting these experiences, I will attempt to read the articulations in which the experiences of shame portray themselves.

Although the vignettes usually are not given a title, they are for the purpose of this study in order to increase the reader-friendliness of the table of contents and for pointing out similarities in the experiences. Some of the vignettes have been read by Schwarz, Käthe Meyer-Drawe, Schratz and others; thus, their arguments will be included to broaden the perspective and deepen elaboration. To further elaboration and provide food for thought for the readers of this paper, questions are added and sometimes even intentionally unanswered.

3.2 Reading vignettes with the pragmatic and pedagogic lens

3.2.1 Experiencing shame due to being exposed in public

3.2.1.1 Vignette 29: Zijada gets laughed at for making a mistake

The students and the teacher are correcting an exam in German, a personal description. They discuss different words, their meaning and spelling. The teacher wants to know: "What does 'to ramble' mean? Let's have a look in the dictionary!" About ten seconds later she asks: "Who has found it? Great, Zero has got it already!" Some students are still searching. The teacher addresses Zijada and asks: "What is written?" Zijada answers, "To ramble!!" Another student hisses in an annoying manner: "Next to it!" "Zijada has written 'The nose rambles' in her exam. The teacher distinctly states, "You have used a totally wrong word!" The students begin to laugh. Zijada smiles insecurely, blushes and lowers her head between her shoulders. The teacher intervenes and says in a loud voice: "Don't laugh, you have also made mistakes!" The laughter fades. (Schratz, Schwarz and Westfall-Greiter 2012: 70 transl)

Zijada does not know that she has made a mistake — until everyone in her class has been informed about it. Using the dictionary is an important method for independent learning; here, it also serves as a tool for supporting the teacher's argumentation: Zijada has "used a totally wrong word". The definition in the dictionary should help her to understand why. But the commands given by the teacher do not allow enough time to read what is written. Instead of focusing on the usage of the verb "to ramble", the focus is directed toward Zijada. The verb is not in the spotlight, but the student.
This makes the reader wonder: is it necessary for the improvement of the cohort's language ability to give the mistake a face? Is it not more important, why it is wrong instead of who used the verb wrongly? The writer of the vignette does not include if and how the discussion about the verb "to ramble" is continued after the teacher reminded the other students that they have made mistakes too. But this is also what makes this vignette so special: it does not include the whole lesson, just this moment. And this moment might be enough to make focusing on the rest of the lesson impossible for Zijada. What seemed like a task that should allow the students to learn from their mistakes turns into a task of shaming those who have made mistakes. When the situation has reached its climax and laughter fills the classroom, the teacher tries to steer back. However, her expression "Don't laugh, you have also made mistakes!" is hard to follow as the teacher initiated the process of pointing at someone who made mistakes. Thus, the students might have thought that reacting in the way they did was what the teacher had wanted. Now, the students are asked to be respectful by not highlighting Zijada's mistake, despite it previously being the teacher's exact action. And the teacher immediately does it again by mentioning: "You made mistakes too!" This utterance should discourage reacting to mistakes but also initiates another discussion about mistakes again. The students might be confused. What might they take away from this experience? Let him who is without mistakes cast the first stone?

From a pragmatic point of view, the vignette starts with a neutral approach to looking into the meaning of the verb "to ramble". When Zero was quick in finding the indicative in the dictionary, the teacher rewards him by publicly announcing his success and thus his positive face benefits: Zero did a good job, he seems to be perceived as a diligent student. Asking him for the answer would be safe, yet he does not get another chance to score a point. Although other students are "still searching" in the dictionary, the next question is addressed to one of them: Zijada. The vignette does not explain in more detail if she has found the right page in the dictionary or if the short time span was enough for her to read the definition, but it does provide her answer. Instead of naming the definition, she repeats the indicative "to ramble". The annoyed hissing of one of her peers underlines the culture illustrated in this vignette: everything has to be done quickly and correctly. This might be why the teacher does not even amplify the definition. Having answered incorrectly, Zijada seems to have missed the one opportunity to name the right definition. It might save time not to directly respond.
to the mistake but to continue with the next mistake: the verb was used incorrectly as a nose cannot ramble. Thus, in this very short time, Zijada has endured two face threats. The second threat explicitly mentioned her name and put her in the spotlight: "Zijada has written 'The nose rambles' in her exam. You have used a totally wrong word!". The utterance does not continue with the first task — it does not continue with the definition found in the dictionary. In a time-saving environment, where the teacher rushes to work quickly but correctly, this moment is used for publicly announcing that Zijada has "used a totally wrong word". This is the second utterance that focuses on the success or failure of the students. The first one is: "Great, Zero has got it already!". Both utterances do not discuss "what should be learned" but "who has succeeded or not". As a result, the teacher seems to use face work "in a distinct manner" for motivation and punishment. But is punishment motivating?

Another interesting aspect for pragmatists is the reaction of the other interlocutors. From a perspective where face-saving strategies are unknown, one would assume that Zijada's peers are simply mean or mischievous, and schadenfreude might be seen as an opportunity for laughter. But if one knows about face-saving strategies, this opportunity for laughter is seen in a different way. Threatening someone's face is unpleasant, not only for the person in the spotlight but also for the other interlocutors. The tension of shame can be felt in the room - not only Zijada is ashamed, but also her classmates might feel uncomfortable. Instead of the bodily reaction of blushed cheeks, the articulation is laughter to ease the disquiet and unpleasantness for those who can release the laugh, leaving more discomfort, however, for Zijada. To her, the laughter increases the face-threat as laughing or being laughed at are articulations that can foster friendly or hostile reactions in the learning environment. If Zijada had started to laugh too or turn the situation into a joke, then laughter would turn into a face-saving strategy and she might not have felt so ashamed. Instead of making fun of Zijada, the students would make fun of the situation, literary, as they would not take the situation so seriously. However, this face-saving strategy might result in being perceived as making fun of the teacher which would then threaten the teacher's face, and thus be a decisive factor for another face-threat act from the teacher towards the student(s).
The aspect of time was already discussed by mentioning how quickly everything had to happen according to the teacher's commands. However, there is another interesting aspect of time: Firstly, the teacher announces that Zijada misapplied "to ramble"; secondly, the "students begin to laugh"; and thirdly, Zijada expresses shame in her non-verbal language. This chronological order highlights how influential the public aspect is to face-threatening acts. Zijada might still be embarrassed if none of her peers knew about the mistake, but being in the spotlight, the threat to her face is more powerful. It might be that the teacher is aware of this power, and as this paper assumes the best intentions of the teacher, the teacher might not want to harm her face, which is also illustrated in the utterance "Don't laugh, you have also made mistakes!" From a pragmatic perception, this command is a face-saving act as the teacher wants to protect Zijada's positive face as she is being laughed at. This command also influences the negative face of the laughing students as it decides over their actions: they are not supposed to laugh and after the teacher's command the "laughter fades" — a sign of the teacher's power as a person of authority.

The teacher clearly has her cohort under control, but is she also aware of the expressions of shame? Holding the reins as tightly as the teacher does, he or she might be distracted from observing the students. As teachers have to think about multiple aspects simultaneously, the focus might, for instance, be more time oriented as the teacher tries to go through numerous mistakes made in the exam. While the teacher's focus might be on how to go through the mistakes in the quickest, and thus believed, most efficient manner, Zijada's non-verbal communication seems neglected. She "smiles insecurely, blushes and lowers her head between her shoulders" but these signs of shame remain unanswered. Although the utterance – "Don't laugh, you have also made mistakes!"— tries to protect Zijada's face from the face-threatening laughter, it does not contain a face-saving act which addresses Zijada directly. Why was it necessary to announce it publicly that it was her using "to ramble" incorrectly? Why neglect to say anything nice to save her face, and instead threaten the face of those who laughed? Even when this vignette captures only a small section of the learning environment, it comes across as quite a hostile environment where mistakes lead to threat, and shame is not spoken about as much as shaming those who do make mistakes.
3.2.1.2 Vignette 55: Zita's struggles are publicly exposed

Third period: English. Together with the students, the teacher goes through the homework. The students should have translated German sentences into English. Students are repeatedly shouting out the correct solution, which is why the teacher frequently demands: "Can you raise your hand?" Subsequently, she calls out the names of the students who are allowed to read the sentence first and then write it on the blackboard. Zita seems to be very focused on reading her notebook as if she wants to hide in there. She does not raise her hand, although she has completed the homework. The teacher is addressing Zita and asking her to read the next sentence. She reads the sentence in a clumsy and timid way. "Now write the sentence on the board," demands the teacher firmly. Zita picks up her booklet and slowly walks toward the board. She notes the sentence, makes several mistakes, which she corrects with a shy smile. Then she puts down the chalk, smiles timidly again and wriggles back to her chair. "That was embarrassing," she whispers to herself and sits down. (Schratz, Schwarz and Westfall-Greiter 2012: 81f, transl)

This vignette captures a moment during the English lesson. Zita has done her homework but it seems as if she does not want to present it to the whole class. Through the pragmatic lens, Zita is applying a face-saving strategy: she tries not to get the teacher's attention. In the meantime, other students who share their answers loudly with the whole class are given the teacher's attention by being acknowledged: "Can you raise your hand?" Zita is ignored first, which she seems to prefer since she attempts to hide underneath her homework booklet. Her non-verbal utterances make it clear that she is afraid of being called by the teacher. The teacher might not recognize Zita's non-verbal signals or wishes to inflict the will on the weak as a hollow power play. To check on the student's homework, the teacher could also have a look for herself which would have added more reason to the task of writing the solutions into the notebooks. Instead, the teacher "demands [...] firmly" that the students "write the sentence on the board" — an insensitive command which will not result in a positive learning experience as maximum exposure and vulnerability are forced on the one student, Zita, who shows the least willingness to present her solution at the front and in the center of the whole class. Why did the teacher not pick one of the vocal contributors?
Through the pragmatic lens we see that Zita senses the possible face threat, although she might call it differently in her own words. To her, a face threat might result in looking stupid in front of her peers and the teacher. Moreover, she might also be afraid of shame because she expects to have made errors. Or she might be uncomfortable when being in the center of everyone's attention. She might also recall a similar situation when someone has made her feel uncomfortable prior to this moment. Is this teaching method is used regularly? Without knowing about face work, she prefers to maintain the current image others have of her and not add a face-threat which could result in embarrassment or even shame. Zita tries to avoid the experience.

Maybe she already knows the teaching method and therefore is aware of what follows: she will have to leave her desk and thus her comfort zone. Metaphorically leaving the comfort zone can sometimes also be a result of physically leaving the comfort zone when a student is asked to leave their desk and go in front of the whole cohort in order to write something on the board. From a pragmatic perspective, being asked to leave one place and go to another is achieved through deictic elements. In this case, the request to change positions also threatened Zita's negative face want as she cannot decide on her own if and where she wants to present her sentence. Even the teacher's request and indirect order "Can you raise your hand?" addresses the hearers' negative faces as the speaker influences the hearer's "freedom of action" (Brown and Levinson 1987: 324) as the teacher indicates what she wants the students to do. While some of Zita's classmates did not hold back their answers, it is Zita who would rather be left in peace but is not. Actually, the very opposite is the case: She gets everyone's attention. For her, this might be a form of punishment — a punishment for having completed the homework, following the teacher's orders of reading aloud and writing on the board.

Reading the sentence out loud made it audible for the whole class and writing it on the board makes it visible. We also neither know the sentence itself, nor its language accuracy. Consequently, we as readers are as insecure just as Zita, but it is not we who are in the spotlight. We are watching from a safe distance. Like her fellow students, we follow Zita who actually shows more than the sentence: Her embarrassment is made visible too. She has to present her insecure body, walk through the room, enter the stage and put her handwriting and ability to create a sentence on display. Writing on the board while everyone is watching how the hand creates letters is already
challenging. The vignette does not capture if the board provides lines for her to write on or if this kind of stability is missing. Doing so in a language that is not her own mother tongue and copying her own work, about which she is not sure if it is correct, is even more frightening.

Zita does not even know if the sentence she has read aloud is correct, without feedback she has to copy it on the board. Without the trust of having a correct answer, she exposes herself to the eyes of her colleagues and puts her sentence in the pillory. Everyone watches her — gazes follow every letter she writes, a simple teaching method but also simply grotesque in a certain way. There is a chance that all of the interlocutors, all her peers and the teacher, will watch her fail. They could watch her lose her face, watch her as she experiences shame. In this case, it seems as if Zita only experiences a precursor of shame: embarrassment. Zita seems to be a good student who fulfills the tasks given without complaining, but from this learning experience her summary seems to be that it "was embarrassing". The face loss of Zita might not yet have caused shame but embarrassment.

The writer of the vignette neither recorded the reaction of the other students nor the reaction of the teacher. How did the teacher close this moment? Did Zita receive praise? Or does the teacher focus on the errors? Were parts of the sentence highlighted, corrected or even crossed through? Does the teacher take a moment to talk one on one with Zita to establish what was going on deeper down? What is left out, however, helps us to have a clearer picture of what happened: Zita was pushed out of her comfort zone and the purpose of the task seems to be in the shadow of her experience of embarrassment. Contained within the light of her experiences might be hostile feelings of her personal shame, or in her own words, "That was embarrassing."
3.2.1.3 Vignette 67: Petra's public recognition

Petra is searching for a ruler in her pencil case — no success. After consulting her seatmate, she takes the triangle ruler and underlines the result of the just calculated exercise with a neatly drawn line. "How far are you?", Mrs. Piel asks Petra. 'I am done.' Consequently, the teacher opens the school's website, interrupts the work of the students and shows the group a picture of two students, who have achieved all A's in this term's report. Petra is one of them. Her eyes sparkle. She is surprised, blushes, swings her fountain pen back and forth. Her legs move and take turns in gliding over the linoleum covered floor. She seems bashful. When her classmates comment on her achievement with "Well done!", "Great!", "Awesome!", she leans back in her chair with a relaxed smile. "Diligence should be rewarded", notes the teacher as if talking to herself and continues with the next assignment: "Who is finished with the exercise can pick a new task from the orange box in the book. The key is in the book too." At the end of the lesson, another smile lightens Petra's face. In her notebook, there are two stickers as a reward of her accurately performed and correctly solved homework assignments. (Schratz, Schwarz and Westfall-Greiter 2012: 86, transl)

Petra is one of two students who are publicly praised for "achieving all As in this term's report". While her peers in the classroom see her picture and hear the praise, Petra's bodily reactions are captured in this vignette: First, "[h]er eyes sparkle. She is surprised, blushes, swings her fountain pen back and forth. Her legs move and take turns in gliding over the linoleum-covered floor. She seems bashful". Only when her fellow students show confirmation that they perceive this public presentation as something positive too, she reacts similarly and relaxes. The teacher's affirmation seemed not to be enough, she might have been worried that the praise to her image might backfire and cause the opposite effect: a face threat. But how could a teacher's praise lead to a face threat?

The German term for bashful is *verschämt* which includes *Scham*, which is translated to shame; therefore, Petra might experience a type of shame. From a pragmatic point of view, it is interesting that she "seems bashful" from a positive utterance. As she is one of two who has achieved the highest grades, she stands out and is perceived by the teacher as more successful than the other students. In an indirect way, the positive faces of the students without all As are threatened. "Diligence should be rewarded", announces the teacher and although she does not mention it directly, other students might feel that they are perceived as not diligent enough. Some of them, however, might have worked harder than Petra but simply not been as
successful. Therefore, Petra might have been afraid that her fellow students would react with envy or insults. The latter two reactions could have been uttered as a direct face threat to Petra's positive face, for instance, someone could have claimed that she would not have earned such grades, or perhaps someone was hoping for the same result and surprised not to have received all A's. Fortunately for Petra, everyone seems happy for her. She is delighted — her face has just gained a more positive perception.

3.2.1.4 Comparison and conclusion

While vignette 55 and 67 capture a totally different experience, reading them from a pragmatic perspective proves that "face is public" (Brown and Levinson quoted in Goldsmith 2007: 220). In both situations, utterances have more impact because they are shown in front of the whole classroom. The hostile emotion of shame is increased due to the audience in vignette 55, and the praise of the teacher is more powerful because of the other students seeing it too. The latter might be used as a tool for motivation for the other students who have not achieved as well. In comparison, forcing Zita to present her sentence twice in public might not boost her learning but hinder it instead as her embarrassment seems to overshadow the task.

Vignette 29 and 55 appear to be more similar as both students experience embarrassment: Zita is embarrassed because of reading a self-produced sentence and publicly copying it on the board, Zajida is embarrassed because the teacher publicly announces her mistake. In both experiences, the students might have felt less embarrassment if not all their peers were witnesses.
3.2.2. Shame as a tool for disciplinary measure

3.2.2.1 Vignette 10: Anton is accused publically

She knocks and the door opens. Mrs. Almer enters and after a brief nod towards the present teacher, she turns towards the students. Her eyes wander through the classroom and then she announces in a firm tone: "Today I want to speak to Anton." There are two children with the name Anton in this cohort and Mrs. Almer clarifies why she needs to see Anton: "During break, Anton hit a girl on her head and with this Anton I would like to speak." Two students point immediately to Anton in the last row. Anton raises his gaze, blushes and remains motionless in his sunk down position. He does not say a word. Mrs. Almer addresses Anton directly and requests: "So you will come with me." He stands up slowly and leaves the classroom together with Mrs. Almer wordlessly, with his head bowed down. (Schratz, Schwarz and Westfall-Greiter 2012: 62, transl)

The beginning of the vignette immediately creates a sense of tension and leaves the reader wondering about the situation.. Although Mrs. Almer is not introduced after she enters the scene, the reader still senses that she holds a position of authority. Instead of solving the mystery, she creates even more tension while her "eyes [are] wandering through the classroom". Three sentences in, the scene still has not been established. Therefore, it is surprising that there is no form of greeting and the pronouncement of the teacher is also surprising. Usually, when two people have the same first name, the simplest way to distinguish them is by adding the surname. This would be common and neutral, without giving away any detail that might be too intimate within the public setting of the classroom. At least, one suspects that Mrs. Almer has something to discuss with Anton in private, otherwise why would she interrupt a lesson and announce that she needed to pull him out of class? Speaking to him alone automatically is beneficial for his face if it is something negative, as a public setting increases face damage. Additionally, a private conversation allows the student to share that which he might not share in front of all his peers. If the topic of discussion is something emotional, Mrs. Almer could act as a pastoral caretaker and an honest conversation where the teacher listens to Anton. This might increase the trust between Anton and Mrs. Almer and help Anton to cope better with his experience.
Instead, Mrs. Almer gives Anton something other than a surname: she gives him a stigma. She wants to speak to the Anton who "hit a girl on her head" and by declaring that "with this Anton [she] would like to speak" (emphasis added), she automatically stigmatizes Anton as violent against a member of his peer group. Thus, he is categorized as a misfit and, in the same way as his surname did not matter, his feelings or his side of the story do not seem to matter either. We as readers do not even know if Anton did something wrong or if it is a recurrent instance in in which he may have been wrongly accused. The author of this vignette does not include this information, but a description of his body language — all we receive is his non-verbal utterances captured through the eyes of the author. This body language clearly indicates that he is ashamed: he "blushes", "remains motionless in his sunk down position." His speechlessness seems to support his motionlessness and might be interpreted as an admission of his guilt. Between the lines, one might read that Mrs. Almer also finds confirmation in his shame as she declares: "So you will come with me". Even then, Anton does not contradict. The slow manner with which he silently rises from his chair with his "head bowed down" conjures the image of a guilty person approaching the guillotine. He might wish to disappear off the face of the earth, and may wonder if this was only the beginning of more public humiliation.

Combining the Pragmatic and Pedagogic lens, we see that the public humiliation which already occurred in the classroom was so damaging to Anton's face that he is experiencing shame which is visible through his body language. By pronouncing the accusation in front of the classroom, the teacher immediately and directly damages Anton's positive face and, therefore, threatens the addressee's feelings and identity in front of his peers through criticism and judgment. By publicly announcing his misbehavior, she might want to influence the etiquette and common ground of all those present, to highlight that this is not accepted within the school's culture. This intentional face threatening is then aimed to prevent future violence between the students and establish a culture in the classroom environment that does not accept physical violence. Public shaming can be an efficient tool to prevent interlocutors from misbehaving or hurting others, as students might hold back because they are afraid of being revealed. As a result, the other interlocutors decide on protecting or threatening the other interlocutors' faces. This decision causes impactful consequences if it is the teacher, as an authority figure, who reveals a student, for "in
classrooms, teachers very often have the right to frame interactions" (Johnstone 2004: 141). Another aspect that frames this interaction is the classroom which provides a forum with an audience to support the face-threatening act. According to Malaguzzi, the room is the "third pedagog" (quoted in Schratz 2014: 59) and in this regard, the teacher might have deliberately chosen the classroom as the first room of punishment to then continue the conversation in another manner and location. The writer of the vignette does not include whether Anton is to follow her into a more private space or the headmaster's office but Anton seems to assume further punishment.

As discussed, it is decided by the teacher that she and Anton change rooms. Reading the vignette with a Pragmatic lens gives us more information about how this change of rooms is initiated. In the classroom, teachers command the students to different places; in this case, Anton was ordered to follow Mrs. Almer with the utterance "come with me" and he slowly follows the command. This command is successful because Mrs. Almer holds a position of authority and uses deictic elements. Through the construction of her sentences and the way Anton reacts, it is clear that his negative face is damaged as well. Anton's "freedom of action" (Trudgill 2003: 92f) is restricted as the teacher does not "show respect for the degree of autonomy that is appropriate to [the student's] identity" (1987; quoted by Goldsmith 2007, 220-222). In this regard, Anton's negative face could have been respected if he was asked, instead of ordered to leave the classroom with Mrs. Almer. This change of wording might have affected the tone and the utterance "So, would you come with me?" carries the implication of refusal, or includes the possibility to refuse. In Anton's position, however, refusal seems unlikely; the teacher is in a position of authority and thus can easily dictate Anton's time and space. Another aspect prevents Anton to refuse: his "face is [already] very small" (Brown and Levinson 1987: 328) and, therefore, the

---

19 The adjective "deictic" originates from the Greek verb deiknumi which means "to point" or "to show" and thus the noun "deixis" is "the act of pointing" (cf. Mey 2005: 337). Deixis is "used to indicate the function that certain words, such as personal and demonstrative pronouns, place and time adverbs like 'here', 'now', and others have in the language" (ibid: 337). In the classroom, teachers order students, for instance, to come to the front when presenting a speech, go to the whiteboard and write a sentence. The function of deixis "is always bound up with the time and place of the utterance, seen in relation to the speaker. Thus, we say 'Come here" (ibid: 337). The meaning of deixis is also put into a more imaginary language: the abstract noun of deixis is visualized and made concrete (in German we also say greifbar which means graspable): index finger. The Latin word index means "pointer", or "forefinger" and the English term index is similarly used to denote the body part which serves as the human 'pointer' par excellence" (ibid: 337). Thus, the index finger is often used to support the deictic elements of the teacher. In this case, the vignette does not mention a gesture of the index finger like a beckon to underline the utterance of "come with me", but the utterance itself and Anton's reaction reveal more aspects of face loss as it threatens Anton's negative face want.
"speaker is vastly superior in power" (ibid: 328). Thus, we can draw the conclusion that a student who has already suffered on an impactful face loss has also surrendered his power to the person who is threatening his face, and, therefore, raising an objection is particularly difficult.

We as readers are left with the benefit of the doubt about Anton's guilt, and although the shameful reactions resemble a confession, Anton does not act aggressively. This makes it hard to believe that the accusation of him having been aggressive is true. From a pedagogical point of view, we observe that the picture which is painted of Anton in this vignette is immediately accusatory and does not allow room for clarification. Mrs. Almer does not leave room for doubt about his guilt because he is "Anton who hit a girl", an ascription that differentiates between the two students with the same name. From a pragmatic perspective, the picture painted of Anton also defines his identity, his face. As discussed in chapter 2.3, the pragmatists Brown and Levinson refer to the self-image of a person as

face and Goffman apprehended the term and defined face as "the positive social value a person effectively claims for himself by the line others assume he has taken during a particular contact." (1967: 306). Once a person, such as Anton "takes on a self-image expressed through face he will be expected to live up to [this line]" (ibid: 307). Anton unfortunately does not uphold expectations as he breaks an important rule: one should not be violent against other people. This infraction seems magnified as Anton is a boy and is accused of having hit a girl.20 His face is significantly threatened even more by the way in which his identity is defined as he is called out as "Anton who hit a girl", which leads us back to Pedagogy where ascriptions are discussed.

According to Schwarz, "ascriptions provide stability and orientation; however, they also create stereotypes and categorizations [...] which simply lead to stigmatization" (2013: 40, transl) Because of the ascription Mrs. Almer might have found a way to clarify quickly who is the confessing offender; however, she also found a way to act as an offender herself. As a result, she was not the only one who used an ascription to "provide stability and orientation" (ibid: 40, transl). Instead, the students have learned that Mrs. Almer cannot be trusted: she states that she wants to talk to one of their peers in private and the students might assume that some issues are too delicate to discuss in public; but then she breaks this sort of implied promise and castes

---

20 The gender aspect is acknowledged as an important aspect for further analysis; however, it would go beyond the constraints of this paper.
shame publicly. Anton must now endure the potentially accusing gazes of his fellow students and the second teacher in the room, in addition to Mrs. Almer.

The atmosphere in the classroom may now be contaminated with negative emotions, which distract the learning and impact the long term memory of the students, leaving a negative effect after Anton has left the classroom. The second teacher may then find it difficult to motivate the students and to reestablish their focus. She and the other students who have witnessed the shaming also are likely to feel uncomfortable, as everyone’s face depends on positive self image and people can be expected to defend their faces if threatened. In conclusion, it seems that it is in the best interest of everyone to maintain the face of each individual (cf. Brown and Levinson 1987: 322). As saving each other’s face is "the basis for communicative behavior" (Mey 2005: 74) and part of the "'working' acceptance", the students might feel that this unspoken law is violated, their vulnerability is exposed, casting doubt about the safety and general atmosphere of their learning environment.

This particular shame and loss of safety might be intentionally used as a tool to punish those who do not follow the rules and to warn the other interlocutors. This disciplinary measure reminds all interlocutors of the norms to which they agreed, for instance that they should not hurt others. As Mrs. Almer is seen as a "guardian of scholastic order" (Schwarz 2013: 48), the act that seems cruel to Anton might be well-intended and shaming used as a form of punishment to achieve a less violent learning environment. But, what price is paid? Do the students understand why her act of psychological violence is justified and Anton's physical violence is not? Or does the teacher fail to use *pedagogical tact* and thus miss a chance to educate them to take care of each other in a more humane and inclusive, yet efficient, manner?

Asking these questions is much easier than answering them, and doing the right thing in the right moment is even more difficult. Experiencing this incident in reading and reflecting upon it outside of the classroom so no student is hurt or nor decisions made that affect others, might encourage teachers to be more aware of their actions and consequences. Some questions trigger different answers depending upon the individual and his or her experiences. This paper does not aim to "give one-size-fits-all" solutions, but to draw attention to considerations that need to be taken into considerations that may have unwanted or negative consequences.
3.2.2.2 Vignette 47: Anna is declared to be sassy

Alina wants to switch places and explains: "I don't want to sit next to Anna. She is always so sassy to me. And she is also sassy with Mr. Auer." Consequently, the teacher asks Anna: "Why are you so sassy?" Anna sits motionlessly. She is holding her head low and remains silent. The teacher looks at Anna and waits. The whole cohort waits. There is only the rattling sound of the blinds. Anna is still, not saying a word. The teacher moves to the middle of the classroom, interrupts the silence and says to Anna, audible for everyone: "If this does not get better, then you will receive break detention, see the principal and I will also speak to your mother!" The girl sitting next to Anna is allowed to change seats. Anna remains alone at her desk. (Schratz, Schwarz and Westfall-Greiter 2012: 79, transl)

The way Anna is perceived influences her own self-image, and this image influences how others perceive her. As (self)image plays a vital role in the "public identification" (Goffman 1963a: 71), Anna's public image, that is "the image of h[er] available to those who do not know h[er] personally, will necessarily be somewhat different from the image [s]he projects through direct dealings with those who know h[er] personally" (Goffman 1963a: 71, pronouns he/him were changed to she/her). Thus, Alina who identifies Anna as "sassy", might not know her well enough to be sure, but according to an "accidental event which exposes the individual to public identification without providing h[er] any compensating claim to desired attributes" (ibid: 71). Anna's comments categorize Anna publicly as a "social troublemaker" (Rumpf 2012: 105), a public image that might be constituted from a small selection of facts which may be true of h[er], which facts are inflated into a dramatic and newsworthy appearance, and then used as a full picture of h[er]. In consequence, a special type of stigmatization can occur. (Goffman 1963a: 71, pronouns he/him were changed to she/her)

The incident that Alina has experienced might have been enough to create the "newsworthy" claim told to the teacher by publicly announcing in the classroom: "Anna was sassy" — a stigma that is not contradicted by the teacher, other students, or Anna herself. We as readers do not know if the stigma is based on truth. It is also unclear if the teacher or Anna's fellow students know for sure. Anna is declared "sassy" based on the subjective perception of Alina. According to Goffman, Anna's "public image" is influenced by the "dramatic and newsworthy appearance" (ibid: 71) in which Anna is stigmatized as a misfit.
Anna's reaction might be perceived as a confession: she remains sitting "motionlessly" and "not saying a word" — a behavior that arguably could not be categorized as "sassy". This leads the reader to wonder if Anna was really to blame. Less ambiguous is that Anna is experiencing shame as she articulates that same emotion through her body language: she holds her head low, she does not express herself verbally and remains silent. Although Anna does not speak one word, her non-verbal body language speaks volumes; nevertheless, her non-verbal utterances seem unheard as the teacher and the whole cohort seem to ignore her shame and, in metaphorical words, pour more salt into the wound by waiting for verbal explanation from Anna. Or are they waiting for an excuse? What if Anna was falsely accused? How could Anna respond to save face?

From a Pragmatic perspective, Anna is in a difficult situation to defend herself. Goffman provides the following scenario how one can respond to neutralize the threat and, therefore, reduce the shame: "[t]he general method is for the person to introduce favorable facts about himself and unfavorable facts about the others" (ibid: 315). If Anna wanted to defend her self-image, the answer to the question "Why are you so sassy" might be perceived as rude were she to contradict Alina and the teacher by claiming "I was not sassy". Anna could also have tried to state "unfavorable facts about the others" (ibid: 314). Thus, she could deny the accusation, shame and blame others. Alina might have been painted as a liar, and her positive face of a trustworthy and truthful student is threatened. This approach might be risky since Anna would perhaps not only threaten Alina's face but is likely to put her own face in danger as Alina and other classmates could react even more aggressively towards her, resulting in more shaming and more detentions. If her response was "I do not want to be sassy", she would partly admit to having done something wrong and imply that she is sorry. This utterance would threaten her own face and, thus, increase her shame as well. If Anna offered a bold excuse, she would not only have admitted her sassy behavior but also damaged her positive face even more as she "indicates that [s]he regrets doing a prior face-threatening act" (Brown and Levinson 1987: 326) which would be seen as "a confession" (Ibid: 327). Instead, Anna could have "introduce[d] favorable facts about herself" (Goffman 1967: 314), thus spoken positively about her own behavior, for instance: "I am always friendly and polite to everybody!" This carries the additional risk of being perceived as sassy by contradicting the teacher.
A verbal response is particularly challenging in Anna's situation due to the teacher's actions: First, the teacher immediately threatened Anna's positive face by not trusting her to be a well-behaved student and instead supported the image of her being sassy. Second, the accusation happened in front of Anna's peers, making the face threat especially harmful and thus the face threat is especially harmful as face and shame are influenced by the aspect of publicity. Third, the question "Why are you so sassy?" leads to Anna inflicting more self damage by requiring her to explain why she was not behaving like an exemplary student. Or, in Goffman's terms, Anna was not keeping up to the line she was expected (cf 1967: 306). Rumpf also read the vignette, providing the following reaction: He sees the teacher's question "Why are you so sassy?" as one "grotesquely standing out of the usual culture of questions asked at school" as one could, for instance, ask why Vienna is the capital city of Austria but not use the same type of question for someone's behavior (2012: 106, transl). Even if it is true and Anna was sassy to others, she may not have realized why she acted in that manner, nor self-reflected about her behavior. Even if she did, the answer might not be one she would share in a public setting, already standing before the guillotine. Not clarifying the truth, but going immediately to the next assumption asking why, the teacher supports the stigma of Anna being a "social troublemaker" (ibid: 105, transl). The teacher, therefore, trusts Alina's opinion who has painted a picture which "[b]oth create[s] and close[s] spaces of evidence, open or block access to the unpredictable other and the unpredictable world. In a nutshell: pictures put us in the picture". (Meyer-Drawe 2010: 816).

After these accusations, Anna might have been speechless with shame. It is then understandable that Anna does not find the words in this challenging situation. The classmates "sense the hole in the communication" (ibid: 105, transl), the pause that remains unfilled with words. Even this silence is a way of articulating as "you cannot not communicate" (Watzlawick). The other interlocutors might be afraid to break the silence, as this would then also interject them into the spotlight. Their act of remaining silent threatens Anna's face as it saves their own by self defense. Therefore, threatening Anna's face is an act of face-saving: a self-defense for their own faces not to be shamed. Shame is a considerable face threat and it takes courage for yourself and others to stand up against face threats.
As face threat often leads to more face threat, it seems that Alina is sure of her face to be safe. Perhaps Alina already made the experience that reporting misbehavior to the teacher is perceived positively and the ace up her sleeve seems to be that Mr. Auer, colleague of the present teacher, was also affected. It is uncertain if Alina feels or knows that she has broken the mutual agreement of the cooperative articulations to honor face by insulting one of her peers publicly, but even if someone does not know much about face work, one can see that this act demonstrates that Alina "does not care about [Anna's] feelings" (Brown and Levinson 1987: 324). She even expects a reward which might improve her own situation: a different seat in the classroom. Alina is, therefore, using aggressive face-work to improve her own face.

Tomlinson argues that negative behavior references to the fact that "something from the viewpoint of the child is not alright" (2012: 113), which leads to question why Alina would initially make the statement "I don't want to sit next to Anna". Reh and Rabenstein observed an experience where two students had to cooperate; afterward the researchers discussed whether the two were influenced by the following thoughts: "Does someone want to work cooperatively together with someone, who is [...] not as high in the hierarchy that he could be on an equal level or even friend? Does someone want to be seen with this person — by and in front of others?" (2012: 241, transl). Although the students who were observed by Reh and Rabenstein experienced another situation, there might be some similarities to Anna and Alina. Perhaps Alina was afraid to be seen as a friend of Anna who was misbehaving as this would be a risk for Alina's claimed face of a well-behaved student? Maybe she does not want to be with someone who has a different line (Goffman 1967: 308)? Does she perceive Anna as lower than she is in the hierarchy? It could simply be that the two girls had an argument. While many reasons could be the cause, it is interesting to see how much impact (sub)conscious face work has. Another aspect is the stigma that Anna is given. As Alina could be categorized as "normal" according to Goffman's terms, she might want to "arrange life so as to avoid" the stigmatized Anna (1963b: 12). This might also be why the girl sitting next to Anna wants to achieve spatial separation. Moreover, "the social identity" of Anna as stigmatized of being sassy "can be used as a source of information concerning [Alina's] own social identity, the assumption being that [s]he is what [Anna is]" (ibid: 47). Sitting next to Anna and being identified as her friend might
provide an identity which is undesirable for Alina, threatening her own *positive face* of a well-behaved student.

Anna could also be aware of her inferiority but, as a "stigmatized individual [Anna] may find that [s]he feels unsure of how normals will identify with [her] and receive [her]" (ibid: 13). This insecurity might increase the "fear that others can disrespect a person because of something he shows and means that he is always insecure in his contact with other people" (Perry, Gawel and Gibbon 1956: 145). Furthermore, "[g]iven what the stigmatized individual may well face upon entering a mixed social situation, [s]he may anticipatorily respond by defensive cowering" (ibid: 17) which would reinforce the non-verbal communication of shame as well.

The teacher in this situation had the opportunity to support an "act of redemption". Instead, Alina is rewarded publicly for her denial and misunderstanding of Anna, and Anna is more estranged from the other classmates (ibid: 113). Alina seems to use face threatening as a tool to improve her own situation, and the teacher supports this action. In addition, the teacher announces three steps to sanction Anna’s conduct: detention, seeing the head of school and talking to her mother (cf. ibid: 106). The public humiliation is an additional punishment Anna undergoes which includes face threats and, as a result, has negative influences on trust between the two parties, the student(s) and their teacher. The might perceive the outcome as restoring peace in the classroom. The students, however, have experienced that sometimes their peers or a "teacher is not a reliable person to be trusted in their lives" (Tomlinson 2012: 114). Anna may have also lost Alina as a friend. While Anna experiences hostile emotions, no one seems to be on her side, as Alina literally left to sit next to someone else. These are the ramifications of trusting one student over another, and consequently elevating Alina over Anna. Anna is separated spatially from her seatmate and remains alone — a public humiliation for a student who has been stigmatized and shamed.
3.2.2.3 Vignette 61: Patrick gets a present

Mrs Peier enters the classroom a few minutes after the bell. She carries a pile of notebooks under her left arm and a parcel under her right one. She gazes frantically into the cohort, who is already working on mathematical exercises set by Mrs. Piel, the second teacher. As if on command, all the students stop their work and stand up. Mrs. Peier seems not to notice the welcome. She determinedly heads for a shelf where she can drop off a load of booklets, then announces with a slightly raised voice: "Patrick will receive a present from me." The whole room falls silent. A sense of surprise lies in the air. The students are still standing, totally calm. All gazes focus on Mrs. Peier who, with her back to the cohort, is trying laboriously to rip open the parcel. Mrs. Piel seems to wait for a sign from her colleague — nothing. She instructs: "Sit down!" which everyone immediately carries out. One last tear and the secret is revealed: books on mathematics! Mrs. Peier declares to the students: "You are my witnesses. Patrick does not have any more excuses!" Glances are drifting from Mrs. Peier to Patrick and from Patrick to Mrs. Piel. Patrick's eyes are riveted on his desk while Mrs. Peier puts the books on his desk. Blush stained his cheeks. Without a word, he pulls the books closer, he does not look up once. A murmur goes through the room. Some fellow students smile smugly. Meanwhile, Mrs. Peier returns to the shelf and begins to devote herself to the pile of homework booklets — without a single comment. The students continue to work on their exercises. Mrs. Peier complains, "Patrick, you have handed in a wrong notebook!" Patrick seems to disagree and raises an objection which is quashed by a loud "No! Drop it!" Mrs. Peier reminds him fretfully: "And what about the lousy piece of rough paper you lately wanted to hand in as homework?" "Which you immediately tore apart," intervenes Paula, the class representative. "Exactly!" confirmed Mrs. Peier, adding, "I always need witnesses!" and turns again towards the homework booklets. (Schratz, Schwarz and Westfall-Greiter 2012: 84, transl)

From Mrs. Peier’s initial entrance into the classroom it is obvious that the students have great respect for her or may even be afraid of her. Students immediately interrupt their tasks, stand up militarily straight and seem to not dare sit down before the traditional signal. The ritualized scenario is interrupted by an unusual utterance by Mrs. Peier: "Patrick will receive a present from me". This expression is unusual for the setting, as teachers normally do not surprise students with presents. It is also unusual as the addressee of the expression is not spoken to directly but in third person, as if he was not present. But Patrick is present, indeed he has become the center of attention. Gazes wander to the presentee and the donor, and to the second teacher, who remains silent.

The second declaration does not, again, address Patrick and neither does the third. Instead, it is f Patrick’s classmates whose role as audience is highlighted, even
claimed: they are Mrs Peier's witnesses. Without the other interlocutors, the situation would never have been as painful to him. His face was threatened publicly and in this face-threatening act the audience seems to have played a more important role than Patrick himself. Mrs Peier could have approached him after class, talking only to him alone and attacking his positive face through criticism, but not stigmatizing him in front of the entire cohort. The manner with which Mrs Peier addressed the issue, without so much as a proper welcome upon entering the classroom, clearly signalizes that her decision was deliberately made. To pointedly address the audience while excluding Patrick labels him "as someone, whose misconduct needs witnesses" (Schwarz 2013: 45). These witnesses seem to not only agree but to enjoy the situation as the reaction of some students is depicted in the vignette with a "smug" smile. Patrick's misbehavior seems to justify the face-threatening act of Mrs Peier and his classmates seem to agree as nobody shows an effort to repair his face, according to the author of the vignette. Patrick's face is threatened, but everyone else's face is safe.

According to the pragmatists Brown and Levinson, the "criticism, contempt or ridicule, [...] accusations [and] insults [...] threaten the positive-face want" and furthermore portray that "the speaker does not care about the addressee's feelings" (1987: 324, italics added). Mrs Peier criticizes Patrick's work habits: he might have lost the Mathematics books and used it as an excuse to ignore his homework, handed in the wrong booklet or a piece of jotting paper instead of a well-organized homework booklet. Indirectly, Mrs Peier also "threatens the addressee's negative-face want" by placing a type of "order" which "indicates that [s]he wants" Patrick to work in a different manner, controlling his "freedom of action" (ibid: 324). The teacher undermines Patrick's "desire for autonomy" which can be threatened by "failing to show respect for the degree of autonomy that is appropriate to [Patrick's] identity" (1987; quoted by Goldsmith 2007, 220-222) and, therefore, questions that he can organize his own learning as she decided to get him mathematics books. The vignette does not state if the books were lost or if he is new to the class and has not yet received his books. "Mathematics books, which are presented here as a present, are questionable presents for a ten-year-old", argues Schwarz (2013: 45, transl). What seemed to be a well-intended gift now has turned into a trap. The present indicates blame and generates shame. Patrick's body language confirms this thought as "[b]lush suffuses his cheeks" and he seems to have lost the courage to look up from his desk. The action of
pulling the books closer stands as a response: he accepts the books — and thus seems to shamefully admit his mistake.

It comes as a surprise that, after the accusation by Mrs. Peier claiming Patrick has handed in the wrong homework notebook, Patrick speaks up and disagrees with Mrs. Peier. He defends himself when being accused again. Patrick seems "transformed, from the enduring to the responding self" (Waldenfels 2002: 102) who stands up for his own defense as he sees himself in the right. The writer of the vignette does not provide evidence to unveil who is in the right but by her reaction Mrs Peier shows that she does not like to be contradicted. According to Schwarz, the teacher is portrayed as a "guardian of scholastic order" (2013: 48) and the beginning of the vignette proves that she was successful in establishing a firm greeting habit and students who generally follow her opinion and do not rebel. When Patrick rebels, his starting situation is already in Mrs. Peier's favor as she has stigmatized him as "sloppy [and] forgetful" (ibid: 48). Mrs. Peier is in a position of power due to her authority as a teacher, and in comparison to Patrick, she is also more powerful than him because his "face is [already] very small" (Brown and Levinson 1987: 328) due to the face loss he has already suffered. As a result, raising an objection is particularly difficult. On top of her advantages, Mrs. Peier also increases the aggressiveness in her tone and provides further evidence to prove that she was right in painting his image as a "sloppy [and] forgetful" student (Schwarz 2013: 48): she reminds him of the other day when he "wanted to hand in [rough paper] as homework".

It is in this very moment when another student, Paula, intervenes. The new voice surprises the reader. The intervention stands out, as so far only Mrs Peier and Patrick were speaking. There is a notable shift when Paula enters the picture as she — as a listener — transforms from "an enduring to the responding self" (Waldenfels 2002: 102) when she speaks up. One might hope that Paula, the class representative, "as chosen representative of [Patrick's] rights [...] initiates a "subversive turn against Mrs Peier's actions" (Schwarz 2013: 46) but although the vignette does not give a detailed description of the way Paula uttered the sentence "[w]hich you immediately have torn apart", it seems as if she added to the question of Mrs Peier and supports the teacher's arguments, as if she was part of a well-rehearsed play in the theatre. By adding to the accusation, Paula threatens Patrick's face further, increasing the value of her own positive face as the teacher agrees with "Exactly!" and, indirectly, praises her witnesses
and her own decision to address this issue publicly. Mrs Peier might believe to enhance her own face as she gains recognition through the students' confirmation. However, the face-threatening act also decreases the trust between them as teacher and learner. Schwarz claims that "the teacher misses [...] the pedagogical tact" (Herbart 1802, 1964 and Muth 1962 quoted in Schwarz 2013:47, transl) in this situation. The student receives a present, and as receiving a present is generally known as an act that creates a pleasant thrill of anticipation and is expected to result in joy, the students might feel that they were fooled. Behind the wrapping of the present is not the wish to make someone happy, instead, the unwrapping presents a disciplinary measure. While the very first utterance when entering the classroom seems to promise that Patrick will receive a gift, he actually is deliberately placed in the spotlight for shaming. Meyer-Drawe states that Patrick is receiving not a present but "attention as punishment" (2012a: 55, transl). The attention of the other students is directed to Patrick, and in the "gaze of the teacher every glimmer of hope vanishes" (ibid: 56, transl).

We observe the peculiar phenomenon, that all gazes are fixed on Patrick but this makes him invisible. His demands do not play any role. They are simply overseen and overheard. The teacher knows exactly who she has in front of her. Her image of Patrick is decided and does not tolerate surprises. (ibid: 56, transl)

It seems as if Patrick is the center of attention, but the teacher does not really see or hear him — she does not listen to his (un)articulated call. Instead, the image which is painted of Patrick stigmatizes him and "does not give him a chance to be anyone else than someone who neglects his homework" (ibid: 56, transl). With her powerful gaze and by virtue of her actions, Mrs Peier "presents herself as a powerful educator, as nemesis" to whom the alignment to good behavior is important, and a "deviation from the norm" is sanctioned (Schwarz 2012: 47, transl). To her, the following "norms and values count in this context: obedience, accuracy, diligence, order, honesty and judiciousness and consciousness of guilt when rules are broken" (ibid: 46, transl, italics in original). As a result, she punishes the misfit publicly by stigmatizing and shaming him. Mrs Peier quite possibly aims to discipline not only Patrick but also all the other interlocutors by using shame as a disciplinary tool. "Teachers have the satisfaction of being in control of time and content of a lesson, but what does this position of power cost?" (Schwarz 2017: 29). Due to this experience, Patrick and his fellow students might come to the conclusion that it is better not to disagree with Mrs Peier, or other teachers; and, one gets rewarded if he or she agrees with the teacher, as it has happened for
Paula. In Pragmatic terms, the students might have learned that in the scenario of one student's face being threatened, it causes less shame if the student endures his image being publicly destroyed, rather than result in threatening the teacher's face and encouraging further trouble for the offending student. An attempt at face saving might, therefore, result in further face threatening.

### 3.2.2.4 Comparison and conclusion

In all three vignettes in chapter 3.2.2, threats to the positive and negative face are experienced. Anton in vignette 10, Anna in vignette 47 and Patrick in vignette 61 experience a damage of their image through face loss. Raising an objection is very difficult in all three cases. Although Patrick does not "simply" give in like Anton and Anna, Patrick's objection is not only overruled — it is crushed.

This leads to the conclusion that face-threatening acts seem to cause a domino effect: one face threat leads to another. This chain reaction may not be limited to only one person but will likely spread to another interlocutor's face. This highlights the importance of understanding face work, as hostile emotions can be dealt with in a less harmful fashion and shaming might be prevented if the interlocutors are aware of the reasons behind people's particular reactions. Moreover, shame might be used as a tool, especially in vignette 10 and 61 where the teacher acts as a guardian of the scholastic order and tries to establish the agreed norms again through shaming. Although shaming might be viewed as an efficient tool when seeking to hurt the student in the spotlight, it might not be the most efficient strategy to achieve the educational objective overall. It may consequently damage the trust in the student teacher relationship and distract from the actual task. A less hostile approach could be used; for instance, by applying more pedagogical tact, a teacher might opt to use this situation as an opportunity for students to learn how to save face instead of threatening it. Ultimately, all students are in the same boat along with the teacher.
3.2.3 Blaming instead of shaming

3.2.3.1 Vignette 7: Lenny blames himself and then the task

The task of today's Mathematics lesson is a running dictation about four different problems to solve, which were allocated in different parts of the classroom by the two teachers. After an introduction, the students run back and forth between the tasks, try to memorize the pieces of information and solve the exercises in their notebooks on their desks. Some remain standing to be faster and run back and forth, others work more slowly. It happens that Lenny has started with a more challenging exercise and has already run back and forth several times. He is stressed and desperately mentions that he is not good at it. His frustration increases, he seems to be paralyzed, shortly before bursting. A teacher tries to calm and encourage him. He answers, 'But I can't do it!' She gives him a hint and tells him to try again. Reluctantly, he walks again to the exercise on the board, the teacher leaves his desk. *It does not work, it does not work, it does not work.* He scolds himself because he does not manage to memorize anything and marches back to his desk. He is terribly angry. *You can't do it, you can't do it, you can't do it. You are too stupid, you are too stupid. Bullshit. It is bullshit.*

(Schratz, Schwarz and Westfall-Greiter 2012: 60, transl)

Lenny's articulations illustrate that the way the task is set is too difficult. Finding the right balance between a challenge outside a student's the comfort zone and creating a safe learning environment that allows one to make mistakes is not easy for the teacher. To expose Lenny to a task so above his comfort zone might threaten the trust between Lenny and the teacher. The spatial expectation of Lenny running back and forth, causing him to become angrier and angrier, also supporting his desperate attempts to avoid damaging his pride in front of others. Since Lenny has to run back and forth, others see that he is struggling; therefore, this task is public which also leads to added humiliation which, again, leads to more anger and a greater threat to his *positive face.* One might assume that a considerable amount of Lenny's belief in himself is built up by his ability to outperform others and, therefore, this competitive task embodies his loss of face and him losing in this task as if it was a football match. In addition, his *negative face* might also be damaged because he is not able to personally decide how he can solve the task. The rules of the activity are set in stone, he has to run around and is not allowed to individually find unique solution that would increase his focus on solving the mathematical problem.

By honestly and publicly declaring that he cannot manage to fulfill the task set, Lenny threatens his own face. Instead of announcing that the task is too difficult, he immediately comments on the meta level of his abilities, self-reflecting his learning process. According to Goffman, social and personal identity are intertwined, whereas
the "ego identity is, first of all, a subjective, reflective matter that necessarily must be felt by the individual whose identity is at issue (1963a: 106). In conclusion, as the task seems too difficult for Lenny, it might indirectly inspire a thought process that goes deeper than the level of difficulty of the task. Lenny might be dubious about his own identity and reflect on his ego identity and even recreate the image of himself. He might, therefore, construct an "image of himself out of the same materials from which others first construct a social and personal identification of him" (ibid: 106) and thus this picture might be under constant construction and in need of protection and defense. The utterance "I can't do it" portrays that Lenny blames himself and his frustration increases with the climax of the furious expression that he is "too stupid" to succeed in fulfilling the task. His self-humiliation threatens his self-image and, hence, his identity. As a result, it is a threat to his positive face want. His negative face is threatened as well, as Lenny does not have autonomy over his own learning as the task closely imitates the manner with which learning should happen, leaving little space for learner autonomy. As his face, therefore, needs protection, simplification of the problem could cause further damage. One possibility of simplification is to perceive Lenny's utterances as proof of his narrow-mindedness and negativity as a learner. Advising him to be more open to failure and think more positively is another threat to his positive face as his image of a capable student is threatened. Moreover, it also attacks his negative face as the advisor makes the decision, what is best for Lenny's learning, for him and thus undermines his authority as a learner.

Only after the self-accusation does Lenny blame the task. Rumpf remarks that it might not be Lenny himself but his sense of reason to protest against this form of "learning attack that takes the learner's breath away and makes him or her look like a complete fool" (2012: 96). The last utterance of "It is bullshit" might be a face-saving strategy as he shifts the blame to the teaching method and the task. This also leads to him also indirectly blaming the teacher and, therefore, threatens the teacher's positive face. The teacher's identity is at risk as teachers should foster the learning of the student and not hinder it. Lenny, therefore, saves his own face more by blaming the task with his exclamation ("Bullshit. It is bullshit.") and blaming the task rather than by accusing himself of being "too stupid".
3.2.3.2 Vignette 53: Sebastian's face is saved by blaming the task

Sebastian is sitting with Silas at a table in the row by the windows and is working on the task cards for expanding and fractions. He raises his hand: The teacher notices and answers with eye contact and a whispered, "I'm coming!" In a few minutes she is at his desk and explains, asks questions, makes suggestions, questions, demonstrates, explains. Sebastian follows her intensively with his eyes, the pencil in his hands. Once he laughs aloud and feels confident. He goes back to his working on his calculations alone and soon he falters. The teacher appears back at his desk and advises, "Try giving your head a shake. Then it'll come!" He sits with slumped shoulders, stretches his right foot out, his left hand resting on his thigh. He counts the number of squares in the illustration with his pen, the finger of his left hand plays with his lips. He writes numbers in blanks. He counts the number of squares again, wipes invisible eraser crumbs from the worksheet, erases. He looks at the board in the front, where a sample problem and solution are written. "Ah!" he says once again in response to his teacher's tip: "You've picked out the difficult task cards. No wonder you can't figure it out right away. It's really difficult. Try the other easier task cards later, just to check!" (Schratz, Schwarz and Westfall-Greiter 2012: 80, transl)

Sebastian struggles. He tries again and again but cannot solve the mathematical task. The teacher is supportive and understanding. She does so by using verbal and non-verbal communication, and it seems that she keeps Sebastian in sight throughout the whole time captured by the vignette. The teacher's gaze secures the student, sending him a signal that she is here for him to support him. He works individually but not alone. When he needs the teacher's help, he is not afraid to ask for it. The teacher responds with clarifications, and not a single face threat, such as "you should know this" or "this is very easy, it should not cause you any problems". She does not blame the student for his incapacibilities or not trying hard enough to solve the task. Instead, she blames the task itself.

When the task is identified as a "really difficult" one, the trust increases and the student might feel that the teacher believes in him as she does not advise the student to drop the task immediately, but recommends instead, to "[t]ry the other easier task cards later, just to check!". Although the piece of advice is phrased in an imperative, the time indicator "later" and the addition "just to check" seem to respect his negative face as it gives him the autonomy to decide on his own if and when he does so. In addition, when the "really difficult" task is blamed, the student's positive face is not only saved but also seems to be rewarded for being a risk taker. This gives Sebastian confidence and he
might see his position from another angle: if the task is "really difficult", then he is allowed to struggle. He might even gain motivation as solving a "really difficult" task is worth more than solving an easy one. The teacher seems to know him well and by also recommending that he try the "easier task cards later", she might want to keep him motivated for another task or might hope that he experiences a feeling of success. In addition, the teacher signals trust and the student not only returns it, but also adopts it: The teacher trusts the student, therefore the student trusts the teacher and also his own abilities. In other words, the teacher's image of the student (Fremdbild) also improved his self-image (Selbstbild) and thus his self-perception. Another domino effect\textsuperscript{21}, but this time it is a positive one for the students' feelings and their learning environment.

3.2.3.3 Comparison and conclusion

In conclusion, both vignettes are examples of how face can be saved. Both students in the spotlight struggle with the task. In vignette 7, Lenny initially blames himself, gets frustrated and in the end only blames the task. In vignette 53, the teacher blames the task before the student reaches a point where he gets frustrated. Blaming the task takes the blame away from the positive face of the student, wherefore it is a face-saving act. In both of these acts, the line the students expect themselves to reach is perceived as too far out of reach. Lenny and Sebastian try to reach the line first. Lenny, however, soon reflects about his own face while Sebastian stays focused on solving the task. This also shows that self-reflection may not always be beneficial for learning, as it sometimes takes the focus away from the exercise itself. Redirecting the focus to the task, by blaming not himself but the task, actually helps Lenny to create a safe and achievable distance between himself and the exercise; before he took it too personally. Not every task is made for every type of learner.

In terms of face work, it is especially interesting to compare the vignettes with those of chapter 3.2.2. While the utterances in vignettes 10, 47 and 61 seem to focus on face threatening, in vignettes 7 ad 53 the utterances focus on face saving strategies.

\textsuperscript{21} Cf. page 87.
4. CONCLUSION AND PROSPECTS

4.1 Summary of the study

Looking solely at this small pool of lived experiences, we have already found proof for how influential face work is in the classroom. The application of the face-saving and face-threatening theories by Brown and Levinson provided examples of how enriching the pragmatic lens can be for Pedagogy, for instance when face-threat becomes a source of acute embarrassment to the person whose face is threatened and the other interlocutors. Both disciplines, Pedagogy and Pragmatics, share a fundamental base: pragmatists believe that the idea behind communication is that we want to communicate to cooperate. In a pedagogic setting, teachers communicate because they want to enrich the student's education; thus, the cooperation between teacher and students is the basis upon which they build the learning process. In this regard, it should be acknowledged that even the smallest (non)verbal utterances communicate something. For instance, although the person in the spotlight remains silent, his body language speaks volumes, sometimes even louder than words. The same is true for the teacher: does the teacher react to a face-threatening act? If yes, how? Therefore, every utterance could threaten the face of the person in the spotlight and also trigger a domino-effect of face-threatening and face-saving acts. Sometimes, face-threatening acts occur to save someone's face and in this particular case it is of high value to be aware of how face work influences the learning environment. Only then, teachers and students can understand the dynamics that create hostile emotions which influence the learning process.

The two hypotheses discussed in chapter 2.1 were scrutinized: First, face threats are even more strongly linked to the experience of shame then discussed in the texts read for this paper, especially in the context of institutionalised learning. Second, although the initial etymological research showed that shame was defined as something negative and positive by Greek scholars but then only connotated negatively, there was evidence found in contemporary theories and experiences in Pedagogy, Pragmatics and other fields that it can also be depicted positively. How beneficial the positive (side)effects of shame are should be investigated further, as this
study only touched the tip of the iceberg and thus should motivate to further interdisciplinary studies.

In the theoretical research, the theories of Meyer-Drawe were fundamental. She states that "learning occurs when the old is gone and the new has not yet emerged" and as an old perspective has to be replaced by a new one, the state of learning is "no[t] pleasant" (2008, quoted by Vasileios and Schwarz 2016: 42). As a conclusion, the experience of shame might also substitute an old experience with a new one, the feeling of being safe might be replaced with insecurity as face is threatened. The line that defined one's face might be in question. The person who experiences shame might even question his self-image as s/he is insecure about the image others perceive of him/her. However, it might only be thanks to face loss and shame that this space between letting go and not yet having established something new has emerged and created a new experience of learning. Meyer-Drawe defines learning as an experience (cf. 2008: 15) and clarifies that "[l]earning is always learning of something by someone and, as a process, comparable to awakening; it is active and passive at the same time." (2012, quoted by Vasileios and Schwarz 2016: 42, italics in original). Face-threatening acts initiate the learning process, provide tasks of learning, tasks in which face-saving acts can be practiced and tasks in which images are redefined. Thanks to these hostile emotions, (self) images and social identities are under threat and therefore questioned, only to be torn away or to be strengthened.
4.2 Limitations of this study

As not only every person but also every collaboration and every classroom environment creates individual factors for linguistic analysis, there are numerous examples to be taken into account and many faces are to be protected. Another challenge is that in a classroom situation there are numerous dynamics between the teachers and the students, the students and their peers, and the teachers and their fellow educators. However, only in this small pool of vignettes, the pragmatic knowledge of face work enriches the understanding of what was experienced by the students and how shame was caused or prevented.

In this regard, other vignettes could be read with different linguistic lenses. A comparison of certain phenomena occurring in pedagogical settings to linguistic theories could increase the understanding of how communication influences learning. Therefore, the cooperative motivation to honor face could be regulated by a common framework for communication and collaborative learning, amongst teachers and students, and amongst peers themselves. Ideally, the framework is universal enough to provide cross-cultural validity and at the same time allow individual amendments. This framework would provide a basis of common ground that allows an unspoken social contract before launching into the challenging cooperation in an already multi-dimensional setting with numerous possibilities to lose face. Although this research is not able to develop a complete framework, it points to new directions for research in a field that previously was mostly discussed in Pedagogy and hopefully inspires others to continue the interdisciplinary inquiry.
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6. Appendix

6.1 Perception: The Blind Men and the Elephant

The Blind Men and the Elephant
John Godfrey Saxe (1816-1887)

It was six men of Indostan
To learning much inclined,
Who went to see the Elephant
(Though all of them were blind),
That each by observation
Might satisfy his mind.

The First approached the Elephant,
And happening to fall
Against his broad and sturdy side,
At once began to bawl:
"God bless me! but the Elephant
Is very like a WALL!"

The Second, feeling of the tusk,
Cried, "Ho, what have we here,
So very round and smooth and sharp?
To me 'tis mighty clear
This wonder of an Elephant
Is very like a SPEAR!"

The Third approached the animal,
And happening to take
The squirming trunk within his hands,
Thus boldly up and spake:
"I see," quoth he, "the Elephant
Is very like a SNAKE!"

The Fourth reached out an eager hand,
And felt about the knee
"What most this wondrous beast is like
Is mighty plain," quoth he:
"'Tis clear enough the Elephant
Is very like a TREE!"

The Fifth, who chanced to touch the ear,
Said: "E'en the blindest man
Can tell what this resembles most;
Deny the fact who can,
This marvel of an Elephant
Is very like a FAN!"

The Sixth no sooner had begun
About the beast to grope,
Than seizing on the swinging tail
That fell within his scope,
"I see," quoth he, "the Elephant
Is very like a ROPE!"

And so these men of Indostan
Disputed loud and long,
Each in his own opinion
Exceeding stiff and strong,
Though each was partly in the right,
And all were in the wrong!

6.2 Collection of vignettes in German

This section presents the vignettes in their original form before translating them into English. The reason for this selection is that some facets might be better graspable in the reader's mother tongue or additional language, or, aspects might have gotten lost in translation. Providing the original texts might also provide a springboard for further studies. The whole body of vignettes can be found the following two sources: Schratz, Schwarz and Westfall-Greiter (2012) and Mairhofer (2014), listed in the bibliography under primary literature. At the end of this chapter 6.2 the reader can also find the unshortened fable referred to in chapter 2.2.3.

6.2.1 Vignette 7


The task of today’s Mathematics lesson is a running dictation about four different problems to solve, which were allocated in different parts of the classroom by the two teachers. After an introduction, the students run back and forth between the tasks, try to memorize the pieces of information and solve the exercises in their notebooks on their desks. Some remain standing to be faster and run back and forth, others work more slowly. It happens that Lenny has started with a more challenging exercise and has already run back and forth several times. He is stressed and desperately mentions that he is not good at it. His frustration increases, he seems to
be paralyzed, shortly before bursting. A teacher tries to calm and encourage him. He answers, "But I can't do it!" She gives him a hint and tells him to try again. Reluctantly, he walks again to the exercise on the board, the teacher leaves his desk. It does not work, it does not work, it does not work. He scolds himself because he does not manage to memorize anything and marches back to his desk. He is terribly angry. You can't do it, you can't do it, you can't do it. You are too stupid, you are too stupid. Bullshit. It is bullshit. (Schratz, Schwarz and Westfall-Greiter 2012: 60, transl)

6.2.2 Vignette 10


It knocks and the door opens. Mrs. Almer enters and after a brief nod towards the present teacher, she turns towards the students. Her eyes wander through the classroom and then she announces in a firm tone: "Today I want to speak to Anton." There are two children with the name Anton in this cohort and Mrs. Almer clarifies why she needs to see Anton: "During break, Anton hit a girl on her head and with this Anton I would like to speak." Two students point immediately to Anton in the last row. Anton raises his gaze, blushes and remains motionless in his sunk down position. He does not say a word. Mrs. Almer addresses Anton directly and requests: "So you will come with me." He stands up slowly and leaves the classroom together with Mrs. Almer wordlessly, with his head bowed down. (Schratz, Schwarz and Westfall-Greiter 2012: 62, transl)
6.2.3 Vignette 29


The students and the teacher are correcting an exam in German, a personal description. They discuss different words, their meaning and spelling. The teacher wants to know: "What does 'to ramble' mean? Let's have a look in the dictionary!" About ten seconds later she asks: "Who has found it? Great, Zero has got it already!" Some students are still searching. The teacher addresses Zijada and asks: "What is written?" Zijada answers, "To ramble!!" Another student hisses in an annoying way: "Next to it!!" "Zijada has written 'The nose rambles' in her exam. You have used a totally wrong word!", states the teacher in a distinct way. The students begin to laugh. Zijada smiles insecurely, blushes and lowers her head between her shoulders. The teacher intervenes and says in a loud voice: "Don't laugh, you have also made mistakes!" The laughter fades. (Schratz, Schwarz and Westfall-Greiter 2012: 70 transl)

6.2.4 Vignette 47

Alina wants to switch places and explains: "I don't want to sit next to Anna. She is always so sassy to me. And she is also sassy with Mr. Auer." Consequently, the teacher asks Anna: "Why are you so sassy?" Anna sits motionlessly. She is holding her head low and remains silent. The teacher looks at Anna and waits. The whole cohort waits. There is only the rattling sound of the blinds. Anna is still, not saying a word. The teacher moves to the middle of the classroom, interrupts the silence and says to Anna, audible for everyone: "If this does not get better, then you will receive break detention, see the principal and I will also speak to your mother!" The girl sitting next to Anna is allowed to change seats. Anna remains alone at her desk. (Schratz, Schwarz and Westfall-Greiter 2012: 79, transl)

6.2.5 Vignette 55


Third period: English. Together with the students, the teacher goes through the homework. The students should have translated German sentences into English. Students are repeatedly shouting out the correct solution, which is why the teacher frequently demands: "Can you raise your hand?" Subsequently, she calls out the names of the students who are allowed to read the sentence first and then write it on the blackboard. Zita seems to be very focused on reading her notebook as if she wants to hide in there. She does not raise her hand although she has completed the homework. The teacher is addressing Zita and asking her to read the next sentence. She reads the sentence in a clumsy and timid way. "Now write the sentence on the board," demands the teacher firmly. Zita picks up her booklet and slowly walks toward the board. She notes the sentence, makes several mistakes, which she corrects with a shy smile. Then she puts down the chalk, smiles timidly again and wriggles back to her chair. "That was embarrassing," she whispers to herself and sits down. (Schratz, Schwarz and Westfall-Greiter 2012: 81f, transl)
6.2.6 Vignette 61


Mrs Peier enters the classroom a few minutes after the bell. She carries a pile of notebooks under her left arm and a parcel under her right one. She gazes frantically into the cohort, who is already working on mathematical exercises set by Mrs. Piel, the second teacher. As if on command, all the students stop their work and stand up. Mrs. Peier seems not to notice the welcome. She determinedly heads for a shelf where she can drop off a load of booklets, then announces with a slightly raised voice: "Patrick will receive a present from me." The whole room falls silent. A sense of surprise lies in the air. The students are still standing, totally calm. All gazes focus on Mrs. Peier who, with her back to the cohort, is trying laboriously to rip open the parcel. Mrs. Piel seems to wait for a sign from her colleague — nothing. She instructs: "Sit down!" which everyone immediately carries out. One last tear and the secret is revealed: books on mathematics! Mrs. Peier declares to the students: "You are my witnesses. Patrick does not have any more excuses!" Glances are drifting from Mrs. Peier to Patrick and from Patrick to Mrs.
Piel. Patrick's eyes are riveted on his desk while Mrs. Peier puts the books on his desk. Blush stained his cheeks. Without a word, he pulls the books closer, he does not look up once. A murmur goes through the room. Some fellow students smile smugly. Meanwhile, Mrs. Peier returns to the shelf and begins to devote herself to the pile of homework booklets — without a single comment. The students continue to work on their exercises. Mrs. Peier complains, "Patrick, you have handed in a wrong notebook!" Patrick seems to disagree and raises an objection which is quashed by a loud "No! Drop it!" Mrs. Peier reminds him fretfully: "And what about the lousy piece of rough paper you lately wanted to hand in as homework?" "Which you immediately tore apart," intervenes Paula, the class representative. "Exactly!" confirmed Mrs. Peier, adding, "I always need witnesses!" and turns again towards the homework booklets. (Schartz, Schwarz and Westfall-Greiter 2012: 84, transl)

6.2.7 Vignette 67

Petra is searching for a ruler in her pencil case — no success. After consulting her seatmate, she takes the triangle ruler and underlines the result of the just calculated exercise with a cleanly drawn line. "How far are you?" Mrs. Piel asks Petra. "I am done." Consequently, the teacher opens the school's website, interrupts the work of the students and shows the group a picture of two students, who have achieved all A's in this term's report. Petra is one of them. Her eyes sparkle. She is surprised, blushes, swings her fountain pen back and forth. Her legs move and take turns in gliding over the linoleum covered floor. She seems bashful. When her classmates comment on her achievement with "Well done!" "Great!" "Awesome!" she leans back in her chair with a relaxed smile. "Diligence should be rewarded," notes the teacher as if talking to herself and continues with the next assignment: "Whoever is finished with the exercise can pick a new task from the orange box in the book. The key is in the book too." At the end of the lesson, another smile lightens Petra's face. In her notebook, there are two stickers as a reward of her accurately performed and correctly solved homework assignments. (Schratz, Schwarz and Westfall-Greiter 2012: 86, transl)

6.3 Explanation of the number system

73 vignettes stem from Schratz, Schwarzer and Westfall-Greiter
12 vignettes stem from Mairhofer which are re-numbered:

Vignette 1 = 74 Vignette 5 = 78 Vignette 9 = 82
Vignette 2 = 75 Vignette 6 = 79 Vignette 10 = 83
Vignette 3 = 76 Vignette 7 = 80 Vignette 11 = 84
Vignette 4 = 77 Vignette 8 = 81 Vignette 12 = 85
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