

From Predicament to Possibility: Attenuating the “Strict Superego” in Higher Vocational College Classrooms

Yuxin Wu*

School of Information, Guangzhou Huanan Business College, Guangzhou 510550, Guangdong, China

**Author to whom correspondence should be addressed.*

Copyright: © 2026 Author(s). This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY 4.0), permitting distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is cited.

Abstract: Higher vocational colleges (HVCs) educate heterogeneous learners whose classroom interactions sometimes manifest as silence, withdrawal, perfectionism, or oppositionality. Reading these responses through “strict superego” highlights how internalized punitive injunctions can convert ordinary setbacks into identity-threatening experiences. Yet a solely deficit focus risks disempowerment. This research proposes an integrative, practice-oriented approach that uses front-line teachers’ insight diagnostically to identify affective injunctions, mobilizes Piagetian constructivist principles to design learning sequences that support successful accommodation, and applies Bourdieusian recognition strategies to convert students’ practical capital into symbolic capital recognized within the institutional field. The approach reframes student difficulties as opportunities for competence building and trust restoration, delivering concrete, ethically cautious strategies for improving engagement, transfer, and student countenance in HVC contexts.

Keywords: Higher vocational colleges; Strict superego; Piaget; Bourdieu; Scaffolding; Formative assessment; Vocational pedagogy

Online publication: April 26, 2026

1. Introduction

Higher vocational colleges (HVCs) simultaneously prepare students for occupational roles and serve as formative social institutions. Learners in HVCs are diverse in age, prior schooling, socioeconomic background, and life responsibilities; teachers therefore encounter repeated patterns of interactional difficulty, silence in theory sessions, reluctance to ask for help, intense perfectionism that stalls progress, episodic oppositionality, and withdrawal from evaluative tasks ^[1]. When mistakes feel like moral failures or when practical competence is not recognized, ordinary classroom difficulty can become a threat to identity and persistence rather than an opportunity for growth.

This research keeps the student’s predicament at the center and asks a straightforward question: given these everyday patterns, what modest, classroom-ready moves can teachers use to reduce threat and build on students’ strengths? To answer this, we draw on three complementary perspectives. Lacanian language, in particular the idea of a punitive or “strict” superego, offers a way to see how some students experience error as moral failure and therefore avoid help or exposure.

Piagetian constructivism explains how learning succeeds when tasks are sequenced so that disequilibrium is bounded and scaffolded, enabling accommodation rather than shutdown. Bourdieu's concepts of habitus and capital direct attention to how practical, embodied skill can be undervalued by classroom norms, producing misrecognition and reluctance to display competence publicly. None of these frameworks is offered as a clinical diagnosis; rather, each supplies a pragmatic lens for noticing what is happening to students and for choosing modest responses.

The approach proposed here is intentionally practical and student-facing. It treats the patterns teachers encounter as interpretable predicaments, constrained schematic readiness, lack of symbolic recognition for practical skill, or affective internalization of failure, and then maps each predicament onto short, low-prep interventions that can be tried and refined in ordinary lessons. The goal is not efficacious transformation but to reduce immediate barriers to participation, generate small, repeatable successes, and make students' competence visible and credible so they can persist and progress.

2. Empirical landscape for practice

Contemporary research in vocational and higher education makes two linked points that are directly relevant to students' predicaments. First, affective risk is real and rising: anxiety, shame, and other mental-health pressures interfere with participation and persistence^[2,3]. For many HVC students, the smallest public slip can feel disproportionately consequential because errors are taken to mean personal inadequacy rather than part of learning. Second, the currency of classroom recognition often mismatches what students actually can do: many learners show strong procedural skill in workshops but perform poorly on abstract or verbal tasks, so their practical capital is not translated into the symbolic evidence that assessments valorize^[4]. This practical-verbal gap corrodes confidence and discourages public demonstration.

To sharpen the linkage between these empirical patterns and classroom practice, the concept of the "strict superego" is useful as a practical, non-clinical heuristic. Lacan's strict superego names an internal voice that moralizes failure and demands impossible standards; in classroom terms, this translates into behaviors that teachers routinely observe: help-avoidance, preemptive self-denigration, punitive over-correction, and an intolerance of small errors. Treating the strict superego as a descriptive lens does two things for practice. First, it foregrounds affective dynamics as cause rather than merely consequence: when a student refuses help or frames a mistake as moral failure, the problem is not only a gap in skill but an internal economy that makes exposure painful. Second, it suggests different, dignity-preserving responses than conventional remediation: the priority becomes lowering the affective cost of trying, not simply increasing practice volume.

Empirically, signs consistent with a strict-superego dynamic cohere with the affective risks documented in the literature. Qualitative studies and practitioner reports describe students who interpret errors catastrophically and who adopt avoidance strategies that reduce help-seeking and public practice. Practitioner pilots and small action-research projects suggest that rituals which reframe errors as data, short, regular error-analysis sessions, lower shame and help students try again^[5]. Converting practical work into visible artifacts (short demo clips, portfolios, employer notes) also appears to increase students' willingness to display competence by making their skills count in the symbolic economy of the classroom and workplace.

Alongside these problems are practical opportunities. Constructivist and cognitive-load research points to predictable ways of supporting students so that cognitive conflict becomes productive rather than destructive: worked examples, stepwise decomposition, and fading guidance all reduce extraneous load and enable gradual accommodation^[6]. Social-cognitive work shows that peer modeling and vicarious learning provide low-cost exposure and increase self-efficacy. Formative assessment research underscores the power of frequent, low-stakes feedback to reduce evaluative threat and encourage iterative improvement.

The literature suggests two practical aims for teachers working with students in predicament: reduce affective threat so mistakes cease to function as identity threats, and create visible pathways that convert hands-on competence into recognized achievement. The evidence for specific tactics is modest but convergent: small, low-burden interventions,

scaffolded sequencing, worked examples, peer modeling, portfolios, and brief error-as-data routines, are feasible in routine lessons and have plausible effects on participation, confidence, and transfer. Given limits in the evidence base, teachers are best advised to implement reversible, low-risk moves, collect short-cycle evidence in their classrooms, and adapt practices to local needs.

3. Integrated diagnostic model

To keep the focus on students' predicaments and on positive, practical responses, the integrated diagnostic model provides three short probes teachers can use in the flow of instruction. Each probe is designed to reveal which predicament is most salient and to point to a matched, immediately actionable response.

The Piagetian probe targets task/readiness. The teacher models one clear next step or offers a 10–15 second worked example, then asks the student to do the next small action. If the student improves noticeably after that single scaffold, the problem is probably a schematic mismatch: the task assumes knowledge or a procedure the learner hasn't yet formed. The immediate response is scaffolded sequencing. Break the task into two to four mini-steps, show the steps visually (cards, checklist, or on-screen prompts), give a short corrective cue, and set up a tiny, guaranteed success. Fade the supports as the student shows the next level of independence.

The Bourdieuan probe targets positioning and recognition. The teacher asks the student to show how they do something and then to give a one-sentence explanation or a very short demo. If the student performs well but hesitates to explain or to display the work, the issue is likely misrecognition: embodied skill has not been converted into visible, countable evidence. The constructive move is to make competence visible and count it. Collect short artifacts (a photo, a clip, an annotated sample) for a practical portfolio, run brief small-group demonstrations that name the skill, and openly credit students using concrete skill terms. These steps lower the cost of exposure and give students symbolic recognition that matches what they can do.

Strict Superego probe targets affective/internalisation. The teacher listens for self-denigrating language, refusals of help, perfectionist qualifiers, or talk that treats errors as proof of identity. Offer a guaranteed micro-success task or a normalizing prompt such as, "This is just information for our next try." When punitive internalization is present, a strict inner voice that punishes mistakes and blocks risk-taking, the priority is de-moralising containment. Run very short error-as-data routines that treat mistakes as information, pair the student with peers who model mistakes and correction, use micro-coaching language that emphasizes strategy and effort (not character), and provide private, low-stakes practice so the student can experience success without public threat.

In ordinary teaching, the same surface signs, silence, refusal, messy work, or repeated mistakes, can come from very different causes. Students may simply lack the right cognitive chunks for the task; they may have practical competence that isn't being recognized; or they may be blocked by an internalized punitive voice that makes error intolerable. Quick probes let teachers distinguish these predicaments and choose targeted, low-cost moves that change the student's immediate experience. Paying special attention to the strict superego matters because punitive internalization often looks like laziness or stubbornness but responds better to containment, normalization, and private practice than to praise or reprimand.

The aim of the model is practical: to help teachers see students' predicaments clearly and to respond with small, positive moves that create micro-successes, increase visibility of competence, and reduce the affective cost of making mistakes. Over time, these modest steps can shift classroom norms so that more students persist, practice, and make learning visible.

These probes are heuristics, not labels. Teachers should triangulate findings and choose a single small intervention or a simple combination and re-probe after one to three lessons. Keep records minimal and monitor simple indicators such as participation count, a single self-efficacy item, and a short transfer task score. Always frame probes as routine checks used with all students, protect dignity when recording or publicizing work, and refer to support services when deeper distress is evident.

4. Practical classroom designs and scripted moves

The practices below operationalize the integrated model in ways that are directly usable by classroom teachers. They are deliberately low prep, dignity preserving, and chosen so front-line teachers can try one move at a time and see short-term change. Start by using a very short diagnostic check (a single scaffold, a short demo request, or listening for self-denigrating language) and pick one matched micro move to try for the next two lessons. After each attempt, note one line: what teachers asked, how the student responded, and whether anything changed.

Rapid differential diagnostic routine. Spend 5–10 minutes per student or small group when classroom teachers notice a recurring difficulty. Use a simple checklist to record three quick signals: scaffold responsiveness (improves after one short model), practical/theoretical discrepancy (does the student do the task but avoid explaining it?), and affective cues (self-denigration, refusal of help). The checklist guides immediate selection of either a scaffolded lesson, recognition strategies, or de-moralizing containment and creates a short trace teachers can review later.

Micro scaffold lesson template (45–60 minutes). Begin with a 5-minute full, concrete demonstration so students see the whole task. Follow with 10–15 minutes of guided practice using step cards or a visible checklist; teachers model one step, students do the next, and the teacher gives immediate, specific corrective feedback. Spend 10 minutes linking the action to one simple principle (one sentence or a quick sketch) and 10–15 minutes on a slightly different transfer task with faded guidance. Close with 3–5 minutes of micro recognition where each student names one small improvement. This structure reduces cognitive load, provides worked examples, and builds repeatable micro successes.

Error Clinic ritual (weekly, 10–15 minutes). Collect anonymous mistakes (short notes, photos, or summaries). In class, analyze two or three examples as learning data: identify procedural or conceptual cause, propose one corrective micro step, and rehearse it once. The teacher frames errors as information, not failure. Over weeks, this ritual normalizes mistakes and reduces shame without naming students publicly.

Practical to symbolic portfolio (ongoing). Ask students to collect short artifacts: a 60-second demo clip, a photo of work, or a brief supervisor comment, plus one line mapping action to principle. Use these artifacts in small group exemplars and include them in formative checks. Making practical work visible and countable converts embodied competence into assessable evidence and helps students see that their skill matters.

Peertranslation pairs and scripted language. Pair a practically skilled student with a partner asked to explain the principle in one sentence, then swap roles. Teach and use neutral, curiositybased feedback prompts, “Tell me about your process here,” “What’s one thing you’d try next time?” instead of moralizing remarks. These moves reduce shame, support translation between doing and explaining, and create opportunities for vicarious learning.

Evaluation and simple monitoring. For pragmatic pilots (8–12 weeks), track three short indicators: participation (number of voluntary attempts per session), performance (accuracy on a scaffolded task and a short transfer task), and a single selfefficacy item (“How confident are you to try this again?” on a 1–5 scale). Add brief microinterviews (1–3 minutes) with a few students and a weekly fidelity note (Did I run one scaffolded lesson? Did we hold an error clinic?). Keep data on index cards or a single spreadsheet column so it remains usable but lighttouch.

Compact tools you can use immediately. A onepage teacher observation sheet with rows per student (codes ticked, oneline note, intervention chosen, date); a fiveitem student selfreport for private use (short items about shame, helpavoidance, preference for showing over explaining, acting out, and belief in improvement); and a five minute microinterview guide with three prompts (“What were you thinking during that step?” “What would make it easier to try this in class?” “Tell me one thing you’re proud of doing here.”).

Intervention protocols (quick scripts). If a student improves after a onestep model (Piagetian pattern): use the micro scaffold lesson, show the whole task, then practice step 1 together; praise routine and sequence. If a student performs handson but avoids explaining (Bourdieuian pattern): prompt a 60second demo clip and a oneline caption, use the clip in a small group, and give explicit skillnamed praise. If a student uses defeatist language or refuses help (Strict superego pattern): offer a guaranteed microsuccess task, use a private, normalizing prompt (“This isn’t graded, what one small next

step would you try?"), and place the student in a peer modeling pair for a short session. Run any chosen protocol for 2–4 cycles and reprobe.

5. Qualitative focus on students' predicaments

The core aim of these designs is to keep attention on students' predicaments while foregrounding small, positive, testable steps teachers can take. Rather than treating behaviors such as silence, help-avoidance, perfectionism, or refusal to show work as fixed traits, this approach reads them as signals about what is making learning hard for a particular student right now. That reading then points to modest interventions that protect dignity, create micro-successes, and generate evidence teachers and learners can use to move forward.

Three recurring predicaments are especially useful to notice. The first is schematic/readiness gaps. Here a student repeats procedural mistakes or stalls because the task assumes cognitive or procedural chunks they have not yet formed. A quick probe is a one-step worked example: model a single next move for 10–15 seconds and ask the student to try the following micro-action. If performance improves immediately, the problem is likely schematic and remediable through sequencing. Try a two-to-four step micro-scaffold, give three short guided repetitions, and fade support as competence emerges.

The second predicament is misrecognition of practical capital. Some learners can do the work but resist explaining it, filming it, or presenting it. That reluctance often reflects a gap between embodied skill and the classroom's symbolic currencies. A simple probe is to ask for a one-sentence explanation or a thirty-second demo. If the student performs but withdraws from display, make competence visible in low-risk ways: collect a single artifact (photo, annotated sample, short clip), add it to a practical portfolio, or run a brief small-group demo where the teacher names the skill explicitly. Counting and naming competence in concrete terms converts practical capital into recognizable evidence and reduces the cost of exposure.

The third predicament is affective containment, what we describe as a strict or punitive internal script. Listen for self-denigrating language, automatic refusals of help, or statements that equate errors with personal worth. A rapid probe is a normalizing prompt paired with a guaranteed micro-win, for example: "This is just information for our next try, show me one small thing that went OK. If punitive internalization appears present, prioritize de-moralising moves: run a very short error-as-data ritual (one problem, one factual observation, one next step), pair the student with a peer who models mistake correction, use micro-coaching language focused on strategy and effort rather than identity, and offer private, low-stakes practice so the student can experience success without public scrutiny.

Implementation is intentionally low-burden. Use the probes as heuristics rather than labels, and try at least two probes across one to three lessons before fixing on an interpretation. Choose one small intervention, or a simple paired move such as a scaffold plus a one-minute error ritual, apply it for one to two lessons, and then re-probe. Keep records minimal and respectful: one tick per probe, the intervention used, and a one-line outcome note (for example, "tried scaffold; 2 voluntary attempts next lesson"). Track one or two simple indicators such as voluntary participation, a short transfer task, or a single self-efficacy item.

This approach respects dignity and agency: it uses students' existing strengths as entry points, keeps interventions reversible and testable, and asks teachers to collect only brief, actionable evidence. Over repeated cycles, small adjustments to sequencing, recognition, and tone can cumulatively lower the affective cost of learning and increase students' willingness to practice publicly.

6. Ethical and contextual cautions

Teachers are pedagogues, not therapists. Avoid clinical labels in conversations with students; the interventions described are pedagogical, not clinical. Severe affective distress should prompt referral to counseling services; follow predetermined

referral pathways to qualified mental health professionals. Strict superego terminology is a pedagogical heuristic, not a clinical diagnosis, and interventions must be non-stigmatizing.

Frame probes and recording as routine practice used with all students so no one feels singled out. Secure consent for recordings and offer opt-outs; anonymize where possible. Cultural and institutional variability means tools should be adapted to local habitus and assessment architectures.

7. Conclusion

Centering the strict superego clarifies how affective economies can make ordinary failure feel catastrophic for some higher vocational (HVC) learners. When that diagnostic insight is paired with Piagetian sequencing to support accommodation and Bourdieuan strategies to visualize practical capital, teachers obtain a compact, practical repertoire of low-cost interventions. Tools such as a micro-scaffold template, brief Error Clinic rituals, portfolios, peer-translation tasks, and scripted feedback recast mistakes as diagnostic data, surface competence, and normalize help-seeking. Implemented alongside targeted teacher development and evaluated through pragmatic mixed-methods pilots, this integrated approach is both feasible and scalable. It offers a clear pathway from predicament to possibility in HVC settings and merits further longitudinal and cross-contextual evaluation to establish impacts on retention, skill transfer, and learner wellbeing.

Funding

Guangdong Educational Evaluation Association (Project No.: BEPG24150)

Disclosure statement

The author declares no conflict of interest.

References

- [1] Ryökkynen S, Pirttimaa R, Kontu E, 2020, Interaction Between Students and Class Teachers in Vocational Education and Training: ‘Safety Distance Is Needed’. *Nordic Journal of Vocational Education and Training*, 9(2): 156–174.
- [2] Kang C, Wu J, 2022, A Theoretical Review on the Role of Positive Emotional Classroom Rapport in Preventing EFL Students’ Shame: A Control-Value Theory Perspective. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13: 977240.
- [3] Rajan S, Herbert S, Polly D, 2023, Mental Health Stressors, Affective Risk, and Student Persistence in Post-Secondary Career and Technical Education Contexts. *Proceedings of the ACTER Conference*, New York.
- [4] Bathmaker A, James D, 2017, *Teaching in Further Education: The Changing Context of Post-Compulsory Education* (4th ed.). UCL IOE Press, New Jersey.
- [5] Meinokat P, Wagner I, 2025, Classroom Disruptions and Classroom Management in Learning Factory Settings at Vocational Schools. *International Journal for Research in Vocational Education and Training*, 12(2): 266–288.
- [6] Lange C, Costley J, 2022, How Sequencing Content and Fading Instructional Support Reduce Extraneous Processing. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 59(3): 253–262.

Publisher’s note

Whioce Publishing remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.