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Abstract

This thesis uses a cultural–historical framework to research the everyday lives of young children in a unique community in the Kaluga region, Russia. The aim of the thesis was to explore how children learn to self-regulate. The literature review situates the study within empirical work on self-regulation and reviews the limited studies that use a cultural–historical perspective. The main finding indicates the need to situate future studies that focus on the development of children’s self-regulation within their particular cultural community. The common theme in the reviewed studies highlights that to investigate how children learn to self-regulate, self-regulation must not be viewed as a purely maturational phenomenon, but an ability that develops within social environment. However, very few studies have offered an understanding of self-regulation in this way, instead focusing exclusively on the individual child, removing the child from social and cultural context. The extant studies that consider the child’s social context tend to view separate characteristics of the environment as being a determinant for the development of self-regulation. Therefore, this thesis adopted a holistic approach to researching how children learn to self-regulate, exploring how the whole environment influences the development of self-regulation. The study viewed the concept of self-regulation as an emotional–cognitive unity within a particular social environment.

A wholeness approach was used to investigate the processes of learning to self-regulate as children participate in family, school and community institutional practices and activities. The study presents an in-depth investigation of one focus family—mother, father, one biological child and non-identical twins (adopted children)—within an experimental Kitezh Children’s Community in Russia. Data were collected over a four-week period ($n = 146.4$ hours of video observations and interviews). In drawing upon cultural–historical concepts of everyday crises, perezhivanie and the social situation of development, this study examined how two children (one focus child and his non-identical twin brother) self-regulated during ‘dramatic’ moments of their interactions with others as they participate in their family practice, school and the community. The concept of dramatic moments was used as an analytical tool to gain insight into the children’s intentions and motive development to explore how the children learn to self-regulate.
The thesis offers the Kitezh model, which opens a new perspective for understanding conditions that contribute to development of self-regulation from a cultural–historical perspective. The model argues that development of self-regulation is linked to two processes—vospitanie and the process of motive development. The thesis uses vospitanie as a concept to explain the process of value transmission from adults to the focus children. It explains how vospitanie acts as a thread, weaving together the adults’ efforts across three institutional practices and how it acts as a developing force. The potential for the child to develop a new motive and ultimately self-regulate depends on the conditions that the family practice, school and community create for the child. In addition, the development of new motives depends on what the child brings to these conditions and their perezhivanie in individual situations. The process of rapid and intense change in the child’s perezhivanie of the dramatic moment is characterised by the kaleidoscope of emotions, which is used as a new concept that contributes to understanding the process of self-regulation. Further, the thesis argues that the process of the child’s motive development is linked to how the child positions himself affectively as they participate in three institutional practices in the Kitezh community.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

This chapter outlines the research problem by introducing what is known and what is less known about the development of children’s self-regulation. It also introduces the theoretical and methodological frameworks of the study, explains key terms and presents an overview of the thesis.

To begin, an overview of the current research on self-regulation is presented.

1.1 Situating the Research Problem

Self-regulation has become an important topic of interest in relation to children’s learning and development, with an increasing understanding of its role in children becoming positive learners (Casenhiser et al., 2012). Shanker (2010) described self-regulation as ‘the ability to manage your own energy states, emotions, behaviour and attention in ways that are socially acceptable’ (p. 2).

Self-regulation, and in particular emotional regulation, in children has been a subject of much research across various disciplines, including psychology and neuroscience (Fox et al., 2010). In recent years, it has been increasingly recognised across disciplines that self-regulation of emotions has significant consequences for young children and that it is important not to separate emotion and cognition. Based on research evidence, they are not separate phenomena (Immordino-Yang, 2011). In addition, research has challenged traditionally accepted thinking that children’s school performance is determined by intelligence and has shown that effective self-regulation is the key for better school performance (Blair & Diamond, 2008; Shanker, 2010).

It has also been recognised that educators play an important role in how children self-regulate. Several studies have argued that educators influence children’s positive emotions (Boyer, 2009; Colmer et al., 2011; Madrid et al., 2010; Onchwari & Keengwee, 2011). The studies emphasise that educators should be aware of children’s developmental needs for the regulation of emotions (Boyer, 2009). For example, educators can recognise the need to teach children how to consider other’s perspectives and play the role of moral regulators (Boyer, 2009). In addition, Denham et al. (2012) emphasise that children’s ability to regulate their emotional expressiveness
and experience and acknowledge ‘their own and other’s emotions is crucial for social and academic success’ (Denham et al., 2012, as cited in Fleer & Hammer, 2013, p. 241).

In recent years, there has been increased pressure from policymakers and governments for greater ‘school readiness’ and ‘schoolification’ in early childhood education, emphasising the importance of cognitive outcomes, particularly literacy and numeracy (Elspeth & Murray, 2018; Fleer & Hammer, 2013; O’Sullivan & Ring, 2018). This tendency is largely driven by governments’ need to demonstrate that effective public spending might considerably jeopardise efforts of early childhood educators who strive to develop the ‘whole child’, not just the ‘thinking child’ (Fleer & Hammer, 2013, p. 240) and reduce efforts for developing children’s emotional competency, which includes the ability to self-regulate (Fleer & Hammer, 2013). This may considerably reduce the ability of such education to develop ‘valued members of community, where individuals not only fit into but contribute to the development of society’ (Fleer & Hammer, 2013, p. 241).

Despite these advances in relation to self-regulation, more research is needed to further understand how children self-regulate, particularly how they regulate their emotions to gain insights into what affects learning and development. Recently, consensus among researchers suggests that studies of emotions should be based on two premises. First, emotion and cognition cannot be separated; second, emotions are experienced within the social realm (Immordino-Yang, 2011; Quinones, 2013). Very few studies offer a conception of emotional development that theorises both understandings, particularly the sociocultural roots of emotions (White et al., 2013). The proposed study seeks to gain further understanding of children’s self-regulation and examine how a particular social environment influences development.

1.2 Personal Narrative

When I was seeking an environment that demonstrated an impact on children’s development, I became aware of a unique experiment in Russia—the Kitezh Children’s Community.
My interest in this community began with my lifelong fascination with ethics, more specifically, how humans develop ethical behaviour. I spent a few years studying world religions, including Christianity, Hinduism and Buddhism and later explored philosophical dimensions of ethics in the works of Leo Tolstoy and Fyodor Dostoevsky. Later, I discovered a pedagogical perspective of ethics in the works of Russian author Elena Roerich. Roerich’s ideas, in particular her letters to the young generation of Russian students were particularly close to my personal aspirations. When I completed my Bachelor of Education in Australia and became a teacher and mother of a school student, I felt the need to research this topic from a pedagogical perspective. I sought to explore how the environment, and particularly methods of upbringing and education, influences the development of ethical behaviour. That is when I discovered the Kitezh Children’s Community, which was connected to the Roerich family.

The Kitezh community was founded in 1992 by Dimitri Vladimirovich Morozov, journalist, historian and expert in oriental studies. Prior to Morozov dedicating his life to establishing this community, he met with the family of Roerich and became acquainted with her son, Svyatoslav Roerich. Morozov (personal communication, October 2018) reported that his personal aspiration to devote his life to something other than the ‘mundane of accumulating material wealth’ was strengthened after his encounter with Svyatoslav. As such, this site was selected for my research.

The current study aims to gain insight into the process by examining how children self-regulate during dramatic moments of their interactions with others as they transition within three domains of the environment—home, school and the community.

1.3 Theoretical Framework

The cultural–historical theory developed by Soviet psychologist Lev Vygotsky (1896–1934) offers a conception of child development that may provide insights into the current research. Traditional theories of developmental psychology do not consider societal conditions, norms and values. Conversely, the concepts developed by Vygotsky (1987) view child development as a cultural and historical process in which the social environment is the source of development of every specifically human function of a child. Vygotsky (1997) argued that every child’s ‘higher
mental function was social before it become an internal strictly mental function; it was formerly a social relation’ (p. 105).

Vygotsky identified a unity between affect and intellect—emotional and cognitive—and social and biological components of child development. His theory is a system of interrelated concepts, which are interwoven rather than separated, and form a unity of biological, environmental and psychological lines of development (Vygotsky, 1987). Vygotsky’s concept of biological and cultural developmental lines introduces the importance of considering the child’s social situation of development. The child’s social situation of development is an important concept, through which Vygotsky perceives development as socially and culturally mediated process—not only the child changes, nor the environment. It is the child’s relations to the environment that changes (Vygotsky, 1987).

This study explores how children self-regulate during dramatic moments while interacting with others as they move across and between three domains of their environment—home, school and the community. Children’s emotions during dramatic moments are analysed and used to investigate the contradictions that occur during the process of the child–environment unit that drives development of higher mental functions.

For the purpose of this study, cultural–historical theory—more specifically, the works of the Soviet scholar Vygotsky (1925–1934) and his students Lydia Bozhovich (1929–1981) and Daniil El’konin (1960–1984)—will be used to illustrate how the environment influences children’s development from a cultural–historical perspective. Further explanations of the relevant Vygotskian theoretical concepts are provided in the theoretical and methodological chapters of this thesis (see Chapters 3 and 4).

1.4 Focus, Aims and Research Questions

The study seeks to gain a holistic understanding about how children learn to self-regulate within a rural Russian community. The study uses Hedegaard’s (2008) wholeness approach and focuses on how the community, family and school apply particular demands through traditional practices to support children’s development of self-regulation. There are three different perspectives
discussed: the community (community members), institutional (parents and teachers) and child perspective (individual child). Using a research method that enables nuanced understanding of the cultural and historical, individual and relational aspects of interactions, specifically dramatic moments, new insights will be gained from this community that to date has received little scholarly attention in the English-speaking world. The research is guided by a main research question and two subsidiary questions.

Main research question:

● What conditions are created to support the developing processes of children’s self-regulation in the Kitezh Children’s Community?

To understand this broad research question, the study focuses on specific aspects of the Kitezh community.

Subsidiary question:

● How do adults and children contribute to the developing processes of children’s self-regulation during their everyday interactions in the Kitezh Children's Community?

For ease of reader's understanding, the adults and the child's views are presented separately and brought together in the Discussion chapter in line with the wholeness approach. The research begins to answer these questions by exploring the developing processes of children’s self-regulation within three dimensions of their environment in Kitezh—home, school and the community. Three findings chapters (see Chapters 5–7) discuss each dimension of the community: the family home, the Kitezh community and the child’s perspective.

1.5 Definition of Key Terms

These key terms are pertinent for the study of young children’s self-regulation. The terms are now explained to provide insight into the research problem. The words are widely used within pedagogical literature in Russia. However, some of the terms may not be familiar to an English-speaking audience. Therefore, this section explains the terms and how they are used for the purpose of this study.
Dramatic moments are naturally occurring emotionally charged dramatic events between two people—such as the focus child in Kitezh and the interactions between the focus child and his parents, peers, teachers and siblings. This concept conveys the meaning of an everyday life crisis (Vygotsky, 1934/1998): an intense, emotionally charged event between two people, a social drama that acts as a developing force.

Perezhivanie is a Russian word that has three key meanings: experience; feeling (emotional experience); and worry (anxiety). The common interpretation of perezhivanie is a person’s mental/psychic state, which is caused by strong perceptions and/or impressions. Vygotsky (1935) described perezhivanie as a psychological phenomenon to explain the emotional experience of the child. He used the term to illustrate how environment influences child development (Vygotsky, 1935). This study uses perezhivanie as a concept; it discusses a further understanding of the role of perezhivanie in relation to the influence of environment on the psychological development of focus children living in the Kitezh community. Further explanation of the concept of perezhivanie and its context in this study is provided in Chapter 3.

Vospitanie (Vygotsky, 1991) is a Russian word meaning ‘upbringing’ or ‘rearing’ (in relation to children). The meaning of the word generally relates to the process through which adults (parents, relatives, teachers and the wider community) engage in the upbringing of children. This usually involves teaching life and social skills, and educating children. In this study, vospitanie is explored in relation to development of self-regulation. Vospitanie is explained as the values that adults transfer to children through explicit and implicit means, and the child’s own contribution to these developmental processes, which combined, create conditions for the development of self-regulation.

Osoznanie (Vygotsky, 1956) is a Russian word that can be translated as ‘conscious realisation’ or ‘act of becoming aware’. The word originates from the verb osoznat—to realise. Vygotsky (1956) defined osoznanie as ‘an act of consciousness [soznanie] whose object is the very activity of consciousness’ (p. 246). In this study, osoznanie is used in relation to the meetings (osoznanie meetings) that children in the Kitezh community attend regularly. The aim of osoznanie
meetings is to help children learn how to reflect on their actions and understand ways it affects others. Further explanation on osoznanie meetings and how they are linked to self-regulation is provided in Chapters 4 and 8 of this thesis.

1.6 Research Design

Sections 1.6.1–1.6.3 present an overview of the methodology and methods used in this research.

1.6.1 Methodology

The methodology employed for this study is grounded in Vygotsky’s theoretical conception of child development and the dialectical–interactive framework developed by Hedegaard and Fleer (2008). Hedegaard’s (2008) framework builds on Vygotsky (1998) work by introducing the wholeness approach, in which the research subject (person/child) and object (environment/world) are in unity and exist through dialectical relations. The two cannot be separated, and as Hedegaard (2014) asserted, learning occurs ‘through changes in the unity of person and environment’ (p. 136). A wholeness approach is linked directly to Vygotsky’s concept of the child’s social situation of development. He suggested that examining such dialectic relations supports the researcher’s understanding of the child’s experience within his or her environment. Hedegaard (2012) introduced demands and motives in relation to the child’s environment, learning and development. Hedegaard and Fleer’s (2008) dialectical–interactive framework builds on Vygotsky’s concept of the social situation of development and extends this by examining the dialectic between the child’s social situation of development and the activity setting of institutional practices.

The activity settings, according to Hedegaard (2012), are the child’s recurrent everyday activities that he or she participates in as the child interacts with institutional practices of the home and school. The activities may include homework, playtime, meals or preparing for bed (Hedegaard, 2012). Examining how a child participates in the activity settings across different institutional practices from the child’s perspective allows observations of the child’s motivations in relation to his or her environment. The aim is to gain insight into relations between the child’s motive orientation and demands that the child puts on others in each concrete setting and the
demands that each concrete setting puts on the child (Hedegaard, 2012). Using the child’s perspective supports the researcher to conceptualise the social situation of development related to the child’s development as a whole (Hedegaard, 2008).

1.6.2 Methods

The methodological approach informs the methods. To examine the societal, institutional and personal perspectives of the Kitezh children, the study draws upon a qualitative methodology, digital video observations of children’s everyday experiences within the various institutions and interviews to gain a historical (and future) perspective. An overview of the methods is provided in Sections 1.6.2.1–1.6.2.5.

1.6.2.1 Participants

One focus family participated in this study for a period of four weeks. The mother, father and two children—Vova and Maxim (aged eight years)—were involved in this study. The focus is mainly on one child (Vova); however, in some instances (see Chapter 6) Maxim’s interactions are also analysed. The children are non-identical twins, adopted by the family four years prior to data collection for this study. In addition, one teacher from the Kitezh school (Lena), a community member (Alexander, who is also a teacher), community leader, school principal and community founder were involved in this research. A more detailed explanation about participants is provided in Chapter 3 of this thesis.

1.6.2.2 Context of the Kitezh Children’s Community

The Kitezh is a small rural community located 300 km south of Moscow in the Kaluga region of Russia. It is a community built for orphaned children, in which children and their adoptive parents live together; often, families have biological children as well. Each family has a separate house with modern facilities. The community has a school, small farm, communal canteen and small chapel, with approximately 20 residential houses. All adoptive parents (except parents from the focus family) work as teachers in the Kitezh school. The parents of the focus family work at the farm that provides the community with fresh produce. Further information on the Kitezh
community and focus family is included in the subsequent chapters of this study (see Chapters 5, 6 & 7).

1.6.2.3 *Digital video observations*

The observation procedure in the Kitezh included four weeks of digital video observations of the focus children in different activity settings and institutions, capturing the morning routine at home, school, after school, dinner, time prior to bed and bedtime. A total of 146 hours \((n = 146)\) of digital data were generated. In addition, video recording captured interviews with community members, teachers, parents and children about their everyday life conditions and their emotional hopes for the future of the children.

1.6.2.4 *The interviews*

For the purpose of this study, the adoptive parents from the focus family participated in a one-hour interview, with a total of eight hours of data (based on four weeks, one hour per week, per parent). The focus children were also interviewed using a questionnaire designed by the researcher. In addition, teachers and other members of the Kitezh community, including the Kitezh school principal, a community leader and the founder of the community were interviewed to gain insights into relationship between the community and family related to the focus children. Twelve hours of interview data were generated. A combination of structured and unstructured interviews was used. Interviews were video recorded to capture non-verbal and affective aspects of the communications. Initially, interviews were used to build a history for each focus child.

1.6.2.5 *Data analysis*

Data analysis for this study was guided by Vygotsky’s concept of drama and everyday life crises, Hedegaard and Fleer’s (2008) dialectical–interactive framework, a wholeness approach (Hedegaard, 2008; Vygotsky, 1997) and Hedegaard’s (2012) model. Dramatic moments were added by the researcher as a new methodological tool and used as a sample of analysis to represent children’s everyday life crises. There were 20 dramatic moments selected for analysis. Six vignettes were used to analyse how the focus children learn to self-regulate at home, school and within the
community. An analysis of how the focus children learn to self-regulate during dramatic moments was undertaken in four stages, which is further discussed in Chapter 3 of this thesis.

1.6.3 Ethics

Particular care was taken when obtaining consent from parents, teachers, children and members of the community. This included being aware of and paying close attention to the sensitivity and respect of children’s rights to privacy. Ethics approval for a research project involving humans was applied for and received from a university ethics committee. No data were collected until a written letter of approval was received. Further, all participants were provided with a research statement and invited to sign an informed consent form outlining the research to ensure voluntary participation and confidentiality. Anonymity of participants was ensured by changing names and eliminating any potential identifying information.

1.7 Significance of the Research

This section explains the significance of the research. Further explanation on the significance of this research from the theoretical, methodological and practical perspectives is given in Chapter 9.

First, the research offers insights to support the theoretical understanding of concepts related to self-regulation from a cultural–historical perspective. For example, it offers insights into the role values play in the development of children’s self-regulation. Although values are featured in literature in relation to children’s self-regulation (Daneri et al., 2018; Jaramillo et al., 2017; Monk, 2010), the current study provides further insights by introducing *vospitanie*—a process in Kitezh through which adults transfer values to children and children are active contributors. This research explains how *vospitanie* is linked to the development of self-regulation. In this sense, *vospitanie* is novel to English-speaking educational research and this study introduces the concept to this audience. The findings of this research in relation to *vospitanie* have theoretical and practical implications for educators and parents, which are further discussed in Chapter 9.

Second, this research provides a cultural–historical perspective of self-regulation. Children's self-regulation is less explored from this perspective. The research extends understanding of
developing self-regulation. The cultural–historical wholeness approach (Hedegaard, 2008) employed in this study supports a deep analysis of the development of self-regulation while it is in process. Studies on children’s self-regulation that do not employ the cultural–historical perspective tend to focus on separate characteristics of children’s development: for example, negative emotional expressiveness of the parent (Milojevich & Haskett, 2018) or poverty level (Roy et al., 2014). Such studies offer a projection of self-regulation based on separate aspects of child development, without capturing the whole child’s social situation development by analysing the relations with the environment. By analysing all three dimensions of the child’s social environment—home, school and the community—this research contributes to understanding how not only adults but also children contribute to the development of self-regulation in the Kitezh community in Russia.

Third, the use of the dialectical–interactive methodology (Hedegaard & Fleer, 2008) enhanced the research and provided significant new insights into the development of children’s self-regulation. For example, by capturing and analysing the child’s perspective (Hedegaard, 2008), this research furthers understanding of how the child contributes to the process of self-regulation. The three findings chapters (see Chapters 5–7), the discussion (Chapter 8) and conclusion (see Chapter 9) provide further explanation of these insights.

1.8 Thesis Structure

This section provides an overview of this thesis by chapters. Chapter 1 outlines the research focus and explains why the Kitezh Children’s Community was chosen as a research site for this study. The key terms, methodology and methods are briefly outlined in this chapter.

Chapter 2 reviews the empirical and some theoretical studies. The aim of the chapter is to position the current study to reveal areas in the literature that can be extended, in particular, the positioning of this study within empirical cultural–historical studies and the development of self-regulation in children. The chapter reviews current empirical studies and their findings, which are used to further understand children’s self-regulation. Positioning the current study in this way acknowledges the limited studies in this area that use a cultural–historical perspective, particularly studies that focus on the development of children’s self-regulation within the Kitezh community.
The review comprises two parts: discussion of contemporary empirical studies of self-regulation from various psychological and educational perspectives, and recent empirical studies that consider children’s self-regulation from a cultural–historical perspective.

Chapter 3 presents the theoretical framework for this study, foundational is Vygotsky’s cultural–historical theoretical concepts used in the study. An explanation of how the concepts link to this study is provided. In addition to the original concepts outlined by Vygotsky, the chapter includes ideas developed by contemporary international scholars who extended understanding of Vygotsky’s concepts. These include works of Vygotsky’s students, Bozhovich (1929–1981) and El’konin (1989), and concepts developed by Hedegaard (2008, 2012, Fleer (2008, 2019) Holodynski (2009) and Kravtsova (2006). This enables theorisation within the current study.

Chapter 4 explains the methodology used in this study. A link between Vygotsky’s cultural–historical theory and the research methods used to expand methodological understandings related to Vygotsky’s (1987, 1994, 1997, 1998) theoretical conception of child development is outlined. Further, the dialectical–interactive framework developed by Hedegaard and Fleer (2008), detailed in Hedegaard’s (2012) model of children’s learning and development through participation in different institutional practices is explained in relation to the Kitezh community in this study. The research methods are explored in detail, including data analysis. Hedegaard’s (2012) model, which includes a wholeness approach in which relations between cultural traditions, practice, activity settings and children’s activities, is used to guide analysis. Hedegaard’s ideas are supported by a cultural–historical approach and Vygotsky’s concept of the social situation of development. Adding to the analysis, dramatic moments are introduced from a cultural–historical perspective. The ethics procedure and limitations of the study are discussed.

Chapter 5 presents the findings related to the Kitezh family institutional practice. The purpose of the chapter is to understand how the family (mother and father) create conditions for children’s self-regulation, with a focus on Vova. Vospitanie is introduced to explain how historical parental values are passed to children in the Kitezh community. Motives and demands are explored
using dramatic moments as a tool to understand how parents and children interact within the Kitezh family.

Next, Chapter 6 introduces the Kitezh school institutional practice. The chapter continues to use the wholeness approach (Hedegaard, 2012) and the concept of dramatic moments (see Chapter 5) to explore how the focus children learn the process of self-regulation at school. The aim of the analysis is to understand how the school creates conditions for children’s self-regulation. Adding to this, the concept of co-regulation is introduced to understand how the focus children learn to self-regulate through interaction with their teacher and each other at school. For the purpose of this chapter, co-regulation refers to the teacher’s activities that attempt to support children’s participation in everyday activities by modifying children’s thoughts, behaviours or emotions according to the expectations and values of a particular context (Colman et al., 2006, as cited in Kurki et al., 2016; Volet et al., 2009). Development of self-regulation is viewed from cultural–historical perspective (as explained Chapter 3) and explored as a dialectical relationship between the child and their environment.

Chapter 7 introduces findings related to the Kitezh Children’s Community and explains how members of the community create conditions for development of children’s self-regulation. As in Chapters 5 and 6, self-regulation is viewed from a cultural–historical perspective. Self-regulation is presented through the process of development, rather than as a final form. The concept is explored as a process of changing relationships between the child and their environment. The focus here is the Kitezh community—the third and final institutional dimension in which the particular practices are examined. Similar to Chapter 5 and 6, this chapter begins with the adults’ perspective and then examines the child’s perspective to understand the motives and intentions that guide the child’s actions within their community setting (Hedegaard, 2008). Dramatic moments continue to be used as a tool for analysis when there is a dramatic event that highlights a conflict between the child’s intentions and the demands of the immediate practice as they move through the community and interact with members.
Chapter 8 is the discussion chapter, which brings together the empirical work and theory to discuss in detail the findings of the study. This chapter explores how the literature and theory play a role in the theoretical and methodological framing and advancing new knowledge located through the study. The chapter concludes with a summary of the research questions and discussion of a conceptual model originating from the findings of the study.

Finally, Chapter 9 concludes and summarises the findings in relation to the research questions that contribute to understanding the development of children’s self-regulation in the Kitezh community. The implications, significance of the research and future areas for study are brought together.

The current chapter frames the research located in the rest of the thesis. It explains the focus and aim of the research and outlines the research questions. The chapter also introduces the theoretical framework of the study and outlines the design and significance of the research. Chapter 2 reviews contemporary research on the development of children’s self-regulation and identifies gaps within literature pertinent to this study.
Chapter 2: Literature Review

2.1 Introduction

This chapter reviews the empirical and some theoretical studies to reveal gaps in the literature and positions this study within extant cultural–historical research on the development of self-regulation in young children. This review is based on selected publications that have been peer reviewed and published by well-known publishers, including Elsevier, Routledge, Springer and Taylor and Francis. The publications from year 2000 - 2020 were reviewed. The key search terms used were ‘self-regulation’, ‘cultural–historical’, ‘child development’, ‘perezhivanie’, ‘twins’, ‘adopted children’ and ‘community’. Several databases were used, including ERIC, ProQuest educational journals, PsychINFO and Google Scholar. This included a comprehensive review of the relevant scholarly journals: for example, Early Child Development and Care, Australasian Journal of Early Childhood, Mind, Culture and Activity, British Journal of Educational Psychology, Learning, Culture and Social Interaction, Russian Education & Society, Russian History, International Research in Early Childhood Education and Procedia (Social and Behaviour Sciences). In addition, book titles and chapters (including publications in Russian) were searched and used in the review. Although the researcher attempted to encompass all existing literature in the field, it is possible that some areas may have been overlooked.

This review situates self-regulation in the literature by elaborating on current empirical studies and their findings. The studies are used for a dual purpose. Initially, to further understand children’s self-regulation and then, to provide evidence of the limited studies in this area that use a cultural–historical perspective, specifically studies that focus on the development of children’s self-regulation within a particular cultural community. The review comprises two parts. First is the discussion concerning contemporary empirical studies of self-regulation from various psychological and educational perspectives. The second part reviews recent empirical studies that consider children’s self-regulation from a cultural–historical perspective.
2.2 Situating Self-Regulation

There is general agreement in psychological, social and education literature that self-regulation is crucial for children’s success in many domains of their lives, including mental and physical health and educational achievement (Bloch et al., 2014; Burns et al., 2012; Robson, Allen, & Howard, 2020). Despite the considerable interest and knowledge accumulated over the past three decades across different disciplines, including education, psychology and social science, there seems to be no agreement about the meaning of self-regulation (Ross, 2008). A large body of literature views children’s self-regulation as primarily related to emotions (Boyer, 2009; McClelland et al., 2010; Milojevich & Haskett, 2018) because it focuses on how children regulate their emotions and behaviours related to emotion (Chen & Fleer, 2015; Eisenberg & Spinrad, 2004). Other studies (Gross, 2007) understand emotional regulation as only one component in a system of self-regulatory processes responsible for a person’s health management. In addition to emotion, other systems included in various definitions are related to biological (hunger); cognitive (attention and thoughts) and behavioural (aggression) processes (Ross, 2008).

There is a vast range of definitions and perspectives concerning children’s self-regulation. Many researchers agree that self-regulation includes both conscious and unconscious processes (Ochsner & Gross, 2005; Pahlavan et al., 2012; Ross, 2008; Vohs & Baumeister, 2011). Interestingly, self-regulation is often divided into separate functions, which are observed and measured, such as inhibitory control, which examines the child’s ability to withhold a response immediately in favour of another action. The child’s ability for inhibitory control can be observed in play. For example, in the game Simon Says, children are required to copy the verbal rather than visual instructions of the teacher, thereby inhibiting their immediate response to copy the actions (Fleer, Veresov et al., 2017). Section 2.3 discusses contemporary empirical studies of self-regulation as understood from various psychological and educational perspectives.
2.3 Self-Regulation: Psychological Perspective

2.3.1 Emotion-related self-regulation in children

Given the complexity of the phenomenon that falls under the general umbrella of self-regulation, researchers have divided this construct into various components (Damond, 2016). For the purpose of this study, the literature review begins with emotion-related regulation—a component that has received substantial attention in the last decade (Boyer, 2009; Chen & Fleer, 2015; McClelland et al., 2010; Milojevich & Haskett, 2018).

Emotion regulation is a complex construct with varied theories of how it develops in children. There are controversies and disagreements about what constitutes emotion regulation. Some studies have suggested only intrinsic processes that regulate emotions: for example, attention, inhibition and cognition (Eisenberg & Spinrad, 2004), while others have suggested extrinsic processes such as those used when carers help children cope with their emotions (Cole et al., 2004). Few studies have adopted a holistic approach.

One of the main challenges faced by researchers when studying emotion regulation is differentiating emotion from its regulation (Eisenberg & Sulik, 2012). Some researchers have argued that the level of emotion displayed by a child cannot be used as a reliable indicator of how well the child is able to regulate their emotion (Cole et al., 2004). When a child displays low levels of anger, it may not mean that the child’s capacity to self-regulate emotion is high because the child may not feel much anger in the first place (Eisenberg & Sulik, 2012). Conversely, a child who displays heightened levels of emotion might be deregulated and may benefit from learning how to cope with their emotions (Denham et al., 2003). It is evident from these studies that degrees of emotion are difficult to measure and regulation is different to displaying emotions.

To overcome these challenges in ascertaining what emotion regulation includes, some researchers have found it useful to focus on the processes involved in emotion regulation rather than on how much emotion is ‘experienced or expressed’ (Eisenberg & Sulik, 2012, p. 77). Rothbart and Bates (2006) developed a concept of *effortful control*, which is linked to the child’s temperament and includes the ability of the child to change and focus attention as needed and cease the behaviour...
when required (Evans & Rothbart, 2007; Rothbart et al., 2001). Other researchers have suggested differentiation between effortful and reactive control is important (Eisenberg & Spinrad, 2004) to demonstrate the distinction between processes of emotion regulation that are conscious, effortful and wilful and those that are unconscious, effortless and automatic (Gross & Thompson, 2007). This directs attention towards separating psychological functions and drawing distinctions between dimensions of development rather than viewing the whole child’s psychological process within the context of their environment.

Recent studies have provided interesting insights into the processes of emotion-related self-regulation in children. For example, Milojevich and Haskett’s (2018) study of children (n = 92) between the ages of four and seven years and one of their parents (n = 88 mothers) in a controlled environment (laboratory settings) examined the impact of parents’ emotional expressiveness on the development of children’s self-regulation. The study found that higher levels of negative emotional expressiveness in parents, particularly in early childhood, correlated with poorer self-regulation in their children (Milojevich & Haskett, 2018). Interestingly, early exposure of children to parents’ high level of negative emotional expressiveness remains a key predictor of children’s low self-regulation abilities as children extend their environment beyond their home: for example, through transition to school, gaining new friends and completing tasks (Rimm-Kaufman et al., 2001). The findings of these studies indicate the need for parents and carers to be able to regulate their own emotions so that they can refrain from regular expressions of negative emotions (Haskett et al., 2012) in their child’s early years.

The ability to self-regulate emotions is linked to the development of prosocial behaviour in children (Decety & Svetlova, 2012). Children who are able to act prosocially (e.g., help, comfort and share toys and food with others) have shown their ability to self-regulate (Eisenberg et al., 1998). These findings are supported by studies that examine the influence of emotion regulation abilities on young children’s prosocial behaviour (Hastings et al., 2005; Kienbaum et al., 2001; Liew et al., 2011; Spinrad & Stifter, 2006). This body of research indicates that the social competence of an individual is linked to the regulation of emotion and emotion-related conduct.
(Eisenberg & Sulik, 2012). Although the results across studies are variable, research generally indicates a negative association between children’s self-regulatory abilities, such as effortful control and attention, and both externalising (aggression and defiance; Kochanska & Knaack, 2003; Rothbart & Bates, 2006) and internalising problems (Eisenberg et al., 2010). These findings are of interest to this study because they explore how self-regulation develops in children within particular social environments. The current study uses a cultural–historical approach and understands the social environment as source of development of all higher mental functions, including the ability to self-regulate emotions. Thus, the findings of extant studies support the importance of social relations as a source of children’s development. However, missing from these large-scale projects have been in-depth qualitative studies that support better understanding from different perspectives.

Over the last two decades, emotion-related self-regulation is increasingly viewed as only one process within a system of ‘conscious and unconscious personal health management’ (Ross, 2008, p. 68). Section 2.3.2 reviews literature in which self-regulation is viewed from this perspective.

2.3.2 Self-regulation as a system of interrelated processes

Gross (2007) offers a framework that conceptualises self-regulation as a system of interrelated processes that regulate biological, cognitive and emotional domains. Gross (2007) uses self-regulation as a generic term that includes regulation of stress, moods, thoughts, attention, hunger, aggression and emotions. According to Ochsner and Gross (2005), despite the wide range of qualitatively different processes involved in self-regulation, the mechanism by which an individual regulates their behavioural response across different domains is the same. This approach to self-regulation is close to this study because it examines self-regulation as a developing process in which different yet interrelated domains, such as emotion-related regulation and cognitive regulation, are united and displayed in the behavioural response of the child.

Various approaches to the study of self-regulation as a coherent system of interrelated processes differ across disciplines. Most literature on different aspects of self-regulation processes within neuroscience, clinical and educational psychology is beyond the scope of this study.
However, relevant to this study is consensus among researchers that any change in a person’s behaviour cannot be understood without explaining self-regulation (Lynch et al., 2007; Rothman et al., 2004). The definition of Pahlavan et al. (2012) reflects the broad, all-encompassing nature of self-regulation as it is understood in everyday terms:

we propose to define self-regulation as any conscious as well as unconscious processes involved in regulation and control of any human inner states or responses, including thoughts, emotions, impulses, performance, as well as attention. (p. 60)

Another important aspect of self-regulation understood from the above perspective is that a person can be trained and their ability to self-regulate can improve (Dignath et al., 2008).

Therapeutic and training interventions have resulted in significant improvement of self-regulatory abilities in children and adults, including people with brain injuries (Klingberg et al., 2002; Sohlberg et al., 2000, as cited in Pahlavan et al., 2012).

Studies that explore the role of the educator in supporting children learning to self-regulate have demonstrated that involvement of teachers who actively support the development of children’s social play significantly improves self-regulation skills, as measured by accuracy on objective tests of inhibitory control and cognitive flexibility (Barnett et al., 2006; Diamond et al., 2007). The role of teachers and caregivers in providing support to children’s learning to self-regulate is particularly important for the current study because understanding how self-regulation develops in children is of interest.

Within broader psychological literature, the construct of children’s self-regulation is complex and generally divided into various components. The key components include emotion-related regulation and cognitive and behavioural regulation. The challenge within emotion-related regulation is to separate emotion from its regulation because regulation of emotion is different from displays of emotion. Researchers have suggested viewing self-regulation as a system of interrelated process. The role of educators (teachers and parents) is important because self-regulation ability can be improved by training. Section 2.4 reviews cultural–historical studies on self-regulation.
2.4 Cultural–Historical Perspective of Self-Regulation

2.4.1 Self-regulation and executive functions

As with other theoretical perspectives, cultural–historical understandings of self-regulation vary. Some cultural–historical researchers have linked the concept of self-regulation to Vygotskian principles of executive function development and emphasise the interplay of natural and cultural factors in the development of higher mental functions, using self-regulation as an example of such functions (Bodrova et al., 2011). The authors argued that before children develop self-regulation, they need to master other-regulation. In other words, children have to engage in a two-way process in which another person regulates their behaviour, and simultaneously, children regulate the other person’s behaviour. This principle emphasises that children’s self-regulation has its origin in social interactions and only later the child internalises and uses self-regulation independently (Bodrova et al., 2011).

Other studies have indicated that before children are able to self-regulate, they need to learn specific cultural tools to help them master self-regulation independently, such as self-talk (Diaz & Berk, 1992; Vygotsky, 1987). Other cultural tools include external mediators (sign systems, such as language) or objects that help children master their behaviour. Bodrova et al. (2011) used the example of children wearing tags in role-play that name their role, helping them regulate their own and others’ behaviour by reminding all the role they are playing.

Other cultural–historical researchers have viewed self-regulation from an educational perspective. Gredler (2009), for example, discussed Vygotsky’s conception of self-regulation as it relates to education. Gredler asserted that according to Vygotsky, self-regulation is primarily related to cognitive development and transformation of learner’s cognition from lower-order to higher-order functions. Similar to Bodrova et al. (2011), Gredler discussed Vygotsky’s perspective of self-regulation as external and shifting to internal mastery of one’s thinking. Gredler (2009) theorised self-regulation comparing Vygotsky’s conception of self-regulation and contemporary conceptions based on empirical research. According to Gredler (2009), Vygotsky understood self-regulation as ‘external and then internal mastery of one’s thinking’ (p. 8). Gredler emphasised that in contrast to
contemporary conceptions of self-regulation, which typically relate to how successfully a learner is able to self-manage execution of task-related academic skills, Vygotsky’s perspective of self-regulation entails the learner’s self-mastery of higher levels of thinking, a transformation of the learner’s thinking. Vygotsky (1930–1931/1998) maintained that such transformation occurs at two levels or stages, known as the stages of sign use and concept development. These two stages lead to the development of higher mental functions, which include voluntary attention, categorical perception, thinking in concepts and logical memory (Vygotsky, 1930–1931/1998). Gredler (2009) maintained that Vygotsky’s perspective of self-regulation and analysis of cognitive development has significant implications for learners, but this concept has not been fully explored or utilised for curricula and instruction (Gredler, 2009).

2.4.2 Self-regulation and emotions

In the last two decades, there has been a significant increase of studies with a focus on emotion regulation from a cultural–historical perspective (Barblett & Maloney, 2010; Halberstadt & Lozada, 2011). Of particular interest is Holodynski’s theory of emotions, in which he applied Vygotsky’s principles of development, sign mediation and internalisation. Vygotsky (1987) used these principles to explain the development of speech and thinking, while Holodynski (2013) used the concepts to explain the development of expressions and feelings, and ultimately, emotions. Expressions, according to Holodynski, refer to culturally evolved sign systems that very young children use to communicate with their caregivers. These include facial expressions (e.g., nose wrinkling, smiling, crying and many other non-verbal signs that infants use to signal their needs to the adult). Holodynski (2013) posited that such sign systems mediate interpersonal regulation between children and caregivers. This leads to the development of intrapersonal regulation of emotions and finally, to the internalisation of emotional expression signs and emergence of a mental plan of emotional processing.

Particularly interesting for this study is Holodynski’s hypothesis about non-verbal expression signs, namely that they can be used by children to communicate with themselves to regulate their own emotions and behaviour (Holodynski & Freidlmeier, 2006). In his model of
emotional development, Holodynski described this phase as emergence of sign use for self-regulation through which children acquire the use of signs as a way of self-regulation. This is different from the appropriation of sign use (Phase 1 of the model) when children regulate communication between themselves and their caregivers. Holodynski suggested that how children learn to use expression signs for self-regulation of their own emotions and behaviour remains unanswered. However, he drew an analogy with Vygotsky’s principal of the development of higher psychological functions through which communication with others becomes communication with oneself. He asserted that in a similar manner, the expression signs children apply to others become expression signs children apply to themselves (Holodynski, 2013). Holodynski (2004) subjected his internalisation model of emotional development to an empirical test. In his study of three groups of children aged six to eight years (20 children in each group), the results supported the model proposing that ‘emotional expression decrease during childhood in situations in which emotions serve only self-regulation’ (p. 16). Further research is needed to understand how this process unfolds.

Holodynski’s model of emotional development outlines the emergence of a mental plane of emotional processing. One interesting study in this direction is Fleer and Hammer’s (2013) exploration of the educator’s role in emotion regulation. This work is interesting from two perspectives. First, it illustrates the process through which children begin to assign meaning to their emotions and become able to regulate them, thereby marrying affect and intellect, and second, self-regulation of emotions from an educational perspective, emphasising the role of a teacher in the process. Using fairytales, told and role-played in kindergarten group settings, Fleer and Hammer (2013) examined the role of the educator, specifically, how they create conditions that support development of children’s emotion regulation. The authors argued that by using emotionally charged fairytales, educators can intentionally create conditions for children in which they learn to consider their emotions consciously. During role-play and interactions with the educator, children express their emotions and name and interpret them as feelings. The children learn to be more aware of their emotions and consciously think about them. Fleer and Hammer (2013) reasoned that
intentional pedagogically guided exploration of emotions through fairytales helps children become aware of their emotional state, which potentially supports children’s self-regulation. The authors indicated that such exploration illustrates Vygotsky’s idea of the unity of affect and intellect, in which by considering emotions (affect) consciously, children learn how to orient their emotions cognitively (intellect), which supports their emotion regulation (Fleer & Hammer, 2013). Holodynski’s (2004, 2013) and Fleer and Hammer’s (2013) work is important for this study because it explores how focus children learn to understand their emotions and behaviour consciously by participating in the osoznanie meetings in which they verbally name their actions and how they affects others. The study explains how Kitezh teachers and community members create conditions that support development of children’s self-regulation; further explanation is provided in the Chapter 8 of this thesis.

An array of empirical research and literature significant for this study includes emotions that are linked to socially acceptable behaviours and actions. These are referred to as ‘socialising emotions’ and include shame, guilt, fear and pride (Holodynski, 2013) and are understood as prosocial behaviours (Syaodih et al., 2017). Prosocial behaviour and socialising emotions are relevant to this study because they are connected to perezhivanie (emotional experience). This will be discussed in Section 2.4.3.

2.4.3 Socialising emotions and prosocial behaviour

Holodynski argued that socialising emotions develop according to the same principle that Vygotsky assigned to the development of any executive function—emotions first appear on a social plane (i.e., between people) when parents and caregivers place social demands and norms on their children and use ‘emotionally arousing strategies’, such as shaming or praising the child to instil socialising emotions in their children (Holodynski, 2013, p. 30). Socialising emotions are internalised by children; that is, children begin to use such emotions on themselves and eventually become consciously aware of the emotions being used.

Holodynski (2013) and Zaporozhets (2002) linked the emergence of socialising emotions to children’s ability to regulate their motives according to their social environment. Holodynski
maintained that through these emotions, children learn to delay gratification of their immediate motives, or rather, coordinate their motives with their environment. He provided an example, in which a child chose to clean the tables after lunch rather than playing with her peers, despite the fact that she found the task boring (Holodynski, 2013). Socialising emotions essentially play a regulatory function that allows children to regulate their behaviour and emotions according to social norms accepted in a particular culture.

Linked to socialising emotions is the construct of prosocial behaviour that some researchers (Syaodih et al., 2017) have used to describe sharing, cooperative, donating and helping behaviours of children. It is argued that such behaviour helps children to interact successfully with others and have a general positive impact on the development of children if cultivated early. Prosocial behaviour is considered educable and some researchers have claimed that introducing specially designed programs helps children build cognitive understanding of prosocial behaviour (Syaodih et al., 2017). Several programs are available: for example, the cognitive-based project of Syaodih et al. (2017) and moral-based learning activities by Haryati (2007). However, it is yet to be understood whether their effectiveness is supported by any empirical evidence, including interventions for the early childhood years.

Other cultural–historical studies have linked emotion regulation to the concept of sign mediation (Chen & Fleer, 2015). Others have used Vygotsky’s concept and phenomenon of *perezhivanie* (Veresov & Fleer, 2016). Section 2.4.4 reviews such studies, explains the under-researched area and provides concluding remarks.

**2.4.4 *Perezhivanie* and self-regulation**

Some cultural–historical studies have linked the development of children’s ability to self-regulate with *perezhivanie*—a cultural–historical concept introduced by Vygotsky. Vygotsky (1994) used *perezhivanie* to illustrate the unity of thinking and emotions (Fleer & Hammer, 2013). A more detailed account of *perezhivanie* as a theoretical concept and phenomenon is provided in Chapter 3. Following is an overview of the empirical studies in cultural–historical tradition that explore *perezhivanie* in relation to children’s self-regulation.
Perezhivanie has been used in empirical studies to explore such far-reaching topics as changing employment (Jóhannsdóttir & Roth, 2014) and play and art through the creation of a common fantasy world (Ferholt, 2009, 2010). Lindqvist (1995) used children’s emotional experience to study early childhood play pedagogy. In her study, Lindqvist (1995) introduced the concept of play worlds. The study explored how children and teachers together created imaginary situations in which they changed the meaning of objects and dramatised stories. For example, in the study, a large basket was used as a hot air balloon for imaginary journeys to far away lands (Fleer et al., 2017). Lindqvist (1995) argued that joint play between adults and children generates creativity and spontaneity and enhances the child’s emotional, cognitive and social development.

Ferholt (2009, 2010) extended Lindqvist’s study by exploring play and art through developing a joint fantasy world between the researcher, educator and child, using The Lion, the Witch and the Wardrobe (Lewis, 1995) and the United States (US) film Narnia (the screen adaptation of the book). Ferholt asserted that a particular type of play is a site that makes perezhivanie visible, and therefore available for observation and analysis (Ferholt, 2009). The study’s focus is the development of imagination and how perezhivanie makes the merging of intellect and emotion visible in the act of creativity. Ferholt (2009) implemented a methodology that she identified as capable of making perezhivanie ‘an empirically researchable phenomenon’ (p. 40), arguing that joint children, researcher and teacher perezhivanie during play has several benefits for teachers, researchers and children. These include increased trust and collaboration between teachers and researcher, improved children’s narrative skills, motivation to read and enhanced teacher motivation (Ferholt, 2009). Lindqvist’s (1995) and Ferholt’s (2009, 2010) studies are linked by the focus on the child and the way the child experiences his or her emotions while learning and developing alongside adults. Lindqvist and Ferholt used perezhivanie as a concept to analyse children’s learning and development though joint participation in play worlds. A different perspective was offered by Brennan (2014), who noted the importance of the subjective experience of caregiving and the carer’s perspective. She used Vygotsky’s theoretical concept of perezhivanie as a unit of analysis to examine the affective nature of caring for infants from the caregiver’s
perspective (Brennan, 2014). These studies direct attention to the importance of *perezhivanie* to early childhood education and are relevant to the current research because they implicitly initiate a link between cognition, emotion and self-regulation.

In addition, there are four studies most pertinent to the current research that provide the basis for linking *perezhivanie* and self-regulation: Sulaymani and Fleer (2019), Adams and Fleer (2015), Chen and Fleer (2015) and Conover and Daiute (2017). Sulaymani and Fleer (2019) explicitly linked children’s *perezhivanie* with self-regulation. In this study, *perezhivanie* was used to explore the introduction of iPads to study the effect on children’s emotional development in a Saudi Arabian classroom. The authors proposed that learning a new skill is accompanied by complying with rules in the classroom, which contributes to self-regulation (Sulaymani & Fleer, 2019). In contrast, Adams and Fleer’s (2015) study of *perezhivanie* deepened understanding about ways children learn and develop through transitions as they move countries. Although this study did not explicitly address development of self-regulation, it demonstrated how children learn to self-regulate by establishing new relations with belongings in their immediate environment.

*Perezhivanie* was used to illustrate the unity of affect and intellect. The children’s belongings acted as a cultural tool to help children redefine their relationship with the environment and feel at home in a new country.

Chen and Fleer’s (2015) study focused on the role of sign mediation in children’s emotional development. Findings suggested that parents ‘re-signing support the emergence of children’s intrapersonal emotion regulation’ (p. 233). Similar to Adams and Fleer (2015), the study highlighted the importance of not separating emotions and cognition when examining children’s emotional development. Further, social relations are a source of development (Chen & Fleer, 2015).

Drawing these cultural–historical studies together, their relevance rests with the unity of affect and intellect, rather than separating these dimensions into discrete entities as in traditional education research (Vygotsky, 1987). While these studies emphasised the unity of affect and intellect, the cognitive (thinking) and behavioural aspects of self-regulation in some studies were not sufficiently explained. This is because most cultural–historical studies of self-regulation
primarily emphasise the emotional aspect. For example, Sulaymani and Fleer (2019) claimed to be ‘focused on how the development of self-regulation (i.e. emotional development) in children can occur’ (266). Yet, the focus was on sharing iPads and emotional development. There is a difference between emotional development and self-regulation. However, the authors seemed to position the study not on the process of self-regulation, but rather how children learn the rules by using a particular cultural tool—the iPad.

Most of these studies mention the role of the caregiver/adult with little or no reference to self-regulation within a family. Further, several studies examined home/school settings (March & Fleer, 2016; Monk, 2010) but not how children learn to self-regulate within a community. These three areas (self-regulation within a family, school and community) shape an important part of the current research, which focuses on the culturally specific community (Kitezh Children’s Community) where school and home exist in unity because of the philosophy of the small community.

An important link between self-regulation and cultural–historical concepts was found in empirical studies about play. Section 2.4.5 discusses the link and how it relates to the current research.

2.4.5 Self-regulation and play

Studies using Vygotsky’s approach to child development offer an interesting insight in relation to self-regulation, particularly the research surrounding children’s play (Fleer, Veresov & Walker, 2020). According to Vygotsky, when the child self-regulates, there are two layers of activity. One is a regulating activity and the other is a regulated activity. Vygotsky argued that in play, both layers are present. He provided an example; when a child is involved in play, the child ‘cries like a patient, but rejoices as a player’ (Vygotsky, 2001, p. 72). El’konin supported this approach, arguing that ‘in a play the child simultaneously performs two functions: performs his role and control his behavior’ (p. 334).

The contemporary empirical studies have argued that to further understand the relationship between play and self-regulation, it is important first to differentiate between levels of play
Vygotsky (1967) asserted that for play to have a developmental effect on the child, the play itself should not stay the same throughout early childhood years but should evolve from immature to mature play. According to Vygotsky, mature play acts as a developmental force for the child; at this level of play, adults should be active in guiding the play. Vygotsky (1967) argued that make-believe play is the most important activity of early childhood. This finding has been supported by Lillard et al. (2013), which was critical in understanding the value of children’s pretend play, whereas adult-guided play was endorsed as the current best practice to support children’s cognitive, emotional and social development (Bodrova et al., 2013).

Within contemporary literature, there is a growing concern about declining self-regulation ability in children (Blair, 2002; Blair & Razza, 2007; Raver & Knitzer, 2002). For example, seven-year-olds of today demonstrate self-regulation levels similar to ‘those of the five-year-old children of the 1940s in that they are not able to control their physical actions in following the directions of an adult’ (Bodrova et al., 2013, p. 117). Researchers have theorised that declining self-regulation in young children ‘puts them at risk of later cognitive and social-emotional problems’ (Bodrova et al., 2013, p. 118). Scholars are interested in the decline of control in children and continue to attempt to identify causal relationship and correlations between decline of self-regulation and other relevant factors.

For example, some studies have linked the decline in self-regulation to the decline of play, arguing that there are positive correlations between levels of play and self-regulation (Berk et al., 2006; Germeroth et al., 2013). Studies indicate that an early childhood curriculum with an emphasis on the importance of teachers supporting the development of children’s social play substantially improves self-regulation skills as measured by accuracy on objective tests of inhibitory control and cognitive flexibility (Barnett et al., 2006; Diamond et al., 2007).

Other studies in Russia and the US have found that ‘children do not show superior self-regulation in play the way past generations have’ (Smirnova & Gudareva, 2004, as cited in Bodrova et al., 2013, p. 117). It seems the decline in both quantity and quality of play that preschools and kindergartens now offer affects children’s self-regulation. Gudareva (2005), for example, reported
that only 10% of six-year-olds showed a mature level of play and 48% of five-year-olds displayed the lowest (toddler) level of play. Today’s make-believe play does not differ in content from play of the past but there is a decline in quality and quantity (Bodrova et al., 2013; Johnson et al., 2005; Karpov, 2005). However, other researchers have questioned this causal relationship between play and children’s self-regulation. For example, Lillard et al. (2013) did not report any positive correlation between children’s play and the development of self-regulation.

Cultural–historical studies about play provide insights into the development of children’s self-regulation, which is relevant to the current research. However, these studies have mostly focused on the development of play within early childhood settings or home. No studies were found that analysed a wholistic view of how play can be used to promote the development of self-regulation in the family, school and community settings.

Another important area related to the development of self-regulation is the transfer of values. Section 2.4.6 discuss how values are explored within selected empirical studies about development of children’s self-regulation and how this is linked to the current research.

2.4.6 Self-regulation and values

Within the literature, studies that explore how values are transferred to children within a cultural–historical perspective are limited. Values are featured in relation to children’s self-regulation because shared values in a cultural group influence parenting and socialisation norms and practices, which have an impact on how children learn to self-regulate (Jaramillo et al., 2017). The following studies examine how values are explored in relation to self-regulation and ways this research positions the current study.

The cultural–historical study of Monk (2010) explored values within three generations of families in an Australian context. The study introduced new interpretations of intergenerational family learning and development and expanded understanding of the role of values in children’s learning and development within family (Monk, 2010). The current study expands exploration of values from family to school and community and links values to the development of self-regulation.
Another study within the cultural–historical tradition (Boettcher & Dammeyer, 2016) featured societal values as powerful factors affecting children with disabilities learning and development. Boettcher and Dammeyer (2016) argued that historically, there has always been a dialectical relationship between societal values and attitudes and children’s developmental conditions. Their research showed that often there is incongruence between natural and cultural lines of development, which is affected by societal value positions. Further, it indicated that it is possible to create a fit between the child’s abilities and the cultural practice (Boettcher, 2016). In parallel to Boettcher (2016), the current study explores how societal institutions (home, school and community) create conditions for socially disadvantaged children and/or children with developmental delays to ensure a better fit between their natural and cultural development.

The recent psychological study of Latino children’s development in the US (Daneri et al., 2018) featured development of self-regulation and linked it to values. The study explored parent–child relationships in early childhood and preschool and elementary school curricula for this culturally specific group. The study reported parent–child relationships as one of the main drivers of self-regulation development in early childhood. The findings featured the role of parenting and community values in the development of children’s self-regulation (Daneri et al., 2018). The current study expands understanding of the role of values in the development of self-regulation from a cultural–historical perspective, exploring how values are transferred from adults to children through vospitanie. Vospitanie as a process, and its links to self-regulation, is further explained in chapters 5, 6, 7, and 8 of this study.

2.4.7 Children’s perspectives

Within the cultural–historical tradition of child development, children are not considered mere objects of adults’ developmental efforts, but as ‘social participants that continually take part in the practices of everyday life, and thus negotiate the care practices they are involved in’ (Ulvik, 2018, p. 74). Through children’s involvement in everyday life practices and interactions with adults and each other, children contribute to their own developmental conditions (Hedegaard, 2002; Hedegaard & Fleer, 2009; Rogoff, 2003; Valsiner, 2007; Vygotsky, 1998). The following recent
studies in the cultural–historical tradition explore how children create these conditions and construct knowledge, and how children and adults contribute to the development of competencies and self-regulation. This section reviews the studies in further detail and explains how they are linked to the current study, which researches children in the Kitezh community.

Hojholt’s (2018) study used empirical data of a group of children, who were observed and interviewed over a two-year period as they transitioned from kindergarten to school. The study emphasised the importance of paying attention to how children construct knowledge at school and taking the ‘children’s perspective’. The findings indicated that children are concerned about each other; they are oriented to each other, not only to the learning task (Hojholt, 2018). Children create significant conditions for each other that form an important part of their learning. The findings indicate that children’s orientation towards relations and other children is paramount for learning and not necessarily in opposition to school tasks. The important finding is that children’s specific difficulties with learning are connected to ‘general contradictions and conflicts in their lives’ (Hojholt, 2018, p. 108).

Hojholt (2018) advocated the importance of considering the social situation in its entirety and interconnectedness to understand children’s perspectives, not only how children manage the conditions that adults create for them. In this sense, Hojholt’s approach is similar other scholars’ approach of considering children’s perspectives (Hedegaard, 2002; Hedegaard & Fleer, 2009; Rogoff, 2003; Valsiner, 2007; Vygotsky, 1998). The current study builds on this approach because it explores how the focus children in Kitezh experience the conditions that adults create and how they contribute to their own learning across three institutional practices—home, school and the community—as they move through the process of self-regulation.

Although there were no studies located from a cultural–historical perspective that examined adopted children situated within a family and moving across settings into school and interacting within the community, a recent study by Ulvik (2018) explored how Norwegian foster parents construct a ‘culturally adequate child’ (p. 73). The study involved interviewing parents from 18 foster families and analysing their narratives of their everyday practices. The study revealed how
developmental goals that parents set and put in practice for their foster children define ‘constructions of an ordinary, unremarkable, child’ (Ulvik, 2018, p. 74). The findings indicate that this is not a naturally occurring process but develops through social interaction of ‘certain kinds’ (p. 87), particularly the social practices in which parents invite their foster children to participate. The study identified the paradox of the childcare practice in modern society—there is a demand to move from external control to self-control; conversely, adults (foster parents) have to govern and shape actively to develop a self-governed and self-competent child. The study explained how this demand is expressed through parents’ goals set for their foster children. It is not enough if a child simply abides by their rules (e.g., have a shower because they say the child has to). The foster parents’ goal is for the child to be willing to have a shower because the child feels it is good to do this when it is needed (e.g., after skiing). Ulvik (2018) proposed that foster parents are representatives of the collective, the whole of the society within specific cultural contexts because they are keenly aware of the competencies the modern society demands of the child.

Ulvik’s (2018) study focused primarily on adults and children interacting within a family; the current study extends analysis of the interactions to school and the community because it explores how focus children learn to self-regulate within three settings: family, school and the community. Similar to Ulvik (2018), the current study analyses the developmental goals of foster/adoptive parents through their narratives, which reveal that adults want their children to learn how to do the right thing, rather than simply know what the right thing to do. The Norwegian mother wants her foster child to have a shower when it is needed rather than when she says so (Ulvik, 2018). The mother sets an ambitious goal for her foster child—to develop self-awareness. However, the study does not explain how the mother achieves this: that is, the strategies she employs to help her child develop self-awareness. The current study bridges this gap by explaining strategies the adults in Kitezh community use to help children learn self-awareness and self-regulation.
2.5 Review Summary

Most studies reviewed support the argument that self-regulation is critical for children’s academic achievement, mental health and social success (Steinberg et al., 2014). However, there is growing concern about declining self-regulation ability in young children (Bodrova et al., 2013). Some researchers have linked this to the decline in play; others have argued that there is no causal relationship between the two variables. Within the literature, the views about what constitutes self-regulation and how it develops in children vary. Self-regulation is often divided into categories and separated into emotional, cognitive and behaviour regulation (Conover & Daiute, 2017). Most studies focus on individual and distinct functions of these components (Gross, 2007). The exception is cultural–historical studies (e.g., Adams & Fleer, 2015; Chen & Fleer, 2015; Fleer & Hammer, 2013; Sulaymani & Fleer, 2019) that attempt to explore emotional and cognitive aspects of self-regulation in unity.

However, the cultural–historical studies that focus on children’s self-regulation are limited. The existing studies tend to emphasise the use of a particular concept of cultural–historical theory: for example, Vygotsky’s concept of cultural tool/mediating sign in relation to perezhivanie (Sulaymani & Fleer, 2019), fairytales (Fleer & Hammer, 2013), children’s belongings (Adams & Fleer, 2015) and electronic messaging with older children (Conover & Daiute, 2017).

This literature review revealed that in most cultural–historical studies, the unity of affect and intellect is not sufficiently explained; these studies tend to emphasise the emotional aspect (Adams & Fleer, 2015; Sulaymani & Fleer, 2019). However, the emotional aspect in the development of self-regulation, specifically what role emotions play in children’s learning to self-regulate, is also not sufficiently explored in cultural–historical research. One exception is the study of Chen and Fleer (2015), which provided deep insights into the emotional aspect of self-regulation. The findings support ‘the development of emotion self-regulation’ (Chen & Fleer, 2015, p. 248) and explain signification of emotions, more specifically, how children and parents regulate each other.

Although perezhivanie (Vygotsky, 1994) has been used in various ways to explore children’s learning and development (Adams & Fleer, 2015; Brennan, 2014; Chen & Fleer, 2015;
Conover & Daiute, 2017; Ferholt, 2009, 2010; Lindqvist, 1995; Sulaymani & Fleer, 2019), the review revealed minimal or no literature that explains how *perezhivanie* can be used to analyse the development of self-regulation. The review indicates scope to develop this concept (*perezhivanie*) methodologically to further understand the unity of emotion and intellect in the process of learning to self-regulate. In addition, the literature review indicated minimal or no literature that provided in-depth case studies on development of self-regulation in a particular cultural community, emphasising an alliance between the home and school. The community used in this research (Kitezh) is unique because of the specific conditions.

Values are explored within literature in relation to children’s learning to self-regulate. However, the extant studies do not explain how values are transferred to children within a particular cultural community and how values of home, school and the community together affect children’s learning to self-regulate.

The unity of affect and intellect in the development of children’s self-regulation and how a particular social environment affects children learning to self-regulate is not sufficiently explored in cultural–historical research. There are no studies of the Kitezh Children’s Community in English, and no studies on how a particular community affects development of children’s self-regulation. The current study aims to fill these gaps. It specifically focuses on how the Kitezh environment acts as a source of development for children’s ability to self-regulate. In addition, the study expands the concept of *perezhivanie* and explores how *perezhivanie* can be used to analyse the process of learning to self-regulate. In this study it is explained through *vospitanie*—a Russian term that describes the process of transferring cultural values from parents/members of the community to Kitezh children.

### 2.6 Conclusion

This chapter provided a review of the empirical studies that explore development of self-regulation. The review comprised two parts: discussion about studies that view self-regulation from different psychological and educational perspectives and exploration of studies that view self-regulation from a cultural–historical perspective. The review identified gaps within the literature
and situated this study within contemporary research literature on self-regulation. The next chapter (Chapter 3) explains the theoretical framework of this study.
Chapter 3: Theoretical Framework

3.1 Introduction

The cultural–historical theory developed by Soviet psychologist Vygotsky (1896–1934) emphasises that psychological development of the child is cultural development (Vygotsky, 1983). According to Vygotsky (1983), the process of the child’s cultural development includes: mastery of the culturally determined means of handling activities with objects, mastery of the culturally determined relationships with other people and mastery of the culturally determined means of self-regulation—regulation of the child’s own psychological activity and behaviour. Vygotsky’s cultural–historical theory offers a conception of child development that provides insights into self-regulation (Kasavinov, 2013).

Vygotsky (1998) argued that child development is a cultural–historical process in which the social environment is the source of development of every specifically human function that appears in a child. Vygotsky (1997) proposed that every child’s ‘higher mental function was social before it became an internal strictly mental function; it was formerly a social relation’ (p. 105). Vygotsky (1987) emphasised the unity between affect and intellect—emotion and cognition—and social and biological components of child development. His theory is a system of interrelated concepts, which are interwoven rather than separated, and form a unity of biological and cultural lines of development (Vygotsky, 1997). Vygotsky’s concept of the developmental lines introduced the importance of considering the child’s social situation of development. The child’s social situation of development is an important concept in which Vygotsky views development as a process—not only the child changes, nor the environment. It is the child’s relations to the environment that changes (Kravtsova, 2006).

Using Vygotsky’s cultural–historical theoretical concepts, it is argued that analysing children’s dramatic moments during social interactions with others will enable insights into the process of self-regulation. The focus is dramatic moments as the children transition across their
home, school and community environments. An explanation of the relevant cultural–historical theoretical concepts and how they link to this study is given in the following sections.

In addition to the original concepts outlined by Vygotsky, the chapter includes ideas developed by contemporary Russian and English-speaking scholars who have extended understanding of Vygotsky’s concepts. This enables theorisation for the current study. These include works of Vygotsky’s students Bozhovich (1929–1981) and El’konin (1960, 1984) and concepts developed by Hedegaard (2008, 2012, 2019), Fleer (2008, 2019) Holodynski (2009) and Kravtsova (2006).

This study uses Vygotsky’s understanding of child development, which is a process of cultural development. The link between child development and cultural contexts has been explored by many scholars prior to and after Vygotsky (Kasvinov, 2013). Vygotsky (1983) understood cultural development as a process that occurs under the influence of the social environment and its culture. Vygotsky (1983) asserted that society, not nature, should be viewed as the determining factor in a child’s behaviour. Ostensibly, Vygotsky's understanding of the child’s cultural context is limited by the influence of the societal culture in which a child lives. Indeed, Vygotsky (1983) argued that the child does not create their own culture, which is completely independent of the societal culture in which the child lives. However, Vygotsky (1983) did not see the child as a passive receiver of adults’ culture because instead of copying, the child reworks the culture creatively.

Vygotsky’s work focused on how culture, including values, traditions and skills of a social group, is transferred to the next generation through interaction of children with more competent others (adults). However, Vygotsky did not focus on a particular culture but on how any culture influences child development—the overall mechanism of such influence (Kasvinov, 2013). Vygotsky explored the mechanism of such influence and how it supports the skill formation of children and ‘ways of thinking and behaviour’ (Wertsch & Tulviste, 1992, p. 425).

In this sense, Vygotsky’s work and theoretical concepts are well suited to this study because the thesis explores the context of children living in the Kitezh community in Russia. The study
explores how a particular cultural community exerts its influence on children’s development and how it creates conditions that support or hinder child development. Further, it explores how children themselves actively create conditions for their own development within this cultural context. The study employs Vygotsky’s understanding of the environment and child development which is further discussed in Section 3.2.1.

3.2 Cultural–Historical Concepts

3.2.1 Environment and child development

Prominent psychologist Vygotsky developed cultural–historical theory in post-revolutionary Russia (1925–1934). One aspect of his theory—interaction of child development and the social environment—is linked to this study because it explores how Kitezh environment influences the education and upbringing of children living in the Kitezh community. Before analysing the environment in Kitezh, it is important to clarify the term ‘environment’. For the purpose of this study, ‘environment’ is viewed from the Vygotskian perspective and comprises three interrelated concepts that are further explained.

First is the view of the environment as an all-encompassing concept, comprising a whole range of characteristics or what Vygotsky (1998) deemed ‘absolute indicators’ (p. 293). Such indicators include physical dimensions (e.g., the child’s living conditions) and ‘social and affective activity, products of cultural development, such as speech and other symbol systems and people’ (Mahn, 2003, p. 130), which include parents’ education (Vygotsky, 1998).

Second is the concept of the unity of the environment and child. For Vygotsky (1998), ‘the environment never is external to the child’ (p. 293). He indicated that, ‘the environment must be studied not as such, not in its absolute indicators, but in relation to the child’ (p. 293). Vygotsky argued that we need to steer away from studying the environment in terms of its absolute indicators, such as the child’s socio-economic status. He stated that studying such indicators and their circumstances per se does not reveal their role in the development of the child. Vygotsky (1998) maintained that if one wants to study the child’s environment, it is necessary to change from absolute to relative indicators. In this sense, Vygotsky (1998) emphasised that it is important not to
separate the two and to preserve the unity while researching the child and environment. According to Vygotsky (1998), the way to research the child and the environment is through analysis of the specific relations with the environment into which the child enters, but only through the analysis that does not mechanically divide this relationship.

Third, and arguably the most important concept of the environment, is that Vygotsky (1998) views the environment as a source of development. He stressed that the environment ‘determines the development of the child through experience of the environment’ (Vygotsky, 1998, p. 294). This idea is further explained in the subsequent sections of this thesis (see Chapter 8) because the Kitezh environment is not considered a collection of separate components or external circumstances of the child’s life that affects development, but how the child experiences that environment as interwoven. The child is situated within the Kitezh community and a family living and working in the community. He attends the school—all integral components of community. The understanding of the interrelation between the three dimensions of the community, family and school and their relation to the child forms the basis of understanding the child’s development.

This directs attention for the need to clarify the term ‘child development’. For the purpose of this study, this will be viewed from Vygotsky’s perspective. Vygotsky was interested in the psychological development of the child, which is different to development of the child as they pass through chronological ages and stages (see for example, Piaget, 1952, 2001). For Vygotsky, psychological development is when a new formation or a new higher mental function emerges in a child, unrelated to chronological age but merged with psychological development. He referred to this emergence of new psychological functions as ‘neo formations’ and related this to the psychological development of the child (Vygotsky, 1998). Section 3.2.2 discusses Vygotsky’s understanding of higher mental functions and how they develop in a child.

3.2.2 Higher mental functions

To understand how the Kitezh environment influences child development, specifically self-regulation, it is important to clarify the dimensions this study will explore. First, it is significant that Vygotsky’s (1925–1934) theory focused on higher mental functions, such as abstract thinking,
logical memory, creative imagination and voluntary attention. However, the subject of his theory was not higher mental functions per se, but the process of their development (Veresov, 2010).

Vygotsky was concerned with the origins and development of these functions and devoted his life to researching how such development occurs.

To emphasise this focus, Vygotsky used the metaphor ‘from buds to fruits’ (Veresov, 2010, p. 86), which illustrates the process of development. The centre point of his research was analysis of that process: the transition ‘from buds to fruits’. Vygotsky believed that each child at every age has higher mental functions that are already developed (‘fruits’) and functions that are still maturing (‘buds’). He theorised that by studying the ‘buds of development’, it is possible to disclose how any higher function appears in a child and eventually a fuller picture of the development of a child’s consciousness emerges (Vygotsky, 1983).

To explain the origins of higher mental functions, Vygotsky (1997) began with discussion of human tools. He argued that humans develop tools to extend their natural functions (e.g., a stick with a hook is an extension of an arm to reach objects that are normally beyond the reach of an arm). The tool is a form of adjustment so that it can be used to conquer nature. These tools become a human’s artificial organs (Vygotsky, 1997). Vygotsky (1997) maintained ‘in a man following to the features of his adaptation (use of tools, work activity), the development of artificial organs replaced the development of natural organs’ (p. 16).

Vygotsky further asserted that during the process of conquering and using nature, humans learnt how to use their psyche and new functions appeared as an extension of their natural psychological function. These too become humans’ artificial organs. (Vygotsky, 1978). Vygotsky called these ‘higher mental functions’ as opposed to ‘lower functions’, such as physiological and sensory/motor abilities, which are present in both humans and animals. Higher, specifically human mental functions, such as logical thinking, voluntary attention and creative imagination are present in humans but absent in animals (Vygotsky, 1997). Vygotsky was primarily concerned with how these functions develop.
Vygotsky (1997) linked development of higher mental functions to the cultural development of behaviour, deeming it ‘one of the most important aspects of cultural development of behaviour’ (p. 18). He concluded that culture is responsible for new types of behaviour; it changes old and builds new mental functions:

- culture creates special forms of behaviour, it modifies the activity of mental functions, it constructs new superstructures in the developing system of human behaviour … In the process of historical development, social man changes the methods and devices of his behaviour, transforms natural instincts and functions, and develops and creates new forms of behaviour—specifically cultural. (Vygotsky, 1997, p. 18)

According to Vygotsky, culture is responsible for the creation of higher mental functions, including social behaviour. Vygotsky’s view on the formation of social behaviour and the way the environment influences the process of development of higher mental functions is pertinent to the current study, as discussed in Section 3.2.3.

### 3.2.3 The general genetic law of cultural development

Vygotsky (1978) was interested to discover how new higher mental functions appear in a child:

We need to concentrate not on the product of development but on the very process by which higher forms are established. (p. 64)

In his attempt to research and understand the process of this transformation, he introduced several ‘laws of cultural development’ (Vygotsky, 1998). Among them, the most critical is defined as ‘the general genetic law of cultural development of higher mental functions’:

- every function in the cultural development on the child appears on the stage twice, in two planes, first the social, then the psychological, first between people as an intermental category, then within the child as an intramental category. (Vygotsky, 1998, p. 106)

Vygotsky sought to understand the mechanics of such development by observing the behaviour of young children. Analysing findings of several experiments, which examined how development occurs in a child’s behaviour, when a child interacts with a particular social situation,
Vygotsky (1997) concluded, ‘the source of development of activity lies in the social environment of the child’ (p. 20).

Vygotsky argued that the point at which a child enters a social situation is a critical moment in the history of the child’s behaviour and marks the transition from the biological to the social path of development:

The transition from the biological to the social path of development is the central link in the process of development, a cardinal turning point in the history of the child's behaviour.

(Vygotsky, 1997, p. 20)

He argued that such transition occurs socially: in other words, through another person:

[The child’s] adaptation to the environment is achieved by social means through people around him ... the child enters into relations with the situation not directly, but through another person. (Vygotsky, 1997, p. 20).

Although Vygotsky (1998) emphasised the social nature of such transition, he maintained that there is a unity of biological and social nature in the process of child development, stating:

development [is] a process that is characterised by a unity of material and mental aspects, a unity of the social and the personal during the child’s ascent up the stages of development.

(p. 190)

Vygotsky emphasised that the environment is not something outside the child and that the child has special relationship to the social realm, which can be linked to certain ages (Fleer & Hedegaard, 2010). He maintained that each psychological age is characterised by a particular social situation of development, which is formed by the beginning of this age. By the end of each psychological age period, new formations emerge. Among them, the most important is that which will become critical for the development during the next stage (Vygotsky, 1998). Such new formations, or as they are sometimes called ‘neo formations’, occur when a child meets new demands that are connected to biological (e.g., walking) or social growth (e.g., entering school; Fleer & Hedegaard, 2010). Vygotsky was interested in studying how such neo formations occur. He believed that neo formations result from contradictions located in the social situation of the child’s
development (El’konin, 1989) and where new demands in the social situation and how the child meets these new demands act as a force for development (Hedegaard, 2008).

However, Vygotsky also introduced the concept of crisis to explain the major change in a child’s motives, such as from play to learning, theorising this as a positive force for child development (Vygotsky, 1998). This study is interested in examining dramatic moments expressed through the new demands a child meets, as they move between institutions in which different practices are evident. The child’s motive orientation and how they meet these new demands as they enter and participate in the activity settings is of interest to this study. Section 3.2.4 explains Vygotsky’s understanding of age-related and everyday crisis and how it links to this study.

3.2.4 Crisis and lytic ages: Child development as a revolutionary process

Vygotsky proposed that child development is not a naturally evolving process in which a child changes gradually, nor is it a change in the environment. He emphasised the dialectical understanding of the process of development and argued that it is not a gradual evolutionary but a revolutionary process in which it is the child’s relations to the environment that changes (Vygotsky, 1998). Vygotsky stated that child development can be divided into critical (unstable, revolutionary) and lytic (stable, evolutionary) ages. Discussing the dynamics of age, Vygotsky (2001) wrote:

Critical ages are altered by stable ages. Critical ages are transforming, turning points in the development of the child, confirming once again that child development is a dialectical process where transfer from one stage to another happens by revolutionary rather than evolutionary way. (p. 77)

Vygotsky (1998) emphasised that critical periods are characterised by the child experiencing a crisis, when development ‘takes on a stormy, impetuous, and sometimes catastrophic character that resembles a revolutionary course of events’ (p. 191). In fact, Vygotsky (1998) called such age periods ‘crisis’ (e.g., crisis of the newborn, crisis at age one, crisis at age three). He argued that both stable and critical ages have ‘neoformations’ (Vygotsky, 1998, p. 195), which Vygotsky (1998) used as a main criterion for dividing child development into age periods.
Vygotsky’s division of child development into crisis and stable age periods is important for this study for two reasons. First is Vygotsky’s understanding of crisis ages as a revolutionary process and the link between crisis ages and the child’s experience (*perezhivanie*). Second is the link between age crisis and changes in the child’s motives, which Vygotsky (2001) explained through *perezhivanie*. The concept of *perezhivanie* is explained in further detail in Section 3.2.5. Following is an explanation of these reasons and how *perezhivanie* is linked to this study.

Vygotsky (2001) argued that during crisis ages, the child’s social situation of development changes abruptly and the child has the strongest experience (*perezhivanie*):

During all critical ages the internal life of the child is often linked to painful and excruciating experience (*perezhivanie*), internal conflicts, and overcoming of difficulties never met before. (p. 173)

Vygotsky mentions two types of crises—one related to age periods and another to everyday life crises that a child endures. The everyday crisis is an important part of child development and has a similar dynamic to the age-related crisis because it is revolutionary rather than evolutionary (Vygotsky, 1998). This study explores the everyday life crisis of two children in Kitezh, which is referred to throughout this study as ‘dramatic moments’. In the current study, it is argued that children experiencing dramatic moments in their everyday life are experiencing a crisis.

In his exploration of the age periods, Vygotsky examined (2001) how the child experiences crisis ages and the child’s attitude towards environment changes as the child transitions from one age period to another:

the essence of every crisis is reconstruction of the internal experience which is perhaps originated in the change of the basic moment which determines the child’s attitude towards environment, more specifically, the change of needs and motives which drives the child’s behavior. The growth and change in motives represents the least conscious, least voluntary part of our personality and during transition from one age period to the other the child acquires new motives, in other words, drivers of his activity undertake re-evaluation of values. Something that the child considered important and has driven him only a moment
ago, becomes unimportant and irrelevant at the next stage. Therefore I think that this reconstruction of needs and motives, re-evaluation of values is the most foundational moment during transition from age to age, and during transition from age to age the environment changes, that means that the child’s attitude towards environment changes. (p. 2018)

Vygotsky (2001) linked the child’s experience (perezhivanie) during crisis to motives. This study explores how two focus children in Kitezh experience everyday life crisis (understood as dramatic moments in their everyday lives). The change in the children’s motives and values as they endure everyday life crisis is explored through Vygotsky’s concept of perezhivanie which is further explained in Section 3.2.5.

3.2.5 Perezhivanie

Perezhivanie is a Russian word and translates into ‘a lived experience’. The translation does not do justice to its meaning because it denotes not only ‘lived experience’ but also the experience that was lived through emotionally. Instead of a common-sense interpretation of perezhivanie, this section offers Vygotsky’s understanding of perezhivanie in relation to child development.

In this regard, Varshava and Vygotsky (1931) described perezhivanie:

Perezhivanie is a common name for direct psychological experience. From a subjective perspective, every psychological process is perezhivanie. In every perezhivanie we distinguish: first, an act and secondly, the content of perezhivanie. The first is an activity related to the appearance of certain perezhivanie; the second is the content, the composition of what is experienced. (p. 128)

This definition reveals the meaning of perezhivanie as a psychological phenomenon and draws attention to the fact that the same word (perezhivanie) means both a process (‘how I am experiencing something’) and a content (‘what I am experiencing’; Veresov & Fleer, 2016, p. 326).

In his later works, Vygotsky (1994) provided another definition of perezhivanie:
*Perezhivanie* is a concept which allows us to study the role and influence of environment on the psychological development of children in the analysis of the laws of development. (p 343)

Here, Vygotsky revealed the meaning of *perezhivanie* as a theoretical concept that is linked to the ‘process of development, the role of environment and the laws of development’ (Veresov & Fleer, 2016, p. 326). This study draws on *perezhivanie* to better understand the child’s experience and further understand the role of *perezhivanie* in relation to the influence of environment on the psychological development of focus children living in the Kitezh community.

Vygotsky (1935) argued that the emotional aspects of a child’s environment determine how this environment will influence the child. To illustrate the emotional experience of the child, Vygotsky used an example of three children who live with an alcoholic mother; she often abuses and neglects them. All three children are of a different age and stage of development and the same environment influences them in different ways. The youngest child is simply overwhelmed by fear of his mother and developed several neurotic conditions, such as stammer and enuresis. The second child is torn between attachment to his mother and fear of her when she is in her state of frenzy; the third takes the role of a senior member of the family who tries to protect the young ones from the mother and also pities the mother (Vygotsky, 1935).

Vygotsky argued that the reason these three children have been influenced by the same environment in different ways is that their understanding of the situation is unique. The children have experienced this situation differently; that is, their emotional experience (*perezhivanie*) of this environment is completely different. Therefore, Vygotsky suggested that the way to research how the environment influences child development is to analyse the point of view of the child’s emotional experiences (*perezhivanie*) and examine each child’s personal characteristics, such as age, psychological development, health and emotional experience. In this sense, the word *perezhivanie* is used to express the idea that the same objective situations may be interpreted, perceived, experienced or lived through by different children in different ways (Van der Veer & Valsiner, 1991).
In his lecture on the problem of the environment, Vygotsky (1994) emphasised that *perezhivanie* is the prism ‘through which the influence of the environment is refracted in the child’s development’ (as cited in Jornet & Roth, 2016, p. 316):

Perezhivanie, arising from any situation or from any aspect of his environment, determines what kind of influence this situation or this environment will have on the child. Therefore, it is not any of the factors in themselves (if taken without reference to the child) which determines how they will influence the future course of this development, but the same factors refracted through the prism of the child’s … *perezhivanie*. (Vygotsky, 1994, pp. 339–340).

In this explanation Vygotsky used the prism as a metaphor, explaining the meaning of *perezhivanie*, where arguably, the focus is not on the prism itself, but on the process of refraction. This definition draws attention to *perezhivanie* as a concept linked to the social situation of development. *Perezhivanie* as a prism refracts rather than reflects the child’s social situation of development. As light enters the prism, ‘the child emotionally and intellectually lives through the social situation’ (Veresov & Fleer, 2016, p. 328).

Another important aspect of this understanding of *perezhivanie* is that it refracts the social environment, but also acts as a developmental force as it ‘changes the course of the child’s development’ (Veresov & Fleer, 2016, p. 329). Not all *perezhivaniya* lead to qualitative changes of the child’s mental functions but only those linked to social events that are intense and emotionally charged—dramatic moments. The dramatic moments refracted through the prism of the child’s *perezhivanie* ‘brings qualitative changes to how the child becomes aware, interprets and relates to the sociocultural environment’ (Veresov & Fleer, 2016, p. 329). Next is a discussion of Vygotsky’s understanding of *perezhivanie* as a unity of person and environment and a unit of analysis.

Vygotsky views *perezhivanie* as ‘the unity of personal and environmental characteristics’ (Roth & Jornet, 2016, p. 316). He explained:

Perezhivanie is a unit where, on the one hand in an indivisible state, the environment is represented, i.e. that which is perezhivaet—a perezhivanie is always related to something
which is found outside the person—and on the other hand, what is represented is how I, myself, perezhivau this, i.e., all the personal characteristics and all the environmental characteristics are represented in perezhivanie. (Vygotsky, 1994, p. 342)

For Vygotsky (1994), *perezhivanie* exists not only as a unity of the person and environment, as explained above, but also as units (*edenitsa* in Russian) of analysis that ‘represent such products of analysis which … manage to retain, in the most elementary form, the properties inherent in the whole’ (p. 342). This explains two sides of the phenomenon of *perezhivanie* from Vygotsky’s point of view—‘the indivisible person–environment unity and the refraction of this unity in the same unit’ (Roth & Jornet, 2016, p. 317).

Vygotsky (1994) reviewed his thinking and assigned particular significance to *perezhivanie* (Roth & Jornet, 2016). In light of that meaning, some concepts of his previous thinking became problematic. For example, the mechanisms of social mediation become unimportant and questioned because ‘no middle thing is possible in *perezhivanie*, where everything already is part of everything else’ (Mikhailov, 2001, as cited in Roth & Jornet, 2016, p. 323). The internalisation was also questioned because when a child internalises any feature of the environment, it is already internal to *perezhivanie* (Roth & Jornet, 2016).

In addition, Vygotsky’s understanding of *perezhivanie* challenged the cause-and-effect explanation of the person–environment relationship because according to his understanding, the person’s behaviour cannot be explained by any internal or external causes (Roth & Jornet, 2016). Drawing on Spinoza’s (2002) understanding of nature as self-causing and self-moving, Vygotsky maintained that personal development is moved by its own internal dynamic. That is where the role of perezhivanie fits, crucial for researching person’s development, where change occurs not because of the ‘factors external to the person–environment unity but because of its own internal dynamics’ (Roth & Jornet, 2016, p. 320).

Despite these contradictions, Vygotsky’s understanding of *perezhivanie* as a concept supports exploration of the Kitezh environment as a source of development for the focus children in with the current study. Vygotsky’s approach demonstrates that ‘only those components of the social
The environment that are refracted through the *prerezhivanie* of the individual are of developmental significance’ (Veresov & Fleer, 2016, p. 334). Table 3.1 conceptualises different aspects of *perezhivanie* for this study.

**Table 3.1**

**Different Aspects of Perezhivanie**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Refracting prism</th>
<th>Unit of analysis</th>
<th>Developmental force</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The prism through which social environment is refracted</td>
<td>Part of the unity of personal and situational characteristics (see Chapter 4)</td>
<td>Perezhivaniya of dramatic events, a social crisis brings changes to the course of the child’s development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Perezhivanie interwoven with cultural–historical concepts

| Social situation of development | Unity of personal and situational characteristics; social situation of development | Dramatic moments, everyday crisis, dialectical characters of development—through contradictions |

Adopted from Veresov and Fleer (2016, p. 327).

To explain how development of children’s self-regulation is linked to cultural–historical concepts, an overview of the cultural–historical reading of self-regulation is presented. This starts with an explanation of the Vygotskian understanding of the social situation of development.

**3.2.6 Social situation of development**

As explained previously, Vygotsky introduced the concept of *social situation of development* to illustrate the transition from old to new formations (neoformations) for each psychological age period. He used this concept to explain the relationship between the child and his social environment:

Social situation of development represents an initial moment for all dynamic changes, which occur in the development during the given period. It defines entirely and completely the forms and the pathway according to which the child acquires new qualities of his personality getting them from the environment, the main source of his development, the path along which social becomes individual. (Vygotsky, 1998, p. 198)

According to Vygotsky (1998) the social situation of development is the system of relations between the child at a certain psychological age and the child’s social environment. When the child
changes, his social situation of development changes and if social situation of development changes, the child also changes. The child’s social situation of development includes not only family, but also other institutional practices including school and different kinds of leisure activities. Therefore, it is important to view the child’s social situation of development holistically and observe how the social situation emerges as the child participates in several institutional practices (Boettcher, 2014, p. 195). For the purpose of this study, institutional practices include family, school and the community. Section 3.2.7 introduces the next concept within cultural–historical theory—the ideal and real form—and explains how it further explains the relationship between the child and his social environment.

3.2.7 Ideal and real form

Vygotsky (1935) argued that the only way to explain the role of the environment in child development is to know the relation between the child and his environment. He emphasised two key factors that need to be considered when analysing the relationship between the child and their environment. First is the child’s psychological age. Vygotsky maintained that the same environment could influence various children’s development in different ways depending on their psychological age. The second factor is the child’s understanding and awareness of any event or situation in his environment. Vygotsky (1935) stated:

the influence of environment on child development will, along with other types of influences, also have to be assessed by taking the degree of understanding, awareness and insights of what is going on in the environment into account (p. 345)

Further, Vygotsky argued that the environment is the source of development for such functions. He concluded this after researching how higher mental functions (e.g., speech) develops in children. Vygotsky (1935) observed an interesting peculiarity, which, he argued, is only attributable to child development and not to any other development:

in child development that which is possible to achieve at the end and as the result of the developmental process, is already available in the environment from the very beginning. (p. 345).
Vygotsky explained that the ultimate result of the developmental process is not only present in the environment from the start but influences the first steps in child development. To explain this, Vygotsky introduced the concept of the ideal and real form, which explains how the transition from lower to higher mental functions occurs in a child and how the social environment supports this form of development.

Vygotsky (1935) outlined the concept of ideal and real form by giving an example of a child who learns to speak. At first, the child is only able to pronounce separate words; however, fully developed speech is already present in his environment. The child speaks only in single words, but his mother uses language that is grammatically and syntactically formed and part of a large vocabulary. Vygotsky (1935) called the mother’s speech ‘an ideal, fully developed form’ (p. 345) and the child’s speech ‘primary or rudimentary’. Further, Vygotsky argued that development occurs through interaction of the ‘ideal’ and ‘real form’ of development. This, he maintained, is a peculiar feature of child development:

this development is achieved under particular conditions on interaction with the environment, where this ideal and final form (that form which is going to appear only at the end of the process of development) is not only already there in the environment and from the very start, is in contact with the child, but actually interacts and exerts a real influence on the primary form, on the first steps of the child’s development. Something which is only supposed to take shape at the very end of development, somehow influence the very first steps in this development. (Vygotsky, 1935, pp. 338–354)

To extend this concept further, Vygotsky (1935) proposed that if the appropriate ideal form is not present in the environment, in the child, the corresponding activity, characteristics or trait will fail to develop or will be developed in a limited and reduced form. He explained this argument by giving an example of how speech develops in young children. Discussing examples from state-organised nursery school for orphaned children in Soviet Russia, Vygotsky suggested that some children who spend a great deal of time in nursery school have problems with speech development—their speech development is usually delayed in comparison with same-age children.
who spend most of their time at home with their parent or carer. Vygotsky explained that in nursery school, children mostly interact with themselves, and because their speech development is still at the rudimentary stage (the real form), they do not have much exposure to the ideal form, as opposed to children who stay at home with their parents or carers. Vygotsky held that some children who stay at home are exposed to the ideal form of speech because most of their time they interact directly with their parents or carers, where this ideal form is constantly present. He concluded that if the ideal form is not present in the environment and interaction occurs between several rudimentary forms, the resulting development may be limited (Vygotsky, 1935). Section 3.3 explains how development of self-regulation is viewed from cultural–historical perspective.

3.3 Cultural–Historical Reading of Self-Regulation

3.3.1 Social situation of development and self-regulation

Vygotsky explained that child development is the process of the child’s mastering his own behaviour and the behaviour of the other. In other words, it is the process of the development of regulation (self-regulation) of behaviour (Vygotsky, 1978). For the purpose of this study, the notion of a child’s self-regulation is guided by the following Vygotskian principles:

- Child self-regulation has its origins in social interactions; it is then internalised and used by the child (Bodrova et al., 2011).

- For self-regulation to develop, the child needs to be able to act both as a subject and an object of regulation; the child needs to be able to regulate on both planes—regulate another person and be regulated by another (Vygotsky, 1983).

- To learn how to self-regulate, the child needs to learn cultural tools; these include but are not limited to speech, numbers, writing, maps, diagrams and art objects (Vygotsky, 1978). These tools combine to make a ‘system of stimulus’ (Vygotsky, 1978) that are means of regulation of the child’s behaviour.

- In the process of development, the child masters the same means (cultural tools) with the help of adults and peers who have been directing the child’s behaviour; if certain tools are absent during development, the child will not be able to use them (Vygotsky, 1935)
Parents and educators organise the environment for the child: create conditions and situations (means of regulation) that foster development of self-regulation.

Values are transferred from adults to children; children are not passive but active participants in the process (Hedegaard, 2008, 2014).

Self-regulation is linked to the social situation of development, which forms a ‘unique relation...between the child and reality, mainly the social reality that surrounds him’ (Vygotsky, 1998, p.198). This reality includes adults, their regulatory activities and means of regulation (cultural tools) that they use with the child (Kasvinov, 2013).

3.3.2 Self-regulation and motives

For the purpose of this study, the concept of children’s self-regulation is viewed from a cultural–historical perspective. It relates to the system of processes within the child/environment matrix, in which emotional, cognitive and behavioural regulatory processes develop and change; these are intertwined and cannot be viewed separately. The child/environment matrix represented by the relations between child and the environment affects the way this system develops.

Vygotsky (1998) emphasised the role of motives for control of the child’s behaviour. Explaining the change that the child goes through during age-related crisis, he asserted:

From this point the essence of every crisis is a reconstruction of the internal experience, a reconstruction that is rooted in the change of the basic factor that determines the relation of the child with the environment, specially, in the change in needs and motives that control the behaviour of the child. (p. 296)

Another interpretation of motives was offered by Bozhovich, who argued that the child learns how to regulate his motives voluntarily, thereby developing voluntary control of his behaviour (Bozhovich, 1976, 1988). Bozhovich differentiated three levels of development of voluntary control of the child’s motives. She linked development of the child’s motives to the child’s needs and emotional experience (perezhivanie); therefore, she referred to an affective/needs sphere when she discussed motives. Bozhovich held that first, voluntary behaviour of the child is conducted because of the strength of the natural/elementary need, which stimulates the child to
overcome obstacles that stand in the way of the child’s satisfaction. The strongest needs are satisfied. The second stage is when equally powerful and one-directional motives fight for dominance. This is when the child reverts to the internal, intellectual plane of action. At this stage, the child evaluates, weighs and imagines consequences of his possible actions and related emotional experience. As a result, the child makes a decision to act in the direction of one of those motives, not the strongest one, but most valuable motive, from the perspective of future events and undesirable consequences for the child (Bozhovich, 1976). Bozhovich (1976) argued for the importance of values that are genetically mediated motives, or motives that have been personalised by the child.

3.3.3 The dynamic relation between motives, values, demands and self-regulation

In a cultural–historical perspective, the concept of motive is part of the theory of activity (Chaiklin, 2015). This concept is not viewed separately, but embedded in the system of Vygotsky’s other concepts, including activity, societal need, goal and action (Chaiklin, 2015). Therefore, the understanding of motive requires an understanding of the whole system of concepts and the relations within. The main difference between the cultural–historical understanding of motive and other perspectives is that the concept of motive is not explained as belonging to an individual person or driving a person’s action (Chaiklin, 2015, p. 212). Fleer (2012, 2014) argued that motive is not internally driven but developed culturally and produced by observing or participating in an everyday activity. It is viewed as a ‘relationship that organises a person’s action in the situations in which they are acting’ (Chaiklin, 2015, p. 212). Hedegaard and Chaiklin (2005) conceptualised motives as ‘dynamic relations between person and practice’ (p. 64). Motives are understood as embedded in societal practice and related to activity within institutions. In this sense, the concept of motive is linked to self-regulation, if development of motives is viewed as development of relationships that organise/regulate a child’s action.

Hedegaard linked the concept of motive to institutional values and demands, motivation in an activity settings and the child’s intentions (Hedegaard, 2012). To analyse the relations between demands and motives, Hedegaard suggested that differentiation between these concepts is required.
For example, demands appear in relationships with others; therefore, demands also create various challenges that guide children’s participation in everyday activities. Motive orientations arise from the child’s intentions (Hedegaard, 2014).

Motivation and motives in the wholeness approach are understood as ‘forces, both in person and in the environment, that together create a dynamic field which account for a person’s activity and learning’ (Hedegaard, 2019, p. 13). Hedegaard & Fleer (2012) argued that to understand children’s motives, one has to focus on the children’s intentional actions within activities while they participate in institutional practices.

Another interpretation of motives and the child’s self-regulation was emphasised by Bozhovich, who held that values are genetically mediated motives: in other words, motives that have been personalised by the child (Bozhovich, 1972). Similarly, these values become the child’s personal needs; however, this transformation does not occur as a simple transition from the child’s primary biological needs. To understand how values and motives of the institutional practice become personalised by the child, analysis of how values and motives of institutional practice exist as demands on the child participating in this practice is needed (Hedegaard, 2019). Demands in these settings from other people or objects are viewed as conditions that exist for and motivate the child’s activities (Hedegaard, 2019). This study explores conditions that adults and children in Kitezh create to support development of self-regulation.

Vygotsky emphasised that a child’s mental ability is not hereditary and social environment is the source of its development. According to Vygotsky (1956), the last stage in the development of thinking is thinking in concepts or conceptual thinking. He argued that appearance of conceptual thinking is culturally determined and only possible if a child assimilates and applies specific scientific knowledge. The important part here is not that learning develops a child’s thinking, but that only specific type of learning—learning of scientific concepts—develops the child’s conceptual thinking. Vygotsky (1956) stated that classroom education is the reason for emergence of conceptual thinking. He linked development of conceptual thinking to the development of self-awareness, arguing that appearance of a developed self-awareness corresponds with the advance
from preconceptual to conceptual thinking (Vygotsky, 1956). This brings us to the concept of 
osoznanie, which is discussed in Section 3.3.4.

3.3.4 Osoznanie (conscious realisation): Control over thinking

According to Vygotsky (1956), the ability of conscious realisation (osoznanie) is ‘an act of consciousness [soznanie] whose object is the very activity of consciousness’ (p. 246). Vygotsky argued that a child’s ability to reflect on his own thinking first appears when the child assimilates abstract concepts. Vygotsky linked the ability of the child to reflect the child’s thinking and with the development of speech:

To consciously realize some operation means moving it from the plane of action to the plane of language—its recreation so that it can be expressed in words. (Vygotsky, 1956, p. 236)

For the child to develop osoznanie (conscious realisation) in relation to an activity, the child needs to have ‘verbal knowledge of the existence and transpiring of this activity’ (Tulviste, 2019, p. 207). The function of osoznanie is thus viewed as ‘the realization of control over thinking’ (Tulviste, 2019, p. 207). This study explores how the concept of osoznanie and reflection is applied in the Kitezh community and how it is linked to the development of self-regulation. This is further explained in Chapter 8 of this thesis.

3.4 Cultural–Historical Reading of Dramatic Moments

Vygotsky (1998) first referred to dramatic moments when he explained development within age periods in conjunction with crisis (Fleer et al., 2017). It is argued that Vygotsky used the concept of crisis or drama frequently in his works. According to Vygotsky (1998), drama provides insights into the development of the child (Fleer et al., 2017). Vygotsky (1998) stated that dramatic moments in a person’s life, drama or crisis, create the conditions for development.

According to Vygotsky’s general genetic law of cultural development, social relations between people is not the field or stage on which such function develops, but social relations themselves become the human mental function (Vygotsky, 1997). However, not every social relation becomes a mental function: only those that are emotionally charged, intense, those which are best described as a collision, a drama between two people (Veresov, 2010). Vygotsky used the
word ‘category’, which in Russian pre-revolutionary theatre’s vocabulary meant ‘dramatic event, collision of characters on stage’ (Meierhold, 1920, as cited in Veresov, 2010, p. 88). Such collisions, emotionally experienced dramatic events, are later remembered and self-reflected by the child (Veresov, 2010). They lead to changes in the child’s psych and behaviour and act as a developmental force for the developing mental function (Veresov, 2010).

Dramatic moments are linked to the child’s emotional development and development of self-regulation. Zaporozhets (2002) argued that ‘children develop a specific emotional attitude toward their surrounding reality and people, an attitude that corresponds to the goals, moral standards, and ideals of society’ (p. 45). According to Zaporozhets (2002), ‘through participating and co-experiencing the child begins to evaluate his own actions, thus passing to the state of self-regulating behaviour’ (p. 53). For the purpose of this study, the construct of ‘dramatic moments’ is understood as highly intense, emotionally charged situations when the focus children in the Kitezh interact with each other and others in a conflicting, confrontational manner. This construct is viewed from two perspectives that are interlinked. First, a dramatic collision between two people is understood as the type of social relationship that itself becomes a developing force for the child (Vygotsky, 1983). Analysing dramatic moments essentially means that the researcher analyses the child’s higher mental functions that have not yet developed but are in the process of maturation, or as Vygotsky (1997) termed them, ‘buds of development’ (p. 226) during which time drama, or ‘category’ is understood as a developing force. In this sense, dramatic moments in children’s everyday life in Kitezh are viewed as an original form of a developing higher mental function.

Second is Hedegaard (2014) concept of motives and demands, when contradictions occur between the demands that the child places on others and demands that are placed on the child (Hedegaard & Fleer, 2014). Hedegaard’s concept of demands is based on Lewin’s (1946) theory and defined as forces from the environment (e.g., demands from other people and from objects) but also forces from the child to the environment; these forces are within the activity settings in which the child participates (Hedegaard, 2014).
The concept of motive in Hedegaard’s works is linked to the concepts of the child’s motive orientation, activity setting and objective of the institutional practice (Hedegaard, 2012, 2014, 2018). To analyse the relations between demands and motives, Hedegaard suggested differentiating between them as follows—demands appear in relationship with others; therefore, demands also create various challenges that guide children’s participation in everyday activities. Further, motive orientation arises from the child’s intentions (Hedegaard, 2014).

To understand the child’s social situation of development, it is critical to understand the child’s motives and how these motives are linked to the demands that different activity settings place on the child (Hedegaard, 2014). The analysis of motives and demands for every dramatic moment that is captured by this study allows exploration of contradictions between motives and demands and further understanding of the relationship between Kitezh children and the Kitezh environment. This ultimately helps explain how the Kitezh environment acts as the source of children’s development and directs attention towards the child’s self-regulation.


Hedegaard’s wholeness perspective is based on Vygotsky’s (1998) and Leontiev’s (1978), unity of a child and environment, Lewin’s (1946) concept of field and Barker and Wright’s (1954, 1971) concept of behavioural setting. Hedegaard (2012) combined the concepts of field and behavioural setting in her concept of activity setting. Hedegaard’s wholeness perspective advocates that to evaluate any learning activity and what it means for child development, four perspectives need to be understood:

1. societal
2. institutional practice
3. activity settings
4. children’s motive orientation.

This approach implies that:

- Learning takes place through changes in the unity of person and environment.
- Changes happen in the child’s motives.
Learning and development occur through conflictual relations between demands and motives that change the child and his or her environment.

The change of child, their motive orientation and competences are dialectically related to the change of their environment (the demands of new activities).

The child’s perspective, which Hedegaard (2014) explained as the child’s motive orientation, is of particular importance. To capture the child’s perspective, it is imperative to examine how the child participates in the activity setting, which according to Hedegaard (2008), is known as the ‘social situation’. The social situation is linked to the motives inbuilt in the activity settings. The activity settings also need to be linked to the projects in which the child is engaged and the intention that the child demonstrates. One way to understand the child’s intention is to observe a conflict between the child’s intentions—in other words, what the child wants to do and what the child is unable to do. Such contradictions/dramatic events will allow the researcher to understand the child’s motives and intentions that guide the child’s actions (Hedegaard, 2008).

3.6 Conclusion

In this chapter, Vygotsky’s cultural–historical theory was introduced, with a focus on the concepts of environment and child development, higher mental functions, crisis and lytic ages, perezhivanie, social situation of development and ideal and real forms. The concepts of vospitanie and osoznanie were discussed in addition to the cultural–historical understanding of self-regulation, dramatic moments and wholeness approach. This included discussion of dynamic relations between motives, values, demands and self-regulation. In Chapter 4, the methodology and methods are outlined.
Chapter 4: Methodology and Method

4.1 Methodology

4.1.1 Introduction

The aim of this chapter is to explain the methodology used in this study and provide links between Vygotsky’s cultural–historical theory and the research methods used to expand methodological understandings related to Vygotsky’s (1987, 1994, 1997, 1998) theoretical conception of child development.

Further, the dialectical–interactive framework developed by Hedegaard and Fleer (2008), detailed in Hedegaard’s (2012) model of children’s learning and development through participation in different institutional practices, is explained in relation to this study. To begin, the researcher’s understanding of the Vygotskian approach to the cultural–historical research methodology is provided.

4.1.2 Researcher’s journey towards cultural–historical theory and methodology

When I was searching for a methodology suitable for my study, I was confronted with a dual dilemma. First, the methodology needed to enable investigation of how young children in Kitezh learn to self-regulate. Specifically, the methodology needed to support research that examined developing rather than matured functions: that is, the process of children developing self-regulation in a particular social environment (Kitezh Children’s Community). Second, there needed to be a way to understand emotion and cognition without separation into discrete units. The cultural–historical theory founded by Vygotsky (1934–1998) offered such a methodology. Following is my rationale and personal journey towards understanding and applying Vygotsky’s cultural–historical theory and developing a methodology for this research.

Over three years of my PhD study, I have been reading Vygotsky’s works in Russian because it is my native language and in English because it is the language my study is written in. I found errors in translation and interpretations of Vygotsky’s work by modern researchers. I was able to compare Russian and English texts and provide comments on translation to my peers during
PhD forums. The readings in both languages and discussions deepened my understanding of cultural–historical theory. Section 4.1.3 presents the rationale for using a qualitative research design and some key principles of the cultural–historical research methodology as it was applied in this study.

4.1.3 Rationale for selecting cultural–historical research methodology

Here, the key is Vygotsky’s understanding of young children’s development as a process. Two aspects of this understanding are of particular interest to the current study. First, Vygotsky emphasised a distinction between lower and higher mental functions in human development. Vygotsky (1984) argued that development of higher mental functions is a process of qualitative reorganisation of the system. Second, according to Vygotsky, the social environment is not a factor, but a source of development of all higher mental functions. Vygotsky (1999) asserted that higher mental functions are completely social by their origin:

The transition from the biological to the social path of development is the central link in the process of development, a cardinal turning point in the history of child’s behaviour. (p. 20)

However, the social environment is not ‘an automatic source of development, but relations and interactions in a given context are the source that enables a significant change in the developmental path’ (Nasciutti et al., 2016, p. 91). Both aspects of Vygotsky’s understanding of development are relevant to the methodology of this study because the first aim is to better understand how the focus children in Kitezh move through a process of developing self-regulation, understood as a higher mental function. The second aim is to examine the social environment of the Kitezh as a source of development that creates conditions for development of this higher mental functions, specifically self-regulation. Section 4.1.4 explains how principles of the cultural–historical research methodology are applicable to this study.

4.1.4 Principles of the cultural–historical research as applied to this study

4.1.4.1 The process

Vygotsky (1997) argued that to understand higher mental functions, research needs to use different ‘non-classical’ methodological approaches to enquiry as opposed to ‘classical’
experimental methodology. In essence, Vygotsky (1997) advocated for analysis of ‘any higher form of behaviour not as a thing, but as a process … and proceed not from a thing and its parts but from a process to its separate instances’ (p. 68).

In this sense, the current study implements Vygotsky’s approach because the process of development is a main component, by exploring how the focus children learn to self-regulate and how members of the Kitezh community create conditions that support the process of self-regulation. By including data collected over one month, part of the process of development is presented.

Vygotsky (1997, 1983, as cited in Veresov, 2010) outlined several principles that help analyse the enquiry as a process. Two of these principles are further explained in Sections 4.1.4.2–4.1.4.3.

4.1.4.2 Developing v. matured function

Vygotsky argued that a child at any particular age has higher mental functions that are already matured and functions that are still developing. He termed the matured functions the ‘fruits’ of development (Vygotsky, 1997, p. 226). Drawing on this principal the ‘buds’ or ‘flowers’ of development’ (Veresov, 2010, p. 88), he suggested that the function that is not yet fully matured at the time of enquiry is examined. In this study, this is the focus children’s process of developing self-regulation. The second principle relates to emotionally charged dramatic events, or a ‘category’ (Vygotsky, 1983, p. 145).

4.1.4.3 The category

The ‘category’, according to Vygotsky (1983, p. 145), is an emotionally coloured, experienced collision: a dramatic event between two people. Such dramatic events are experienced emotionally and mentally as social drama between two people, which relates to crisis that a person experiences in everyday life. Vygotsky (1934/1998, as cited in Nasciutti et al., 2016) argued that there are two types of crises over the course of development: one is age-related and the other is an everyday life crisis. The principle of dramatic events is related to the second type of crises, which according to Vygotsky (1983), is an important aspect of developmental processes when it is related to emotionally charged events. Vygotsky emphasised that such emotional collisions act as a force
that brings changes to the person’s psychological development. In addition to acting as a developmental force, dramatic events are a special kind of social relation between people, which manifest as the initial (‘the buds’) form of any higher mental function (Vygotsky, 1983). Therefore, dramatic events need to be included in research concerning the development of higher mental functions because they have the capacity to reveal the original form of any mental function—the drama between two people (Veresov, 2010). For the purpose of this study, the term ‘dramatic moments’ is used to denote not artificially created but naturally occurring emotionally charged dramatic events between two people—such as the focus child in Kitezh and the interactions between the focus child and his parents, peers, teachers and siblings.

In addition to Vygotsky’s understanding of drama between people as a developing force and original form of the developing mental functions, the researcher used dramatic moments to capture the child’s intentions and motives to explore ‘how’ the function of self-regulation develops. Dramatic moments are linked to Hedegaard’s (2012) model of children’s learning and development and Vygotsky’s (1998) social situation of development. Further explanation of how dramatic moments were linked to Hedegaard’s model and how they were captured and analysed is outlined in the Section 4.2.

Section 4.1.5 presents the dialectical–interactive framework (Fleer & Hedegaard, 2008) and model (Hedegaard, 2018) that were used for the methodological design of this study, along with the above cultural–historical concepts. To begin, the epistemological nature of the dialectical–interactive framework is explained.

4.1.5 The wholeness approach and dialectical–interactive framework

4.1.5.1 The wholeness approach

The dialectical–interactive framework developed by Hedegaard and Fleer (2008) supports the researcher’s understanding of how children participate in activities across three different institutions—the home, school and Kitezh community. To begin, Hedegaard’s wholeness approach is explained.
Hedegaard’s wholeness approach is based on Vygotsky’s (1998) and Leontiev’s (1978) unity of a child and environment, Lewin’s (1946) concept of field, and Barker and Wright’s (1954, 1971) concept of behavioural setting. Hedegaard’s wholeness approach advocates that to evaluate any learning activity and what it means for the child’s development, there must be three perspectives:

- societal perspective
- institutional perspective—specific to the activity setting
- personal perspective; child’s motive orientation.

This approach implies that:

- Learning takes place through changes in the unity of person and environment.
- Changes occur in the child's motives.
- Learning and development occurs through conflictual relations between demands and motives that change the child and his or her environment.
- The change of child, their motive orientation and competences are dialectically related to the change of their environment (the demands of new activities; Hedegaard & Fleer, 2008).

The child’s perspective, which Hedegaard (2014) explained as the child’s motive orientation, is of particular importance. To capture the child’s perspective, it is imperative to examine how the child participates in the activity setting, which according to this methodology, is known as ‘social situation’ (Hedegaard, 2008). The social situation is linked to the motives built into the activity settings. The activity settings also need to be linked to the projects in which the child is engaged in and the intention that the child demonstrates. One way to understand the child’s intention is to observe a conflict between the child’s intentions—in other words, what the child wants to do and what the child is unable to do. Such events are often viewed as contradictions or dramatic events and help the researcher understand the child’s motives and the intentions that guide the child’s actions (Hedegaard, 2008). In Hedegaard’s model (see Figure 4.1), different institutional practices include family practice, kindergarten and school and all encompass values, cultural
traditions and rules of the society. In the current study, the Kitezh environment includes the home, school and community.

Hedegaard’s (2008/2014) wholeness approach views the subject of the research (a person/child) and the object (the environment/world) as a unity that exists in dialectical relation. The two cannot be separated, and as Hedegaard (2014) argued, learning occurs ‘through changes in the unity of person and environment’ (p. 136). Hedegaard’s wholeness approach is situated within Vygotsky’s concept of the child’s social situation of development. Vygotsky (1998) suggested that examining such dialectic relations supports the researchers understanding of the child’s experience within his or her environment. Hedegaard introduced demands and motives in relation to the child’s environment, learning and development.

The activity settings according to Hedegaard are the child’s recurrent everyday activities that are experienced through institutional practices of home and school. The everyday activities include completing homework, playtime, meals or preparing for bed (Hedegaard, 2012). Examining how a child participates in the activity settings across different institutional practices supports analysis of the child’s perspective; that is, the child’s intentions or motives are better understood in relation to their environment. Further, the researcher is able to gain insight into relations between the child’s motive orientation and demands that the child puts on others in each setting and the demands that person’s within the concrete setting put on the child (Hedegaard, 2012). Using the child’s perspective supports the researcher to conceptualise the social situation of development related to the child’s development as a whole (Hedegaard, 2008). Capturing the child’s perspective for this research also meant that the child’s perspective was interpreted by the researcher, as qualitative research technique suggests. In this sense, the child’s perspective in this study includes and is limited by the adult’s (researcher’s) perspective.

**4.1.5.2 Dialectical–interactive framework and Hedegaard’s model**

The dialectical–interactive framework has three interrelated concepts. First, children’s development occurs through their involvement in societal institutions, such as the school and home. To illustrate how society and community are linked with the concept of institutional practices,
Hedegaard (2012) developed a model that demonstrates how children learn and develop through their simultaneous participation in institutional practices, in which different perspectives are depicted: a societal, institutional and an individual (see Figure 4.1).

**Figure 4.1**

*Figure 4.1*  
*An activity model (Hedegaard, 2012)*

The model demonstrates how society creates conditions for children’s learning and development by placing values and demands upon them and how such conditions influence practice at the institutional and individual levels. In Hedegaard's model, the first plane—*societal perspective*—defines the conditions for institutional practice, including values and cultural traditions (Fleer & Hedegaard, 2010). Hedegaard (2004) explained that every society creates
different conditions through these institutions. For example, the values, rules, regulations and resources that government makes available in Russia will be different to those in Australia. In turn, the institutional practices (family home, school and community) in Kitezh can be significantly different from mainstream practices in Russia; thus, it will place different demands on children. This will create different motives in individual Kitezh children because they participate in different institutional settings in their everyday lives.

The second concept of the dialectical–interactive framework, which is linked to the second plane in Hedegaard’s model, is institutional practices. This is connected to child development and must be researched and documented to understand the child’s development in full. This is built on Vygotsky’s concept of the social situation of development—to understand the child’s social situation of development, it is critical to understand the child’s motives and how these motives are linked to the demands that different activity settings place on the child (Hedegaard, 2014). To analyse the relations between demands and motives, it is important to understand that these are two different forces. One comes to children from the outside world and people in the form of various demands that guide children when they participate in everyday activities; the other comes from the child to his or her surroundings—in the form of the child’s motive orientation (Hedegaard, 2014).

A child is engaged in different institutional settings (home, school, places of worship and playgrounds), where certain demands are placed on the child and where the individual may have different motives across each institution. To understand how a child learns and develops through the social situation of development, it is important to capture how the child participates in the specific activity setting (e.g., helping adults, across all institutional settings in his or her everyday life). Observing these practices will allow the researcher to capture the perspective of the child and understand how the child ‘relates to the demands that the child meets while participating in different settings’ (Hedegaard, 2014, p. 192) because practice in one institution influences the child’s activities in other institutions (Hedegaard, 2014).
In Hedegaard’s model (see Figure 4.1), different institutional practices include family practice, kindergarten and school. All encompass values, cultural traditions and rules of the society. In the current study, the Kitezh environment includes the home, school and community. Linking the institutional practices to the current study of the Kitezh, these practices include participation in various community activities, such as community meetings and community games, which is explained in further detail in the Chapter 7 of the thesis.

The third concept of the dialectical–interactive framework is linked to the third plane of Hedegaard’s model (see Figure 4.1) and explains how this methodology seeks to examine qualitative changes in the child’s motive and competences in terms of the child’s social situation of development, for example, when the child moves from one institution to the next (Fleer, 2008). This approach views children not as passive receivers of the social environment but as active contributors to their own developmental conditions, therefore this approach places particular importance on capturing the child's perspective. To capture the child’s perspective, it is imperative to examine how the child participates in the social situation (Hedegaard, 2008). The social situation is linked to the motives within the activity settings. The activity setting is linked to the projects in which the child engages in and the intention that the child demonstrates. One way to understand the child's intention is to observe conflict between the child's intentions and demands, in other words what the child wants to do, and what the child is unable to do. Such contradictions/dramatic moments support understanding of the child’s motives and the intentions that guide the child’s actions (Hedegaard, 2008).

Hedegaard (2012) theorised that society creates conditions for children’s learning and development through placing values and demands upon them. Children in the Kitezh community acquire values in the process of socialisation. The values that children acquire in Kitezh are linked to values of the Russian society. To understand the societal perspective for this study, Section 4.1.5.3 discusses how society creates conditions enacted in institutional practice and how cultural traditions and values of Russian society put demands on the focus children and their parents in Kitezh. This relates to the first plane of the Hedegaard’s model—society (see Figure 4.1).
To explore how Russian society creates conditions for children in this study and further analyse how these align with the Kitezh system of values, it is important to understand the system of values that exist in present-day Russia. Following is a brief overview of the current values position in Russia.

4.1.5.3 Societal perspective

Russian society—Social context and changing values

The Russian *Encyclopaedia of Pedagogy* defines socialisation as ‘the development and self-realization of the individual over his whole life in the process of assimilating and reproducing the culture of society’ (Nikandrov, 2008, p. 58). This process is influenced by education and largely, the experiences throughout life, including events, material conditions such as digital media, books and other content that to which a person is exposed. These often have a stronger influence on the individual than does formal education (Nikandrov, 2008). One of the most important aspects of these influences is the society’s system of values that children experience.

In Russia, Romm (2015) indicated there is a crisis in the system of values, as the society searches for a new value position, which will affect a change in education. The absence of one fixed accepted social values system increases the gap between individual personal values and social values, leading to increased anti-social behaviour in younger generations (Romm, 2015). From 1990s the term ‘social education’ became a pedagogical category as a form of education responsible for socialisation of an individual (Mudrik, 2006). It builds on the traditions of Russian pedagogy which historically saw fostering social development of children its main aim (Romm, 2015). The Russian pedagogical tradition was shaped by five key influences:

1. Christian values, specifically Russian Orthodox Christianity—the education was viewed as mastering the Christian worldview and virtues; much attention was paid to developing ‘inner’, ‘spiritual’ ‘true’ reality and acting morally

2. dominance of community life and prevalence of the collective over individual, in which social justice was tightly linked with the communal way of life
3. tradition of popular education and public schools where graduates were trained in ‘the spirit of public morality, without which no society can be strong’ (Romm, 2015, p. 1074); the basic principles of such schools include teaching equality and establishing a close relationship with the community

4. participation of society in education—this determined development of pedagogy, highlighting dependency on who was in control of the education process (e.g., whether it was a small rural community in a geographically remote area or a large metropolitan school with state government in control).

Much research has been done in the last 15 years revising and extending theoretical and methodological understandings of the social dimensions of education in Russia (Selivanonva, 2014, as cited in Romm, 2015). Increasingly, it is viewed as more linked to the problems of human social development rather than improvement of society (as during Soviet times) and developing the sense of morality, citizenship and interpersonal relationships.

The fluid system of values affects all spheres of life in Russia, including the situation with orphans. As the current study explores Kitezh—the community in which most children are orphans brought to Kitezh from state orphanages—Section 4.1.5.3.2 presents an overview of the current system including statistics and recent reforms.

Situating the children in the study—Orphans in Russia

In present-day Russia, most children without parental care are social orphans meaning that they have at least one living known biological parent at the time they are placed into state orphanage childcare institution (Biryukova & Sinyavskaya, 2017). When children are placed in the state system it usually means that his or her parents’ parental rights are removed by the court of law.

In 2005, there were 133,000 children taken from parental care; this decreased to 58,200 in 2015 (see Figure 4.1). Generally, in Russia the risk of orphanhood remains high. In 2015, there were more than 2% of the total number of children under 18 years placed into an orphanage (Biryukova & Sinyavskaya, 2017). The state orphanage system is multilayered and complex, with many stakeholders from federal, regional and local levels. This complicates collection of statistical
In addition, the replacement parenting system is also complex and includes:

1. guardianship (guardians)—replacement parents in family-based care (*apeka* for children under 14 and *popechitelstvo* for children over 14 years in Russian)
2. foster families—paid family-based care (*priyomnaya semya*)
3. adoption.

The foster care system in Russia is relatively new; however, it is the most rapidly developing system of orphan care (Biryukova & Sinyavskaya, 2017). Over 2005–2015, the number of children placed with foster families increased from 2% to 24% (Biryukova & Sinyavskaya, 2017). It is claimed that this rise was assisted by the introduction of the *Federal Law No. 48-FZ (On Guardianship and Fostering)* in 2008, which, among other child-related benefits, provided financial assistance to foster parents, including salaries and money allowances. Simultaneously, the number of adoptions declined from 22% in 2006 to 19% in 2015. Being new, the foster care system in Russia has various challenges, including the minimal professional training and ongoing guidance for foster parents which resulted in the growing number of children returning to institutions from foster placements. The focus children in this study were orphans but adopted into a family living with in the Kitezh community. At the time of their adoption, the children were four years old. Their biological mother is alive. However, she lost her parenting rights because of alcohol addiction. Their biological father is also alive but has not been involved in their upbringing.

**Education in Russia**

Russian education is in crisis with problems at almost every level of the system (Ismagilov et al., 2016). This is linked to the global crisis of education related to a gap between the existing system of education and the ‘rapidly changing’ social conditions of the modern world (Ismagilov et al., 2016, p. 356). The traditional Soviet education system has been demolished and has not been replaced by anything worthy (Ismagilov et al., 2016). The crisis of the Russian education system has been affected by many factors, including but not limited to changes in the political system and globalisation as the industrial society has been replaced by the information society (Karkhut, 2013;
Sal’nikov et al., 2006; Zakhartsev, 2012) and budget cuts (Ismagilov et al., 2016). Further, although the number of universities increased, the level of higher education has decreased and corruption penetrates all levels of the system (Aleksandorva et al., 2012; Rasheva, 2013, as cited in Ismagilov et al., 2016). Russian preschools lack people with teacher training, and the system does not prepare school ready students (Ismagilov et al., 2016). There is a need to provide a wholeness approach to children’s learning and development, which is where the Kitezh community has been developed to fill a niche for orphaned children in Russia.

The Kitezh community

Russian values influence the founding principles of the Kitezh community. In particular, historical values are expected to be enacted and followed by each person in the community (see Kavelin, 1989). The traditional values originate from the Russian collective—the village commune (derevenskaya obshina), which was not only an economic union, but a complex and influential construct that connected and guided many aspects of people’s lives, with particular emphasis on social justice (Kaveling, 1989, p. 59, as cited in Romm, 2015). As explained in Chapter 3, a traditional Russian value is vospitanie (‘upbringing’, ‘character education’ or ‘social training’), where creating the conditions (material, spiritual and organisational) that are necessary for development of the individual (Nikandrov, 2008) begins in the community and is expected in the family home.

The Kitezh community was built for orphaned children to live with their adoptive parents. The community was founded in 1992 by Dimitri Vladimirovich Morozov, journalist, historian and expert in oriental studies. As founder and community leader, Dmitry Morozov has lived and worked in Kitezh for nearly 30 years. He raised his biological son and several adopted children in the community. Morosoz developed ‘Metapedagogika’—a pedagogical system of raising children within a close-knit community, called the Kitezh. He has published several books about family pedagogy, foster parenting and upbringing, including Generation Kitez, Breaking the Glass of a Greenhouse and Your Fostered Child (Morozov, 2015). He has also published extensively via social media and presents at Russian and international education and parenting forums.
The Kitezh school has a close relationship with the community because of its physical and social position—the school is situated within the village and the students are children who live in that community. In addition, teachers at the Kitezh school are parents of the children who live within the community; therefore, the school is an inseparable part of the Kitezh community.

4.2 Method

The method used for this study combined principles of the cultural–historical research, qualitative technique and Hedegaard’s & Fleer (2008) dialectic-interactive framework. Vygotsky explained that traditional quantitative methods are not suitable for researching mental functions that are developing and need to be replaced by qualitative ones (Vygotsky & Luria, 1994). This prompted me to select qualitative over quantitative technique for the methodological design of this study. One aspect of the qualitative research technique—the interpretive approach—is particularly relevant to this study. This approach suggests that the inquiry has an investigative purpose, which is an important aspect of insights gained via qualitative research (Carter & Little, 2007). In addition, the inquiry within qualitative research is ‘attempting to make sense of or to interpret phenomena in terms of the meanings the people bring to them’ (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005, p. 3). This research examined children in their natural settings and was conducted through analysis of the accessible information, including video recordings, on-site interviews and researcher’s observations.

4.2.1 Role of the researcher

Two aspects of my position as researcher are worth noting. First, it reflects the qualitative technique—researcher-as-instrument approach (Hammersley & Atkinson, 1995). Such an approach suggests that the principle data are gathered directly by the researcher, as opposed to traditional, quantitative methods, which generate data through the use of ‘instruments’ such as questionnaires, checklists, scales, tests, and other measuring devices (Hatch, 2002). The logic behind the researcher-as-instrument approach is that the human capacities necessary to participate in social life are the same capacities that enable qualitative researchers to make sense of the actions, intentions and understandings of those being studied (Bogdan & Biklen, 1992; Hammersley & Atkinson, 1983; Lincoln & Guba, 1985). The principal data for this study were gathered directly by the
researcher with the use of video recordings and interviews while the researcher was living with the community for one month.

My role as the researcher was different from the traditional observation research ‘fly on the wall’ approach (Hedegaard, 2008). I became part of the Kitezh community, more importantly, part of the children’s life. I formed relationship with the focus children and their parents, as well as teachers and members of Kitezh community. I had a dual role—as a researcher with the specific research aims and objectives and a person experiencing a relationship with the children and adult participants (Hedegaard, 2008). This created challenges but also enabled rich data to be collected. My social relationship with the participants allowed many opportunities for informal conversations and interactions, enriching data collected during formal observations and interviews.

In line with Hedegaard and Fleer’s (2008) dialectic-interactive methodology, my role as researcher continued during the data analysis, when I was away from the research context. The information gained through informal meetings and conversations formed part of the context of my field notes and still images, which supported data analysis. Section 4.2.2 explains tools used by the researcher to collect and generate data for this study.

4.2.2 Instruments that complement cultural–historical research

4.2.2.1 Digital video observations

By observing how the child participates in the same activity (helping others with cleaning for example) across two different institutions (school and home) and coding perspectives of the institutions and the child, it is possible to understand the child’s motives and how he or she relates to other people, including demands that people make on the child when she or he participate in that activity and how (or if) the same activity is experienced in another setting (Fleer, 2008).

Fleer (2014) argued that digital video observation, which is now widely available due to advances in technology, offers an excellent method to conduct research in child development from a cultural–historical perspective. Fleer (2014) claimed that such a method is superior to traditional paper and pencil approaches and particularly suitable to Vygotsky’s cultural–historical theory for a number of reasons, three of which are discussed further.
First, visual methods not only show the ‘process of how the social becomes the individual but allows to analyse this process in all its dialectical complexity’ (Veresov, 2014, p. 224). Video observations captures change and reflect Vygotsky’s non-linear conception of development. In other words, it enables the researcher to capture a ‘dialectical process between the child and their social and material world as a form of cultural development’ (Fleer, 2014, p. 19). Veresov (2014) and Li (2014) maintained that digital video observations capture the non-linear, revolutionary, dialectic and dynamic nature of the process of child development and the inseparable wholeness, the unity of the relations between a child and their environment as the child transitions between personal, institutional and societal dimensions. This supports Vygotsky’s (1997) claim that ‘the uniqueness of this process of changing behaviour that we call cultural development requires very unique methods and ways of research’ (p. 27). Digital video observations method caught up with Vygotsky’s thinking because it offers a unique opportunity to examine the everyday life of the child (Fleer, 2014).

The second reason for using digital video observation for cultural–historical research is that this method is able to portray social reality and capture the emotions of individuals in conjunction with actions, activity and mediation (Fleer, 2014). It allows the researcher to capture the unity of affect and intellect, which according to Vygotsky (1987), is an important consideration for researching child development. Vygotsky warned that there is a danger in ignoring this unity while conducting research; he emphasised that by ‘isolating thinking from affect at the outset, we effectively cut ourselves from any potential for a causal explanation of thinking’ (Vygotsky, 1987, p. 50). Digital video observation and subsequent analysis supports capturing emotional exchanges between participants of the research, including the researcher. Video analysis enables the researcher to examine the same social interactions several times to explore how they become emotionally charged and discover how emotions contribute to the meaning of each social situation of development (Fleer, 2014).

The third reason for using digital video observation is that the researcher is positioned in a new role that is congruent to the cultural–historical approach of researching child development.
Unlike the traditional ‘fly on the wall’ approach, in which the researcher assumes a passive role, detached from the events they observe and the researchers role is not included in the analysis of the research, the researcher using the cultural–historical perspective needs to conceptualise their own participation as part of the research (Fleer, 2014).

The researcher who uses cultural–historical perspective recognises the dual nature of their role—one as the researcher and another as a participant who enters the relationship with the researched children and adults (Hedegaard, 2008). Using digital video observation as a method captures how such relationships develop and how the researcher contributes to the activity setting in the research context (Fleer, 2014). The duality of the role is recognised by the researcher when they continue to record the event and do not turn off the camera when they interact with children. It is also recognised when the researcher considers their role during analysis of the recorded observation (e.g., when they consider their personal moral values they bring to a particular situation). The double role of the researcher can be captured through digital video observation via dialogue with children and non-verbal interaction (Fleer, 2014).

4.2.2.2 Interviews

Interview within cultural–historical perspective is viewed as a process that includes more than simply asking questions and receiving answers. It is a shared knowledge construction that affects both researcher and the researched persons. The method of interview is perceived as a dialogue that is characterised by intersubjectivity, where both parties actively define a shared meaning (Haviid, 2008). Children in this process are viewed as active participants of the research and this process affects their development. The challenge for the researcher is to recognise and examine the dialectical relations between her own theoretical perspectives and intersubjectivity that is acquired during interviews (Haviid, 2008).

Field notes were taken every time after interviews and video observations to capture the researcher’s thoughts related to the research questions. Field notes were then used for data analysis and thesis chapters.
4.3 The Procedure

4.3.1 Participants

Particular importance was given to the perspective of participants, which is critical in qualitative studies (Hedegaard, 2008). Questions like, ‘What is happening here, specifically? What do these happenings mean to the people engaged in them?’ were paramount in this research. This project was ultimately about participants (children, teachers and parents) in a complex, dynamic interactive unit acting in a specific social setting (the Kitezh Children Community). The inquiry sought to understand the world the participants lived in from their perspective, which was paramount in this research.

4.3.1.1 Selection of participants

The participants were recruited by contacting the leader of the community, Victor Anisimov. Victor and the researcher discussed possible participants and participants who fitted the research protocols were invited to participate. The study was designed to capture the dramatic moments in young children’s everyday life while moving between three institutions: home, school and the community. Therefore, families with young children living and attending school in the community were selected. The participants of the study are detailed in Table 4.1.
Table 4.1

Participants in This Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants name and age</th>
<th>Relations to the study</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vova, 8</td>
<td>Focus child</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maxim, 8</td>
<td>Focus child</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivan, 51</td>
<td>Father of the focus children</td>
<td>Raised several biological and adopted children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nina, 31</td>
<td>Mother of the focus children</td>
<td>Qualified as a vet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nata, 9</td>
<td>Step sister of the focus children</td>
<td>Biological daughter of Nina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lena</td>
<td>Teacher of the focus children</td>
<td>Qualified teacher and psychologist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander</td>
<td>Community member</td>
<td>Teacher in Kitezh school; present in morning walks in the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victor</td>
<td>School principal</td>
<td>Was a community leader for several years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vladimir</td>
<td>Community leader</td>
<td>Recently elected community leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dmitry Morozov</td>
<td>Community founder</td>
<td>Does not live in Kitezh</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All names are changed in line with ethical protocols.

4.3.1.2 The focus children

The focus children, Vova and Maxim, were four years old when they were brought to Kitezh from a state orphanage in Kaluga region. The children were adopted by Nina and Ivan, who had a five-year-old daughter, Nata. At the time of this study, Vova and Maxim were attending their first year at Kitezh primary school. A year before, they attended kindergarten in Baryatino, a village near Kitezh in the Kaluga region. Most children in Russia attend kindergarten before school; however, it is not compulsory and not a prerequisite to enter school.

4.3.1.3 Introducing the focus children’s family

Ivan and Nina run a small family farm in Kitezh. The farm supplies Kitezh with fresh produce, including milk, cottage cheese, cream, butter, fruit, vegetables and honey. It is approximately a 10-minute walk from the Kitezh community. Nina completed vocational training in the agricultural business and was preparing for her driving test at the time of the study. Ivan has a
long history at Kitezh and was one of the first settlers in the community at the time of its establishment in 1992. He was a community leader for several years and raised two biological children, who are now adults, and two adopted children, who are also adults and have left Kitezh.

4.3.2 Data gathering

Data generation included two visits to the focus family home each day for one month. The visits culminated in approximately one hour of video observations per visit. It also included daily video observation of the focus children during their morning and afternoon lessons at school and their free time within the community. On average, video observations amounted to 4.8 hours of video observations per day during 28 days of data collection on site, which totals 134.4 hours of video observations. In addition, video recording captured interviews with community members, teachers, parents and children (as relevant) about their everyday life conditions. Table 4.2 details data collection routine for video observations.
Table 4.2

*Video Observations*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Routine</th>
<th>Methods</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Morning at Kitezh family home (preparing for school)</td>
<td>Video observation</td>
<td>60 min</td>
<td>Focus children, Parents of focus children, Stepsister of the focus children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Morning walk around Kitezh community (before school)</td>
<td>Video observation</td>
<td>15–20 min</td>
<td>Focus children, Community member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. School lesson (am)</td>
<td>Video observation</td>
<td>45 min</td>
<td>Focus children, Teacher, Other children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. School lesson (pm)</td>
<td>Video observation</td>
<td>45 min</td>
<td>Focus children, Teacher, Other children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Home/community time (after school)</td>
<td>Video observation</td>
<td>60 min</td>
<td>Focus children, Other children, Community members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Preparing for bed (evening time at home)</td>
<td>Video observation</td>
<td>60 min</td>
<td>Focus children, Focus children parents, Stepsister of the focus children</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total** | 134.4 hours

The routine followed each day was almost the same for each weekday morning, with slight variations (e.g., when the father was away at the farm and the mother was at home). By the time the researcher entered the house, Maxim and Vova were usually awake, dressed and in the kitchen drinking their tea and eating snacks. The focus participants usually dressed and made their beds before they entered the kitchen. Due to the close proximity of school to their house, it took two minutes to walk to school, so they did not wake early. On rare occasions, their morning walks were replaced by a 10-minute warm up in the school gymnasium if the weather was rainy or too cold.

---

1 Average of 4.8 hours per day (290 min) during 28 days of video observations on site.
The data generation routine for video observations was followed daily except for on Saturdays and Sundays, when the children did not attend school. During the weekend, time was spent recording the focus children interacting within the community; field notes and video observations were taken.

For the purpose of this study, the adoptive parents and children in the focus family were invited to participate in interviews. Children from the focus family were interviewed using a semi-structured questionnaire designed by the researcher (see Appendix 1). In addition, teachers and other members of Kitezh community, including Kitezh School Principal Victor and founder of the community Dmitry Morozov, were interviewed to gain insights into relationship between the community and family of the focus children. The following provides a selected example of the interview questions for the parents.

**Question:** When do you think your child started to show that she/he is willing to help you?

**Probe/prompt:** When was the first time you noticed that your child was willing to help you when you needed it/asked for it?

Interviews were video recorded to capture non-verbal and affective aspects of the interviews. Initially, interviews were used to build case history of each focus child. The interviews allowed the researcher to learn about focus family, their background and their relationship with focus children, particularly their developmental difficulties, such as language difficulties and challenges at school. Table 4.3 details data generation from interviews.
Table 4.3

Interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vova</td>
<td>1 hour (2 × 30 min)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maxim</td>
<td>1 hour (2 × 30 min)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivan</td>
<td>1 hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nina</td>
<td>1 hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lena</td>
<td>4 hours (4 × 1 hour)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victor Anisimov</td>
<td>2 hours (2 × 1 hour)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vladimir</td>
<td>1 hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dmitry Morozov</td>
<td>1 hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>12 hours</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4 Data Analysis

4.4.1 Development of data analysis

Data analysis for this study was guided by four dimensions:

1. Vygotsky’s concept of drama/everyday life crisis—dramatic moments
3. a wholeness approach (Vygotsky, 1997; Hedegaard, 2008)

The researcher’s synthesis of these premises and how it supported data analysis for this study is further discussed. The four dimensions are closely interrelated and cannot be separated. Therefore, in the following sections, the overlapping concepts are frequently presented. In the process of data analysis, ‘dramatic moments’ has been used as a theoretical concept and methodological tool. Figure 4.2 conceptualises the process of data analysis to illustrate how dramatic moments were analysed across above premises.
Figure 4.2

Analysis of dramatic moments

Figure 4.2 shows four stages of the data analysis development from the researcher’s perspective. What follows is further explanation of each stage undertaken by the researcher as illustrated by Figure 2.

4.4.1.1 Stage 1

All data were reviewed and 20 dramatic moments were selected to reveal patterns of when and how often the focus children experienced dramatic moments (see Appendix 2). Table 4.4 is an extract from Appendix 2. It is a reduced version of the data sample that shows selected dramatic moments that the focus children experienced during their everyday life.

Table 4.4

Sample of Dramatic Moments (Extract from Appendix 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Clip Number</th>
<th>Routine</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>25 Sep</td>
<td>11 (1)</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>Yoga class at school. Vova refuses to do exercise, starts getting very upset: cries, wrinkles his face crying, protests against teachers trying to help him. Yells &quot;I won't do it&quot;,&quot; I don't want to do it&quot;. Remains withdrawn for a while. After a few minutes starts to do exercises together with the group (neck stretching).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chinese whispers game at school. Vova does not hear the word, becomes upset and withdraws from the game. The teacher repeatedly asks him to join the group. She encourages other children to ask him to join the group. Children ask Vova to join the group. After that he sits in the corner looking upset, does not look at the group who continues to play. After a while starts to observe the group. Moves further away from the group, starts doing pull-ups in the corner of the gym. When asked to join the group, he refuses again.

The researcher used data from Appendix 2 to explore motives of the child within the environment of the Kitezh. The sample of 20 dramatic moments (see Appendix 2) captures most activities that the focus children participate during their everyday life including:

- preparing for school (home)
- morning walk (community)
- classes and group exercises (school)
- after-school play (community)
- preparing for bed/family time (home).

The researcher grouped 20 dramatic moments according to main participants and identified two dyads—child–child and child–adult—to further analyse. Within the child–adult group, there were four subgroups (child–adult [mother]; child–adult [father]; child–adult [teacher]; and child–adult [community member]). The interactions within the dyads were analysed because they revealed representative examples of the focus children experiencing dramatic moments. Table 4.1 (see Appendix 2) shows these patterns in relation to each focus participant and the group they belong to such as the family: mother, father Maxim and Vova, or at the school: the teacher, Maxim, Vova and Valya.

In the top part of Appendix 2, 11 dramatic moments were selected because they demonstrate selected strategies each focus child used when he experienced dramatic moments. The first five examples of dramatic moments show withdrawal as a strategy used by Vova when he experienced a dramatic moment with an adult who is either a teacher or member of the Kitezh community.
The next six examples show how seeking help of the other/tell on others/blame other was the strategy used by Maxim (another focus child) when he experienced dramatic moments with an adult who is either his parent (mother/father) or member of the Kitezh community.

The remaining examples of the dramatic moments (see Appendix 2, Examples 12–20) were selected primarily for their capacity to demonstrate how members of Kitezh community create conditions that support the processes of children’s self-regulation, so the focus is on the conditions, rather than self-regulation strategy of the child.

In addition, two examples of the dramatic moments (see Appendix 2) were specifically chosen to show a similar activity that the child participates in across two institutional practices (school and home). In the first example, it is a group exercise (yoga class); in the second, it is group play (testing a new microphone). The reason for this selection was to demonstrate how the focus child participates in similar activity across two different institutional practices to explore how one practice influences another.

4.4.1.2 Stage 2

Applying the wholeness approach in conjunction with Hedegaard’s model and dialectical–interactive framework, the data were analysed to understand how focus children experienced dramatic moments when they participated in a similar activity across the home, school and within the community. This supported analysis of the processes involved with motive development, which were linked to self-regulation. Six dramatic moments were selected, which were combined into six vignettes—two vignettes to illustrate each chapter—Family, School and Community.

4.4.1.3 Stage 3

The third stage involved undertaking Hedegaard’s three levels of analysis for each of the six vignettes to reveal the processes of self-regulating as they experience dramatic moments. For the purpose of this study, the selected dramatic moments were presented and analysed as six vignettes illustrating how focus children learn to self-regulate when they experience dramatic moments during their participation in Kitezh institutional practices. Each institutional practice (home, school and community) includes two vignettes that demonstrate how focus children interact with adults.
and other children during intense, emotionally charged dramatic moment and how they self-
regulate. Each vignette was followed by three level of analysis (Hedegaard, 2008):

1. common sense
2. situated practice
3. thematic.

Each vignette includes findings in relation to research questions, followed by conclusion
drawn from analysis. Tables 4.5 and 4.6 summarise the initial findings from Vignette 6.1 and 6.2
(see Chapter 6), which outlines the strategies used by the teacher to help the children self-regulate.

**Table 4.5**

*Conditions for Development of Self-Regulation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School institutional practice perspective (Teacher 1)</th>
<th>Child’s perspective</th>
<th>Emerged concepts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Values/demands:</td>
<td>Teacher’s demands not as the child is not psychologically ready</td>
<td>Anchoring to the environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Be here and now’;</td>
<td>reorienting the child to the classroom and task at hand</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>giving options and explaining consequences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Know what you feel’;</td>
<td>recognising mood and emotions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 4.6**

*Conditions for Development of Self-Regulation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School institutional practice perspective (Teacher 2)</th>
<th>Child’s perspective</th>
<th>Emerging concepts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Values/demands:</td>
<td>Child supports teacher’s values and put them as demands on his peers</td>
<td>Child’s affective positioning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>compliance with the activity rules no negative/offensive</td>
<td></td>
<td>Child’s need for warmth and emotional support</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The two vignettes (as explained in Chapters 5 and 6) illustrate how Kitezh children participate in two institutions (home and school) and pay attention to the practice in one institution that influences children’s activities in another institution (Hedegaard & Fleer, 2013). A dramatic moment is analysed as conflict between a child’s motive and the motives of the institutional practices (home and school). For example, an emotionally charged confrontation between Vova (one of the Kitezh focus children) and his father during the morning routine at home is the activity setting of an individual child—something that Vova experiences in his everyday life. Observing and recording the child’s everyday activities in different institutional practices (e.g., home and school) allows us to determine if (and how) such activity is recognised across settings (Fleer, 2008).

The fourth stage involved analysing how society (in Russia) exerts its influence through values and the demands it makes on the institutions. All four stages were completed as an iterative process, sometimes involving analysis of only one dramatic moment, and other times moving between several dramatic moments in the home, school and community. Section 4.4.1.4 explains the process in further detail.

4.4.1.4 Stage 4

Applying Hedegaard and Fleer’s (2008) dialectical–interactive framework and Hedegaard’s model (2012), it is possible to gain insights into dramatic moments that children in Kitezh experience during their everyday life and understand the forces that drive children’s self-regulation during such moments. In particular, it is possible to reveal the children’s intentions and motives by examining how they participate in one activity across different practices, school and home. Table 4.7 (adopted from Fleer & Hedegaard, 2008) shows how a dramatic moment can be analysed as conflict between a child’s motive and the motives of the institutional practice (school). The table also conceptualises how one dramatic moment that is linked to an activity setting (and the conflict
that arises from it) relates to the theoretical concepts, research methods and role of the researcher. In this example, cleaning is the activity setting of an individual child—something that he does in his everyday life (see Table 4.7). Observing and recording the child’s everyday activities in different institutional practices (e.g., school and home) as in Table 4.7 allows us to determine if (and how) such activity is recognised across setting (Fleer, 2008).

Table 4.7
Analysing Different Perspectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Child’s perspective (Activity)</th>
<th>School institution</th>
<th>Family institution</th>
<th>Theoretical concept/s</th>
<th>Research method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cleaning: Refusing to help teacher to tidy up after the class, running away without showing any remorse</td>
<td>Cleaning: Children should follow the rules and feel ashamed if they fail to do so, non-compliance with the rules should lead to strict disciplinary measures</td>
<td>Cleaning: Talking about cleaning the house of a sick friend. Discussing how they can do it together with the child</td>
<td>Social situation of development</td>
<td>Observation (empirical—researcher is a ‘fly on the wall’—passively observes the event)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Perezhivanie</td>
<td>Interview (dialectical—researcher is an active participant, ‘the truth’ is revealed through counter arguments)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Conflict/dramatic moment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shared knowledge construction and deconstruction while dialoguing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.5 Ethics

Undertaking research within a cultural–historical perspective involves interaction with adults and children; therefore, ethical issues should be considered from the beginning of the research and integrated within the methodology and throughout all stages of the project, particularly when the research subjects are children (Sorensen, 2014). In this research, close attention was paid
to ethical issues, including informed consent, privacy, doing no harm, no exploitation and careful consideration of the consequences of the research (Hammersley & Atkinson, 2010).

Particular care was taken for obtaining ethical permission from Monash University Human Ethics Committee (see Appendix 3) and following procedures outlined in the approval, including but not limited to gaining consent from the Kitezh community, and the parents, teachers and members of the community (see Appendix 4). All members of the community were aware of the research; close attention was paid to the sensitivity and respect of adults and children’s rights to privacy. Further, all participants were provided with a research statement and invited to sign an informed consent form outlining the research to ensure voluntary participation.

Participants were made aware that all attempts to maintain confidentiality and anonymity were followed as much as possible. However, because of the small scale of the study, this was not always possible and participants may be identified by their words and actions. However, with publication of results, anonymity of the participants is possible for the wider community as participants names were changed, eliminating any potential identifying information.

Acceptance from parents and teachers is not enough to ensure that research meets ethical considerations (Sorensen, 2014). The UNESCO Convention on the Rights of the Child (1989) urges researchers who work with children to listen to the voices of children (Sorensen, 2014). Therefore, the children were invited to provide their own consent to participation in this study before video observation and interviews were conducted. The purpose of the research was explained to the children, as well as what they could expect from the researcher and what the researcher expected from them. The researcher showed respect to children and their play and activities at all times and showed her interest in them as people, not only as research subjects. The researcher also ensured that all participants were free to withdraw from the process (whether it was a process of video observation or interview) at any time up until the point of data analysis, at which time it was not possible.
4.6 Conclusion

The methodological design of this study was influenced by concepts of cultural–historical research (Vygotsky, 1931/1997) and Hedegaard’s (2012) model of children’s learning and development through participation in institutional practices. Dramatic moments were added by the researcher as a new methodological tool and used as a sample of analysis to represent the focus children’s everyday life crisis. The analysis used to determine ways children learn to self-regulate during dramatic moments was explained in this chapter. Chapter 5 provides data analysis related to the first institutional practice—family.
Chapter 5: Kitezh Institutional Practices: Family

5.1 Introduction

This chapter introduces Kitezh family institutional practice. The purpose of the analyses is to understand how the family (mother and father) create conditions for children’s self-regulation. Hedegaard’s (2012) model, which includes a wholeness approach in which relations between cultural traditions, practice, activity settings and children’s activities is used to guide the analysis. Hedegaard’s ideas are supported by a cultural–historical approach and Vygotsky’s concept of social situation of development. Adding to the analysis, dramatic moments are introduced from a cultural–historical perspective. These concepts are discussed in further detail in the theoretical (see Chapter 3) and methodological (see Chapter 4) chapters of this thesis. An overview of these concepts and how they relate to data analysis and research questions is included.

The concept vospitanie is introduced to explain the way historical parental values are passed to children. This is an umbrella term that relates to the system of upbringing in Russia, where parents are responsible for and develop children’s skills in various aspects of their life, such as social skills, personal hygiene, good table manners and respect for others. This is further explained in Chapter 3 of this thesis.

Values that place demands on children create conditions for dramatic moments between the child and adult. Perezhivaniye, or the child’s emotional experience, provides a lens on a kaleidoscope of emotions, which seems to support the child’s learning and developmental trajectory, contributing to self-regulation. An overview of these concepts and how they relate to data analysis and the research questions is included.

5.2 Wholeness Approach

The main focus of Hedegaard’s (2012) model is the wholeness approach to children’s learning and development. The cultural–historical model discusses the relation between society, the institution and the individual. By examining how children participate in different institutional practices, it is possible to understand the children’s changing relations with the environment (Fleer
Hedegaard, 2010). Hedegaard and Fleer (2019) conceptualised the activity setting in which children’s various activities in specific practices are located.

The activity setting is viewed from two perspectives. First is the parents’ values perspective, in which the parents’ values position the activities and create demands on children’s participation in these activities. Second is the institutional perspective, in which activity settings are recurrent structures of traditions for activities that occur in an institutional practice (Hedegaard, 2019). For instance, a bedtime routine is an example of a recurring everyday activity setting in many Russian families. From the child’s perspective, the activity settings are recurrent social situations in which the child participates with other people. For example, in the Kitezh family, Vova (the focus child) participates in the bedtime routine with his twin brother Maxim and Nata, his stepsister.

5.3 Kitezh Family Institutional Practice

The second plane of Hedegaard’s (2012) model—the institutional perspective—relates to school, home and after-school practice. To better understand institutional practice within the Kitezh family, first the mother’s and then the father’s values are presented. This provides the context for two examples, which Vygotsky argued is important for understanding the child’s learning and developmental trajectory. The first vignette has a focus on the activity setting of the lounge room and bedroom, where the mother is interacting with the children prior to preparing them for bed. The second vignette focuses on the activity setting of the kitchen, the father is interacting with the children prior to leaving for school in the morning. Section 5.3.1 explains how values and vospitanie in the activity settings of the Kitezh family practice shape the mother’s motives and demands.

5.3.1 Mother’s perspective: Communal values and vospitanie

This section presents the parents’ interviews. The mother’s comments are presented first, which provide her perspective on family pedagogy. The father’s perspective is then presented.

The mother is a relatively new member of Kitezh community. She has a nine-year-old daughter Nata from a previous relationship. The mother met Ivan (the father) not long after she separated from her previous partner (Nata’s biological father). The mother completed studies in
agriculture and veterinary science and runs a small family farm together with the father. This affects her time with the children because she is often away at the farm early in the morning to attend to farm duties (milking cows). The mother is often not present when the children come home from school and is occasionally away in the evenings. However, because of close proximity of the farm to the Kitezh village, the mother often moves backward and forward from the farm to their family house, which gives her an opportunity to see her children and be generally aware of their whereabouts and activities.

Traditional values that are understood as beliefs and enacted as cultural traditions are passed from one generation to the next (Hedegaard, 2005). The values that the mother teaches Vova, Maxim and Nata are influenced by her system of values and cultural identity that she learnt during her own childhood. The mother grew up and lived all her life in Russia, so her values are linked first to the traditional Russian family values and second, to the Russian pedagogical tradition.

The mother explained:

I come from a large rural family, where children were brought up in a traditional way: we [children] were not allowed to question parents’ authority.

In her own family home with Vova and Maxim, the mother has established several strict family rules, where her demands are required to be followed by the children without question. For example, each child is required to make their bed in the morning and brush their teeth before going to school. They are not allowed to discuss these rules. The mothers comment reflects traditional family values in rural Russia, where for centuries the Orthodox Christian religious ideals dominated, and it was not unusual to find unconditional submission to parents and no questioning of their authority (Kapterev, 1915, as cited in Romm, 2015).

Further, the mother outlined that collective, communal values were given priority over the individual’s needs and demands when she was growing up:

We were brought up with the idea that everything should be shared among us children, and nobody would get away with hiding anything from members of the family.
The mother explained that while living in Kitezh, her understanding is that it is a commune where everyone knows about everyone and everything is shared:

Kitezh is one big home, one family. It is not like they [the focus children] live in one home and go to another place, even if they outside of our house, it is still one home.

The mother asserted that she did not tolerate any deviation from her family rules. The mother discussed how she had established *a system of upbringing through discipline* for her own children, which results in consequences if the children are unable to meet her demands:

Vova won’t get away with it. He will be penalised one way or another. Not giving him sweets at home is too easy, he can get them at someone else’s house. He needs to be deprived of something he really wants and can’t get anywhere else, for example, a trip to the city.

In the mother’s interviews, she explained that emphasis is placed on moral values, particularly honesty. The mother does not let the children ‘get away with stealing and lying’:

From my childhood, I remember that the key is not let us [children] get away with it [wrongdoing] even once. In my family, we [children] always had consequences. If Vova is caught stealing, he will not have a trip to the city. The children know the rules: don’t lie, don’t steal!

The concept of *vospitanie* in the Russian pedagogical tradition is understood as socialising members into the family and community, which is viewed as the process of assimilation and reproduction of the culture of the society by the child (Mudruk, 1993). This resonates with Vygotsky’s (1998) idea of learning through culture and cultural transmission. The mother prioritises teaching the children values and actions that align with her own and that of the Kitezh community:

When I enter the canteen and see Vova putting his face to the bowl of soup and not using the spoon, I feel angry and embarrassed. People know he is my son; I don’t want people to see my son like that. He is my family, one of us. We don’t do that. He knows he is not allowed to do that. He knows there will be consequences.
The mother experiences a range of emotions when she sees that her children are not conforming to her expectations. The influence of the community’s expectations and what others will think creates conditions for the mother to follow her own values. The mother transfers her own values of the collective with no questioning of the parents’ authority to Vova and Maxim through vospitanie. These values, in turn, were personalised through the mother’s own experience in her childhood, which was influenced by Russian societal cultural tradition.

The mother provided further information about her own childhood and explained ways that she had experienced traditional values. Similar to her own upbringing, the mother established the tradition for shared activities in her own family. For example, the mother encourages sharing snacks as the children drank their cup of tea before going to school every morning and after dinner. The researcher observed this during her 28 visits to their family home; the children often shared snacks and offered tea and snacks to the researcher, not only when the parents were present, but often when the researcher was alone with the children (e.g., after school).

Another traditional practice that the mother valued was the children’s participation in the evening routine. Prior to bed, it was expected that all children would be together and participate in one activity. The usual practice for the children was to spend time together either reading a book or watching television.

The mother’s values influence the demands placed on children. The children are given firm boundaries and face consequences each time they do not follow the rules set by the mother. This defines the relationship between the mother and focus children. Vygotsky (1962) argued that learning occurs through our interactions and communications with others within our culture. According to Vygotsky, the social environment influences the learning process; culture is the primary determining factor for knowledge construction.

The mother has introduced her personalised values of prevalence of the communal over individual, not questioning the authority of the parents, strict family rules and consequences for violating these rules as evidenced from her interview (e.g., denying Vova a trip for to the city if he caught stealing). The mother established a range of activity settings within her current family
practice to develop the children’s daily routines, which leads to self-regulation. These form part of the children’s social situation of development and include, for example, preparing for school, which has several compulsory activities like washing their own face and making their beds, having a cup of tea and snacks, saying thank you after meals and saying goodbye when leaving for school. The routines the mother initiated create the conditions for the children to experience the values. The values were placed on the children as demands within the family practice. Section 5.3.2 introduces the father’s perspective and explores how his values are placed as demands on Vova’s and Maxim’s participation in this family practice.

5.3.2 Father’s perspective: Developmental environment and firm family rules

The father is a long-term resident of Kitezh and has been part of the community for 20 years. The interview and observations reveal that the father organised a variety of activities for the children. This included a mini gym in Vova’s and Maxim’s room, which they used every day, audio and video recordings of children’s songs, fairytales, computer games, puzzles and board games. Their family home was full of colourful paintings (made by the father, an amateur artist) and had a large collection of children’s books. The father encouraged Vova and Maxim to use the maths puzzles.

The father expressed curiosity about bringing up young children and held values that were similar to the mother’s routines and rules:

I always wanted to see how it is to adopt and raise children when they are really young, from scratch so to say, to see how 'nurture v. nature' argument would work. When we found the twins [Vova and Maxim], who were four, we thought—here is our chance [to raise young, adopted children].

The father discussed his understanding of Vova’s and Maxim’s development, explaining in great detail their difficulties during the transition from the orphanage to the Kitezh, and provided insight into his ideas about their schooling:

It was me who insisted that Vova and Maxim attend kindergarten before they enter their first year in Kitezh school. Everyone else was against it. I thought they needed a developing
environment. The kindergarten did them a lot of good, and helped their transition to school, I am sure. They learnt how to play and cooperate with other children not just between themselves.

The father seems to understand Vova’s social challenges. He explained:
Vova always has this issue—he does not like to join the group activity, there is some barrier in him that prevents him of doing that. He was like that in kindergarten, and I know he is still like that at school now.

The father is aware of Vova readily showing a range of emotions in his everyday life:
Vova gets very emotional very quickly for no particular reason and can be very stubborn.

When discussing Maxim, the father stated:
Maxim used to have difficulties with speech; he talked too fast, pronounced words too fast, did not articulate. He is better now.

The father explained that at home, he and his partner Nina (the mother) use disciplinary measure on both children:
If Vova or Maxim misbehave, and I mean, really misbehave, they stand in the corner until they understand what they did wrong and apologise.

The father explained that he values family rules and firm boundaries for Vova and Maxim, although he commented that he is not the one who usually enacts the rules. The father emphasised that both children are not ‘afraid’ of him and both, particularly Vova, often test the rules and argue with him:
Vova often argues with me. He is not afraid of me at all. He is afraid of Nina [mother]. He sometimes cheats and lies to me. (Father)

The father confirmed that both children sometimes do not listen to him but are afraid of and almost always listen to their mother:
Nina’s word is law for them, not mine. I think they are afraid of her because she is much firmer with them than me.
It is suggested that the father's experience of raising several children within Kitezh community has equipped him with certain ideas about children’s development, which he shared during his interview. These ideas reflect the father’s strong belief in the value of the environment that changes children’s lives in a positive way. As with the mother’s case, and in line with Vygotsky (1962), the social environment influences the learning process.

The interviews revealed that the father is curious about whether his current home/family is capable of creating the environment for Vova and Maxim to help their development and overcome any perceived developmental difficulties (e.g., biological/hereditary determined, as explained in Chapter 3).

The father had personalised Kitezh community values, such as the value of the developmental environment and is keen to implement it within this Kitezh family practice. The father also believes in firm boundaries and strict family rules, which he seemed to be reluctant to reinforce. The video observations revealed that both Vova and Maxim often disagree with the father and are involved in conflicting and highly emotional situations with him, particularly when the mother is not at home. The observations also revealed that the father usually supports the mother’s rules, which relates to the activity settings that she established within this family practice.

5.3.3 How parents’ values and demands are linked to the development of new motives

The interviews with the mother and father revealed that the mother established most activity settings within their family practice. These include preparing for school in the morning, the afternoon routine (such as coming home from school and helping on the farm) and readying for bed in the evening. Although the father occasionally disciplines the children, it is the mother who usually reinforces their family rules. Examining the mother’s and father’s perspectives helps to understand how the parents create conditions for Vova’s and Maxim’s learning directed towards self-regulation.

The mother’s and father’s values exist as demands on Vova and Maxim as they participate in Kitezh family practice. These demands allow development of new motives and competences. For example, the mother’s value of consequences for disrespecting family rules supports Vova to learn
how to take responsibility for his own actions. The children also place their own demands on the settings. The children influence the activity settings and contribute to the conditions of their own learning and development (Hedegaard, 2019). To understand how Vova and Maxim participate in the activity settings within Kitezh family practice, dramatic moments are discussed (see Section 5.3.4).

5.3.4 Dramatic moments—A tool to analyse the child’s perspective

The concept of ‘dramatic moments’ is further detailed in Chapter 3 of this thesis. In the following sections, it is used as an analytical tool to gain insight into Vova’s intentions and motive development to explore how the child learns to self-regulate.

Dramatic moments demonstrate conflict between what the child wants to do and what the child is unable to do, which ultimately reveals the child’s intentions and motive development. Hedegaard (2020) argued that situations in which the child experiences dramatic, emotionally charged conflicting moments with other participants of the activity can provide insight into the child’s motive orientation.

Section 5.3.5 analyses the selected dramatic moments (see Vignette 5.1), in which Vova interacts with his mother at home. The activity setting the child participates in is preparing for bed. The child is involved in several activities within this setting. The vignette illustrates how Vova’s mother creates conditions for Vova’s developing self-regulation and how he contributes to developing his own self-regulation through reciting a nursery rhyme.

5.3.5 Vignette 5.1: Dramatic moments in the family—Vova and his mother

The vignette takes place between Vova and his mother in the lounge room and Vova’s bedroom. It is late evening (8:30 pm); the children have had dinner and showered and were having playtime before bed. Maxim, Nata and their father are in the lounge room. The two children (Maxim and Nata) are at the computer desk, taking turns testing their new microphone that the father connected to the computer earlier in the evening. Nata and Maxim are laughing together; it is suggested they are happy in each other's company. Nata holds a microphone near her mouth and speaks into it; her voice sounds unusually loud (see Figure 5.1).
Figure 5.1

*Nata and Maxim happy at the desk*

Vova is at the door (entrance to the lounge room) observing Nata and Maxim (see Figure 5.2). He appears comfortable and content. It is inferred that he is enjoying watching Nata and Maxim; he is smiling and leaning in a casual manner against the door.

Figure 5.2

*Vova observes the children, happy and comfortable*

Nata puts the microphone close to her mouth and calls Vova to try the microphone. At that moment, their mother also asks Vova to test the microphone, pointing to the two children playing with the microphone (see Figure 5.3).
Vova’s facial expression changes from smiling and relaxed (see Figure 5.2) to a concerned and tense (see Figure 5.3), as indicated by the avoidance of eye contact. Vova’s body posture and position also changes. It is inferred that the way Vova stands up straight and touches his fingers together in this movement that he is beginning to feel tense (see Figure 5.3). His whole posture changes and he stands upright, with part of his body remaining behind the door. It seems as if he is trying to distance himself from the children and the activity. The mother’s face is stern; her gesture emphasises what she wants Vova to do (see Figure 5.3): join the other two children and have a turn on the microphone.

When she observes Vova refusing to join the group, she says, ‘Oh, sure, do start your show. Show us your drama performance’. Nata supports the mother by repeating her demand that Vova join them, offering, ‘Yes, Vova, come here. Show us your drama theatre. We have just the thing for it—the microphone’. At that point, Vova turns and runs to his bedroom.

The mother follows Vova to his room. She tells him to either join Maxim and Nata or go to bed. Her voice is firm and direct. The mother repeats her demand to join the two children with the microphone. Vova shakes his head left and right, indicating no. He refuses to join the activity. The mother says that in this case, he should go to bed like a small child. Vova looks upset and wrinkles.
his face preparing to cry (see Figure 5.4). He complies with his mother’s demand and quickly takes
his shorts off. He stands next to his mother holding his shorts, looking unhappy, then starts crying.

**Figure 5.4**

*Vova is upset after his mother told him to go to bed ‘like a small child’*

When the mother observes Vova crying, she says, ‘There is nothing to cry about’ and leaves
the room. Vova continues to cry (see Figure 5.5).

**Figure 5.5**

*Vova’s face creases; he begins to cry, suggesting he is upset*
When the mother leaves the room, Vova continues crying and crawls into his bed. For a brief moment, he sits up in his bed; his face is serious and troubled.

**Figure 5.6**

*Vova looking upset and troubled in his bed*

![Vova looking upset and troubled in his bed](image)

**Figure 5.7**

*Vova hides under the blanket*

![Vova hides under the blanket](image)

Vova draws the blanket to completely hide himself. It seems he is trying to hide from the situation. For a few moments, Vova remains under the blanket and cries loudly. In the meantime, Nata and Maxim continue reciting nursery rhymes loudly via the microphone. The two children
take turns saying short nursery rhymes. Vova remains relatively indifferent and remains in his bed until he hears his brother Maxim reciting the nursery rhyme titled ‘Mishka’—Little Bear.

At that moment, Vova crawls out from under his blanket. While listening to his brother, Vova moves his lips as if he is reciting the poem together with Maxim, word by word, but silently. There seems to be no emotion present on his facial expression (see Figure 5.8).

**Figure 5.8**

*Vova moves his lips when he hears his brother Maxim reciting a nursery rhyme*

Vova hears a mistake Maxim makes in reciting the nursery rhyme. He points his finger in the direction of the lounge room where Maxim is, laughs and says, ‘Not “because I love him” [grins, shakes his head from side to side as if saying ‘no’], but “because he is good”’. Vova smiles broadly and laughs; his smiling face and seemingly happy demeanour suggests he is emotionally involved in that moment (see Figure 5.9).
Figure 5.9

Vova points his finger towards Maxim when he spots a mistake Maxim makes in the Little Teddy nursery rhyme

Vova corrects his brother quietly and begins to recite the whole nursery rhyme from the beginning to the end without any mistake.

Figure 5.10

Vova looks happier and more relaxed
Seemingly pleased with himself, Vova sits in his bed smiling. After he finishes the poem, his whole demeanour changes. He sits in his bed with a smile, suggesting he is feeling calmer, happier and more relaxed (see Figure 5.10).

5.3.6 Dramatic moments in the family: Vova and mother

The mother acknowledges that Vova is upset; however, a dramatic emotional condition is created by her remarks and the way she responds towards Vova when the child is experiencing emotionally intense moment and upset (see Figures 5.4 and 5.5). It has been argued that creating a positive emotional climate by a parent predicts better self-regulation (Baker et al., 2001, as cited in Smiley et al., 2016). Research show that mothers who are more sensitive, warm and supportive have children performing better on self-regulation tasks (Bernier et al., 2010, as cited in Cadima et al., 2016. Research also show that sensitive, warm and responsive relationships between children and parents can counteract the detrimental effect of lower self-regulation skills in children who experience social disadvantage (Mezzacappa, 2004; Noble et al., 2005, as cited in Cadima et al., 2016).

Table 5.1 summarises the dynamics between Vova’s intentions and demands that he meets as he participates in his family practice at home. The demands of the family, as an institutional practice (represented by the mother), conflict with Vova’s intentions.

**Table 5.1**

*Family Practice Demands and Child’s Intentions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family practice demands (Mother)</th>
<th>Child’s intentions (Vova)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Make Vova test the microphone—join other children when they are testing the microphone (active participation)</td>
<td>Observe the children testing the microphone (passive participation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make Vova comply with mother’s demand to join the children or go to bed</td>
<td>Be left alone and not be asked to join the children or go to bed/sleep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help Vova understand that it is good for his future to try the microphone now</td>
<td>Join the group activity/more active participation (reciting a poem)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.1 shows that the child’s intentions conflict with the mother’s demands. When the mother points to Nata and Maxim testing the microphone (see Figure 5.3), she asks Vova to join them. Vova steps away from the door and tenses his body, indicating he does not want to join them. When mother again asks Vova to join the children, he turns away and runs to his room. This action indicates the child’s intention is not to join the group; he prefers to observe (Point 1 of the child, see Table 5.1). When the mother challenges his intent, he withdraws. When the mother chases Vova to his room and insists on compliance with her demand, Vova begins to cry. The dramatic moment indicates that the conflict between the child’s intension (Point 2 of the child, Table 5.1) and the mother’s demand (Point 2 of the mother, Table 5.1) is not resolved. When the mother explains that it is good for Vova’s future to try the microphone (Point 3 of the mother, Table 5.1), Vova remains upset and withdrawn because at that point, his intention (Point 2 of the child, Table 5.1) is still in conflict with the mother’s demand (Point 3 of the mother, Table 5.1). When Vova recites the poem loudly after hearing Maxim’s voice, the child’s intention (Point 3 of the child, Table 5.1) is closer to his parent’s initial demand (Point 1 of the mother, Table 5.1).

5.3.6.1 Creating the conditions for Vova’s self-regulation

As evidenced from the father’s interview and the researcher’s video observations, Vova seems to be uncomfortable joining a group activity and prefers to observe the group without joining. In this vignette, Vova displayed a repeated intention when faced with demand from his social environment to join the group activity—he wants to observe the group without joining. However, he often joins the group activity later, if provided with time to observe the group first and not repeatedly told to join. In this situation, Vova fails to join the activity when his mother continues to put a demand on him to join the group and an additional, simultaneous demand to go to sleep.

Vova seems overwhelmed by two demands—to participate in testing the microphone, the demand that is constantly repeated by his mother and the additional demand from his mother—to go to sleep. Vova remains emotional for seven minutes because he is under pressure of two demands.
His usual strategy of observing and then joining the group activity does not work in this situation because he does not have an opportunity to meet his motive to observe the group activity.

From Vova’s facial expression and seemingly tense body position, his sobbing and crying, it is inferred that the child is experiencing ‘an emotionally coloured and experienced collision ... a dramatic event’ (Veresov, 2010, p. 88) with his mother (evident from Figures 5.4 and 5.5). The heightened emotions between Vova and his mother create tension in their interactions that is referred to as drama (Veresov, 2010). This dramatic moment is intense, emotionally charged and a highly conflicting event. Vygotsky (1934/1998) referred to these moments as ‘everyday life crises’, which are crucially important for developmental process because they lead to revolutionary qualitative changes in the psychological development of the child.

In this example, the conflict between Vova’s intention to observe the group and his mother’s demand to make Vova join the group seemed to overwhelm the child. The mother demanded compliance. However, Vova’s intense emotional displays indicated he was upset because he was not given the opportunity to fulfil his intention of simply observing his siblings. The way Vova stood at the door, smiling and watching his siblings play with the microphone suggests he was content. However, when the mother made a demand on him rather than meet his demand, he withdrew from participation completely and retreated to his bedroom. The mother continued with her demand as she followed him to his bedroom and repeated that Vova should join his siblings. It is suggested that the continued demand was met with an intense emotional moment. He wrinkled his face and tears ran down his cheeks; he began to make sobbing noises. The mother continued talking and explained why she insisted on Vova joining the group. She provided Vova with a choice, seemingly in the form of an ultimatum: ‘Vova, you either join the group or go to sleep like a small child’.

It is inferred that for Vova, the demands from his mother are in sharp contrast to his own intentions. The mother’s motive is to give her child an opportunity to join the expected bedtime practice and social activity and to try something new that she perceives will be useful for him in the future (using the microphone). However, Vova is unable to imagine the distant future or at least not
in the same way as his mother does. It is well understood that adults and children have different understandings of the same situation (Vygotsky, 1935). In addition, Vova’s heightened emotional state is not conducive to meeting his mother’s demands, which conflict with Vova’s intentions.

**5.3.6.2 Kaleidoscope of changes in the child’s emotions**

Vova was left alone after the mother left his room and his sister stopped calling him to join the group. He remained upset and emotional for a few minutes, unable to self-regulate and was completely withdrawn until he heard his brother Maxim making a mistake in Mishka (Little Teddy Bear) nursery rhyme. Vova made an immediate connection through his *perezhivaniye*.

The unity of affect and intellect in Vova’s *perezhivaniye* at that moment is evidenced by the kaleidoscope of changes in the child’s emotions and behaviour: Vova moved from a dramatic emotional moment to seemingly being pleased that he was able to spot a mistake in his brother’s repetition of the nursery rhyme. He was then proud of his own ability to demonstrate to the researcher that he could recite the whole nursery rhyme by heart without mistakes. Through this process of an emotional kaleidoscope, Vova’s whole demeanour changed from physical movement away from the situation and engagement in a dramatic moment (see Figures 5.5–5.7) to seemingly happy, confident and relaxed (see Figure 5.10) and joining the social interaction from afar (see Figure 5.9).

Through the process of moving through a dramatic moment to a positive *perezhivaniye*, Vova’s relations with his social environment changed. He was able to create a positive emotional link that mediated development of a new culturally defined motive—*willing to join the group activity from a distance*.

However, Vova was not a passive receiver of this family practice conditions. He was able to develop a new motive, not only through conditions provided by this family practice and his positive *perezhivaniye*, but also through creating new ways to participate in this family practice—by engaging in new activities that he created as he participated in this activity setting.

Vova’s process of developing a new motive, and ultimately a new level of self-regulating, through the kaleidoscope of emotions contributed to the process of creating his own conditions for
participating in this family practice. Vova modified the way he participated in this family practice by creating his own activities. The development of the child’s new motive is mediated by the conditions of his family practice and by Vova’s positive *perezhivaniye*. Table 5.2 presents a summary of the initial findings.

**Table 5.2**

*Conditions for Development of Self-Regulation (Mother)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family institutional practice perspective (Mother)</th>
<th>Child’s perspective</th>
<th>Concepts that emerged</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Values/demands:</td>
<td>Parents’ values/demands not met as the child is not psychologically ready</td>
<td><em>Vospitanie</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of the communal over individual</td>
<td>Child puts own demands on parents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strict family rules</td>
<td>Child develops new motive through creating his own activities through <em>perezhivaniye</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not questioning parents’ authority</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Kaleidoscope of emotions</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upbringing through discipline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.2 conceptualises how family institutional practice and the child (Vova) create conditions for Vova’s learning to self-regulate. The first column summarises the parents’ perspective and includes values that exist as demands on Vova’s participation in the activity (testing the microphone at home). These values originate from family history, as evidenced from the mother’s interviews. The second column shows the child’s perspective and how Vova developed a new motive by creating his own activities and *perezhivaniye*. The third column shows new concepts that emerged from analysis of Vignette 5.1 and include *vospitanie* and *kaleidoscope of emotions*.

Section 5.3.7 presents Vignette 5.2, in which Vova’s interaction with his father during a selected dramatic moment is discussed to reveal how the social situation of development creates conditions for Vova’s self-regulation.
5.3.7 Vignette 5.2: Dramatic moments in the family—Vova and his father

Vova, Maxim and their father are the main participants. The mother is away at the farm. It is 8:15 am and the Kitezh family is having their usual morning routine, which involves preparing for school.

Maxim and Vova are in the kitchen. Maxim is at the dining table. Vova stands next to the table when their father enters the kitchen. The transcript that follows details Vova’s experience as he argues with his father. The researcher left a box of chocolates box for the children on a prior occasion.

Figure 5.11

*Vova pointing to the chocolate box*

In Figure 5.11, Vova points to a box of chocolates on the table and asks his father, ‘Mum says I am allowed to have it [chocolates]’.

Vova insists that their mother allowed him to have it.

Vova: Mum said I could have it.

The father ignores Vova’s request and asks Vova to show him dirty spots on the trousers that Vova holds in his hands (see Figure 5.12). Vova begins arguing.

Father: Show where your trousers are dirty.
Vova: They are all in stains.

He shows he is angry, inferred by positioning his arms on his hips.

Father: Show where the stains are.

Vova: They are hard to see. They are small (arms crossed, tensed whole body, walks away from the basket stomping his feet on the ground).

Father: Show where small stains are. Show me.

Vova: UGH, I CAN’T SEE THEM (Using a loud voice, positioning arms on hips, voice is growing louder, inferring anger).

Father: You can’t see them but you are saying they are small so you can show them to me.

Vova: I CAN’T. I DON’T WANT TO! AND I WON’T! (angry, voice trembling, about to cry).

Father: Vova, put your pants out of the basket and take them to your room.

Vova: UGH (angry, arms on hips, takes his pants and stomps out of the kitchen).

Vova returns, sits at the table, drops his head on his arms and begins sobbing (see Figure 5.13).
Father: Why are you upset? What is this concert about?

Vova: I wanted to get that chocolate.

Father gives him the chocolate. Vova takes the chocolate and walks away to his room.

In the above example, a dramatic moment between Vova and his father occurs when Vova participates in the activity setting (preparing for school)—a routine practice in his everyday life. Initially, Vova’s demand to eat a chocolate in the kitchen is not met. His father ignores his request. His father in turn places a new demand on Vova. The father’s motive is to ensure that Vova complies with the demand. However, when the father puts his demand on the child, Vova has initiated a dramatic moment (by shouting and refusing to show the dirt on his trousers) because his own demand to receive a chocolate is not met. Vova continues to refuse to comply with his father’s demand. Vova wishes to communicate his point of view and attempts to argue with his father. However, he is not able to receive the chocolate and eventually complies with his father’s demand. Vova’s emotional dramatic moment escalates; his body tenses, he sounds angry and raises his voice. He puts his arms on his hips, stomps his feet, shouts out loud and his voice waivers because his own demands are not met. First, he does not receive a chocolate; second, he is not able to prove that mother said he could have a chocolate.
5.3.8 Dramatic moment—Conflict between father’s demands and Vova’s intentions

From Vova’s raised voice, stance (hands on hips), facial expression and seemingly tense body position, it is inferred that the focus child was experiencing an intense, emotionally charged dramatic moment with his father (evident from Figure 5.11). The heightened emotions between Vova and his father created a special kind of social relation that is referred to as ‘drama’ (Veresov, 2010). According to Vygotsky (1983), on the inter-psychological plane, such social relations act as developing force. The contradiction is between what the child wants to do (his demand—a chocolate) and what he is unable to do. The father’s demand contributes to creating conditions for Vova’s development.

Table 5.3 summarises the dynamic between Vova’s demands and the demands that are placed on him. The demands of the focus family, as an institutional practice (represented by the father), conflict with the child’s demands (Vova).

Table 5.3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family practice demands (Father)</th>
<th>Child’s intentions (Vova)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Make Vova put his trousers into the laundry box</td>
<td>1. Be left alone and not to be asked to put his trousers into the laundry box</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Insists Vova must comply with his family rules even when Vova refuses to do so</td>
<td>2. Voice his own opinion about his father’s demand and express it to him</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Get Vova to understand that it is not good to make a &quot;drama&quot; out of this situation, downgrades the situation by offering chocolate to Vova</td>
<td>3. Wants to take a chocolate himself</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.3 shows that the child’s intentions are in conflict with the father’s demands. When the father asks, ‘What is your problem? What is all this drama about? Is that all because of that chocolate?’, he provides Vova the chocolate by offering him the box of chocolates. This action
seems to meet the demands of the child. However, Vova responds to his father with a raised voice: ‘I wanted to take it myself’ (Point 3 of the child, Table 5.3) and begins to cry. The dramatic moment indicates that the conflict between the child’s intention and the father’s demands has not been resolved.

The mother and father create different conditions for Vova’s development. The father’s parenting is different to that of the mother. The mother tends to place her demands with an ultimatum (‘join them or go to sleep’); the father continues to act in a calm and caring manner (see Figure 5.13), offering Vova cup of tea and vitamin pill even when Vova is upset, angry and raises his voice in response to the father. The father ignores Vova’s request for the chocolate and continues to insist firmly on meeting his own demand. The father engages in an argument with Vova, though he indicates that the altercation makes Vova more upset (see Figure 5.13). Vova eventually complies with the father’s demand (father’s Demand 1, see Table 5.3) and receives a chocolate.

During the vignette, the father does not seem to understand why Vova displays emotions and the reason for the ‘drama’. When the father asks Vova about his emotional display, the Russian word ‘concert’ is used. It seems the father is suggesting that Vova’s emotional reaction during the dramatic moment is not in proportion to the father’s request to complete an expected and routine task. When the father hands the box of chocolate to Vova, it seems as if the ‘concert’ was an insignificant matter to the father, which does not warrant attention. The father’s words and demeanour seem to convey to Vova that his feelings during the dramatic moment are not important. The father creates conditions in which Vova’s demands are met, only after drawing attention to Vova’s dramatic event and when he has completed the task.

5.3.9 Vova’s perezhivanie—Further evidence of a kaleidoscope of emotions

Vova is unable to develop a new motive to comply with his father’s demands (demands of his social environment); it seems the father’s motive is to support Vova to regulate his emotions without dramatic events. There is a link between development of the child’s motives and the child’s emotional experience (perezhivanie; Bozhovich, 1976, 1988). The father’s motive puts demands on
Vova, which at this time, Vova cannot meet without a dramatic moment. The child learns how to regulate motives voluntarily, thereby developing self-control of behaviour (Bozhovich, 1976, 1988). It seems that Vova is not psychologically ready to meet the father’s demand. A new motive develops if it is mediated by a child’s positive *perezhivanie* (Bozhovich, 1955). However, in this situation, it seems Vova’s *perezhivanie* is not positive.

The father wants Vova to meet a new motive—*be willing to cooperate with him and comply with his family rules*. The father does not respond to Vova’s demand for chocolate and creates a new demand (take the trousers out of the laundry basket and put them back into his wardrobe); through conversation, the father manifests his own motive. The father is seemingly teaching the child to delay his own immediate motive for the benefit of the whole family (to cooperate with the father). The father places a new demand on the child during an intense, emotionally charged dramatic moment. The father’s demand requires Vova to meet the demands and values of this institutional family practice before being offered a chocolate.

It is suggested that father’s *vospitaniye* includes making Vova aware of his emotions and behaviour. By naming and labelling Vova’s behaviour, as indicated by the father/child dialogue in Section 5.3.7, the father teaches Vova to recognise his emotions and behaviour and encourage self-regulation by making Vova conscious of his emotions.

Similar to Vignette 5.1, Vova’s path towards new motive and learning to self-regulate is accompanied by intense and rapid change of emotions. Here, the *kaleidoscope of emotions* is better understood by the example of Vova escalating the tension by using a raised voice, gesticulating repeated requests and disappearing to be by himself. This directs attention towards Vova’s self-regulation. Table 5.4 summarises the initial findings from Vignette 5.2.

**Table 5.4**

*Conditions for Development of Self-Regulation (Father)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family institutional practice perspective (Father)</th>
<th>Child’s perspective</th>
<th>Emerged concepts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Values/demands:</td>
<td>Parents’ values/demands not</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Strict family rules
Firm boundaries
Developmental environment
met as the child is not psychologically ready
Child puts own demands on the parents
Child develops new motive through creating his own activities through *perezhivaniye*

**Vospitaniye**

**Kaleidoscope of emotions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5.4 Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Development of Vova’s self-regulation is linked to the development of motives. A new motive develops as the relations between the child and his social environment changes. Three key factors in this process—Vova’s *perezhivanie*, conditions that his mother and father create for his participation in this institutional family practice and Vova’s own activities that he creates as he participate in this family practice—mediate development of a new motive that helps Vova self-regulate. In other words, he learns to coordinate his motives with demands of his social environment. There is a complex interplay of these conditions, which indicates Vova is beginning to self-regulate in each particular case (see Vignettes 5.1 and 5.2).

Table 5.5 summarises the findings of this chapter and conceptualises the process of development of Vova’s self-regulation through development of new motives.

**Table 5.5**

*Development of Self-Regulation through New Motives: Kitezh Family*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Child’s <em>perezhivaniye</em></th>
<th>Conditions of Kitezh family practice</th>
<th>Child’s own activities</th>
<th>New motive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vova’s negative <em>perezhivanie</em> with the mother</td>
<td>Negative child/mother interaction</td>
<td>Observes the group activity from the distance withdraws/leaves the group</td>
<td>Child’s intention conflict with the mother’s demand; no evidence of the new motive development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapid and intense change in Vova’s <em>perezhivanie</em> kaleidoscope of emotions</td>
<td>Positive emotional and cognitive links: Vova’s brother voice</td>
<td>Listens to his brother’s voice Corrects his brother’s</td>
<td>Willing to join the group activity more actively</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The process of motive development is characterised by the conflict between what the child wants to do and what the child is unable to do. The conflict manifests itself in an emotionally charged, intense situation, a dramatic moment because it demonstrates the child intentions and how they relate to the demands placed on the child. During dramatic moments, Vova experiences everyday crisis, which has a potential to act as a developing force.

As Vova participates in this Kitezh family practice, he is faced with demands that are placed on him, which exist as his parents’ mediated values. These values/demands manifest as conditions that this family practice creates for Vova’s participation (see Column 2, Table 5.5). The conditions are based on the system of upbringing—vospitanie that originated within the family history of each parent (see mother’s and father’s vospitanie in Column 2 of Table 5.5).

The potential of developing a new motive and ultimately, self-regulation, depends on the conditions that this family practice creates for Vova, how the child relates to these conditions and his perezhivaniye in any unique situation. The conditions are multilayered and not homogeneous. Some conditions are more constant and always present within the activity settings, which the mother established at home. For example, books and audio recordings of children’s nursery rhymes are always present within the preparation for bed activity setting. Other conditions are not constant, but change from one situation to another, such as parent/child interaction.
In Vignette 5.1, the mother–child interaction is not positive for Vova, creating conditions in which the conflict between demands of the social environment and his own demands to the environment seem overwhelming to the child. However, Vova finds a link within more constant conditions—a catalyst of change in the child–environment relations which he uses to develop a new motive—be willing to join the group activity (more active participation, rather than observing, as explained in Vignette 5.1). Hearing a familiar nursery rhyme created a positive emotional link for Vova and his positive perezhivanie mediated development of a new motive—be willing to join the group activity. Vova used the initial link reinforced by his positive perezhivaniye and created his own activities to modify how he participated in this family practice. The process of rapid and intense change in the child’s perezhivaniye of the dramatic moment is characterised by the kaleidoscope of emotions, which is used as a new term to describe the process of development.

In Vignette 5.2, the father–child interaction was also dramatic for Vova, which made it difficult for him to develop a new motive—be willing to comply with the family rules. However, unlike in Vignette 5.1, Vova was not able to connect positively to any of the constant conditions available within the activity setting (preparing for school routine). Vova experienced difficulties with self-regulation when he interacted with his father and was unable to find any link within his social environment that changed the child–environment relations. Vova’s negative perezhivaniye of the entire situation prevented development of a new motive congruent to the demands of his immediate social environment—be willing to comply with the family rules. However, the collision between Vova and his father indicates change in child–environment relations; it shows that Vova is developing a new motive—willing to challenge the parent’s authority, which he starts to assert when he participates in his family practice. This development is also marked by the kaleidoscope of emotions that Vova experiences within his perezhivaniye.

5.5 Conclusion

In this chapter, the Kitezh family institutional practice was introduced. Two vignettes were used to explore how Vova and Maxim learn to self-regulate within family practice. In Chapter 6,
Kitezh school institutional practice is introduced and case studies are analysed to explore how the children learn to self-regulate at school.
Chapter 6: Kitezh Institutional Practices: School

6.1 Introduction

In Chapter 5, the Kitezh family institutional practice was analysed to explore how the focus family creates conditions for development of the child’s self-regulation. This chapter introduces Kitezh school institutional practice. The chapter continues to use the wholeness approach (Hedegaard, 2012, 2019) and the concept of dramatic moments (see Chapter 5) to explore how the focus children learn to self-regulate at school. The aim of the analysis is to understand how the school creates conditions for children’s self-regulation. Adding to this analysis, the concept of co-regulation is introduced to explain how the focus children learn to self-regulate through interaction with their teacher and each other at school. For the purpose of this chapter, co-regulation refers to the teacher’s activities that attempt to support children’s participation in everyday activities by modifying children’s thoughts, behaviour or emotions according to the expectations and values of a particular context (Colman et al., 2006, as cited in Kurki et al., 2016; Volet et al., 2009).

Development of self-regulation is viewed from the cultural–historical perspective (as explained in Chapter 3) and explored as a dialectical relationship between the child and their environment. Two vignettes (see Vignettes 6.1 and 6.2) are used to illustrate this process in which dramatic moments that Vova experiences at school are captured for analysis of self-regulation from the child’s and teacher’s perspectives. To reveal the child’s perspective, the analysis examines the child’s motives, intentions and the demands that the focus child places on this institutional practice. The demands originating from the Kitezh school practice are also examined. The child’s perspective is closely interlinked with the adults’ and researcher’s perspective (Hedegaard, 2008).

The chapter begins with analysis of the teacher’s perspective based on her interviews with the researcher. It explores the teacher’s values and ideas of pedagogy in relation to the focus child, and pedagogical strategies used to create conditions for Vova to learn how to self-regulate when he is in her class.
This is followed by two vignettes: when Vova interacts with the teacher and when Vova interacts with his peers in the school setting. This is explored to reveal the effect of the strategies used by the teacher and how these are met as demands by the focus child. Each vignette focuses on different aspects of the processes involved as Vova is directed towards and learns about self-regulation.

Vignette 6.1 explores a dramatic moment during a reading lesson, when the teacher disciplines Vova. The focus is on teacher/child co-regulation, in which the teacher interacts with Vova during a dramatic moment. The analysis reveals the teacher’s strategies used during dramatic moments and how Vova modifies his participation in the activity. The teacher’s strategies, child’s perspective and link to self-regulation is explained.

In Vignette 6.2, the activity is physical education lesson in which Vova’s twin brother Maxim experiences a dramatic moment with one of his classmates and Vova tries to intervene. The focus is on peer regulation. The analysis explores how Vova’s interference and active support of the teacher’s position influence his peers’ participation in this activity setting. The link between peer regulation, motive development and self-regulation is discussed.

6.2 The Teacher’s Perspective: Anchoring to the Environment Strategies

In this section, the teacher’s interviews were analysed to reveal the relations between conditions that the teacher in the Kitezh school created for the focus children’s’ participation. The teacher is a long-term resident of Kitezh who lives with her partner and their adopted son in one of the Kitezh houses. She graduated from a university in Moscow with a double degree as a teacher and psychologist. She has been working in Kitezh school for several years.

The teacher described the children’s introduction to Kitezh, which was supported by a program developed by a clinical psychologist. The program included physical exercises aimed to develop the children’s sensory-motor skills and recommendations for the parents regarding ways to develop children’s socio-emotional skills.

Discussing the focus children’s transition from short-term state orphanage to Kitezh community, the teacher explained:
In the beginning, the twins (Vova and Maxim) were feral, scared kids. Their speech was very limited, they almost could not talk. Gradually they developed speech; however, it was heavily dominated by swearing, which I think that could have picked up from their biological family. The children wanted to know who is who in Kitezh. It was as if they wanted to have really clear images in their heads who everybody was, every adult. They were constructing people’s positions in their heads, asking: ‘Who are you? Who are you to my dad?’

According to the teacher, Vova and Maxim were supported through the transition into Kitezh through their attendance at the state-sponsored kindergarten in the nearby village. The teacher explained that Vova and Maxim continued to develop social skills at the kindergarten, which they began to demonstrate each day as they returned to Kitezh:

The kindergarten helped them [Vova and Maxim] in many ways. Before kindergarten they were not able to say ‘sorry’ or ‘please forgive me’ if they did something wrong to adults or children in Kitezh. Maxim particularly struggled with it, despite his mum’s constant efforts. He would simply give up at the very last moment, he would come up to the person he wronged with the intention to apologise, but he would not say, ‘sorry’ at all or just whisper it so softly that no-one could hear him. At kindergarten, they [Vova and Maxim] saw other kids doing it [saying sorry] on regular basis, it was part of their everyday lives, so gradually Vova and Maxim started to do it properly in Kitezh.

The teacher discussed differences between Vova’s and Maxim’s temperaments that affected their learning about the values and expectations in Kitezh:

Vova gets very emotional very quickly, he is explosive. He is more active than Maxim, more dynamic, but less thinking. He is an ‘act first, think second’ kind of guy. At the beginning when they [focus children] were brought to Kitezh and trying to adapt, it appeared that Vova ‘got it’ much faster than Maxim, but his adaptation was only skin-deep. Vova is still very unsure about unfamiliar situations and often unwilling to join the group [play or work]. He is confident and bossy only when he is with Maxim but quickly retreats
and prefers to observe when other children are around. Maxim is a more quiet and thinking kind of child. He is also more compliant than Vova, and easier to join the play.

The teacher directed attention to the difference between the children, which also affects the way the twins learn to self-regulate:

Even a simple request can make Vova fiery, explosive. He overacts even at the very simple thing; his first response is always negative—negative emotions. Often when I ask him to do something, he immediately becomes defiant and starts to argue why he won’t do it. He takes everything too personally and every situation is emotionally charged for him.

The teacher suggested that the reason for emotional reactions is that Vova finds it challenging to separate many different occurrences that he experiences both at home and at school:

His [Vova’s] world is mixed up. He cannot separate the home situation from the school situation; he gets overwhelmed by emotions. When I give him a simple request, the child immediately starts to explain millions of other unrelated things, what is happening at home and what his dad is doing or saying, arguing passionately but mostly incomprehensively why he won’t do what I ask.

The teacher recognised that it is difficult for Vova to self-regulate and that he struggles to separate his home environment from the school environment.

6.2.1 The teacher’s strategies to support dramatic moments in everyday life

To help Vova and Maxim to cope with dramatic moments of their everyday life, the teacher created her own strategies that facilitate the children’s learning about the process of self-regulation. During the interviews, the teacher identified how the twins self-regulate during intense dramatic moments. She suggested that when the children are faced with challenging situations, they become overwhelmed, upset and cry, and approach an adult (parent or teacher). They then ‘tell’ on each other, accuse each other and complain about the behaviour of the other. The teacher explained:

If an adult, for example, their parent believes them and disciplines the other party, it fuels the situation even more. The child still has a lot of emotions attached to the situation, as he
feels he got his revenge over his brother and that he, not his brother is in the right. It makes him feel good and reaffirms his behaviour.

The teacher explained that instead of supporting Vova’s or Maxim’s grievances about each other or other children and adults, she aims to reduce the significance of that ‘drama’ for the child. The teacher provides Vova and Maxim with different ways to self-regulate during dramatic, emotionally intense moment because she suggested that they react differently in the same situation. The teacher explained that when the child is experiencing an emotional and challenging situation, she ‘anchors him to the environment’ to reduce the level of emotional intensity attached:

I try to switch the focus of his [Vova or Maxim] attention from the intense emotional turmoil happening in his head, to his current environment. I kind of press his pause button and make him connect to the environment, as if saying, ‘Look, everything is fine here, nothing is happening, it is peace’. I kind of anchor him to that peace, which is here and now, around him, helping him to reduce the emotional intensity and deal with the actual situation, rather than what is boiling in his head.

By refocusing the child’s attention from the dramatic moment to what is happening in his environment (peaceful, everyday moment, minimum emotions with no dramatic emotions), the teacher aims to reduce the intensity of the dramatic moment. The teacher suggested that as the child ceases to have intense emotions at that moment, he will begin to experience the situation differently—not as an intense emotional moment but as a trivial, rather insignificant event of his everyday life. This provides the child with an opportunity to focus on the task at hand (e.g., the request of the teacher).

The teacher outlined that part of this strategy is to give the children options and explain the consequences linked to each option:

When Vova or Maxim are having difficulties, for example, during the class and I can see they are not coping, I pause them and give them choices. I say to them, ‘Look, stop for a moment. Let’s pause and look. Where are you? What’s the problem now?’ Then I articulate, spell out to them what is actually happening here and now, and give them choices. I say,
‘Wait, nothing is happening. I just asked you to do X. I am not angry with you. You are not in trouble. What you are saying is not happening. You are not at home; you are here at school. My request has nothing to do with your dad, or mum or sister, or dog. I just asked you to do X, the rest is not relevant. You now have two options: you can do X, and then you will have A consequences, or you can do Y, and you will have D consequences’.

From her experience working with Vova and Maxim, the teacher understands that reasoning with the child challenges them further and adds to the dramatic moment. Instead of devaluing the child’s feelings by saying, ‘You must not argue with me, your argument makes no sense, just do what I ask’, the teacher orient the child to the language he is able to understand, refocusing him to the ‘here and now’, the present moment.

From the teacher’s interview, it is understood that she is ‘anchoring to the environment’ and refocusing the child to the ‘here and now’. From the teacher’s perspective, she creates conditions by developing different strategies, which potentially contributes to the children learning to self-regulate. Table 6.1 summarises the teacher’s strategies.

Table 6.1

*Teacher 1 strategies, which Together, Form a Process in Support of Self-Regulation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The process of self-regulation</th>
<th>Teacher’s strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategy 1</td>
<td>Reduces the significance of the drama for herself and the focus child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy 2</td>
<td>Anchors to the environment—reduces the emotional intensity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy 3</td>
<td>Manages the situation here and now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy 4</td>
<td>Aims to support the child to experience the situation differently</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy 5</td>
<td>Focus on the task at hand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy 6</td>
<td>Affectively attuned to the children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy 7</td>
<td>Refocus on the moment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy 8</td>
<td>Provide options and choices to the children</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Other strategies the teacher uses to help Vova and Maxim learn to self-regulate include games. For example, a game was created titled ‘Chest of Emotions’, in which Vova and Maxim are supported to recognise their emotions. The children use different facemasks, which correspond to different moods and emotions (e.g., ‘Good mood—happy’ or ‘Bad mood—unhappy’). The children take turns wearing different masks and observe themselves in the mirror, naming the different emotions they feel in the morning and after lunch. The teacher reflected that Vova had difficulties glancing at the mirror while wearing a mask.

Vignette 6.1 presents an example of the interaction between focus children (Vova and Maxim) and Teacher 1 (Lena). The example supports analysis of the teacher’s strategies within her classroom and how focus children move through the process of learning to self-regulate within the Kitezh school institutional practice.

### 6.2.1.1 Vignette 6.1

The location is the Kitezh primary school. The focus is on the interaction between Vova and the teacher, and Vova and Maxim. The scene occurs during a reading lesson. The classroom has a whiteboard on the wall and three desks arranged in one row. There are only three students present during that class: Vova, Maxim and Valya. They all are seated in a line, next to one another and behind their individual desks. Vova is in between Maxim and Valya. The teacher sits on a chair next to the whiteboard, which is adhered to the wall; the teacher is facing the children.

The children have their reading books open on their desk in front of them. They complete reading exercises from their textbook and begin playing a game, which the teacher calls ‘the train’. In this game, the ball is passed between the players (children and the teacher). Each player has to say one word and pass the ball to the next player. The next player has to say a word that begins with the last letter of the previous word. Maxim is not playing because he is working on the mathematics task that he has not finished from the previous lesson. The ball is in Valya’s hands. She observes Vova and laughs. Vova stares at her and bursts into laughter.
Figure 6.1

*Vova and Valya observe each other laughing*

![Image of Vova and Valya laughing](image1)

Valya hesitates because she is not sure what word to say next. Vova turns to her, leans closer and whispers a word. Valya drops her head on the table and begins laughing and cannot stop.

Figure 6.2

*Vova whispers a word to Valya*

![Image of Vova whispering to Valya](image2)

The expression on Vova’s face seems mischievous, as he tries to encourage Valya to use his verbal prompt (an inappropriate word). Valya hides her face behind the ball and does not repeat the word aloud. The teacher hears the word and observes Vova, who repeats the same word in a whisper, this time looking directly at the teacher.
Vova whispers the swear word softly but the way he grimaces his face articulating the word leaves no doubt as to what word he is saying. Maxim forgets his mathematics exercise and observes Vova.

The teacher does not show any emotion; however, she asks Vova to do sit-ups.

Teacher: You will do sit-ups.

Vova’s immediate reaction is defiance.

Vova (loudly): What for?

At that moment, Vova’s entire demeanour changes—his tone of voice becomes loud and his body language changes. He leans back in his chair, crossing his arms and staring directly at the teacher with a smile. This response seems to indicate defiance and questioning of the teacher’s authority. The teacher seems upset at Vova repeating the rude word to her. There is a long pause and for a few seconds, she stares at Vova with a stern, angry expression (knitted brow, lips pursed). However, she tries not show her emotions and speaks to Vova in a quiet, unemotional tone.

Teacher: I see what you are doing and hear what you are saying. It is nobody’s fault that you cannot control yourself and say rude swearing words. So, go ahead, do sit-ups.

At that moment, Vova drops his head on his table in seemingly pretend despair. He then wiggles in his chair, stretches his arms, turns from side to side and bites the sleeve of his jumper. It
seems that he is uncomfortable and reluctant to do sit-ups. Maxim and Valya laugh, seemingly amused by the interaction between the teacher and Vova (see Figure 6.4).

**Figure 6.4**

*Vova bites the sleeve of his jumper while Valya and Maxim laugh*

Vova’s actions indicate that he seems reluctant to do sit-ups, even though he does not show that he is upset (see Figure 6.4). Vova arises, walks to the corner of the classroom and does five sit-ups (see Figure 6.5)

**Figure 6.5**

*Vova beginning to undertake sit-ups in the classroom*

Vova completes one sit-up and states, ‘one’, completes another one and counts aloud, ‘two’. Both Valya and Maxim focus on Vova. Maxim does not do his mathematics exercise; he observes what Vova is doing and Valya holds the ball close to her face waiting for Vova to rejoin the train game. Having completed five sit-ups, Vova returns to his desk and Valya immediately throws a ball
to him saying ‘ryba’ (‘fish’ in Russian). Vova repeats the word several times and seems to be trying to think what his next word should be. For a few seconds, he thinks about his word choice, muttering different sounds. He then begins talking to the teacher:

Vova: Ryba. B. B ... b ... b.... boo ... boo.... Booblik (‘small, dry, bagel-like treat’)

Teacher: What does ‘booblik’ have to do with it?

Vova (defiantly): Booblik has ‘b’, so does ‘ryba’.

Teacher: Please pronounce the word ryba; what is the last letter? Is it ‘b’? Please pronounce the last letter of the word ryba.

At that point, Vova appears upset. He hides his face in the palm of his hands, looks down and wrinkles his face as if he is about to cry. However, he continues to argue with the teacher:

Vova (loudly, defiantly): It could have been not ryba, but ryby (plural for ryba).

Teacher (in a calm non-emotional tone of voice): So, you know the word that starts with ‘y’?

Vova begins to make loud sobbing noises and pushes the ball deliberately off his desk with his elbow. The ball hits Valya’s book and bounces towards the teacher:

Teacher (calm but firm): Vova, please move to the back of the class. It is enough.

Vova (loudly): No! Ugh (cries). It is because I did not know that last word (yells loudly).

Teacher (firm tone of voice, looking directly at Vova): No, Vova. Look, you tried everything today and that is enough. You said bad swearing word, you show us that you got offended, and now you are simply making a performance, hysteria for us. We don’t need it. Please move over there and start reading your sounds. I will continue to play with Valya (picks up the ball, says the word and throws the ball to Valya).

Vova drops his head on his hands and makes a loud crying noise (see Figure 6.6). Maxim tries to reach him with a pen but glances at the teacher and hesitates.
Figure 6.6

Vova rests his head on his desk in the crook of his elbow and covers his face. He seems upset.

Maxim tries to reach Vova while looking at the teacher.

The teacher continues to play the train game with Valya. Vova remains silent with his head down on his desk. He then lifts his head and for a few seconds observes the teacher and Valya playing. Vova appears upset; his eyes are full of tears. He periodically rubs his face trying to dry tears running down his face. Maxim watches him closely and tries to engage with him. He tries to establish eye contact with Vova, while smiling and leaning towards him. Vova seems upset and does not react to Maxim’s attempts, until he hears the word ‘makaka’ (macaque in English) pronounced in the game by the teacher. Valya begins laughing at the word. Maxim also laughs and leans closer to Vova. He smiles and whispers something to him. Vova smiles and whispers back to Maxim (see Figure 6.7).
Vova begins to engage with Maxim by whispering back and for a few seconds, the children exchange in a quiet conversation that they both find amusing. They smile and laugh at what they are saying. The researcher can hear variations of the word ‘makaka’, which the teacher used in the train game. Vova stops crying and begins to smile; his body and posture seems more relaxed (see Figure 6.8). Maxim continues talking to him in a cheerful playful manner; he smiles and leans towards him (see Figure 6.7).

Figure 6.8

Vova’s emotions change
The teacher notices the exchange and demands that both children return to the tasks she gave them: Vova to reading the sounds in the book, Maxim to doing his mathematics exercise. At that moment, Vova responds in a loud, defiant tone:

Teacher: Vova, you are not doing what I asked you.

Vova: I am doing it (reading sounds). Only silently.

Teacher: No, you are not. What did I ask you to do? Take your chair and move to the corner and do it. You are just laughing with Maxim.

Vova: (drops his head on the desk, makes a squeaky noise as if starting to sob, defiantly): Ugh! But I’m better at the desk.

Vova remains at his desk and begins observing his book as if reading. Maxim looks in his exercise book and picks up a pen. By this time, the lesson is over. The teacher dismisses Valya. Vova and Maxim remain silent for a few minutes; the teacher shares with the children that she has to inform their parents about their behaviour during her lesson. She dismisses the boys; they pack their bags and leave the school.

Discussion—Vignette 6.1

During the train game, Vova whispered a rude word to Valya and repeated the word to the teacher. The teacher did not display emotion and calmly asked him to complete sit-ups. When Vova was challenged by the teacher to find a correct word in the train game, he displayed emotions and pushed the ball off his desk and initiated an argument with the teacher, while trying to put forward his point of view. Vova’s voicing of the swear words and disposition seemed to upset the teacher and she began to discipline him.

The first time the teacher disciplined Vova by asking him to do sit-ups. It is possible that this disciplinary measure is a routine practice in this teacher’s classroom because Vova did not seem surprised when he was asked to complete the sit-ups. However, Vova was reluctant to complete the sit-ups and did not seem to be emotionally engaged in the task. He quickly completed his sit-ups and returned to the train game.
The second time, the teacher excluded Vova because he pushed the ball from the desk and could not find a word beginning with the letter ‘R’. Vova was excluded from the train game; the teacher requested that he sit in the corner of the room and complete the reading exercise by himself. This disciplinary measure seemed to upset Vova because he displayed a dramatic emotion to this request. He yelled ‘no’, dropped his head on his desk and began crying.

Vova’s emotional response shows that the second type of discipline initiated by the teacher (move away from the game) has a different meaning for Vova than does the first punishment (sit-ups). The child seemed emotionally engaged with the situation—he was visibly upset at the request for him to move away from the game. Vova refused to move away; he yelled ‘no’, dropped his head on the table and cried. The emotional reaction lasted for a considerable time (240 seconds). It seems he was finding it challenging to regulate his emotions. It was only after his brother’s intervention and repeated attempts to engage with him that Vova stopped crying.

Table 6.2 summarises Maxim’s strategies as he tried to engage with his brother and provide emotional support as Vova experiences intense dramatic moment.

**Table 6.2**

*Sibling Comfort and Successful Peer Regulation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maxim—Sibling creating conditions for peer regulation</th>
<th>Vova’s reaction to Maxim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategy 1</td>
<td>Attempts to physically touch Vova</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy 2</td>
<td>Attempts to establish eye contact, smiles and leans towards Vova</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy 3</td>
<td>Uses positive emotions, physical closeness and verbal talk</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The teacher’s idea of co-regulating emotions with and for Vova

The teacher–Vova and Vova–Maxim interactions during dramatic moments (see Vignette 6.1) reveal how the Kitezh school as an institutional practice creates conditions for the development of children’s self-regulation.

The teacher helped Vova name his emotions and behaviour, with the aim of creating conditions so that he can recognise and name emotions in the future. The teacher stated, ‘Look Vova, you tried everything. You said a bad swearing word, you show us that you got offended, and now you are simply making a performance, hysteria for us. We don’t need it’.

Children learn to self-regulate their emotions through co-regulating with adults (Holodynski & Friedlmeier, 2006). The teacher gave Vova a coping strategy—she requested that he do sit-ups and then after the second challenging behaviour, asked him to withdraw from the train game and complete the reading task. At that moment, Vova was unable to control his immediate response to the situation because it seemed he does not want to be excluded. The teacher co-constructed the strategy with the aim of supporting the child to learn how to use this in the future without her help. According to the teacher’s interview, eventually Vova will be able to distance himself from his dramatic moment and will not act on his immediate need (e.g., burst into tears or yell).

During dramatic moments, the teacher remained calm; her tone of voice and body language remained neutral. Research shows that the teacher’s calm and neutral reaction to the child’s anger and negative emotions reduces the intensity of the child’s expressed anger and anxiety (Morris et al., 2007). However, in Vignette 6.1, Vova displayed dramatic moments despite the teacher’s calm and neutral reaction.

The teacher’s voice and her whole demeanour towards Vova conveyed a calm but seemingly neutral attitude; her face showed no emotion. She looked down at Vova rather than in his eyes when she spoke to him. She sounded polite, yet there seemed to be no warmth in their interaction because of her neutral tone of voice and the way she observed the child. When Vova experiences a dramatic moment, the teacher does not provide emotional support to him. Research shows that warm, supportive and responsive interaction with adults helps children understand their own emotional
experiences and the emotional experiences of others (Willingham, 2011). Vova’s repeated refusal to comply with the teacher’s demand and his inappropriate interaction with Maxim is an indication of this possibility.

Table 6.3

*Teacher1 Pedagogy and Ideas of Co-regulation—Telling the Child What to do*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher’s strategies</th>
<th>The child’s challenging behaviour (as deemed by the teacher)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategy 1</strong> Shows no emotions when the child displays challenging behaviour and then experiences dramatic moments</td>
<td>Says a swear word (to the teacher)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategy 2</strong> Asks the child to do physical activity</td>
<td>Ignores first request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategy 3</strong> Ignores further challenging behaviour of the child</td>
<td>Deliberately pushes ball off desk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ignores interactions between focus children</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategy 4</strong> Excludes the child from the group activity</td>
<td>Cannot find the correct word, insists on changing the rules of the game</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategy 5</strong> Threatens to tell the parents about the child’s behaviour</td>
<td>Refuses to comply with the teacher’s demand to be excluded from the game; child enters dramatic moment of defiance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findings indicate that the teacher’s strategies seemed to encourage Vova to continue to display challenging behaviour rather than provide support for self-regulation.

Child’s perspective and peer regulation.

In this vignette, Maxim was focused on Vova. As evidenced from Vignette 6.1, from the beginning of the reading class to the end (see Figures 6.2–6.8), Maxim continued to interact with Vova, who remained the focus of his attention. Maxim’s eyes were constantly on Vova. The child positioned his body in a way that he could easily observe Vova. Maxim was actively involved in the train game, even though he was aware of the teacher’s demand to do his own mathematics exercise independently. Maxim’s involvement intensified when Vova began to experience a dramatic moment (see Figure 6.6).
In this example, extending Holodynski and Friedlmeier’s (2006) findings of adults helping children to self-regulate, it is indicated that siblings help regulate each other’s emotions. Maxim immediately noticed Vova’s emotional state and began interacting with him.

It is possible that Vova’s intent to work with the values initiated by the teacher depends on how he positions himself within the activity setting. The child’s position seemed to be linked to his demands and motives. For example, it is possible that Vova wanted to maintain his position as a ‘good’ student, but this seemed to be linked with his motive directed towards gaining emotional support. When the teacher in Vignette 6.1 interacted with the focus child in a way that did not seem conducive to meeting his demand, Vova sought an alternative mode of action and received an alternative response (connected to Maxim, as explained in Vignette 6.1). Vova did not interact positively with the teacher and was unable to be positioned as a ‘good’ student. This is evidenced by Vova’s behaviour in Vignette 6.1, after a dramatic moment is experienced with the teacher, when Maxim reaches out to interact with him. Maxim seemed to meet Vova’s demand for support. The strategies the teacher attempted to implement to co-regulate Vova were not as effective as Maxim’s because Vova continued his actions until the end of the class.

Findings indicate that within the process of learning to self-regulate, Vova sought for an affective link to mediate the process. The link has to satisfy the child’s need: in this case, Vova’s need for emotional support. Once Vova found the link (provided by his brother, Maxim), he was able to self-regulate and resume his participation in the group activity, although not in the way his teacher intended. By providing emotional support to Vova through Maxim, Kitezh school institutional practice creates condition that supports Vova’s learning to self-regulate.

Section 6.2.1.2 presents Vignette 6.2, in which interaction between Vova and his peers during physical education class is explored. The focus is on peer regulation when Vova tries to intervene as Maxim is experiencing a dramatic moment with his classmate (Valya). The purpose of this example is to analyse the active role children play in a particular setting. The analysis explores how the focus child transfers the cultural values of the adult world to his practice and how his interaction with peers is linked to their acquisition of motives to act in a certain way.
6.2.1.2 Vignette 6.2

In this example, the teacher (Teacher 2, Alexander) is a short-term resident of Kitezh. Alexander is a graduate from one of the top Moscow universities with a double degree in Teaching and Arts. He has been teaching in the Kitezh school for two years.

The activity setting is a physical education class—an everyday experience for the children. The participants are Vova, Maxim, classmate Valya and teacher Alexander. The activity is a warm-up exercise, which the teacher calls ‘spider’s walk’. According to the teacher’s rules, the children have to do the exercise in turn, rather than together and do the spider’s walk to the end of the mat, then run back in an upright position. Vova notices Valya attempting to do the spider’s walk on her way back, instead of running as requested by the teacher. He turns his head, observes Valya and yells at her (see Figure 6.9).

*Figure 6.9*

_Vova yells out to Valya_


Valya ignores him and continues doing the spider’s walk all the way back (see Figure 6.10).
Figure 6.10

*Vova observes Valya when she continues to do exercise her way*
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Vova eyebrows are sternly together; it is inferred he is angry with Valya for not following his instructions. Valya smiles, giggles and continues to do the exercise her way. Maxim catches up with Valya and for a brief moment, he is quite near to her. He turns to her (see Figure 6.11).

Figure 6.11

*Maxim talks to Valya*
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Maxim (loud and with strong disgust in his tone): Yak! Your socks! Oh! Yak! (looking directly at Valya).
The teacher hears Maxim and steps closer.

Teacher (kneels close to Maxim and speaks in a calm, quiet tone): Why do you pick on her? Why do you offend her?

Valya begins taking her socks off. At that moment, Vova quickly moves closer to the children and observes Valya’s socks (see Figure 6.12).

**Figure 6.12**

*Vova moves closer*

Maxim (to the teacher): I just … I do not like that she shows her teeth.

Teacher (very calm): So … do you have to tell her that? You have the need to express it to her?

Vova positions himself between Maxim and Valya and observes Maxim (see Figure 6.13).
Figure 6.13

**Vova positions himself between Maxim and Valya**

Figure 6.1

Valya moves closer to the teacher and hides herself in his arms, seeking comfort. Vova tilts his head sideways and observes Valya (see Figure 6.14).

**Figure 6.14**

*Valya seeks comfort in the teacher’s arms; Vova observes them*

Figure 6.1

Vova then turns to Maxim and talks to him (see Figure 6.15).
Vova (articulating loudly): She does not have rotten socks. She has normal socks!

Maxim (to Vova, loudly): But she has one sock with a hole in it!

Vova (to Maxim): So, what! (very loud) I don’t care!

Vova moves towards Valya and touches her on the head (see Figure 6.16).

Figure 6.16

*Vova comforts Valya*
Vova: Valya is a good girl. Do not be upset, Valya. You know, Maxim was expelled from school yesterday.

Teacher: We do not talk about it here. (To Maxim) Do you like if someone says you have clothes with holes in it? Do you like if someone says that you were expelled from school? Do you like it or not?

Maxim: If you want you can say that. I don’t care.

Teacher: It is better not to say things like that.

Vova: Well, how can I put it? Valya is an educated girl. She does not have rotten socks. It is just at her place they do not wash things every day. They wash it every second day.

Valya: Because it is cold.

Teacher: OK, let’s continue our lesson. But I want you to know that in my class when I am here …

At that moment, Maxim moves away from his position, crawls closer to Vova and turns his head away from the teacher.

Teacher: Maxim!

Maxim: What? (loudly and defiantly, still looks away)

Teacher: Move here closer to me and sit down here please. When I am talking to you, I need to see you look at me.

The teacher observes Maxim, waiting for him to obey his request. Maxim still looks away from the teacher; he tilts his head backwards, lies on his back and observes the ceiling. He remains in this position for a few seconds until Vova takes his hand and twists one of his fingers twisting his hand backwards (see Figure 6.17).
Maxim screams, arises, steps closer to the teacher and begins doing sit-ups. The teacher watches him in surprise.

Teacher: What are you doing Maxim? I just wanted you to sit down here, on your bottom, and look at me when I am talking to you.

Vova: Oh, what? What’s needed? He is doing sit-ups, you know, sit-ups.

Teacher: Oh, I see. I just wanted you to sit here near me. OK, let’s do one more round of spider’s walk.

The children stand and begin doing the exercise.

Teacher and sibling directing self-regulation

In Vignette 6.2, Vova attempted to regulate his peer Valya and sibling Maxim. First, he raised his voice at Valya, demanding that she ran, rather than complete the spider walk on her way back. Vova requested that Valya follow the teacher’s instructions. Maxim commented on Vova’s socks. The teacher comforted her and Vova defended Valya against Maxim’s comments about her socks and showing her teeth when she smiles. Vova offered empathy to Valya by stroking her head in a similar way to the teacher. Vova attempted to twists Maxim’s finger, prompting him to do what the teacher asked.
In the explained situation, Vova supported the teacher’s position and adopted a regulatory role for his peer and sibling. By defending Valya against his brother, Vova changed the culture of the interaction between his peers in this activity setting, supporting his teacher’s position that such remarks are not tolerated. It is possible that this is evidence of Vova’s imitating values of the adult world and actively trying to change the way children participate in the activity.

In this vignette, Maxim experienced a dramatic moment when he first offended Valya with his remark about her socks, then was confronted by Vova and the teacher. It is possible that being under pressure from both Vova and the teacher was overwhelming for Maxim. The child withdrew and refused to cooperate with the teacher and defied the teacher’s attempt to draw him into dialogue. Maxim showed inferred defiance, first by verbally denying that the remarks do not have an effect on him (teacher/child dialogue, p. 151), second, by physically moving away from the teacher, leaning backwards, lying on the mat and deliberately watching the ceiling when the teacher asked him to look at him. Maxim responded to the teacher in a rude and loud manner (teacher/child dialogue on p. 151. Only when Vova twisted his finger did Maxim stand and move closer to the teacher. To the teacher’s surprise, Maxim began doing sit-ups. The teacher explained that he simply wanted Maxim to move closer and sit down next to him, looking at him when he communicates to the child.

This section presented findings of how the focus child (Vova) experienced his interaction with his peers in dramatic moment and how his interaction created conditions for development of their motives and self-regulation.

Peer and sibling interaction: How children develop motives guided by cultural values.

Bozhovich (2009) argued for the importance of analysing the child’s needs because this supports understanding of how the environment influences the child. In Vignette 6.2, the conditions for children’s participation in the spider’s walk activity are determined by the motives of the child and the demands of the activity setting (Alexander’s physical education class). The teacher established the rules and asked the children to comply with them. However, once the activity was initiated, the teacher did not directly interfere in the process. The children acted autonomously and
completed the spider walk the way they wanted. However, their interaction and participation were
guided by the values of the activity setting (following the rules and the teacher’s affective position).
Once the focus child (Vova) noticed the rules of the spider walk exercise were not being followed
(by Valya), he took on the role of trying to reinforce them. The way children behave during conflict
when they interact with each other reflects the values that guide their relevant cultures (Martínez-
Lozano et al., 2011).

When a conflict arose between Maxim and Valya (Maxim commented on Valya’s socks and
the way she shows her teeth), Vova intervened and defended his peer (Valya) against his brother’s
remarks. By acting in Valya’s interests, it was inferred that Vova wanted to resolve the conflict by
supporting his peer, not his brother. A growing number of studies indicate that peer interaction has
an important role in child development (Martínez-Lozano et al., 2011). Here, it is sibling regulation
that is found to adjust his brother’s behaviour.

Vova’s reactions coincided with the teacher’s position; he was empathetic towards Valya
and questioned why Maxim commented on Valya’s socks and teeth. The teacher positioned Valya
as ‘strong and intelligent’. The teacher modelled affective behaviour and Vova imitated it
immediately by supporting Valya (moving closer to her and stroking her face). Vygotsky (1987)
explained that ‘imitation is the source of instruction’s influence on development’ (pp. 210–211). By
imitating the teacher’s warmth, it is suggested that Vova affectively positioned himself as a
protective and empathetic pupil within this activity setting (Alexander’s physical education lesson).
The child’s position was influenced by his perezhivanie with the teacher.

It is not possible to determine the exact nature of Vova’s intent when he decided to support
his teacher’s position during the dramatic moment. One possibility is that the Vova related to the
teacher’s affective positioning (Quinones, 2013) towards Valya. Table 6.4 summarises findings in
relation to Teacher 2 (Alexander) pedagogy and Vova’s contribution to the process of Valya’s and
Maxim’s self-regulation, as explained in Vignette 6.2.
Findings indicate that the teacher’s strategy in this instance supports Vova’s self-regulation, but not his brother Maxim’s. This indicates that each child brings their own experience to the situation and each child experiences the situation in a different way (Vygotsky, 1998). A second finding indicates that Maxim is able to self-regulate with the physical support of his brother (twisting his finger) given that he completed sit-ups.

Peer interaction: A setting in which children develop motives

Research suggests that peer interaction has a developing and enriching effect on children’s development (Asher & Coie, 1990; Coie & Dodge, 1998; Damon, 1994, as cited in Martínez-Lozano et al., 2011). Vova acting in support of the teacher’s position seems to have an immediate regulatory effect on his peer (Valya) and sibling. Vova changed the way Maxim and Valya participated in the activity setting. In peer interaction, children regulate behaviours of each other by
supporting those they think appropriate and criticising those who do not coincide with the rules of the activity setting (Rubin et al., 2006). By observing Vova actively supporting Valya, Maxim seemed to develop a new motive—avoid what the teacher and his brother said and not display emotions (‘I don’t care. You can say that’). Vova took his finger and twisted it, which supported Maxim to self-regulate as he determines his own punishment (completing sit-ups).

When the teacher, Alexander, created conditions that satisfied Vova’s demand by modelling empathy and emotional support and reflecting that the remarks made were not appropriate, Vova interacted positively with the teacher and Valya. He maintained his position as a ‘good’ student for the duration of the class. Despite the fact that his brother Maxim experienced a dramatic moment, Vova did not support him, but chose to support the teacher. Vova initiated Maxim’s compliance with the teacher’s demand (to move closer and look at him) by taking and twisting his finger, taking a physical regulatory role of his brother’s actions.

6.2.1.3 Summary: How Vova and Maxim learn to self-regulate at school

Vova’s and Maxim’s developing ability to self-regulate within Kitezh school activity unfolds within a three-dimensional learning process: first is how the twins learn values of Kitezh school institutional practice. The two teachers act as agents of the environment (the source of the children’s development), placing their cultural values as demands on the children’s participation in the activity settings. As Vova and Maxim participate in the activity setting, it seems they move through the process of experiencing cultural values. The teacher attempts to co-regulate the children by offering different strategies that support cultural values. The children also learn through regulating each other and their peers, as evidenced in Vignette 6.1 and 6.2.

It is suggested that there is a difference between Vova and Maxim’s level of understanding when participating in and with Kitezh school institutional values. By choosing to imitate the teacher’s response (as explained in Vignette 6.2), Vova seemed to demonstrate that he understood that his brother’s actions were in tension with the values and demands of the school’s institutional practice. Despite Maxim’s dramatic emotional moment, Vova chose to work with and support the teacher, rather than his brother.
The second dimension is the development of motives. As Vova and Maxim continue to participate in the activity settings in their everyday life, they begin to transform values into new motives that guide their participation in the activity settings. Development of new motives alters the children’s immediate reaction during a dramatic moment as they learn to control their emotions and actions; this is linked to the process of self-regulation. However, Vova and Maxim are not passive recipients of adults’ values and demands. The children act on their own motives and modify their participation in the activity settings by putting forward their own demands. In this two-directional process—adults placing their demands on the child’s participation in the activity settings and the child putting his own demands on his participation—the relationship between the child and the environment changes (Vygotsky, 1998). Within this change, the development of qualitative new motives evolves, which are neither set as demands by the adults, nor demands by the child. These new motives contribute to the development of self-regulation (as explained in Vignette 6.1).

Vova’s interaction with the two teachers and their demands have a developing role for Vova’s motives and self-regulation. Similarly, Vova’s interaction with his peers has a developing effect on his peers and is observed as an activity setting in which children develop new motives (as explained in Vignette 6.2).

The third dimension is how Vova and Maxim position themselves when they participate in Kitezh school institutional practice. Vova’s and Maxim’s intent to work with the values initiated by the teachers depends on how they position themselves within the activity setting. This is linked to the children’s perezhivaniye and needs/demands. In other words, the child’s position as either good or bad within Kitezh school depends on how he emotionally experiences each situation and how that situation met the needs/demands the child places on it (Bozhovich, 2009). In some instances, the children’s positioning reveals their motives and demands (as explained in Vignette 6.2). For example, Vova not only seeks to satisfy his personal motive for emotional support when he experiences dramatic moments (as explained in Vignette 6.1—Maxim and Vova), he also seems to positively interact with the teacher, who demonstrates they are able to meet this demand (as explained in Vignette 6.2—the teacher and Valya).
6.3 Conclusion

In this chapter, Kitezh school institutional practice was introduced and two examples were discussed to explore how Vova and Maxim learn to self-regulate at school. Chapter 7 introduces Kitezh community institutional practice and explores how focus children interact with each other, their peers and a community member when they participate in a group activity in the park.
Chapter 7: Kitezh Institutional Practices: Community

7.1 Introduction

This chapter introduces Kitezh Children’s Community and explains how members of the community create conditions for development of children’s self-regulation. As in Chapter 5 (Family) and 6 (School), self-regulation is viewed from cultural–historical perspective. It is viewed through the process of development, rather than as a final form and is explored as changing relationship between a child and the environment.

As explained in Chapters 5 and 6, the study uses Hedegaard’s model (2012). Specifically, the institutional perspective that relates to the school, home and after-school practices continues to be used for analysis. The focus here is the Kitezh community: the third and final institutional dimension in which the practices are examined. Similar to Chapters 5–6, this chapter begins with the adults’ perspective and then examines the third plane of Hedegaard’s model—the child’s perspective to understand the child’s motives and intentions that guide the child’s actions within their community setting (Hedegaard, 2008). Dramatic moments continue to be used as a tool for analysis when there is a dramatic event which highlights a conflict between the child’s intentions and the demands of the immediate practice.

The chapter begins by explaining Kitezh community values and educational pedagogy. The information is derived from the interviews with Dmitry Morozov and two community leaders. The first leader is the Kitezh School Principal Victor Anisimov, who was also a community leader for many years. The second is Vladimir—the current community leader. In addition, Morozov’s books and internet publications were used as information sources.

7.2 Kitezh Children’s’ Community Institutional Practice

7.2.1 Morozov’s perspective: Empathy and contribution by each member

Morozov’s philosophy provides attention to the inner world of a child specifically, moral development, which for young children who have experienced trauma is believed to be at the core of the healing process (Morozov, 2008). Therefore, in the Kitezh community, a ‘developmental
environment’ is created. This is directed towards facilitating each child’s process of development, by creating conditions related to three interrelated dimensions—nature, family and community. These dimensions are key within the therapeutic community (Morozov’s interview).

Morozov referred to Kitezh as a community in which children have the focus of attention from all adults and each child feels loved, safe and treated with respect:

From the very beginning in Kitezh Vova and Maxim were not stressed. The adults were not aggressive, they show their sympathy to these children. Every adult in Kitezh would come up to them, lean down and say, ‘Hello, how are you?’. The children felt they are acknowledged, noticed. The community village is set up in the way that houses are close to each other. There are no fences around houses, no angry dogs, no aggressive people around.

When asked how Vova and Maxim experienced their transition from home to school, Morozov noted that school in Kitezh is quite different from the typical school in Russia:

We have very few children in Kitezh school, and they don’t need to walk far to get to it, it is only a few steps away from their houses. The Kitezh school is all around you, the children are not afraid of it. It is possible that Vova and Maxim saw other children not being afraid of school. And they saw their teachers often within the community, they were familiar with them before they met them as teachers.

The environment creates conditions for each child’s development (Vygotsky, 2004) because each part of the community is physically close. Due to the close proximity of the school to the houses, familiarity is built. This extends to members of the community because they are all physically close and together create a safe and familiar community.

In addition, Morozov emphasised that the physical transition from home to school in Kitezh happens in a gentle way in comparison with other families in Russia, where children have to be driven to school by car and parents have to go to work, often far from school. In Kitezh, the parents are not required to leave the community to work and children do not use transport to travel to school.
When asked what conditions foster children’s self-regulation, Morozov responded that for children, particularly for those who were traumatised (which comprise most Kitezh children), it is critical that the child’s challenges experienced in the home environment are resolved. He explained:

A child brings to school all his fears, challenges and problems. A child brings to school all his relationship with his parents, friends and community. It is not possible for a teacher to make a child learn, to draw the child’s attention to the lesson if all these problems are not resolved. A child sits in class and all those problems are in his head, so all he can think of is to bolt from the class as soon as possible. He sees the teacher as some outsider. Therefore, in Kitezh we try to address the child’s inner world, organise it.

Morozov advised that to foster self-regulation, the most important condition he tries to create during his lessons is empathy and respectful relationships. According to him, it is particularly important for traumatised children:

When I teach, I feel every student. I establish deeply trustful, respectful relationship with every student. Safe relationship. When I talk to them, I look into their eyes, I feel their interest. I stop (the lesson) if even one student loses his interest. I take a break. Whether you teach maths, history or Russian, you establish deeply trustful, safe relationship with a child. And the child learns because you respect him. You teach him because you like him. And the child knows that, he respects you. Perhaps the impersonal school also has the right to exist, but not with traumatised children.

Morozov emphasised that the role of each parent and educator is to recognise the child’s individual qualities that will unfold during their life course and direct each child in the here and now towards a positive future:

After 25 years of my work with traumatised children, I come to conclusion that every human being comes to this world with a large number of inborn attributes. These are temperament, energy level, conscience, already you can tell from a very young age. What we sometimes loosely describe as inborn program of each child, sets the limits of each child’s development. The program of reactions, how the child reacts to good and evil, that
program is inborn. The aim of each parent and educator is to recognise that program which the child come with to this world, then it is possible to direct some of its aspects to a more socially acceptable channel. For example, a child comes to this world with qualities of a warrior, but we have no war. If a child can express his anger in a poem, he won’t punch you in the face.

It is suggested that Morozov’s approach to pedagogy is to acknowledge and recognise the individual genetic characteristics of each child and their inborn program, which sets limits on each child’s development. This contrasts to Vygotsky’s (1998) understanding of learning through social interaction; he considered all higher mental functions in humans as not innate, but as developing through social interaction. However, both Morozov and Vygotsky (1997) agreed on the important role that education plays in each child’s development.

When asked about how Vova and Maxim learn to self-regulate, Morozov responded that these children learn not only at school but also within Kitezh community. He emphasised that the very principle of Kitezh community is that every member must contribute and the expectations from the community are that Vova and Maxim make their own input:

Vova and Maxim have many opportunities to make their input. They help their parents at the farm, they help in the community canteen, they help their teacher at school. They learn 24/7, what is expected from them.

There are similarities between Morozov’s and Vygotsky’s understandings. What each child brings to the situation shapes the environment and the environment shapes the child; it is a reciprocal relation between the child’s development and the environment that contributes to the process of development (Vygotsky, 1994).

When asked about development of moral behaviour of the twins, Morozov explained that they would not always relay the facts of what occurred when they were new to Kitezh. He noticed that the twins did not display aggression but sometimes displayed anger.

In summary, Morozov’s philosophy, which is the foundation for Kitezh community, contributes to creating conditions for a therapeutic community for orphaned children and their
adoptive families in Russia. The strategies were agreed upon by all Kitezh community members and form a system that all members of the community live and are guided by. From the interview with Morozov, the overarching ideas are:

- creating conditions to build a ‘developmental environment’ with a focus on nature, family and community
- attention to the inner world of a child and moral development, which Morozov argued supports development of children who have experienced trauma
- building a safe and supportive community where each child feels loved, and is treated with respect
- physical environment created so children and adults are in close proximity
- challenging experiences in the home environment need to be resolved before learning begins
- empathy and building respectful relationships
- recognition of individual inborn characteristics that limit each child’s development.

These ideas shaped practical strategies that members of the Kitezh community had implemented throughout the years. The strategies are currently operational and form the system of Kitezh community developmental tools. The strategies are introduced and further discussed in the following section where the school principal and community leaders contribute to the discussion.

7.2.2 School principal’s perspective: Osoznaniye

Victor Anisimov (pseudonym) is a long-term resident of Kitezh. He holds PhD in Education and graduated from Tula State Pedagogical University. Victor continues his research work, writes journal articles and presents at national conferences on education and family pedagogy. He has several publications on early school years (in Russian).

Victor’s input is important for this study because he has been living in Kitezh with his wife and their adopted children for 15 years. He has held the position of principal of Kitezh school for the whole time. In addition, for several years, and only one month prior to the data collection for this study, he was a community leader.
When interviewed about the twins’ transition into Kitezh from a state orphanage, Victor mentioned that the children’s speech required further development and during their first few months they tried to be with their adoptive parents all the time:

For the first few months they [Vova and Maxim] were always trying to be as close to their parents as possible. They walk everywhere holding to their hands. The children constantly appeal to their parents to obtain feedback from them in relation to everything: their speech, their behaviour—everything.

The children only played with toys. They neither built a plot of the game, nor did any role-play. For quite some time they were not able to organise any play, they always needed an adult to organise it. They also could not understand any time frames: they did not know the seasons, or even what is today, tomorrow and yesterday.

Victor explained that the process of becoming familiar and understanding the Kitezh community was complicated for the twins because the mother’s biological child was living in their adoptive family. The entire family was required to make adjustments. Victor stated:

The children have to compete for their parents’ attention with Nata. That created many conflicts, especially in the beginning. Nata also had to assert her position in that family and they used to fight a lot. Gradually, it got better. Nata established herself firmly in the position of an older sister, and the twins now her younger brothers whom she teaches (reads to them etc). She still regulates their behaviour very firmly.

When asked about conditions that Kitezh community created to help the children live within the family and community, Victor explained:

Together with the clinical psychologist, we created a correctional program for the twins which included a number of measures to develop their abilities. The program included play therapy and exercises to develop their sensory-motor skills and speech. The program also included separate recommendations for the parents to help the twins’ transition into their adoptive family. This included recommendations for the mother and the father how to build
relationship with Vova and Maxim, so that they have clear boundaries and understanding of the roles within the family, communication strategies.

The program supports the whole child within the community and highlights the importance of play, indicating the importance of Hedegaard’s (2008) wholeness approach to children’s development. The community leader indicated the importance of clear boundaries and understanding the role that the children had within the family, which is made explicit to the parents and children. The child’s development is a focus particularly development of communication strategies, including speech and sensory-motor skills.

Victor also mentioned that the kindergarten (in nearby village Baryatino) had a positive impact on the children:

The kindergarten was a great setting for the twins to learn how to build social relationships. The group they attended was big enough for that. The kindergarten helped them to learn the ethical boundaries of behaviour: very quickly they started to understand who is doing something wrong and who is doing [something] right.

When asked how the twins had changed from the moment of their initial few days in Kitezh, Victor emphasised that the children’s focus is now turned much more towards the ‘external world’:

Now they are more switched on to the world around them. They want to include people in their play, children and adults alike. They are more social: they learn how to discuss things with people, how to negotiate. Their speech changed too: now they use subordinate clauses, causal links. They also create their own play spaces around their house where they have their little construction projects.

Victor also discussed the differences between Vova and Maxim:

Vova is much more open. He wants to establish contact and expresses his opinion openly.

Maxim in more focused on his internal world, his internal feelings. He is more cautious with people.
In addition, Victor commented on the children’s behaviour, noting the competition between the brothers and with other children particularly when following (or not following) the rules of the community:

Each of them wants to be seen as ‘the best’ in terms of how they do things in Kitezh, how they behave. I noticed that this competition often means “I am good, but Maxim is not”. In other words, each child wants to be good at the account of another. They often complain about each other, ‘tell on’ each other and other children.

Victor predicted that the competition would continue between the twins for several years, until they develop their understanding of respectful relationships.

When asked why Vova and Maxim often threaten to take each other to court, Victor explained that ‘court’ is one of the children’s projects in Kitezh. The court is organised to help children resolve conflicts between each other and between children and adults. Court members are elected by Kitezh children. There is one adult curator who holds an administrative role and does not influence the court’s decisions. Every child in Kitezh can ask the court to become involved in a situation when it arises. Victor mentioned that often children in Kitezh, including Vova and Maxim, use the court as a threat to have their demands met.

Victor explained that Children’s Court in the Kitezh has its own constitution that governs the work of their executive body Junior Council (Malyi Sovet):

Children write what they want to see into their constitution. They record their values, their inspirations in the constitution which then governs the work of the Junior Council.

In addition, Victor explained that in Kitezh children attend Osoznaniye (from Russian soznanie—consciousness). The closest English translation is ‘awareness’; however, it does not do justice to this word because it only reflects one meaning: to be aware of something, while the Russian word osoznanie suggests not only awareness, but full understanding. Victor explained what it means in Kitezh:

Osoznaniye is a joint children and adults gathering which happens in Kitezh on regular basis (usually once or twice a week). At osoznanie children have an opportunity to raise an issue
of their concern or interest. Alternatively, adults offer a topic. The issue is discussed, questions are raised, arguments and strategies developed. I see it as a tool for developing reflection, conscious awareness of their [children’s] own actions. It is a group osoznanie.

Vygotsky (1998) argued that prerequisite of the mastery of one’s own behaviour is reflection in consciousness (p. 171). In other words, a person’s ability to self-control and self-regulate depends on his ability to consciously reflect in his mind what he is doing. Vygotsky explained that consciousness of one’s own mental operations is the essential condition for a person’s ability to subordinate his actions to his own authority (Vygotsky, 1998). He also argued that such ability (consciousness of one’s own mental operations) develops in children quite late (Vygotsky, 1998).

By organising regular osoznaniye (from Russian soznaniye—consciousness) meetings, members of the Kitezh community create conditions for children to develop conscious reflection of their own actions by naming and acknowledging their behaviour. When asked about who is present during osoznanie gatherings, Victor replied that usually there is a group of children (e.g., all children of certain age and one mentor who is currently responsible for that group). Victor further stated:

At osoznaniye, the adults try to create an atmosphere where children can make a decision. Children learn to make decisions and accept certain laws of living together in the community (in Kitezh).

Victor also explained that in addition to osoznanie, all members of the community have weekly community meetings in which all children and adults can raise issues for discussion.

Victor mentioned that if the Vova and Maxim (or other children) were noted to be going against expected behaviours or values expected, the purpose of the discussion was not to instil a feeling of guilt or the feeling that punishment is inevitable. He offered:

First is to help them [Vova and Maxim] understand the social meaning of their actions, how it affects other people. Second to help them understand that relationship between people
always suffer when they [Vova and/or Maxim] do something wrong, and they need to compensate for that damage. To mend the relationship.

Vygotsky wrote that children develop self-control and voluntary direction of their action in the process of participation in the games with rules. Vygotsky argued that the child first learns to conform to the rules of the game and masters it together with other children in a small group when he plays, then later the child learns how to modify and control his individual behaviour by himself, when he is not in a game (Vygotsky, 1998, p. 169).

Vygotsky (1998) views the origin of self-regulation in children’s play, the game with rules. The focus children participation in the Kitezh community initiated what were referred to as games such as *osoznanie*. The Children’s Court gives the children an opportunity to learn the rules of these games and gradually learn to self-regulate with the support of the community. For example, by participating in Children’s Court the children discuss with other children, who have raised concerns about them. This can lead to an argument and within the process of argument, and confrontation within the group the children first learn how to behave according to the socially accepted rule of the small group. Then the next form of behaviour develops, when the children transfer the learning from the group situation to their individual understanding to enact this in their everyday life. Gradually the children learn to self-regulate on individual level, they learn to control their first impulses and subordinate their activity to the rules accepted within Kitezh community.

This learning is possible through development of conscious reflection, by participating in *osoznaniye*, the children experience the learning and gradually develop strategies to participate in conscious reflection of their actions. The development of conscious reflection is linked to the development of children’s speech (Vygotsky, 1998).

When asked if that system is congruent to the system of upbringing that exists within Vova and Maxim’s home, Victor explained that both parents know the boundaries within which any system of discipline should be built:

It is possible that parents’ system (of upbringing) is different to the one I just mentioned (compensation for damaged relationship). But one thing I know for a fact—both parents
understand that any disciplinary system should have limits where punishment does not turn into physical or psychological abuse.

When asked about Kitezh system of values, Victor answered:

The system is oriented towards the needs of Kitezh children, the needs of their development and rehabilitation. In relationship (between adults and children) the same values as declared in the role-play “I build the world” are used. This includes osoznannost, constant development and attempts to understand the state of the child. In reality however, often collisions between those values and real-life experience occur. That creates a space where mistakes are discussed and strategies are developed.

When discussing further about Kitezh system of values, Anisimov revealed:

There is a unity between interconnectedness of all of us living in Kitezh, and individual responsibility of each member. Yes, everything is interconnected, but at the same time the child learns to understand that does not mean he or she is not responsible for their individual actions. There is a certain balance between collective interconnectedness and individual responsibility. It is not like ‘ah, well, something is done wrong, but it is all of us done wrong’. No. Individual responsibility remains.

When asked what pedagogical or philosophical system they follow in Kitezh, Anisimov responded:

I don’t think there is a need for it in Kitezh. All pedagogues and humanists come to similar conclusions in the end. I am against any system that becomes domineering, I think people should be guarded by their experience. When circumstances change, children change, the system and values should also change.

Section 7.2.3 examines the current community leader perspective and further explains the ‘I build my world’ game.
7.2.3 Community leader’s perspective: ‘I build my world’

Vladimir is a current community leader. He is an ex-army officer and lives in Kitezh with his wife, daughter and two adopted children. During the interview, he commented about Vova and Maxim’s transition to Kitezh:

We made two decisions that helped their transition. First, we freed their parents, helped them at the farm so at least one parent was constantly available for the children during their first year at Kitezh. Second, we made a commitment and developed a roster where each adult in Kitezh took turns of looking after the twins to familiarise them with Kitezh and its people.

Vladimir shared similar observation to other adults in the community about the twins’ development, agreeing that they required support with language and social interaction from all members in the community. He commented that the twins had developed in all aspects, including their social, emotional and speech development, which he suggested was supported by the kindergarten the twins attended in the nearby village. The decision to send the twins to the kindergarten was made at the community meeting. In addition, Vladimir explained that the transition of Vova and Maxim is an ongoing process and currently it is supported by the twins participating in the ‘I build my world’ game as they entered school.

Vladimir further explained that the game is designed specifically for Kitezh children. By participating in this game, children transition through three roles: pups, students and mentors. The children start as ‘pups’—usually newcomers to Kitezh or very young children. Pups do not take responsibility for themselves or others; they are understood as active and spontaneous. Vladimir indicated that ‘pups rights are limited. This includes their participation in certain events, and time limits’.

Vladimir further explained that the next role in the game is ‘student’. To reach the status of a student, the child needs to prove that he is able to control his behaviour, organise his life and know rules of Kitezh. Once a child demonstrates that he is able to be responsible for himself (e.g., when he is able to dress and make his bed without help), the child is provided with more rights.
According to Vladimir, after ‘student’, the child progresses to take the role of ‘mentor’, where *the child is ready to take responsibility for another, not only for his own life, but also for the life of the child he wants to help. Once a year at the community meeting each child can choose a mentor out of three candidates that have been offered.*

Vladimir further explained that each stage of the ‘I build the world’ game has certain values. For example, one stage is focused on *exploring the world,* another on *respect for others* and the third can be focused on *harmony in my life.* Vladimir clarified:

The game ‘I build the world’ has existed in Kitezh for more than 10 years. The purpose of the game is to give each child a tool of development: it allows the child to see how he changes as he goes from one role to another.

Vladimir mentioned that Vova and Maxim do not have a mentor but will when they are older. Similar to other members in the community, they will be provided with the opportunity to choose their mentor among adults or older children in Kitezh.

Vladimir further explained that in addition to ‘I build my world’, children in Kitezh community are guided by accepted rules in the community. For example, instead of punishment, the community has developed a system of compensation. Vladimir explained:

If a child breaks a window, for example, he does not get punished. Instead, he needs to compensate for the damage he has done. The child can be taken to the Children’s Court where he will be asked to come out with the compensation or assigned a task for compensation. It can be as simple as making a cup of tea to the “damaged” person for several days or do some other useful tasks for them.

From the interviews with the community leaders (Victor Anisimov and Vladimir), the following projects and values concerning the Kitezh community were revealed:

- Children’s Court—allows children within Kitezh community to learn how to be responsible for their actions; this includes the system of compensation for where children learn how to compensate other children or adult members of the community for damage for which the children are responsible
• Children’s Junior Council—a role-play that helps children within Kitezh community learn about the foundations of the democratic governance of the community

• *Osoznanie*—a joint children and adult gathering that is a tool to develop reflection, conscious awareness of the children’s actions and learn community rules

• a balance between collective interconnectedness and individual responsibility that each child in Kitezh needs to learn

• the ‘I build my world’ game, in which children go through different stages that give them different levels of responsibility and access to participation in the community activities.

7.2.4 Summary

The Kitezh community leader’s and school principal’s perspectives reveal a complex and multilayered system that exists in Kitezh to guide and foster children’s development. The system includes children’s projects or role-plays such as ‘I build my world’, Junior Council and Children’s Court, as well as adult-driven ventures, such as pedagogical council and *osoznanie* meetings. Each of these projects expresses values and ideals of the Kitezh community that are placed as demands for children’s participation in this community practice. Each project does not exist in isolation but is closely linked to all other projects within Kitezh community. When children play ‘I build my world’, they not only participate with children, but also interact with adults in their family homes and within the community. Therefore, when children come to Junior Council, they have to understand ways of participation in the community. When children participate in the Children’s Court, they are guided by the principles they learnt at *osoznanie* meetings. The Kitezh system can be conceptualised as a matrix in which each separate part does not exist without another and all parts form a unity of the interconnected whole—contributing to children’s development within the community.

Vignettes 7.1 and 7.2 provide a glimpse of the interaction between the twins and the community member and schoolteacher Alexander. During play time, it is revealed how the focus children learn to self-regulate within the boundaries of this matrix, and how Kitezh developmental tools (described above) affect each child’s process of self-regulation.
7.2.5 Vignette 7.1: Dramatic moments in the community

The children (including focus children Vova and Maxim) are taken for a short walk around the village to enjoy some fresh air before their class. Alexander, one of the community members (see Chapter 6) accompanies the children.

Alexander: Why are you upset today, Vova?

Vova: Maxim abused me. He said to me, ‘You are an idiot’.

Maxim: No, I did not.

Vova tries to punch Maxim but misses and slaps air close to Maxim’s face (see Figure 7.1).

Figure 7.1

Vova tries to slap Maxim

The children keep walking.

Vova: Yes, you did. Stop lying.

Vova hits Maxim on the arm and Maxim fights back (see Figure 7.2).
Alexander: Gentlemen! (loud and stern)

Alexander holds both children firmly by the sleeves of their jackets and separates the children. He holds them tightly, keeping them away from each other (see Figure 7.3).

Alexander: Fighting is not allowed. You need to resolve all your arguments by conversation.

Do you understand? Do both of you understand?
Vova: I will get him anyway (angry, tensed whole body, walks away from the group).

Maxim: Mum also does not allow us to fight.

Alexander: No fighting.

The children continue walking.

7.2.5.1 Interpretation of Vignette 7.1

No punishment: Resolving conflict by conversation

In the above example, the community member (Alexander) is aware of the children’s emotions. He notices Vova’s mood and asks how he is doing; it is inferred he is trying to provide emotional support. When Vova turns his anger on Maxim and the boys begin fighting, the community member interferes immediately and informs them that their interactions are not acceptable. The community member provides an alternative for the children’s physical actions and explains that conflict must be resolved by conversation. Vova does not receive this explanation well, as from his physical positioning it is inferred that he remains upset and angry as he walks away from the group. He threatens to ‘get him [Maxim] anyway’. It appears that resolving the conflict by conversation is unfamiliar practice for the children. Conversely, Alexander practices a familiar Kitezh principle of ‘no punishment’, similar to that offered at osoznanie meetings and pedagogical councils that he has regularly attended over the years.

Conflict between community member demands and child’s motives

In this vignette, the social relations appear as drama—emotionally charged collision between people (Veresov, 2010). In the above example, the dramatic moment experienced between Vova and Maxim (see Figures 7.4 & 7.5) relates to fighting and arguing during their morning walk. The community member places demands on the children to resolve their conflict by conversation (see Figure 7.6).

Hedegaard (2014) asserted that children learn and develop through participation in different institutional practices when motives and demands from one practice influence another practice (e.g., demands from school practice influence learning at home; Hedegaard, 2014, p. 1). It is suggested that the new demand that Alexander places on Vova during his dramatic moment of collision with
his brother, that is to resolve the conflict by conversation, influence the way that Vova behaves (acts angry) in a similar dramatic moment at home.

Veresov et al. (2016) posited that dramatic collisions are related to crises children experience in their everyday lives. These emotionally charged intense collisions, dramatic events have a developmental function (Veresov, 2010). Vygotsky (1998) described it as everyday life crisis as opposed to age-related crisis. The crises that children endure when they experience emotionally intense dramatic moments in their everyday life are important for development, because, as Vygotsky (1998) argued, such emotional events are necessary for the development process:

Development takes on a stormy, impetuous, and sometimes catastrophic character that resembles a revolutionary course of events in both rate of the changes that are occurring and in the sense of the alterations that are made. (p. 9)

Dramatic moments act as everyday life crises that lead to qualitative changes in the child’s psychological system, including:

- changing relations with the environment
- changing relations with herself/himself
- new competence (neo formation).

Dramatic moments act as a developing force through which contradictions between the child’s motives and demands of the ‘others’ and environment create conditions for developing a new competence.

The findings from Vignette 7.1 indicate that:

- The community practice approach to conflict contrasts to Vova’s family practice.
- The dramatic moment that Vova experienced within community during his everyday morning walk was approached differently than was the dramatic moment that Vova experience at home (as explained in Chapter 5).

In Vignette 7.2, the interaction of children and a community member during play time is explored to reveal the child’s intentions and how the child is learning to self-regulate.
7.2.6 Vignette 7.2

The scene takes place in the park near Kitezh communal canteen. The children are preparing to play a ‘zombie’ game, in which a ‘zombie’ will suddenly emerge from the pile of leaves. The children start the leaf pile and continue to bring more leaves to make the pile bigger. Alexander watches the children and occasionally directs them. A two-year-old child, Kolya, playfully throws leaves at Maxim. Vova stands nearby watching them. Maxim leans away from Kolya. Alexander looks at them.

Figure 7.4

*Kolya throws leaves at Maxim*

Maxim smiles and steps behind Kolya. Suddenly and very momentarily, but quite strongly, Maxim squeezes Kolya’s head with his hands.
Vova immediately points towards them. Alexander notices and calls Maxim.

Alexander: Maxim, what are you doing?

Vova (loud, facing Alexander): He did this to Kolya’s head. Like that (puts his hands on his head and protrude his lips making a sound) Prrr!
Maxim walks away. Kolya, stands there for a few seconds then also walks away. Alexander walks towards Maxim, kneels to below his height and begins talking to him.
Alexander: Why did you do that to him? You must not hurt people.

Maxim seems upset, he lowers his head, looks away and starts walking away from Alexander. Alexander calls him.

Alexander: Maxim, I want to talk to you.

Maxim wanders around for a few seconds and reluctantly returns. Alexander again kneels to below Maxim’s eye level and talks to him looking directly in his face. Maxim looks down, pouching his lips and seemingly nervously touching and squeezing his fingers.
Alexander: Maxim! Do you hear me? Try not to hurt people anymore, alright?

Maxim nods, lows his head and walks away from Alexander. He walks further from the group of children collecting leaves until he finds a tree which he climbs. Maxim stays in a tree for a few minutes and does not join the other children.

**7.2.6.1 Interpretation of Vignette 7.2**

Alexander teaches *osoznanie*

In this vignette, the community member (Alexander) demonstrates his approach to *vospitanie*: first by ensuring that Maxim understands it is not okay to hurt people, and second, by showing that conflict can be resolved by conversation rather than punishment or fighting. Alexander immediately calls Maxim’s name when he notices that he squeezed Kolya’s head and informs him that hurting people is unacceptable. Alexander’s choice of words is interesting in this regard. He uses the verb *tvorish* (create) rather than a more neutral verb *delaesh* (do) when he asks Maxim what he is doing (*Maxim, ty chto tvorish?*). The verb *tvorish* often has a derogative meaning...
when used together with the question word *chto* (what). By using this verb, Alexander immediately signals to Maxim that what he is doing is not acceptable and must stop. However, after the verbal signal, Alexander makes an effort to physically move to the child’s level (see Figure 7.3) and takes time to talk to Maxim looking directly in his face, not towering over the child, looking up to him.

It appears that Alexander wants to explain and support Maxim to understand that conflict and unacceptable acts can be resolved by conversation. It is suggested that Alexander’s approach to *vospitanie* is not to reprimand or discipline the child for inappropriate behaviour, but help Maxim to learn and develop an understanding, an awareness of his actions—*osoznanie*. Alexander explains the same point twice (see Figures 7.4 and 7.55) and each time he changes his positioning to be at the child’s level.

Maxim appears to be uncomfortable about being confronted by Alexander in this way, he looks away, lowers his head, nervously, squeezes his fingers and attempts to escape the situation by walking away (see Figure 7.5). Conversely, Vova seemed comfortable to ‘tell on’ Maxim by immediately pointing to Maxim’s actions and attracting attention of Alexander (see Figures 7.2 and 7.3). Vova seems comfortable interfering with Alexander’s conversation, ensuring he understands what Maxim is doing. It appears that Vova readily shares his brother’s actions and takes the side of the adult community member (Alexander).

Alexander’s *vospitanie*: Complex dynamics

The example demonstrates how children participate in the Kitezh community institutional practice. The episode reveals three interlinked and complex dynamics of interaction between an adult and a child and between children. First, between Alexander and Maxim, second between Alexander and Vova and then between Vova and Maxim when Vova attempts to regulate Maxim by ‘telling on’ him and exposes his actions to Alexander.

The first dynamic reveals how Alexander regulates Maxim by transferring his own values to this community practice through *vospitanie*. Alexander’s *vospitanie* is a complex system of values and pedagogy existing in this example as quiet demands on Kitezh children’s participation in this community practice.
Hedegaard (2020) argued that as children internalise cultural values as their personalised needs, this process cannot be understood as a simple shift from biological needs. Hedegaard (2020) suggested that to understand this process, one must conceptualise how values that developed historically exist in different institutions as demands on the child's participation in these practices (p. 17). By participating in the Kitezh community practice and learning about the demands (as expressed by the teacher's demands), Vova may begin to internalise the values and use them as demands on Maxim's participation in the community practice. Part of Alexander’s vospitanie is the value of the idea that conflicts can be resolved by conversation. In addition, by making an effort of going to the child’s level every time he talks to Maxim, Alexander demonstrates that he acknowledges and values the child’s perspective. It is inferred that Alexander acknowledges that it can be overbearing and stressful for the child to be confronted by an adult, particularly after the adult signalled to the child that he has participated in hurting another child, which is unacceptable. Alexander demonstrates that he does not want the child to be overpowered by an adult and comply with his demands out of fear of punishment. Alexander models the way children participate in this community practice.

Hedegaard (2020) emphasised that teachers and parents can understand and consider the child’s perspective (e.g., what makes sense for the child) and use it to motivate the child to act according to values of that institutional practice. The inferred dynamic between Vova and Maxim reveals how Vova chooses to side with the community member, rather than his brother. Vova openly shares Maxim’s actions to the community member, demonstrating that he knows it is not acceptable. It is suggested that Vova has started to internalise the community values because he recognises unacceptable behaviour that Maxim participates in.

In addition, in this vignette, Vova engages in peer regulation as described in Chapter 6 as he, together with Alexander, model the way of participation in this community practice. Hedegaard argues that through influencing the activity setting, a child contributes his own input and modifies the way he learns (Hedegaard, 2018). It is argued that through peer interaction children actively recreate the cultural values and rules of the adult culture and transform them into motives (Martínez-
Lozano et al., 2011). By modelling the way for participation in Kitezh community practice during the Zombi game in the park, Vova’s interference plays an important role as a cultural influence on Maxim’s motives. This is how peer interaction is linked to culture and motives (Martínez-Lozano et al., 2011).

Maxim learns *osoznanie*: The child’s perspective

The complex dynamic of interaction is directed towards the process of Maxim learning how to self-regulate. Members of Kitezh community, in this case Alexander and Vova create conditions which help Maxim learn how to self-regulate when he experiences intense, emotionally charged dramatic moments (as explained in Vignette 7.2). The process of *osoznanie* begins, as the child is made aware of his actions by the community member. It is possible that when Maxim walks away from Alexander in the first instance, he shows defiance and denial. Vova seems to be pleased when he manages to escape Alexander. When Maxim is called by Alexander again, Maxim seems nervous and uncomfortable possibly expecting some form of punishment (see Figure 7.5). When the child is made aware of his actions and requested not to repeat the same actions in the future, he seems to walk away in a reflective mood (head down).

It is suggested that one activity (dramatic moment, conflict) is viewed similarly by two institutional practices—home and school, but differently by the community practice. At home (particularly with his mother) and at school (with teacher Lena), Maxim is used to the same experience; when he participates in unacceptable actions and the adults confront him some form of punishment is usually an outcome. At school, it is usually a set of sit-ups (as explained in Chapter 6). At home, it is either a set of push-ups or not being offered a treat, like chocolate or trip to the city (as explained in Family chapter). Maxim is used to these demands and from his experience with his mother at home and teacher Lena at school, he assumes he is required to complete a punishment every time an adult lets him know that the action is not acceptable (see Vignette 6.2; Maxim completes sit-ups, which surprises teacher Alexander).

Maxim’s experience of dramatic moments within community practice this time is different. He was made aware of his actions and left alone to reflect upon them. The community member did
not insist on compliance, nor were threats, ultimatums or punishment suggested. Alexander did he follow the Maxim when he withdrew or insisted on re-joining the group play.

The episode described in Vignette 7.2 shows how Maxim is initiated into the community process and practice. By interacting with the community member and other children, the child learns about the community rules and values that are placed as demands on his participation – the explicit expectation of ways to act in Kitezh. These demands represent the ideal form (Vygotsky, 1998) of the child’s participation in the community practice. The adult community member (Alexander) is an agent who transfers the rules and values of the Kitezh community practice to the child, he mediates the transition from Maxim’s real to ideal form of participation.

El’konin (1999) discussed development of self-regulation and volitional behaviour begins with the system of social relationship between a child and an adult. According to El’konin, the child learns the rules first in the presence of an adult, then the child uses an object as support to act according to the rule, and finally, the child internalises the rule (El’konin, 1999). The community member helps Maxim to develop osoznanie, not only awareness, but full understanding of how to build his world, according to the rules and values guiding and lived by this community. As Maxim attends the osoznanie meetings on regular basis he is moving through the process of experiencing and seems to be gradually developing an understanding. Osoznanie meetings act as a mediator, an object to support Maxim as he learns to use and abide by the community rules. Using osoznanie as support helps Maxim to develop a new motive – for example, not to hurt other children when playing, which in turn facilitates development of self-regulation – the child’s ability to deliberately modify thoughts, emotions and behaviour (McClelland & Cameron, 2012).

The findings from Vignette 7.2 indicate that:

- Demands from the Kitezh community practice help focus children learn rules and values of the community and transit from real to ideal form of participation.

- Adult community members mediate this transition by placing demands on the children’s participation in the community practice (as explained in Vignette 7.2).
Participating in the community settings (e.g., in the zombie game in the park and osoznaniye meetings) helps focus children develop new motives and learn to self-regulate.

7.3 Conclusion

The wholeness approach based on Vygotsky (1932/1998) works and developed further by Hedegaard (2008/2014) suggests that examining how the child participates in one activity across different institutional practices helps understand the child’s whole social situation of development. This reveals the child’s motive orientation and better understanding of ways children move through the process of learning how to self-regulate.

This chapter explored Kitezh community leaders’ perspective and how focus children interact within community practice. The selected dramatic moments (see Vignettes 7.1 and 7.2) were used as a tool which represent children’s everyday life crisis and can be viewed as a developing force as explained in Vignette 7.1.

In Vignette 7.2, as the children were out walking in the community, the adult in the community practice provided Maxim with an alternative way of interacting after attempting to hurt another child compared with what happens in the family (see Chapter 8). The child’s conflict during morning routine (fighting during his morning walk around the village as explained in Vignette 7.1 of this chapter) is recognised as a situation that can be resolved through conversation, rather than punishment. There is no demand on the child to comply with any disciplinary measures. Unlike the parents at home, the community member does not assign any guilt to Vova, but calmly explains that disagreements can be resolved by conversation. The children stop fighting but are unable to ‘resolve the issue by conversation’ because they need support with the type of language required to be used to sort out their difference. The community practice sets a new precedent for Vova and Maxim which they are not familiar with.

In Chapter 8, the three findings chapters are brought together to examine ways the focus children in this study experience dramatic moments across different institutional practices. Taking Hedegaard’s argument, this allows the whole child within their social situation of development to
be revealed which supports a better understanding of the relationship between Kitezh environment and focus children.
Chapter 8: How Children Learn to Self-Regulate in Kitezh

"The history of the cultural development of the child brings us close to the issues of vospitanie".

L. S. Vygotsky (1983, p. 191)

8.1 Introduction

This chapter brings together and discusses the main findings of the study which are situated in the theoretical and empirical literature reviewed. An explanation of how the literature and theory played a role in theoretical and methodological framing and advancing new knowledge provided within the study is elaborated. To support the discussion, the research questions are first outlined.

The findings are informed by Hedegaard’s model of children’s learning and development and the four main cultural–historical concepts drawn upon: perezhivanie (Vygotsky, 1934/1994), dramatic moments\(^2\) (March & Fleer, 2016; Veresov, 2010), cultural tools (Vygotsky & Luria, 1931/1994) and motives and demands (Hedegaard, 2008/2018).

Section 8.2 begins with an explanation of how the Kitezh community contributes to the process of self-regulation in young children by presenting an overarching model of the Kitezh community’s practice. An explanation of how this model is implemented within the family and school practices is then examined. Section 8.2 of the chapter is focused on the subsidiary research question and explains how adults contribute to the developing process of children’s self-regulation. Section 8.3 of this chapter explains how children contribute to their own developing processes of self-regulation. The chapter concludes with the conceptual model, which draws together the subsidiary findings and the main findings under the overarching research question.

This chapter contributes to the discussion of the overarching and subsidiary research questions:

Main research question:

\(^2\) In the literature, the terms ‘dramatic collisions’ (Veresov, 2010), ‘dramatic social situations’ (Veresov, 2016) and ‘dramatic events’ (March & Fleer, 2016) have been used. In this study, ‘dramatic moments’ is used to convey the same meaning—an everyday life crisis (Vygotsky, 1934/1998): an intense, emotionally charged event between two people, a social drama that acts as a developing force.
• What conditions are created to support the developing processes of children's self-regulation in the Kitezh Children's Community?

Subsidiary question:

• How do adults and children contribute to the developing processes of children's self-regulation during their everyday interactions in the Kitezh Children's Community?

Exploration of the through the current empirical study included data collected via digital video observation of two focus children in the Kitezh community in Russia. The children’s everyday lives were analysed as they spent time with their family, with their teachers in the community school and with community members in the compound. All video data were collected in the natural setting. Video data were supplemented with semi-structured interviews and analysis of the available published material about the Kitezh Children’s Community.

8.2 Theoretical Positioning

Vygotsky (1934/1994) argued that learning occurs through our interactions and communications with others situated within our culture. According to Vygotsky, the social environment influences the learning process and culture is the primary determining factor for knowledge construction. Extending Vygotsky’s ideas about learning and development, Hedegaard (2008) developed a wholeness approach to children’s learning and development by proposing a model that represents the societal, institutional and personal perspectives (see Chapter 4). The model links the child’s motives and demands in and across different activity settings with others in these settings and their motive and demands (Hedegaard, 2014). To understand the child’s perspective, the researcher enters the institutional practice, in which the child participates every day, and records the child’s intentions and how the child relates with other participants in the activity setting. In the current discussion, to understand the child’s intention is to interpret the situations in which the child engages in a dramatic moment (e.g., when the child’s actions are interpreted as being unable to meet his own intentions).

In the current study, Hedegaard’s (2008, 2012) model of children’s learning and development was utilised to fully understand the conditions created within the Kitezh community.
The second plane of Hedegaard’s (2012) model—the institutional perspective—relates to school, home and after-school practices. This study extends Hedegaard’s model by adding the local community. One child’s everyday life is analysed as are the conditions created for him to move through the process of learning ways to self-regulate. Instances that occur in home, school and community practices (e.g., Children’s Court, the Junior Council and games played to support children’s learning, development and belonging within the community, such as the ‘I build the world’ game) provide a rich basis from which to understand the development of self-regulation.

Hedegaard (2020) asserted that when a child experiences a dramatic, emotionally charged conflicting moment, insight into the child’s motive orientation can be analysed. Dramatic moments were used as an analytical tool to study the focus children’s intentions and motive development to better understand the process involved with learning to self-regulate. The dramatic moments can be viewed as a developing force (Veresov, 2010) in relation to self-regulation, as explained in Vignette 5.1.

As part of the wholeness approach to children’s development, the importance of taking the child’s perspective to explore the process of self-regulation is crucial. Theoretically, the child’s perspective is focused on the child’s social situation of development (Hedegaard, 2018; Vygotsky, 1998), which is related to the child’s own psychological age rather than their chronological age. The theoretical construct is based on the relation the child has with the environment. This study explored how a particular cultural environment—the Kitezh—influences children’s process of learning to self-regulate.

Vygotsky (1934) explained that to understand how the environment affects child development, it is important to examine the environment (including the child’s life conditions) not as a setting in which development takes place, which affects the child according to the setting’s characteristics, but to examine the relationship the environment has with the child. The impact of the environment on the child changes depending on the child’s psychological characteristics, which are refracted through the environment by an emotional experience or perezhivanie. Vygotsky (1934) explained that the child’s life conditions cannot directly determine the child’s psychological
development because under the same life conditions, different psychological characteristics can be formed; this depends on the relationship the child has with the environment.

For the purpose of this study, self-regulation is understood as a holistic and developing process of the child learning to control their emotions, through the reciprocity in interactions, and understanding cultural and historical values where:

- affect and intellect operate in unity
- the Kitezh Children’s Community acts as a source of development
- cultural tools (e.g., speech) mediate development.

Section 8.3 explains how the first finding of this study, vospitanie, emerged from the data and contributes to self-regulation and relates to the subsidiary research question.

8.3 How Adults Contribute to Children’s Self-Regulation

8.3.1 Vospitanie and values: the Kitezh community model

This section discusses how vospitanie supports the transference of values to children in the Kitezh Children’s Community through the system of upbringing in the family, educational interactions within the school and the community. To further understand this process, particularly from a cultural–historical perspective, understanding how children learn about values is paramount. According to Hedegaard (2008), children acquire values through participating in institutions and learn values of the society through their upbringing and education. However, we have little understanding of what this involves in the Kitezh community.

In this study, vospitanie is explained as the values that adults transfer to their children through explicit and implicit means, and the child’s own contribution to these developmental processes, which combined, create conditions for the development of self-regulation. It is a process woven through three settings within the Kitezh community, the family and school. In the current study, vospitanie is explored in relation to development of self-regulation. Parents’, teachers’ and community members’ interviews and their interactions with the focus children outlined in vignettes (see Vignettes 1 and 2 in Chapters 5–7) were analysed in this study. The findings indicate that vospitanie in Kitezh is a system, which like a strong thread, is woven through all practices children
participate in while interacting the family home, the school and community. Conceptually, this system is explained by Figure 8.1.³

**Figure 8.1**

*Kitezh Children’s Community model of vospitanie*

---

**8.3.2 Osoznanie meetings**

The *osoznanie* (‘realisation’ and ‘knowing’) meetings (the top left section of the circle, see Figure 8.1) are held regularly (once or twice a week); children and adults participate together. Children raise an issue of concern or interest, which is then discussed. Adults drive the discussion, helping children raise questions, direct arguments and develop strategies to resolve an issue or deepen the understanding of a particular interest. The aim of *osoznanie* meetings is to help children learn how to reflect on their own actions and understand how they affect others. In this sense, the concept of *osoznanie* meetings are similar to Vygotsky’s (1998) concept of reflection, which provide insight into the development of self-regulatory potential of the child. Vygotsky (1998) asserted that to develop ‘voluntary controlling mechanisms’, the child needs to develop speech and reflection:

³ Further analysis of each element of the model and how it relates to self-regulation is provided in Chapter 7.
Reflection with the help of speech (a mould of speech of one's action), the development of speech formulas for successive actions, is the basis for the development of consciousness of self and higher voluntary controlling mechanisms.

Vygotsky (1998) emphasised that the phenomenon of reflection is to be viewed in its development; reflection becomes self-reflection when a person processes his or her experience through verbal thinking as ‘the words regulate and direct behavior’ (p. 158). Vygotsky argued that this is a two-way process because speech influences the intellect and contributes to its development and intellect influences speech as it forms. As speech develops, its function changes from a reflecting to a controlling act, which regulates the child’s behaviour (Vygotsky, 1984). According to Vygotsky (1984), children are not able to control their behaviour until they integrate the norms of behaviour which they learn from adults or more capable others into their own speech. Within Kitezh community time, modelling and interactions during discussion and the emphasis on reflection of interactions hold a high priority. Findings indicate that within the Kitezh community, osoznanie meetings are one strand in a thread that contributes to children developing a self-regulatory process.

8.3.3 ‘I build my world’ role-play

The next part of the model (the top right section of the circle, Figure 8.1)—‘I build my world’ is a role-play designed specifically for Kitezh children. The game has several stages; each stage helps children to learn certain values. For example, one stage focuses on exploring the world, the next on respect for others. By participating in this game over the years, children transition through three roles: pups (newcomers with no responsibilities learning to be responsible for their own actions), students (with more responsibilities and rights) and mentors (graduates who are responsible not only for themselves but for a junior player). According to the community leader (Vladimir), the purpose of the game is to provide each child a tool of development, which supports the child to observe how he changes as he moves from one role to another. Through participating in the game, children who attain higher levels begin to mentor younger children to progress. Here, Vygotsky’s (1934/1986) concept of the ideal and real form is implemented in practice. The mentor—a child at the higher level in ‘I build my world’ game represents the ideal form because
they are present in the social environment of the junior child from the very beginning, when the junior child joins the game. The junior child represents the real form and is at the lower level of the game, contributing and learning from and with others. The ideal form or mentor influences the younger child’s social interactions and contribution to the Kitezh by creating conditions for development. In addition to the concept of ideal and real form (Vygotsky, 1934/1986), the role-play ‘I build my world’ is close to Vygotsky’s (1991) understanding of vospitanie.

Vygotsky (1991) explained that the emphasis in vospitanie should be on organising social coordination, interpreted here as each child’s relationship with the other. The game builds on the reality of their interpersonal relations, through which children are encouraged to value the emotional experiences of their peers and share their own impressions and feelings. According to Vygotsky (1991), reflection on the impressions of other children’s deeds is a powerful method of understanding and enacting the cultural and historical values of the community and contributes to children’s vospitanie.

In the Kitezh community, Vygotsky’s concept of vospitanie, specifically the organisation of children’s interpersonal relationships and passing of cultural and historical values, is implemented through the ‘I build my world’ role-play. The aim is for children to regulate each other’s behaviour by participation in the game throughout all stages of their development, starting as pups and finishing as mentors. By regulating each other through the game, the children learn to regulate themselves. Findings indicate that within the Kitezh community, the ‘I build my world’ game is a second strand in a thread that contributes to children developing self-regulatory process.

8.3.4 Children’s Court role-play

The next part of the model (the lower right section of the circle, Figure 8.1) is the Children’s Court. According to the community leader (Vladimir), this is also a children’s project. The aim of the Children’s Court is to help children work through conflicts with others and between children and adults. Each child in the Kitezh community can take a child or adult to ‘court’ to resolve disagreements. Court members are elected by Kitezh children. The court runs with the minimum involvement from adults—one adult holds an administrative role and does not influence the court’s
decisions. By participating in the Children’s Court, the children learn how to be responsible for their actions. This includes a system in which the children learn about consequences of actions and ways members can be held responsible for ‘damage’ caused to other children, adults or the community and can contribute by way of remediation. Here, Vygotsky’s (1998) concept of reflection is evident because by participating in the Children’s Court, children learn to reflect on their experiences and those of others’, both verbally through learning to explain their behaviour and through observing (and possibly experiencing) the consequences of actions and ways these affect the community. Findings indicate that within the Kitezh community, the Children’s Court role-play game is a third strand in a thread that also contributes to the children developing self-regulatory process.

8.3.5 Junior Council and Children’s Constitution

The next part of the model (the lower left section of the circle, Figure 8.1) is the Junior Council and Children’s Constitution. The Junior Council is a role-play situation that supports children to learn about the foundations of the democratic governance of the community. It consists of child members only and acts as an executive body. The Children’s Constitution is where children record their values. The Children’s Constitution governs the work of the Junior Council. All children within the Kitezh contribute to the Junior Council and writing of the Constitution. Findings indicate that within the Kitezh community, the Council and Constitution contributes a fourth strand in a thread that supports children developing self-regulatory process.

Using Hedegaard’s model, from the Kitezh community’s perspective, the strands are drawn together and weave a thread to support children in the process of self-regulation by providing spaces to realise, know and reflect (osoznanie) about actions and expectations. The children are provided with mentors who are experienced and understand the cultural and historical values of the community and through the game ‘I build my world’, which supports younger members into the fold. In a similar way, the Children’s Court role-play provides agency for the children and supports them to model and understand the consequences of their own and others’ actions. Finally, in the Junior Council, and through the Children’s Constitution, children’s values are agreed upon and
documented. Findings indicate that these strands of thread, when woven together, provide a powerful foundation from the community, from which the children are provided with agency in relation to their own and others’ development and contribute to the process of self-regulation of each participant. The concept that is foundational is *vospitanie*, which is now discussed in greater detail in Section 8.4.

8.4 *Vospitanie*—Creating Conditions for Self-Regulation

The model (see Figure 8.1) is based on Vygotsky’s (1934/1998) understanding of learning and development and is conceptualised as a matrix where each strand does not exist without another and all parts form a unity of the interconnected whole. The matrix exists within child/child and child/adult interactions. The model has been developed to conceptualise the analysis of social interaction within the Kitezh community in group situations.

Further findings indicate that the guiding principles from the games (see Figure 8.1) are used during interactions with an adult member and the focus child. For example, in Vignettes 7.1 and 7.2, Alexander takes Vova and Maxim for a walk in the community. He teaches *osoznanie* by modelling ways to resolve conflict as it occurs in the moment, not by reprimanding or disciplining the children but by helping them learn and develop an understanding and awareness of their own actions through ‘realisation’ and ‘knowing’—*(osoznanie)* by the use of encouraging reflection. The example outlined (see Chapter 7) indicates the way Alexander supports Maxim to become aware of his actions. Alexander stated that the type of behaviour that Maxim enacted is not done in the community (‘we do not do this in Kitezh’). Alexander explained the accepted way to behave and encouraged the child to ‘go and think about it’ without assigning guilt or punishment. Alexander created conditions for the development of the child’s self-reflection, which according to Vygotsky (1984), is the basis for development of a child’s self-regulation. Maxim physically takes himself to a quiet place—it is inferred he creates his own conditions that contribute to the process of self-reflection. Participating in the process of *osoznanie* through the community and in one-on-one interactions with community members supports children to become consciously aware of their actions and understand how their actions affect the other. The children are directed to learn which
actions and interactions are valued and which are not. The adults create conditions for children to learn self-reflection through osoznanie in two ways—first, through daily interactions with adults like Alexander, and second via participation in the osoznanie meetings and the Children’s Court.

A further finding indicates that components of the model are less prominent within the home and school settings, where personal values of the parents and the female teacher rather than the Kitezh model of vospitanie determine the way interactions create conditions for children’s self-regulation (see Vignettes 6.1, 6.2, 7.1 and 7.2). For example, in the home setting, the mother has a strong perspective of her own vospitanie, which as the data indicate, she implements rigidly. However, to understand how vospitanie affects everyday life of each focus child as they participate in institutional practices and how it is linked to self-regulation, the concept is now discussed in relation to interactions that occur in the family and the school.

8.5 Vospitanie and Learning to Self-regulate: Institutional Practices of the Family and School

When participating in the institutions of the family home and Kitezh school, the focus child (Vova) regularly enters dramatic moments. The dramatic moments occur at home during interactions with his family members; here, interactions between the mother and father are discussed. In school, the dramatic moments occur during interactions with his teacher, Lena. During the 6 dramatic moments analysed, the child and adults all experience a process in which tension builds to high emotions and conflict. The high emotions are understood as challenges within the child–adult relationships, which in other studies has been shown to undermine the child’s self-regulation skills (see Berry, 2012). The adults implement the process of vospitanie through their own motives and demands.

In one example drawn upon (see Vignette 5.1), when moving through a dramatic moment, Vova experiences his father’s vospitanie. The father demands that Vova ‘do what I say immediately’, which results in a dramatic moment between the two as Vova refuses to comply. Vova’s reaction is perceived as expressing a negative emotional experience during the interaction (see Vignette 6.1). Vova’s self-regulation is understood as developing because he is unable to meet
the demands, or initiate a new motive congruent to his father’s demands. Part of understanding vospitanie in this context is the father’s strict direction for Vova’s actions and conversations—be willing to comply with the family rules, without question. The dramatic moment is emphasised, as Vova’s own demands seem to conflict with the demands of his social environment; he attempts to put his own opinion forward.

Despite his challenging perezhivanie (emotional experience) from the start of the situation Vova attempts to develop his own conditions of participation in the family practice by creating new activities as he was getting ready for school. The routine dramatic moment between Vova and his father may be what Hedegaard (2012) suggested is an indicator of change in the child’s motives and competences. I argue that these dramatic moments lead to developing self-regulation. The demand of the father is to support and influence Vova’s integration into the family values and practices. Theoretically, this may help Vova create a new motive orientation that he will use during participation in his family practice but as he is not psychologically ready to meet the demand, a dramatic moment is forthcoming.

Ulvik (2018) argued that adults govern and shape actively; they make their children participate in the interactions of ‘certain kinds’ (p. 87), all with the aim to develop the self-governed or self-regulated child. In parallel to Ulvik’s (2018) study, the parents and teacher in Kitezh can be observed governing actively—with strict family rules within the family and strict disciplinary measures at school. Adults in the Kitezh create conditions that make the focus children participate in the interactions that seem strict and stern. However, such interactions are aimed to help focus children to become culturally aware. How (and whether) such an aim is achieved is a topic for further discussion, which now follows.

In a recent study by Milojevich and Haskett (2018), it was found that parents and carers should limit their negative emotional expressiveness in front of children because it may have a detrimental effect on the children’s self-regulation. A large body of research (Nozadi, Spinrad, Eisenberg, & Eggum-Wilkens, 2015; Mezzacappa, 2004; Milojevich & Haskett, 2018) offers insight into children’s developmental trajectories, including development of self-regulation based
on the existing characteristic of life conditions in which the children find themselves. For example, children living in low socio-economic and disadvantaged communities are deemed to have low self-regulation skills (Mezzacappa, 2004). However, rather than accepting that the child–adult’s dramatic moments have a detrimental effect on the child’s self-regulation, the current study supports a deeper analysis into the process of learning to self-regulate. Unlike extant studies that rely on specific aspects of the environment such as negative emotional expressiveness, which contribute to the development of self-regulation, here the wholeness view of the child’s social situation of development is considered (Vygotsky, 2004). Fleer and Hedegaard (2010) highlighted that without the wholeness approach of the social situation of development, it is not possible to understand ‘contradictions or similarities across … practices and values and demands … and how it … creates (the child’s) social situation of development’ (p. 165). The findings of this study support Fleer and Hedegaard (2010) followed a child in their natural setting for extended time periods to enable analysis of the child’s whole social situation of development.

A second example is used to highlight this point: Vova’s interaction with his mother (see Vignette 5.2), which is also marked by the process of building tension and dramatic moments and challenging emotional expressiveness. The mother is involved with routine altercations with Vova. In Vignette 5.2, from the mother’s perspective, it seems she is intent on putting forward her own demands for Vova based on her values and vospitanie (insisting Vova join the other children and try to use the microphone). This is a similar requirement to the father; neither adult listens to Vova’s discussion or reasoning.

The joint Kitezh family practice places demands on Vova to heed the expected values expressed through the parents vospitanie and creates conditions for dramatic moments to occur. According to Vygotsky (1974), these dramatic moments can act as the driving force of development. Vygotsky (1998) emphasised the dialectical nature of the process of child development ‘in which a transition from one stage to another is accomplished not as an evolving process but as a revolutionary process’ (p. 193). In this process, the conflict between Vova and his family can be viewed as a driving force of development. According to Vygotsky (1974), the
transition to the new stage of development occurs ‘from a real conflict between organism and environment and from active adaptation to the environment’ (p. 191). Moving through dramatic moments with his family members represents an everyday crisis for Vova, which theoretically acts as a developing force for the child and facilitates development of new competences, which contributes to the process of his developing self-regulation.

Dramatic moments occurred frequently in the school setting, with Lena (the teacher), whose 

\textit{vospitanie} is based on reward and punishment (see Vignette 6.1). Lena interacts with Vova during the reading class and because of Vova initiating a dramatic moment, she administers a ‘punishment’ and orders him to complete sit-ups. When Vova does not comply with Lena’s demands, she bans his participation in the train game (see Vignette 6.1), an activity he seems to enjoy. The ban leads to Vova experiencing an intense emotionally charged dramatic moment, which may be perceived as challenging emotional expressiveness. Vygotsky (1991) emphasised the link between emotions and the child’s developing \textit{vospitanie} and learning. He argued that to enhance the effectiveness of learning, adults need to stimulate the learning process emotionally by linking new knowledge with the appropriate emotion. Vygotsky (1991) reasoned that only knowledge which moves through the child's emotion can take root. It is suggested that challenging emotional expressiveness during the interaction with Lena does not facilitate learning effectiveness for Vova.

A study into the development of children’s self-regulation (Waltering & Shi, 2016) indicated that teachers should not rely solely on the reward-and-punishment system to manage children who are most challenging in the classroom. Waltering and Shi (2016) supported Vygotsky’s understanding about a reward-and-punishment system as it relates to self-regulation. Waltering and Shi (2016) cautioned that if teachers implement a punishment-and-reward approach alone, it is not effective and can be counterproductive to development of children’s self-regulation. Further, it may cause more frustration, especially for children with extreme disruptive behaviour because for these children, demonstrating such behaviour is a means of ‘feeling in control and asserting themselves’ (p. 1097). The rigid disciplinary system at school implemented by Lena (See Chapter 6) and the strict family rules adhere to in Kitezh family home (see Chapter 5) seem to be
counterproductive for the development of Vova’s self-regulation because he often demonstrates disruptive and challenging behaviour in both settings.

The findings demonstrate that the father’s, mother’s and Lena’s *vospitanie* is similar because they insist on compliance with their demands and administer immediate punishment for non-compliance. As explained in Chapters 5 and 6, *vospitanie* in the Kitezh family and school originates culturally and historically from the father’s, mother’s and the teacher’s own experiences growing up in the Soviet Russian context and has its foundation in cultural values of not questioning the authority of the adults, and following strict rules, including a system of reward and punishment. This authoritarian approach to *vospitanie* is exactly what Vygotsky cautioned against (see Vygotsky, 1926/1991). Although this type of approach creates conditions for dramatic moments in the Kitezh family and school, acting as a developing force for Vova, *vospitanie* based on compliance and punishment according to Vygotsky, has its own challenges. These are further explained.

In *Ethical Behaviour*, Vygotsky (1991) emphasised that unlike the criminal code, *vospitanie* must not be based on laws, rules of behaviour and punishment because ‘to avoid something out of fear still does not mean you are performing a good deed’ (p. 258). Vygotsky (1991) cautioned against *vospitanie* based on authoritarian principles, such as the pedagogies with ‘compulsory value of the authority of parents and teachers, which sustains the sanctions of punishments and rewards’ (p. 262). Instead, Vygotsky (1991) emphasised *vospitanie* by organising social coordination, which includes building children’s relationships with each other, when children begin to value *perezhivanie* of their peers and share impressions and feelings. Although these conditions do not seem present in the home and school, they are created within the broader Kitezh community through the ‘I build my world’ game and other developmental role-plays as explained above (see Figure 8.1).

The findings indicate a contrast between the Kitezh community and the family and school *vospitanie*. It seems that opposite forces within the process of *vospitanie* are at work in relation to the focus children’s self-regulation. On the one hand, *vospitanie* creates conditions for dramatic
moments to occur and acts as an everyday crisis and a developing force, contributing to
development of new motives and children’s learning to self-regulate, where children participate in
games and create a Constitution that contributes to developing self-regulation (see Figure 8.1).
Conversely, the authoritarian principle of Vova’s parent’s and his teacher Lena’s vospitanie, which
according to Vygotsky (1991) may slow self-regulation because it contributes to development of
behaviour which is regulated by obedience, punishment and reward.

An alternative approach to vospitanie is offered by Alexander (teacher and community
member) in Vignettes 6.2, 7.1 and 7.2. The alternative approach occurs during interactions with
Alexander as he is teaching Vova and Maxim in school and during community walks. Alexander’s
approach supports the wider community approach and is based on modelling behaviour and
reflections (see Figure 8.1). Alexander does not insist on compliance by the children, neither does
he punish the children. Instead Alexander supports the children to practice osoznanie (see Vignettes
7.1 and 7.2). Alexander displays emotional warmth and support to the children as they move
through dramatic moments. He also explains to the children how their actions do not align with the
expected practices and what the children need to heed as they refine their behaviour ‘as we do in
Kitezh’ (Alexander, personal interview). Such an approach reflects Vygotsky’s (1991)
understanding of the role of emotions in children’s learning because it is inferred that Alexander
enhances the children’s learning of the Kitezh values with a beneficial emotional experience—to
help each other, which is a valued practice.

The following section discusses how the second findings of this study—kaleidoscope of
emotions furthers understanding of perezhivanie as it supports the process of learning to self-
regulate during interaction with Vova’s siblings.

8.6 Children Contributing to Their Own Self-Regulation: The Child’s
Perspective

8.6.1 Perezhivanie as a prism and the kaleidoscope of emotions

Drawing on Hedegaard’s model, the child’s perspective in relation to creating the conditions
for self-regulation is now presented. Research suggests that peer interaction has an enriching effect
on child’s development (Martínez-Lozano et al., 2011). To understand how peer interaction affects children learning to self-regulate in this study, the concept of *perezhivanie* was used. Vygotsky (1934) introduced this concept to explain the affective relations between the child and the environment.

Using Vygotsky’s (1935/1994) metaphor, this study employs *perezhivanie* as the prism, through which the child refracts his changing relationship with the environment. To understand how the environment affects the child and his learning, this study examines the child’s *perezhivanie*, while learning to self-regulate.

The concept of *perezhivanie* was used to contribute to understanding how the child learns to self-regulate in recent cultural–historical research by Sulaymani and Fleer (2019). Adding to Sulaymani and Fleer’s research, this study employs *perezhivanie* to demonstrate the unity of affect and intellect in the process of development to explore conditions which support the process of self-regulation. However, this study extends exploration of such conditions from the school setting to the family and community settings and introduces the concept ‘*kaleidoscope of emotions*’ to explain the development of self-regulation. The findings direct attention to the *kaleidoscope of emotions* that captures the moments of change within the child–environment relationship and supports the child’s learning and developmental trajectory, contributing to self-regulation.

In Vignettes 5.1 and 5.2, the development of Vova’s self-regulation is marked by a *kaleidoscope of emotions*. This movement is defined as a fleeting, but rapid emotional and behavioural change, which occur simultaneously within a short period within his *perezhivanie*.

The process of moving through a *kaleidoscope of emotions* involves Vova being calm and happy (see Figure 5.2) to tense, concerned and defiant as his mother speaks to him (see Figure 5.3). Then from crying and upset as he disagrees with his mother and withdraws from the activity (see Figures 5.4–5.7) to no emotion (see Figure 5.8) and then again to smiling, laughing and happy as he re-engages with the group activity (see Figure 5.9) from afar.

In Vignette 6.1, Vova transforms from laughing and happy when he interacts with Valya (see Figure 6.1) to crying and upset (see Figures 6.6 and 6.7) when he protests against teacher’s
demand to withdraw from the train game, then to smiling and happy again when he interacts with Maxim and re-engages with the game (see Figure 6.8). The *kaleidoscope of emotions* demonstrates how the child's relations with his social environment is a process that changes fleetingly. As Vova moves through a *kaleidoscope of emotions* his perezhivanie of the social situation constantly changes. This rapid change is initiated by interaction with his mother and mediated by Vova's sibling Maxim.

Section 8.6.2 explains how Maxim's interference supports Vova’s self-regulation when focus children participate in Kitezh institutional practice of home and school.

### 8.6.2 Maxim’s voice and interference supports Vova’s self-regulation

Research shows that children’s self-regulation, particularly regulation of emotions, emerges from co-regulation with adults (Silkenbeumer et al., 2018). According to Vygotsky’s (1997) idea of internalisation, children first become aware of their emotions and feelings with their initial carer’s help—as the carer names the child’s emotions. Then children co-construct the appropriate coping strategies and act on them together with adults and gradually learn to choose the appropriate strategy from the repertoire of the familiar strategies that they used together with adults. Finally, children use such strategies independently without support of an adult (Silkenbeumer et al., 2018).

In peer interaction children regulate behaviours of each other by supporting those they think appropriate and criticising those that do not coincide with the rules of the activity setting (Rubin et al., 1998, as cited in Medina & Marinez, 2008). As an extended dramatic moment plays out between Vova and the mother in the home, Vova hears his brother Maxim’s voice reciting a nursery rhyme. Vova’s attention is refocused from the dramatic moment that he is experiencing and he changes his behaviour from withdrawal to more active participation (although still distanced from Vova).

Similarly, Maxim’s interference and support in the classroom refocuses Vova’s attention from the dramatic moment he experiences after his teacher's demand (see Figure 6.6) to what is happening in the classroom (the train game). Holodynski (2013) argued that children use non-verbal expression signs to communicate with themselves to regulate their own emotions and behaviour.
When Maxim observes that Vova is upset and has withdrawn from the class activity (see Figure 6.6). He turns towards him and tries to touch Vova with his pen, attempting to interact with him. This is the moment of change in Vova’s kaleidoscope of emotions as he changes from being upset, sobbing and completely withdrawn (see Figure 6.6) to more involved and not crying (see Figure 6.7). Vova lifts his head from the desk, turns towards Maxim and half opens his face, starting to re-engage with the class activity, this time through interaction with Maxim. It is suggested that Maxim’s non-verbal expressions (as explained above) helped Vova regulate his emotions and behaviour.

Hojholt (2018) emphasised that at school children are oriented towards each other, towards relations; they use each other as social resources in learning how to participate in class activities and often discuss the school tasks. The children's orientation towards each other in class is often not in opposition to the school tasks, even though it looks like it is (Hojholt, 2018). When Maxim leans towards Vova (see Figure 6.7) he whispers ‘macaque’—the word used by the teacher as part of the train game. Vova repeats the word back to Maxim and the twins start discussing the word secretly laughing and smiling to each other. By whispering the word to Vova in the emotionally coloured and amusing way, Maxim re-engages Vova into the learning task in class, even though on the first glance their orientation towards each other is in opposition to the learning task. The interactions with Maxim changes Vova’s emotional state from a dramatic moment to a more positive one (see Figure 6.8)—Vova smiles and resumes his participation in the activity, though not in the way his teacher intended.

In both instances Vova moves through a *kaleidoscope of emotions* to eventually regulate his emotions and behaviour so that he is able to rejoin the activity. It is suggested that similar to home, the change at school is mediated by his brother’s voice and presence in the environment.

### 8.6.3 How Vova creates his own conditions for development of self-regulation

In Vignettes 5.2 and 6.1, Vova refuses to follow the adult’s directions and strategies. In both cases, the adults (mother and the teacher) firmly insist on compliance with their demands and use disciplinary measures that they established for these activity settings (sent to his room and request...
that he complete push-ups and not joining in a game). The disciplinary measures are determined by the mother’s and teacher’s personal values, and their conceptualisation of vospitanie. The practices are not received well by Vova.

In both cases, Vova finds his own way to self-regulate by changing the way he participates in the activity setting. Instead of complying with each adult’s demands and using their strategy to self-regulate, Vova regulates through his perezhivanie, which is closely associated with his brother's speech. This helps Vova switch his focus from the dramatic moment he experiences to the current environment and creates conditions so that he can join the learning activity.

Research has identified a link between an emotionally supportive teacher and child relationship and development of self-regulation (Cadima et al., 2016). Lena, the teacher used a calm and neutral tone of voice and non-emotional body language in an emotionally charged situation (dramatic moment) and attempted to co-regulate Vova by providing an activity-based solution (excluding him from the game and giving him a reading task). The strategy provided an opportunity for Vova to distance himself from the dramatic moment he was experiencing and focus on the learning task. Vova seemed unable to engage with the strategy effectively, possibly because of his developing self-regulation skills. It was found that self-regulation is improved when children’s relationship with their teacher is warm and supportive (Blair & Diamond, 2008). It is possible that the teacher’s perceived low levels of warmth and emotionally supportive response when Vova experienced dramatic moments seemed to decrease the effectiveness of her strategies. Vova was able to self-regulate when he was offered engagement from his brother as Maxim reached out to Vova and repeatedly tried to re-engage him into the classroom. It seemed that Vova and Maxim created conditions for development of self-regulation. By putting his own demands on the Kitezh school practice, Vova modified how he participated in the activity setting and created his own pathway towards self-regulation. He used support and care of his brother to ‘anchor’ him back to the reality of the classroom from the dramatic moment he experienced.

Hearing Maxim’s voice (at home) and using Maxim’s physical gesture of reaching out (at school) are not the only mediators that contribute to the process of learning to self-regulate for
Vova. The children (Vova and Maxim) use cultural tools, which mediate their learning. This is further explained in Section 8.6.4.

**8.6.4 How nursery rhyme supports Vova’s self-regulation**

It is suggested that a familiar nursery rhyme recited incorrectly by his brother (see Vignette 5.2) acted as a cultural tool (Vygotsky & Luria, 1931/1994) for Vova. This cultural tool exists because of the conditions the Kitezh family practice created for the child. By providing a rich variety of developmental tools, including audio recordings of children’s nursery rhymes and establishing their home routine in a particular way, where children often listen to nursery rhymes before they go to bed. The family practice created conditions which make it possible for Vova to learn the nursery rhyme and recognise the mistake as his brother recited the nursery rhyme. The conditions enabled Vova to connect to his brother’s voice while reciting and instantaneously, the use of the cultural tool-language to support him move through the process to self-regulate.

The findings of the Chen and Fleer’s (2015) study focuses on the role of sign mediation in children’s emotional development. The findings suggest that parents ‘re-signing support the emergence of children’s intrapersonal emotion regulation’ (Chen & Fleer, 2015, p. 233).

Similar to Chen and Fleer (2015), this study used the concept of cultural tools. Extending Chen and Fleer’s (2015) study from child–parent to child–child interaction, the current research investigated how the child uses cultural tools interacting with his sibling, when he learns to self-regulate. The findings reveal that Vova is not a passive recipient of the adults’ values and demands expressed in Kitezh through *vospitanie*. The child created his own conditions for learning to self-regulate, as explained above, by modifying his activities as he participates in the Kitezh institutional practices.

Vygotsky (1994) emphasised the importance of the affective nature of the subjective experience corresponding to the same environmental conditions. As Vova learns to self-regulate while he participates in Kitezh institutional practices, he experiences the same situation differently than Maxim. To understand how Vova learns to self-regulate it is important to consider how he emotionally experiences the situation. Vygotsky (1994) argued that the analysis in the research
should be perceived from the child's _perezhivanie_. However, it is not always possible to know what the child thinks or feels. One possibility to understand Vova's _perezhivanie_ is by observing and analysing how he emotionally positions himself in relation to the adults because such positioning may determine different developmental trajectories for Vova's self-regulatory ability. The way Vova positions himself emotionally in relation to each teacher (Lena and Alexander) is further explained in the following section which discuss the child's affective self-positioning.

**8.6.5 Child’s affective self-positioning**

As outlined in Chapter 3, the child’s affective self-positioning was introduced by Quinones (2013) who drew on Vygotsky and Bozhovich’s legacies. Vygotsky (1991) emphasised that to understand the specific developmental conditions that effect particular children, it is important to consider the place that children occupy within a significant relationship. According to Bozhovich (2009), children’s positions are defined by two key factors: the historically developed demands of the social environment that are placed on children according to their psychological age and demands that are placed on children by the people around them, depending on the children’s individual development and conditions of the individual families.

In Quinones (2013), the concept of affective positioning emphasises the importance of understanding the emotional experience (_perezhivanie_) of children’s positioning because it determines their position in life. The children’s position is important because it is based not only on how children feel about the position they occupy at the present moment, but also the position, which children want to occupy. Children view their everyday moments through the lens of their internal position, forming their attitude to life and the people around them (Bozhovich, 2009). In Quinones (2013) study the concept of affective positioning was used to illustrate how parents affectively position children within their respective communities and how it affects each child’s development. By drawing on Hedegaard’s (2008) concept of the child’s perspective supports insights into the child’s motives and how the child positions himself with two different teachers. The child’s self-positioning influences the process of self-regulation. This study extends the concept
of affective positioning to self-regulation, as the study explores how the child’s positions himself in the process of learning to self-regulate.

In Vignette 6.1, Vova positions himself as a naughty undisciplined child, someone who is defiant and openly refuses to comply with his teacher’s demands. It is inferred that through his defiance and emotional outburst during the dramatic moment (as explained in Vignette 6.1), Vova is possibly seeking attention from his peers and his teacher. Bozhovich (2009) argued for the importance of analysing the ‘world of the child’s needs’ because it helps understand how the environment influences the child:

if we want to understand exactly how the environment affects children and what influence it exerts on their mental development, then we must analyse the relationship between the environment and the child’s needs, the extent to which it is capable of satisfying them or, in some cases hinders their satisfaction. (p. 70)

Bozhovich (2009) further argued that the way to undertake such analysis is to examine the child’s emotional experience, maintaining that there is a strong connection between the child’s emotional experience (perezhivaniye) and the child’s system of needs and motives. Understanding the child’s perezhivanie helps understand the child’s system of needs and motives. Understanding the child’s needs in turn, helps predict what perezhivanie the child will have (Bozhovich, 2009, p. 72).

The way Vova positions himself within the activity setting (see Vignette 6.1) directly depends on his immediate perezhivanie. For example, when Vova experiences a dramatic moment and he is unable to self-regulate, his emotional experience defines the way he positions himself as a person not able to abide by the rules. When Vova’s emotional experience is more positive (as explained in Vignette 6.1), he positions himself as a capable student, willing to abide by the rules. When Vova connects to his brother’s warmth and support, Vova self-regulates and re-engages with the class. It is suggested that Vova’s need for emotional support is revealed through his affective positioning within the school activity setting. The child’s self-positioning fluctuates depending on perezhivanie he experiences at any particular moment.
In Vignette 6.2, it is suggested that by following Alexander’s (Teacher 2) values and expectations, Vova acts on his intent to be associated with the teacher. Vova imitates the teacher showing empathy to Valya, his class peer. In this process, Vova learns about values that coincide with the teacher’s value position—‘not to cause psychological harm by using remarks and provide support to each other’ (teacher–child dialogue, Vignette 6.2).

The various approaches that the adults use with Vova (Alexander, caring explanations, Mother and teacher, confrontational, non-emotional) seem to create different conditions for Vova’s learning and development. When Vova’s mother provides the ultimatum with no affection, Vova enters a dramatic moment, and moves through a kaleidoscope of emotions, and hides under the blanket and completely withdraws from the activity (as explained Vignette 5.1). Similarly, when the female teacher (Teacher 1) demands Vova stop participation in the game and sit in the corner, Vova protests, cries and completely withdraws from the classroom activity for several minutes (as explained in Vignette 6.1).

When Vova’s male teacher Alexander explains and shows empathy to another child, while explaining the rules of how to interact with others during the spider’s walk game (see Vignette 6.2), Vova immediately supported and imitated the teacher (the teacher provided comfort to Valya, Vova also provided comfort to the child, reaching out to her, stoking her head and saying comforting words). By modelling affective behaviour with Valya, the teacher (Teacher 2) creates conditions for Vova (and his peers) to learn and practice empathy.

Section 8.7 explains how the research findings contribute to new knowledge and how the findings are conceptualised in a model that synthesises adults’ and children’s conditions across three institutional practices. This section relates to the main research question.

8.7 Conditions Created to Support the Developing Processes of Children’s Self-Regulation in the Kitezh Children’s Community

8.7.1 Contribution to new knowledge

This study contributes to the theoretical discussion of child development from a cultural–historical perspective. The Russian term ‘vospitanie’ is used to explain the transition of values from
parents, teachers and community members to children in the Kitezh. Although familiar to Russian pedagogy, the use of this term in this context is novel to Western child development and education research. There is a focus on the concept of *perezhivanie* in relation to development of children’s self-regulation, which is enriched by the metaphor of *kaleidoscope of emotions*, introduced to better understand the interest of motives in child development. Table 8.1 summarises these concepts and how they contribute to new knowledge:

**Table 8.1**

*Summary of Findings Contributing to New Knowledge*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New concept</th>
<th>Description and link to existing concepts</th>
<th>How it contributes to new knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Vospitanie</em></td>
<td>The process of transition of values from adults to children; in this study, the concept is close to Vygotsky’s understanding of <em>vospitanie</em> in relation to transference of values and ethical norms (Vygotsky, 1991)</td>
<td>The term and concept—<em>vospitanie</em> in this studies context (development of children's self-regulation) is novel to Western child development and education research. This study reveals how at least two functions of <em>vospitanie</em> operate within Kitezh community. First, it provides further insights how values are transferred to children across home, school and community and how this process is linked to self-regulation. The study reveals how <em>vospitanie</em> acts as a thread weaving together the adults' efforts across three institutional practices. Second, the study explains how <em>vospitanie</em> acts as a developing force. By employing specific tools, for example, <em>osoznanie</em>. The process of <em>vospitanie</em> in Kitezh creates conditions, which contribute to development of children's self-reflection ability and helps them with the process of self-regulation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Kaleidoscope of emotions</em></td>
<td>The metaphor is used to explain the process of rapid and intense change in the child's <em>perezhivanie</em> as dramatic moments are experienced</td>
<td><em>Kaleidoscope of emotions</em> reveals the process of transformation in the child's <em>perezhivanie</em>; how the child's <em>perezhivanie</em> is transformed and how this change is manifested through the child's emotions and behaviour. The metaphor captures the moment of change in the child/environment relationship and contributes to the process of child development. The use of this metaphor furthers understanding of <em>perezhivanie</em> (Vygotsky, 1934/1994) in relation to the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child's affective self-positioning</td>
<td>The concept is introduced to explain how the child positions himself affectively as he participates in three institutional practices in the Kitezh community. The child's affective self-positioning is linked to his needs and demands of his social environment. Such positioning influences the way the child learns to self-regulate</td>
<td>The concept builds on Quinones (2013) concept of the child’s affective positioning (how the parents position the child within family and the community) but extends the concept by exploring how the child positions himself within institutional practices and how it relates to the child's self-regulation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.7.2 The conceptual model

The analysis of the findings drew upon the following cultural–historical concepts:

- perezhivanie
- dramatic moments
- cultural tools
- motives and demands

The research methodology outlined in Chapter 4 supported development of the conceptual model (see Figure 8.2), founded on Hedegaard’s model (2012).

The findings of this study supported development of a conceptual model which includes several conditions, which according to the research findings, contribute to the development of Vova’s and Maxim’s self-regulation as they transition to live in the Kitezh Children’s Community. The model is used to conceptualise the following research findings:
Conditions contributing to the developing processes of children's self-regulation in the Kitezh Children's Community, Russia.

As discussed, the process of learning to self-regulate for two focus children in the Kitezh is guided by *vospitanie*—the system of transferring cultural values from adults to children. The system is implemented differently across three institutional practices. The difference depends on the conditions that are created within each practice by the adults. For example, within the family, *strict family rules* with a prevalence of the *collective/communal values* introduced by the mother and *developmental environment* with a rich variety of cultural tools provided by the father contribute to ways the children enter into the process of learning to self-regulate (see Figure 5.2 and Table 5.1).
In parallel to the family, at school, *strict disciplinary systems* are employed by the main teacher Lena, which creates conditions where Vova regularly has emotionally intense interactions in the classroom. The second teacher, Alexander, offers an alternative to reward and punishment methods by modelling a warm, and empathetic approach. The way Vova positions himself affectively with each teacher—how he relates to each teacher emotionally, how each teacher meets his demand for emotional warmth and support, and how Vova meets the demands of the institutional practices affect the development of self-regulation. Within community practices, Alexander teaches *osoznanie* which supports the children to learn about self-reflection. By participating in various developmental activities within community practice (see Figure 8.1) the children experience the behaviour of the collective and learn to value their peers *perezhivanie*. The children's own *perezhivanie* as they participate in three institutional practices, affects the process of their developing self-regulation. The focus children create their own conditions through participating in activities (see Figure 8.1) and modifying the way they participate in the institutional practices. In addition, the children use speech as a cultural tool which mediates their learning to self-regulate. For example, in Vignette 5.1, Vova used Maxim’s speech when Vova reacted to Maxim reciting a familiar nursery rhyme. Figure 8.3 conceptualises how the focus children learn to self-regulate when they interact with adults and their peers within Kitezh institutional practices.
Learning to self-regulate is founded on a complex system of interrelated processes. This study explored three main processes, which are interconnected and contribute to the process of developing self-regulation—learning values, development of motives and the process of child’s self-positioning which includes the child's *perezhivanie*. The child's *perezhivanie* is pertinent to all processes, because it is an integral part of the child–environment unit.

### 8.8 Concluding Remarks

This chapter discussed the main findings of the study—*vospitanie*, kaleidoscope of emotions and the child’s affective self-positioning. It explained how the findings helped illuminate the research questions and how this is linked to children's self-regulation. Chapter 9 provides the conclusion and outlines implications and future directions of research that stem from the findings of this study.
Chapter 9: Conclusion

This chapter outlines theoretical, methodological and practical contributions of this study, clarifies limitations and offers recommendations for further research.

9.1 Introduction

This study has explored how two adopted children situated in the Kitezh Children’s Community move through the process of learning to self-regulate transitioning across three institutional practices: family, school and the community. The central focus was on one child, Vova. The study has explored how adults (parents, teachers and community members) create conditions to support the process of the children’s self-regulation and how children contribute to this process by creating their own conditions. The dramatic moments during interactions between adults and children and between the children were used as a methodological tool to gain insights into the process of learning self-regulate from the child’s perspective. Employing Vygotsky’s (1934–1998) cultural–historical approach and a dialectical–interactive methodology (Hedegaard & Fleer, 2008) supported the empirical, theoretical and methodological considerations for conducting the study.

Video observations of the participant children’s everyday activities, video interviews, field notes, photos, video clips and various documents related to the children’s education and learning afforded by participants provided extensive and rich information about the focus children’s social situation of development. The wholeness approach (Hedegaard & Fleer, 2008) supported analysis of the child’s social situation of development and contributed to understanding ways the focus children learn to self-regulate. The analysis is presented in three findings chapters where key findings are linked to the main research question (What conditions are created to support the developing processes of children's self-regulation in the Kitezh Children's Community?) and a subsidiary research questions (How do adults and children contribute to the developing processes of children’s self-regulation during their everyday interactions in the Kitezh Children's Community?).
Chapter 8 provided a detailed explanation of the findings in light of the contemporary literature on children’s self-regulation and explained how this study has added new knowledge to the field. This chapter explains the significance of this contribution and how it is provided through three key areas: theoretical, methodological and practical. Section 9.2 discusses these areas in further detail.

9.2 Theoretical Contribution

9.2.1 Vospitanie

The term and concept of vospitanie has been used in Russian educational literature for many years (Bogachenko & Perry, 2015; Gracheva, 2020; Kuxhausen, 2006; Zbenovich & Lerner, 2013). It has also been used in educational research by English-speaking researchers and in English-speaking countries (Barker, 2019; Black, 1991; Galmarini-Kabala, 2019; Mostowlansky, 2019; Williams, 1980). However, the meaning of vospitanie in literature varies. Some authors link vospitanie to character formation (Bogachenko & Perry, 2015), others (Gracheva, 2020) explain vospitanie in relation to development of the child's feelings or an aesthetic understanding.

For the purpose of this study vospitanie is explained as the values adults transfer to their children through explicit and implicit means, and the child’s own contribution to these developmental processes, which combined, create conditions for the development of self-regulation. This understanding of vospitanie is novel to Western educational research.

This study contributed to a more in-depth understanding of vospitanie by providing a theoretically based foundation and linking the concept to the transition of values from adults to children (Jaramillo et al., 2017; Monk, 2010) and to the development of self-regulation. The conceptual model, developed through analysis of the data collected in this study (see Figure. 8.1, Chapter 8), demonstrates how vospitanie as a system of interrelated processes create conditions for children’s self-regulation in the Kitezh community.

The study explains how vospitanie acts as a developing force for children’s self-regulation. The conceptual model of vospitanie developed by this study (see Figure. 8.1, Chapter 8) reveals how by employing specific cultural tools, for example, osoznanie meetings, the process of
*vospitanie* in the Kitezh creates conditions, which contribute to development of children's self-reflection ability and helps move through a process that supports development of self-regulation over time. This theorisation is based on Vygotsky’s (1998) concept of reflection, which provides insight into the development of self-regulatory potential of the child. Linking development of self-regulation with learning about behaviour, Vygotsky linked development of reflection with the development of speech and emphasised the importance of learning self-reflection with the help of speech. The Kitezh model of *vospitanie* presented and discussed in this study indicates that by placing a high priority on learning to self-reflect by integrating *osoznanie* meetings into children’s everyday life, Kitezh children learn to reflect on their actions and how these affect others. As Vygotsky (1984) suggested, by developing speech, children develop intellect; this affects development of self-regulation. At the Kitezh, *osoznanie* meetings the children learn self-reflection by discussing their behaviour and that of others, naming their actions and developing solutions for improvement together with more capable others, parents, teachers and senior students. In this sense, the conceptual model developed demonstrates how *vospitanie* contributes to children’s developing self-regulatory ability in the Kitezh community.

*Vospitanie* in this study is also theorised as a process of transferring values from adults to children, linking to the process of self-regulation. Extending the current understanding by explaining how *vospitanie* acts as an integrated system of processes operating within three dimensions of Kitezh social environment, the family, school and community. The wholeness approach (Hedegaard, 2008) employed in this study offers a complete view of the child’s social situation of development and findings indicate how *vospitanie* acts as a thread weaving together the adults’ efforts across three institutional practices and how the child contributes to his own development. Section 9.2.2 explains how another finding of this study—*kaleidoscope of emotions*—contributes to theoretical understanding within cultural–historical approach of child development.

### 9.2.2 Kaleidoscope of emotions

This study introduced the *kaleidoscope of emotions* concept. The concept captures the moment of change within child–environment relationship and explains how the child’s *perezhivanie*...
(Vygotsky, 1934–1994) is transformed when the child experiences dramatic moments and how this change is manifested through the child’s emotions and behaviour. In this sense, the concept develops understanding of perezhivanie by explaining how the change in the child’s perezhivanie occurs and how this change is linked to the development of self-regulation. The use of this metaphor in relation to the child learning to self-regulate and analysis of the child’s perezhivanie through the kaleidoscope of emotions given in this study is novel to cultural–historical research.

9.2.3 Child’s affective self-positioning

This study extended the concept of the child’s affective positioning (Quinones, 2013), in which parents and members of the community position the child affectively in relation to the child’s participation in the family and community practices. The current study further developed this concept by analysing how the child positions himself affectively in relation to his participation in the family, school and community institutional practices and how it relates to the child’s developing self-regulation. Findings indicate that the child’s affective self-positioning is linked to motives and demands in the social environment. Section 9.3 explains methodological contributions of this study.

9.3 Methodological Contribution

This study used dramatic moments as an analytical concept—naturally occurring emotionally charged dramatic events between two people, ‘the drama, which happens between the people’ (Vygotsky, 1983, p. 145)—such as the focus child in Kitezh and the interactions between the focus child and his parents; peers; teachers and siblings.

From a methodological perspective, dramatic moments were located in the data and analysed. Similar concepts have been used in cultural–historical research (e.g., ‘dramatic situation’ and ‘dramatic events’ [see March & Fleer, 2016] and ‘emotionally charged situations’ [see Chen & Fleer, 2015]). However, dramatic moments as a concept, and as the main focus of data analysis to date has been used exclusively in the current study. This furthers Vygotsky’s (1934/1998) understanding of drama between people as a developing force and original form of the developing mental functions (see Hedegaard, 2018) and understanding of the child’s intentions and motives.
This is because through analysis of the dramatic moments, this study gains insights into ‘how’ the function of self-regulation develops.

The data analysis was developed through a detailed, step-by-step procedure, which is explained in Chapter 4 (i.e., how dramatic moments were selected and analysed and how analysis of the dramatic moments through selected vignettes helped contribute to better understanding the research questions). The procedure can now be used by other researchers to advance understanding of the child’s cognitive and emotional development in relation to the process of development of self-regulation. Further explanation of this procedure is given in Chapter 4 of this thesis. Section 9.4 explains the practical implications of the findings.

9.4 Practical Contributions

In practical terms, this study provided understanding of the conditions that are created to support the developing processes of children's self-regulation in the Kitezh Children's Community. The conceptual model (see Figure 8.1) developed by this study demonstrates how adults contribute to the developing processes of children's self-regulation and how children contribute to their own developing processes of self-regulation. The model emphasises that these conditions are implemented differently across three institutional practices. The difference depends on the conditions that are created within each practice by the adults. In addition, the model draws attention to the child’s perspective by emphasising that children (Vova and Maxim) create their own conditions for developing self-regulation through their perezhivanie as they participate in various activities within three institutional practices of family, home and the community. The model provides a holistic analysis of the child's social situation of development in the particular cultural environment in a particular community situated in rural Russia. However, the model may be applicable to family and educational pedagogy outside of Russia and readers are encouraged to undertake an analysis of the child’s social situation of development in relation to the processes involved in learning how to self-regulate. For example, the model can be used as a blueprint in which constant elements are the child’s perezhivanie and activities, across institutional practices that the child participates.
In addition, this research contributes to family and educational pedagogy by providing an extended understanding of the dramatic moments in everyday life in the Kitezh community. In practical terms, the analysis of the findings in this study draws attention to the parents and educators need to be aware of the potential power of the dramatic moments as a developing force, so they do not see them merely as a destruction to the learning process in class or negative child/adult; child/child interaction at home, which automatically warrants disciplinary measures. As Vygotsky (1998) indicated, dramatic moments in a person’s life, drama or crisis, create the conditions for development.

Other practical implications for family and school pedagogy are specific to developmental activities that Vova and Maxim participate in their everyday life in Kitezh community. For example, this study explains how *osoznanie* meetings help to develop children’s self-reflection which according to Vygotsky (1991) helps to develop self-regulatory ability through speech. Parents and educators might benefit from implementing similar activities within their practices. According to Vygotsky’s (1935), concept of ideal and real form, if the ideal form (in this case, verbal interaction with parents or teachers) is not present in the environment and interaction occurs between several rudimentary forms (such as between two children), the resulting development may be limited (Vygotsky, 1935/1994). Developmental tools, such as *osoznanie* meetings, suggested by this study can be integrated into children’s everyday learning activities to enhance development of speech, and subsequently, development of self-reflection and self-regulatory ability.

**9.5 Limitations and Further Research**

**9.5.1 Limitations**

The study has two major limitations. First, it is the limitation of a small scale study: data for this research was collected during a limited period (four weeks) and subsequent base line data were not collected; the vignettes are mostly focused on one child (Vova) and the data samples (dramatic moments) were selected based on perceived challenging, emotional interactions between adults and children and the children and their peers. Second, the study used qualitative technique, which is limited by the subjectivity of the researcher, therefore, data interpretation is limited by the
researcher’s subjective understandings, although based on the existing research in the field of self-regulation.

9.5.2 Future areas of the research

The study revealed how cultural–historical theoretical concepts and the wholeness approach were used to study the process of the child's learning to self-regulate and how adults and children create conditions, which contribute to this process. The focus of the study was on exploring the whole situation of the child's development, rather than looking at separate characteristics, such as, for example, negative emotional expressiveness of child/adult interaction. Such approach is less common in child development research, particularly in studies of children's self-regulation, and therefore, deserves further exploration by future research, which will extend this study. The wholeness approach framed within cultural–historical theoretical concepts introduced by this study is well positioned to explore development of the whole child, rather than separate aspects of the child's development, such as for example, the child's academic performance.

The findings of this study may be transferable to other contexts. For example, the findings can be used to explore development of children's self-regulation within the families, schools and communities within Australia. The link between the wholeness approach and development of the child's self-regulation revealed by this study can be used by future research to explore how children develop self-regulation within everyday family, school and community life in Australia and how it supports development of children's self-regulation, rather than separate characteristic of child development that has been the focus in some studies (Fleer & Hammer, 2013). This will further explore and extend the understanding and aim of this study outlined Chapter 1. It is particularly relevant now because growing research evidence suggests that child's academic and social success in school to a large extent depends on the child’s ability to self-regulate rather than supporting a singular focus on the child’s intellectual ability (Blair & Diamond, 2008; Denham et al., 2012; Shanker, 2010).

Vygotsky’s (1991) approach to vospitanie, particularly in relation to ethical behaviour, can be explored by future research studying different ways children develop ethical capability at school
and at home. This will further develop the conceptual understanding of vospitanie, as it relates to Vygotsky’s perspective. Future research can include a longitudinal study in the Kitezh community and explore the implementation of ethical capability from three perspectives: the educator’s perspective (pedagogy and teaching methods), children’s own contribution to learning and family perspective (parents’ and carers’ pedagogy). Alternatively, a comparative study of the Kitezh and Australian communities can provide further insights into vospitanie by studying how children learn values and different perspectives on vospitanie in these communities.

In practical terms, the developmental tools revealed by the current study’s conceptual model can offer a valuable contribution to future research. For example, emphasis on learning self-reflection through speech (Vygotsky, 1991) and dramatic moments, explained in this study and osoznanie meetings can be included into teacher's and parents' resources to support children as they move through the process of self-regulation. A comprehensive evidenced based learning resource package could be developed as a result of such research to support teachers’ and parents’ efforts towards developing students’ ethical capability.

In addition, the findings of this study in relation to vospitanie, more specifically, the developmental tools revealed by this study’s conceptual model, can be used in future research to develop a comprehensive support package for parents with adopted and fostered children, because this study specifically focused on such a family. This include elements of the Children’s Court role-play, Children’s Junior Council role-play, osoznanie meetings and elements of ‘I build my world’.

Finally, further research is needed to ascertain how conditions indicated in this study affect development of focus children’s (Vova’s and Maxim’s) self-regulation over time (e.g., three years after the initial research to explore the process of development).
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Appendices

Appendix 1: Example of Interview Questions

Interview questions

Parent/Guardian

Activity setting: Helping others
Practice: Home

1. When do you think your child started to show that she/he is willing to help you?
   Probe/prompt: When was the first time you noticed that your child was willing to help you when you needed it/asked for it?

2. How does your child help you at home/garden?
   Probe/prompt: Can you give me an example how your child usually helps you at home/garden?

3. How does your child react when you ask him/her to help you at home/garden?

4. How does your child react when you tell/show that you are unhappy/angry that your child does not/did not help you?

5. What do you usually say to your child when you discover that he/she did not comply with your request (e.g. request to help you to tidy up in the house)? How does your child react to your words/actions at that moment?
Interview questions

Community member

**Activity setting:** Helping others
**Practice:** Community

1. *When do you think* <CHILD'S NAME> *started to show that he is willing to help you?*
   
   **Probe/prompt:** When was the first time you noticed that <CHILD'S NAME> was willing to help you/others when you/others needed it/asked for it?

2. *How does* <CHILD’S NAME> *help within Kitezh community?*
   
   **Probe/prompt:** Can you give me an example how Misha usually helps you or others in the community?

3. *How does* <CHILD’S NAME> *react when you ask him to help you?*

4. *How does* <CHILD’S NAME> *react when you tell/show that you are unhappy/angry that he did not help you?*

5. *What do you usually say to* <CHILD’S NAME> *when you discover that* <CHILD’S NAME> *did not comply with your request (e.g. request to help you to tidy up the community canteen)? How does* <CHILD’S NAME> *react to your words/actions at that moment?*
**Interview questions**

**Teacher**

**Activity setting:** Helping others  
**Practice:** School

1. *When do you think* `<CHILD’S NAME>` *started to show that he is willing to help you/others?*  
   *Probe/prompt:* *When was the first time you noticed that* `<CHILD’S NAME>` *was willing to help you/others when you/others needed it/asked for it?*

2. *How does* `<CHILD’S NAME>` *help you/others at school?*  
   *Probe/prompt:* *Can you give me an example how Misha usually helps you/others at school?*

3. *How does* `<CHILD’S NAME>` *react when you ask him to help you?*

4. *How does* `<CHILD’S NAME>` *react when you/others tell/show that you/others are unhappy that he did not help you/others?*

5. *What do you usually say to* `<CHILD’S NAME>` *when you discover that Misha did not comply with your request (e.g. request to help you to tidy up classroom)? How does Misha react to your words/actions at that moment?*
## Appendix 2: Dramatic Moments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Clip Number</th>
<th>Routine</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Self-regulation strategy</th>
<th>Common sense analysis</th>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>25-Sep</td>
<td>11 (1)</td>
<td>school am</td>
<td>Yoga class at school. Vova refuses to do exercise, starts getting very upset: cries, wrinkles his face crying, protests against teachers trying to help him. Yells &quot;I won't do it.&quot; &quot;I don't want to do it&quot;. Remains withdrawn for while. After a few minutes starts to do exercises together with the group (neck stretching).</td>
<td>Withdrawal</td>
<td>In this example the focus is on how the child self-regulates. Vova uses withdrawal as self-regulation strategy. The child seems more comfortable observing the group rather than participating in the activity. His motive is to remain passive observer and when the adults put a new demand on him, forcing him to participate in the activity, it creates conflict with the initial motive of the child. The child protests against adult's demand and returns to being withdrawal. As the adults do not continue forcing the child to join the group, but simply leave the child be, the child gradually relaxes and eventually joins the group (starts doing the exercises with the group)</td>
<td>Vova uses withdrawal as his self-regulation strategy when he does not want to join the group activity. He prefers to observe the group activity rather than participate in it. If Vova does not have additional pressure on him (for example, if the adult's demand to join the group does not continue after the child refuses to join the group), the child eventually calms down and chooses to participate in the activity.</td>
<td>Child/Adult/ s (Teacher)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chinese Whispers game at school. Vova does not get the word, gets very upset and withdraws from the game. The teacher repeatedly asks him to join the group. She encourages other children to ask him to join the group. Children ask Vova to join the group. After that he sits in the corner looking upset, does not look at the group who continues to play. After a while starts to observe the group. Moves further away from the group.
starts doing pull ups in the corner of the gym. When asked to join the group, refuses again.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20-Oct</td>
<td>before school</td>
<td>Vova tries to show off how well he can do pull ups on the bars, but only manages to do one and gets upset. Throws tantrum, raises his voice, yells out and hides in the canteen hall. Alexander asks him to come out but Vova refuses. He eventually comes out but acts completely withdrawal for the remaining time of the morning walk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>school am</td>
<td>Vova says rude words during the reading class. The teacher notices that and immediately orders Vova to do 5 sit-ups as a disciplinary measure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>19-Oct (1)</td>
<td>The adult's attempts to get Vova out of his hiding spot (the canteen) fail and Vova continues to be withdrawn after the adult insists on him re-joining the group. The child eventually comes out of the canteen but remain withdrawal and seemingly upset for the rest of their walk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>19-Oct (2)</td>
<td>The adult's attempts to get Vova out of his hiding spot (the canteen) fail and Vova continues to be withdrawn after the adult insists on him re-joining the group. The child eventually comes out of the canteen but remain withdrawal and seemingly upset for the rest of their walk.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Withdrawal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>school am</td>
<td>Vova says rude words during the reading class. The teacher notices that and immediately orders Vova to do 5 sit-ups as a disciplinary measure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>19-Oct (1)</td>
<td>The adult's attempts to get Vova out of his hiding spot (the canteen) fail and Vova continues to be withdrawn after the adult insists on him re-joining the group. The child eventually comes out of the canteen but remain withdrawal and seemingly upset for the rest of their walk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>19-Oct (2)</td>
<td>The adult's attempts to get Vova out of his hiding spot (the canteen) fail and Vova continues to be withdrawn after the adult insists on him re-joining the group. The child eventually comes out of the canteen but remain withdrawal and seemingly upset for the rest of their walk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>3-Oct 24(1)</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>home getting ready for bed</td>
<td>Vova refuses to join Maxim and Nata when they test their new microphone at home. Vova gets upset and escapes to his room. He cries. Mother follows him and tells him either join Maxim and Nata or go to bed. Vova starts sobbing and crawls to bed, puts his blanket over his head. Hear him sobbing loud. He is very upset.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sleep when others are having fun with the microphone. The mother's rigid two options are not perceived well by the child. Vova is getting visibly more upset and starts sobbing more, hiding his head under the pillow as if trying to hide from the whole situation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>away from the group and going to his room. His mother follows him to his room and continues to put the demand on him. In addition, she puts another demand on Vova - join the group or go to sleep that sounds like impossible choice for the child to make. Vova is already struggling with the initial demand of his environment to join the group, he now has another demand from his mother - to go to sleep, which sounds more like a punishment for not joining the group. The child is overwhelmed by these demands and bursts into tears. He obviously not happy with both demands, and his own motive - simply observe the group is not met. By putting additional demand on Vova when he already struggles with the first demand of his environment, the mother creates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
conditions which make it very difficult for the child to self-regulate, at least by using his usual strategy of withdrawal. The child fails to self-regulate and does not join the group activity. Conclusion: parents and caretakers need to be aware of the child's self-regulation strategy and not put additional demands on him when he already struggles with the first demand of his environment.

Vova and Maxim play in the park after school. Vova grabs Maxim's cap. Maxim asks Vova to give it back, and gets very upset. Vova puts Maxim's cap on top of...
his own cap and teases him. Maxim gets more upset, almost crying. They fight. Then move away from each other and calm down.

Vova is in the kitchen asks for a chocolate researcher left for children last night. Father ignores his request, asks Vova to take his pants out of the laundry basket. Vova refuses, starts heated argument with the father saying that the pants have stains on therefore should stay in the basket. Father insists on his demand. Vova gets very upset, stomps feet, crosses arms, and starts sobbing. Eventually complies with father's demand but remains upset and dramatic (drops his head on his arms looking sad, sobs). Display of emotions/tantrum
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26-Sep</td>
<td>Vova and Maxim fight while getting dressed for school. Father notices fighting, asks Vova to return the chocolate he got early on that morning. Vova does not comply. Maxim does not always respond physically to Vova's punches, saying instead &quot;I will take you to court&quot;. Father asks both children to wash their face and brush their teeth. Vova gets upset. Stomps his feet. Nata asking her father why Vova stomps feet every morning making her life hell. Father responds that Vova is 'just this way'. Vova bursts into tears but goes to brush teeth.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td>Seek help of the other (court), tell on others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9,1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Display of emotions/tantrum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Oct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Vova and Maxim are in the gym. Maxim picks up a deflated party balloon from the floor and tries to blow it. Vova jumps at him and starts hitting him, getting very agitated. He yells at Maxim: "Mama does not allow us to pick up dirty things from the floor. This balloon already has someone's else saliva on it". Maxim wants to continue blowing up the balloon but Vova hits him again, this time with a skipping rope, he is getting very emotional and does not let him blow up the balloon. Maxim is also upset, he retreats from the gym and calls Vladik (an older child) from the school hall to defend him. Vladik walks into the gym and asks Vova why he hurts Maxim. Maxim explains and Vladik tells Vova to leave Maxim alone.
Mother disciplines Maxim for telling on Vova. She says: "Do not make up things about Vova. Do not lie. Treat others as you want to be treated". Maxim looks around and smiles nervously. Mother asks "What is so funny now?" Maxim lows his head and looks sad. She continues her moral lecture, until Maxim says: "Yes" in a sheepish trembling voice. He suddenly starts talking about a different situation completely unrelated to the current conversation.

Art class at school (in the gym) Vova and Maxim are separated from their classmates who sit on the floor in a circle and watch 2 teachers drawing. Maxim and Vova are hanging on the metal bars trying to do push ups. Vova attacks Maxim they fight and scream. Maxim is on
the floor, Vova kicks him. Maxim bursts into tears and says, "I will tell the father".

Vova hunts down Maxim in a spontaneous game of "war". Maxim runs away from Vova and hides in the house. He locks the door of the house, but Maxim spots him as the door has glass part. Vova furiously tries to open the door and get Maxim. Vova is getting more and more upset as he fails to open the door. He cries "War must go on!"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14-6-Oct</td>
<td>10 (3) pm</td>
<td>After school, Vova kicks Maxim on the floor. Maxim bursts into tears and says, &quot;I will tell the father&quot;. Vova hunts down Maxim in a spontaneous game of &quot;war&quot;. Maxim runs away from Vova and hides in the house. He locks the door of the house, but Maxim spots him as the door has glass part. Vova furiously tries to open the door and get Maxim. Vova is getting more and more upset as he fails to open the door. He cries &quot;War must go on!&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-12-Oct</td>
<td>11 am</td>
<td>PE lesson. Alexander as a teacher. Maxim abuses Varvara (his classmate) saying: &quot;Oh, yak. She has rotten socks. She stinks&quot;. Vova steps in to defend Varvara. Alexander interferes. Interesting moment when the teacher says &quot;Sit up&quot;, Maxim immediately starts doing &quot;sit ups&quot;. Looks at others, blame others</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
like in his mind he automatically connects his bad behaviour with punishment (the other teacher asks them to do sit ups when they misbehave). Alexander is puzzled by Maxim "sit ups". He explains that he simply wants Maxim to sit down (in Russian this sounds similar).

The father orders Vova and Maxim to do push-ups on the kitchen floor as punishment for swearing. Vova finishes first. He is upset. Tears on his face. Maxim is sad and starts sobbing. When he finishes, he continues to look sad and cries. When his mother asks him why he is crying, he answers: "They lock me up in the Angel House (one of the houses where children have classes)."

Seek help of the other, telling on others
Children collect autumn leaves in the park. They make a pile to jump in. Maxim hurts 2 years old Kolya - he momentarily but firmly squeezes Kolya's head with his hands. Alexander confronts Maxim about it explaining how it is wrong. Alexander kneels down to Maxim's level when he explains why it is wrong to hurt the baby.

This example demonstrates how member of the Kitezh community create conditions for child's self-regulation. Alexander uses this tense moment to teach Maxim about how he should treat a small child, something that Kitezh community is very strict about. Alexander uses calm but firm voice when he explains it to Maxim and gets down to his level making sure that he does not intimidate Maxim.

During morning walk Vova starts fight with Maxim, slaps and punches him. Maxim is stunned and about to cry. Alexander interferes, breaks their fight and explains that they need to resolve disagreements by conversation.

Display of emotions/physical separation

School's hall before class. Children tell Vova that he will go to court. Vova is defiant, he insists that he will take them to court.

Display of emotions
instead: yells out at them. Children confront him about his yelling and gangs up on him.

Total 20 video clips/20 dramatic moments
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<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consent Form</td>
<td>Consent Cm member</td>
<td>09/05/2018</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STATEMENT OF FOCUS CHILD ASSENT

YOU CAN USE THE FOLLOWING STATEMENT TO EXPLAIN THE PROJECT TO YOUR CHILD:

Someone who does research with children is coming to your home/school soon and she would like to find out more about how children play and learn. She will use a video camera to film children playing and working.

You can choose whether you would like to be part of the project.

If you choose to take part you can change your mind at any time, she won’t mind. You can circle or colour on one of these faces to show how you feel about taking part in this project.

😊  ☹

Date:……………………………

Child’s Name : ........................................................................................................

Date of Birth:........................................................................................................
Informed Consent Form for community member

Project Number:
Dramatic moments in children's everyday life: A cultural-historical reading of self-regulation

NOTE: Signed written consent will remain with the Monash University researchers for their records.

I agree to take part in the above named Monash University project. The project has been explained to me and I have read the Explanatory Statement, which I keep for my records.

I understand that in agreeing to take part in this project, that I am willing (please tick):

- to be videotaped and photographed at home and within Kitezh community
- to be videotaped and observed during interaction with focus child/children and other members of the community
- participate in the interviews with the researcher

At the end of fieldwork, the researcher would like to use the words and images collected from this project for different purposes. I give permission for my students' images and words to be used in (please tick):

- a doctoral thesis
- scholarly journal articles or book chapters
- conference presentations
- poster presentations
- teaching in undergraduate coursework programs regarding children’s development
- selected images/words stored/shown electronically (e.g. form of digital doctoral thesis; teaching materials)

I also understand that (please tick):

- I may be identifiable, though all practical measures will be taken to avoid this.
- images will be in the form of video sequences, still photographs, descriptive reports and scholarly discussion limited to the field of education or relevant debate among educational professionals who may be interested in new research about child development, inclusion, disability.
- the video data and other photographic recordings will be stored by the university researchers in a secure place on the university's premises, for a period of ten years after the conclusion to the research, with the proviso that access to this recorded data will only be provided in the context of scholarly presentations or university study. There will not be a provision for open public access to this recorded data and I am providing consent only to the researchers’ use of this material for the sake of enhancing knowledge within the field of education.
- recorded video and other photographic data may be selected for public access i.e., with the understanding that “public access” will always mean scholarly or professional discussions in the field of education, including in an on-line context for educational purposes.
- I understand that I can stop participating any time I wish and that I can email the researcher requesting to view the images of my students. If I change my mind about the use of the data for the purposes listed above I can contact the researcher and the data will not be used for any future purposes. However, I cannot withdraw data retrospectively after 6 months.
Community member’s name .................................................................

Signature of the community member:..................................................................

Phone or/and email: ..................................................................................

...........................................................................................................       

Date:.............................................
Informed Consent Form for Parents/Guardians of a focus child

Project Number: 12834: Dramatic moments in children’s everyday life: A cultural-historical reading of self-regulation

NOTE: Signed written consent will remain with the Monash University researchers for their records.

I agree that my child may take part in the above named Monash University project. The project has been explained to me and I have read the Explanatory Statement, which I keep for my records.

I understand that in agreeing to take part in this project, that I am willing (please tick):

- [ ] for my child to be videotaped and photographed at home/school
- [ ] for my child to participate in this study if she/he is selected as a focus child based on the study criteria
- [ ] to give access to my child’s portfolio, art works and attendance records for research purposes

At the end of fieldwork, the researcher would like to use the words and images collected from this project for different purposes. I give permission for my child’s images and words to be used in (please tick):

- [ ] a doctoral thesis
- [ ] scholarly journal articles or book chapters
- [ ] conference presentations
- [ ] poster presentations
- [ ] teaching in undergraduate coursework programs regarding children’s development
- [ ] selected images/words stored/shown electronically (e.g. form of digital doctoral thesis; teaching materials)

I also understand that (please tick):

- [ ] my child may be identifiable, though all practical measures will be taken to avoid this.
- [ ] images will be in the form of video sequences, still photographs, descriptive reports and scholarly discussion limited to the field of education or relevant debate among educational professionals who may be interested in new research about child development, inclusion, disability.
- [ ] the video data and other photographic recordings will be stored by the university researchers in a secure place on the university’s premises, for a period of ten years after the conclusion to the research, with the proviso that access to this recorded data will only be provided in the context of scholarly presentations or university study. There will not be a provision for open public access to this recorded data and I am providing consent only to the researchers’ use of this material for the sake of enhancing knowledge within the field of education.
- [ ] recorded video and other photographic data may be selected for public access i.e., with the understanding that “public access” will always mean scholarly or professional discussions in the field of education, including in an on-line context for educational purposes.
- [ ] my child can stop participating any time during the data collection period. However, I cannot withdraw data retrospectively after 6 months.
Child’s name

Date of birth:

Parents'/Guardians' names/

Signature of Parent/Legal Representative:

Phone or/and email:

Date:
Informed Consent Form for Teacher


NOTE: Signed written consent will remain with the Monash University researchers for their records.

I agree to take part in the above named Monash University project. The project has been explained to me and I have read the Explanatory Statement, which I keep for my records.

I understand that in agreeing to take part in this project, that I am willing (please tick):

☐ to be videotaped and photographed at home/school
☐ participate in the interviews with the researcher
☐ to give access to my students’ portfolio, art works and attendance records for research purposes

At the end of fieldwork, the researcher would like to use the words and images collected from this project for different purposes. I give permission for my students’ images and words to be used in (please tick):

☐ a doctoral thesis
☐ scholarly journal articles or book chapters
☐ conference presentations
☐ poster presentations
☐ teaching in undergraduate coursework programs regarding children’s development
☐ selected images/words stored/shown electronically (e.g. form of digital doctoral thesis; teaching materials)

I also understand that (please tick):

☐ I may be identifiable, though all practical measures will be taken to avoid this.
☐ images will be in the form of video sequences, still photographs, descriptive reports and scholarly discussion limited to the field of education or relevant debate among educational professionals who may be interested in new research about child development, inclusion, disability.
☐ the video data and other photographic recordings will be stored by the university researchers in a secure place on the university’s premises, for a period of ten years after the conclusion to the research, with the proviso that access to this recorded data will only be provided in the context of scholarly presentations or university study. There will not be a provision for open public access to this recorded data and I am providing consent only to the researchers’ use of this material for the sake of enhancing knowledge within the field of education.
☐ recorded video and other photographic data may be selected for public access i.e., with the understanding that “public access” will always mean scholarly or professional discussions in the field of education, including in an on-line context for educational purposes.
☐ I can stop participating any time during the data collection period. If I change my mind about the use of the data for the purposes listed above I can contact the researcher and the data will not be used for any future purposes. However, I cannot withdraw data retrospectively after 6 months.
Teacher’s names ........................................................................................................

Signature of Teacher: ................................................................................................

Phone or/and email: ............................................................................................

....................................................................................................................................

Date:..............................................