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Abstract

This doctoral thesis documents a collaborative ethnographic study in a junior school setting applying the Social and Emotional Aspects of Learning (SEAL) curriculum - ‘an explicit, structured, whole-curriculum framework and resource for teaching social, emotional and behavioural skills to all pupils’ (DfES 2005, pg. 5). Children’s emotional skills in particular are positioned as a remedy for the mental health problems perceived to be facing contemporary society (Seligman 2005). However, Gillies (2011) has shown how such understandings of emotion in education categorise particular emotions as right or wrong. This, she suggests, works to pathologise the emotional lives of children (Gillies 2011). In response, Kenway and Youdall (2011) call for a move towards a ‘socio-cultural-spatial analysis of emotion ... [that] ... allows us to engage with emotion in new ways’ (pg. 132). Like Kenway and Youdell (2011) I have found that few educational studies make links between space, place and emotionality, and particularly from children’s perspectives. The thesis develops a socio-spatial lens in order to foreground a definition of emotion as the meanings that people make of affective experiences and productions in relation to particular contexts. In this thesis I am interested in children’s meaning-making and how this is influenced by the school setting. The thesis is divided in two intersecting volumes. Volume A documents how I have developed a methodology for researching emotion from children’s perspectives and Volume B presents a series of vignettes that capture children’s meaning-making. The methodological approach was foregrounded by a concept of emplacement (Pink 2009), which considers place (which is considered to be emotionally textured) as dynamic and socially produced. This perspective attends to the ways that children are both shaped by and shape the emotional landscapes of schooling. In line with this theoretical lens I co-developed arts-orientated methodologies with a group of nine children (aged 9 and 10) to examine the social and spatial dimensions of emotion, such as den-building, film-making and scrapbooks. To reflect the way that the research design shapes research findings, the thesis is designed in a way that supports the reader to make choices about how they move between these two volumes. In doing so I also intend for the reader to construct their own understandings as they navigate the thesis, in order to reflect the subjective and unfolding nature of the research process. The design of the thesis also reflects the complexities of capturing the intersectional nature of the material and immaterial in children’s constructions of emotion, it shows how different moments in children’s school lives are intertwined in the social production of emotional landscapes. In essence this doctoral study aims to show how a socio-spatial analysis of emotion enables alternative (by this I mean moving away from a ‘skills’ orientated perspective) and productive ways of thinking about emotion to enter into educational settings and educational research.
He should be in the IR because he has got angry problems.

Control your anger, like a grown-up.
Preface: A Reader Guide

This reader guide is intended as a starting point to set you on your journey through this thesis. As you will find out, you will be able to choose your own way through this thesis, and decide when it is time to end. This section will provide you with an overview of this research study. In addition, the format of the thesis will be introduced as well as some suggestions on how you might read it.

1. Researching Emotion in Education

Research Overview

This study brings together my experiences from three areas, architecture, psychotherapy and education. I began university in 1999 with the ambition of studying to become an architect, inspired by an interest and aptitude for design. Through my architectural education and experiences in practice I developed strong interests in opening up the design process to communities and also designing architecture that facilitated personal and collaborative appropriation. During my masters in architecture I became drawn to person-centred theory and practice in relation to the architectural design process, informed through my experiences as a client of a person-centred therapist. During a year out from the masters I completed a variety of professional development courses in the person-centred approach and applied my understanding through voluntary roles in schools and local charities, working with young people on a one-to-one or small-group basis to support them at school. After this I returned to architectural education to pull together my interest in collaborative processes of architectural design with person-centred perspectives. However, this led me to reflect upon my own experiences as a student, and critique this against the understanding I had of the person-centred approach. I became frustrated by how little I felt understood while in dialogue with tutors. I started to take my project work to my therapist for discussion. Through doing so, I became more and more
interested in communication as I recognised the value of being heard and of hearing others. I was alerted to the importance of listening in learning.

After completing my training in architecture I took on a role as an action researcher in 2004, working with children and young people to explore creative approaches to teaching and learning using the built environment as a learning resource. I had the opportunity to structure and facilitate architectural education workshops, which embedded my value for listening. Essentially I sought the opportunity to not only identify the benefits of architectural education in schools, but also to explore the relationship between listening and learning. I became interested in the way that teachers interpreted and responded to children’s conduct at school, and also how they used these interpretations to assess children’s capabilities to learn. For example, some teachers felt that children were manipulative and used their emotions to get their own way. Part of the teacher’s role was to see through such manipulation and not respond to it. At the time, I felt that these kinds of positions were barriers to listening to children and found myself quickly becoming frustrated or disheartened by some of the teachers’ attitudes, and in some instances my own responses caused tensions in the research process. I am now more sensitive to the textured nature of these positions and their relationship to a range of socio-cultural factors. Through the action research I tried to co-create an ‘ideal’ learning climate with the children, whereas now I am much more interested in engaging with the positions of different actors and the effects upon how people relate to, communicate and understand one another in schools.

My current perspectives on research have been strengthened in roles after this project. I continued to work within architecture and education and was the research associate for a project which aimed to identify effective approaches to engaging the school community in school design and procurement processes. At the same time I co-founded a small enterprise, which established, managed and facilitated projects to engage young people with architecture and design. I started to feel uneasy about the work that I was doing. It felt very biased. These projects were orientated around our acceptance and promotion of particular ideas about learning. The work that I did with schools ran at the same time as a wide range of new creative educational initiatives were being developed at both local and national
policy levels. These were exciting to me at the time, and shared a focus on the development of creative educational approaches which were said to enable children to shape their own learning process. These initially seemed to really resonate with my own interests in the person-centred approach – and particularly my interests in listening to children. However, these approaches were linked to notions of ‘positive’ emotional experiences of learning, for example, making learning fun or less competitive. I found that I began to sit less comfortably with these approaches. They seemed to conceptualise emotions in a different way to me. In these approaches emotions are either seen as a skill to be mastered, or as something that should always be experienced by the child in a positive way in order to ensure good development. These views seemed to fear certain types of emotion and the developmental consequences of experiencing ‘negative’ emotions in childhood (Research journal, Jan 2010).

With the increased interest in emotional curricula in primary schools in the UK, there is an emphasis upon cultivating ‘positive’ emotions for learning. A wide range of emotions are now viewed as barriers to successful learning. An influential figure in this movement, Daniel Goleman, states that ‘students who are anxious, angry or depressed don’t learn… when emotions overwhelm concentration, what is being swamped is the mental capacity cognitive scientists call ‘working memory’, the ability to hold in mind all information relevant to the task at hand’ (Goleman 1996, pg. 78). This quote demonstrates the ‘rational emotionality’ (Gillies 2011) that is used to support the development of emotional curricula. Goleman’s argument is tied to a cognitivist model of learning rooted in a rationalist paradigm. From this perspective emotion is positioned in opposition to rational thought. As Boler (1999) argues historically emotionality has been seen as a feminine trait and associated with irrationality and weakness. Children’s emotional regulation, while I would argue has always been an integral but unspoken part of education, is now an explicit focus in mainstream schooling in the UK (Ecclestone and Hayes 2009). Influential to this focus upon children’s self-management of emotion is the increased importance of emotional labour within an ever more service-orientated work environment (Hochschild 2003). The requirement that workers manage and express their emotions in particular ways within the service industry appears to be influencing education. Children are expected to develop ‘emotion skills’ which will promote ‘greater education and work success’, especially as ‘work and workplaces increasingly focus on social and emotional competencies, with increased emphasis on teamwork, communication, management
skills’ (DfES 2005a, pg. 48). These skills are also positioned as a remedy for the mental health problems perceived to be facing contemporary society (Seligman 2005), and are supported by a range of educational policy, most prominently the social and emotional aspects of learning (SEAL).

The SEAL curriculum is accompanied by a democratic rhetoric. It is claimed that SEAL relinquishes adult control, as children are taught techniques to regulate their emotional-behaviours, and foster children’s voice, as they are encouraged to express their feelings (DfES 2005a). However, critics have argued that such curricula are associated with a rational-scientific discourse of emotion which supports new forms of governance, as children learn to self-manage their feelings and actions according to pre-determined values (Boler 1999). Therefore, in trying to limit the expression of particular emotions, in the interests of the child’s academic development, children’s emotions become sites of power in school settings.

The management of children’s conduct through working on their emotions, for example by praising a child in front of their peers, has had a long history in educational practice (Boler 1999). SEAL is therefore not a new set of practices but instead provides a language that captures and extends the role of emotion in education, with a particular emphasis upon children’s self-management of emotion with an emphasis on fostering their ‘positive’ feelings. There is an emphasis on children’s social and emotional development, framed by the perspective that ‘the development of emotional and social competence and well-being can reduce mental health problems of young people’ (DfES 2005a, pg. 50). The concepts of children’s ‘emotional needs’ and ‘emotional well-being’ frame how emotions are conceptualised in reference to children from studies within the field of child development (Hamre and Pianta 2005; Noam and Herman 2002; Wentzel 2002). Woodhead (1987) has provided a helpful critique of the concept of ‘needs’. His critique can be used here to explore the complicated value judgements behind these child development discourses.

Woodhead (1987) describes four different categories for identifying children’s needs: ‘basic qualities of human nature; prerequisites for mental health; processes of cultural adaptation; or conformity with dominant social values’ (pg. 129). The notion that children need to have positive emotional experiences can be associated with the category of ‘need’ as a prerequisite for mental health – ‘an inference from what is known about the pathological consequences of particular childhood experiences’ (Woodhead 1987, pg. 137). Viewing children’s emotions from the perspective of emotional needs, practitioners working with children have the role of identifying and responding to children’s needs.
Burman (2008) argues that the determination of children’s ‘needs’ corresponds with notions of ‘readiness’. She suggests that ‘middle-class children are more ‘ready’ than working-class children since they are more prepared and familiar with the skills needed to engage with schooling’ and thus ‘maintains unequal treatment of children’ (2008, pg. 264). The attention given to emotional needs in education is focused upon the ‘positive’ development of ‘all’ children (DfES 2005). Therefore class, race or gender inequalities in education are made invisible. Rather, in the emotional literacy movement personal growth is expressed as ‘an individual, linear, progressive journey’ (Burman 2008, pg. 276). Emotions are viewed as a mechanism through which ‘positive’ development can occur. Such positive development is accorded with future social cohesion (DfES 2005a). Within emotional literacy policy the contexts in which people act are ignored, in doing so the ‘available explanations for the social problems encountered by individuals are even more restricted’ (Burman 2008, pg. 276). While a developmental understanding of emotion is helpful in uncovering how children’s emotional experiences have resonance within their later lives, children’s emotions also become sites for personal scrutiny. In some schools, a key focus of behaviour management strategies is supporting children to recognise and manage their emotions. For example, schools use ‘Praise Pods’, which are ‘structured in such a way as to reinforce specific behaviours’ (Praise Pod!, no date). Children enter the pod and are interviewed by a member of staff in order to encourage the child to articulate why they are being rewarded. This interview is captured on a short video that can be sent to parents. Missing from these positive reinforcement practices is a consideration of emotional exchanges as an important means for children to differentiate themselves from others because such exchanges involve sustaining, contesting or redefining their own and others’ social positions at school (see, for example, Goodwin 2006). Therefore, emotions need to be analysed beyond the scope of developmental and behaviourist theories.

A wide-range of fields of study, including critical psychology (i.e. Billington 2013), sociology of emotions (i.e. Burkitt 2012) and emotional geographies (i.e. Kraftl 2013), are challenging the rationalist conceptualisation of emotions and are developing new ways of thinking about emotion and affect. Within much of this work, emotions are analysed in relation to social practice. For example, Wetherell (2012) states that ‘affective practice is relational... This is evident simply in the ways in which most affect performances come in conventional pairs that get divided between people - accusation and defence, provocation and laughter, intimidation and fear, startle and surprise.’ (pg. 86-87). In the area of emotional geography, there is a shift towards a ‘non-objectifying view of emotions’, which instead views emotions as ‘relational flows, fluxes or currents,
in between people and places’ (Davidson et al 2005, pg. 3). This move away from analysing emotion as ‘objects’ or ‘things’ also reflects a move towards representing emotional experiences in relation to space and place (see, for example, Urry 2005).

Davidson and Milligan (2004) address the interrelationship between emotion and place and argue that emotions can only be understood within a context of place, which they describe as the ‘emotio-spatial hermeneutic’ (pg. 524). In their view, ‘meaningful senses of space emerge only via movements between people and places’ (pg. 524). This co-constitutive relationship between people and place is defined by Pink (2009) as emplacement. For Pink (2009) the senses are integral to the way that individuals experience space and place. Davidson and Milligan (2004) suggest that ‘an exploration of the diverse senses of space … [may leave us] … better placed to appreciate the emotionally dynamic spatiality of contemporary social life’ (pg. 524). By drawing on these social and situated conceptualisations of emotion, emotion can be understood as integral to the structuring processes through which individuals construct values and meanings in relationship with others and within specific sites and settings.

These perspectives on emotion, which understand emotion as produced through our relational and situated experiencing, are rarely examined in the fields of education and educational research (Kenway and Youdell 2011). Therefore, this study is situated within a wider aim of finding alternative ways to conceptualise emotion in education that move beyond the dominant rationalist paradigm. Therefore, through this doctoral thesis a definition of emotion develops. This emergent definition of emotion was formed through the fieldwork process. Towards the end of fieldwork it became clearer that I was seeking to ‘understand emotion – experientially and conceptually – in terms of its socio-spatial mediation and articulation’ (Bondi et al 2005, pg. 3 original italics). In relation to this aim, this study engages with children’s multiple and shifting perceptions of emotion and is concerned with how these are constituted through their relational emplacement in a school embedding emotional pedagogies. To do so, I explore the interdependent relationship between children’s affective practices and the institutional spaces of the SEAL school. As Casey (1996) states ‘lived bodies belong to places and help to constitute them’ and ‘places belong to lived bodies and depend on them’ (pg. 24).

Through engaging with children’s ‘affective practices’ (Wetherell 2012) as located in space and time, I aim to recognise children’s spatial agency within school settings. Ingold (2007) recognises agency in his description of the ‘inhabitant … [as] … one who participates from within, in the very process of the world’s continual coming into being and who, in laying a trail of life, contributes to its weave and texture’ (pg. 81). In this
study, I consider children’s placemaking as an affective practice (Wetherall 2012) situated within wider social contexts and to which children are emotionally invested. I examine how children’s placemaking practices are both shaped by and influence children’s perceptions of emotion. Through this thesis I will present a series of vignettes, which examine children’s placemaking within a school setting, and explore how these are connected, ‘though ‘sticky’ associations’, to one another and over time (Ahmed 2004, pg. 45). This study explores how this very stickiness, the repetition of associations, frames how children both perceive and perform emotion.

The research included a policy review and ethnographic study in a SEAL school setting over a 9-month period. The study included participant observations of students’ participation in a wide range of school-based activities, interviews with local authority representatives, interviews and focus groups with school staff and students, creative research workshops with students, and participatory research with a core group, self-named the ‘SEAL Squad’, of nine students (aged 9 -10).
Preface: A Reader Guide

This reader guide is intended as a starting point to set you on your journey through this thesis. As you will find out you will be able to choose your own way through this thesis, and decide when it is time to end. This section will provide you with an overview of this research study. In addition, the format of the thesis will be introduced as well as some suggestions on how you might read it.

1. Researching Emotion in Education

Finding your Way

Two volumes accompany this guide, which are preceded by this reader guide and contextual introduction and followed by a reflective section outlining the crosscutting themes and implications of this doctoral study. Volume A reflects on the methodological development of the research study. Incorporated into this volume are reflections from my field diary. This volume captures my decision-making throughout the research process. Volume B presents a series of vignettes from the research site. These vignettes illustrate children’s experiences of emotion in relation to different sites across the SEAL school. Each vignette draws upon field data to develop a theoretical understanding of how emotion works within a school setting. You will move between these two volumes as you engage with the thesis. The ways that the two volumes interlink is intended to reflect the relationship between the research process and meaning-making. My engagements with the field (presented in Volume A) shaped how I came to make sense of it and construct theoretical understandings of the field (presented in Volume B).

This thesis does not have a predetermined end. You will begin by reading this Introduction followed by two Context chapters. The context chapters will outline a contemporary history of emotions in education by drawing on literature across a range of disciplines. This will provide a background for an introduction to how emotions are recognised in education today. Following on from these chapters you will be led to Volume A. The choices of where to go next are then yours. The ending of the thesis will be at your own discretion. As you move through this volume, making choices about
which chapter to read next, you may return to vignettes that you have already encountered or may miss others before deciding to finish. You may instead want to return to the thesis multiple times, each time taking a different journey which will lead to different responses and insights. The approach I have taken to writing this thesis is intended to reflect my views about meaning-making in research. Meaning does not start or end, it is never fixed, but is forever changing with the world in which it is situated. At the same time, meaning has both a multiplicity of histories and futures. The meaning-making processes of individuals are entangled with personal histories and anticipations of the future, which find presence in everyday experiences. The choices you make as you find your way through the volume will shape what you take from the thesis. A map is provided to assist you in finding their way. You may wish to read the volume as it unfolds, without planning the directions of their movements. Alternatively, you could use the map to plan your journey through the volume before you begin. It is also possible to track your journey, ticking the chapters you have read and those you have not.

1) Developing a concept for representing the study

‘Writing is meaning-making, reading is meaning-making – the way that text is constructed can encourage multiple interpretations ... I need to make the process of producing the thesis as transparent as every other aspect of the research process.’ (Research Journal, July 2011)

This thesis was inspired by my interest in representing the socio-spatial analysis of emotion, which I have found difficult to capture in words. Initially, I was interested in the possibility of representing the research as an installation experienced with the body, which would convey my own and the children’s relational emplacement within the school. As this approach was not possible within the constraints of the PhD process, I looked for ways to reflect the complexities of emplacement in a predominantly text-based format. I looked to Jorg Louis Borges short story, The Garden of Forking Paths, in which a Chinese spy living in England but working for Germany talks about his ancestor's aspiration to write a book, of the same name, written as a labyrinth. This book, envisaged by Ts’ui Pen, was written as ‘a labyrinth which was truly infinite’ (Borges 2000, pg. 82). It is intended that the reader of the book constructs her or his own route by making choices at each ‘turning’ in the novel.
'In all fictions, each time a man meets diverse alternatives, he chooses one and eliminates the others; in the work of the virtually-impossible-to-disentangle Ts’ui Pen, the character chooses - simultaneously - all of them. He creates thereby ‘several futures’, several times, which themselves proliferate and fork... In Ts’ui Pen’s novel, all the outcomes in fact occur; each is the starting point for further bifurcations. Once in a while, the paths of the labyrinth converge: for example, you come to this house, but in one possible past you are my enemy, in another my friend’ (Borges 2000, pg. 83).

The short-story poses questions about the nature of time. Borges explores the notion of ‘network’ of times, wherein time is not linear but it forks and branches into many possible futures. Time is not singular; rather Borges constructs a notion of an infinite network of ‘divergent, convergent and parallel times’ (Borges 2000, pg. 85).

‘The Garden of Forking Paths is a huge riddle, or parable, whose subject is time... your ancestor did not believe in a uniform or absolute time; he believed in an infinite series of times, a growing dizzying web of divergent, convergent and parallel times. That fabric of times that approach one another, fork, are snipped off, or are simply unknown for centuries, contains all possibilities.’ (Borges 2000, pg. 85)

I like this notion of multiple possibilities, shaped by our personal biographies and the choices we make in the present. Research also has multiple possibilities. The ways that a researcher makes sense of the field depends on what they experience and what they don’t during fieldwork. What the researcher is drawn to and what they are not shapes how they choose to see. In addition, the ways that others come in and out of a relationship with the researcher during fieldwork shapes what can be known. The researcher’s own interpretations of what they see will be informed by their personal histories and values. From my experience of fieldwork these things were never stable. As Coffey (1999) suggests, both the researcher and the research participants are changed through the research process. As we change so do our interpretations. For me, it would therefore be misrepresentative to write up research in way which suggests that what I take from research is fixed. I also think that it is difficult to know what others will take from my research.

‘Perhaps my thesis can actively encourage an ‘experience’ for the reader; supporting them to ‘interact’ with the text in a hands-on way (like opening
letters in the ‘Jolly Postman’) and provide opportunities for them to make
decisions about how they navigate the text, in turn influencing the narrative
they construct (as the reader might do in a ‘Choose Your Own Adventure’
book)... It feels important to acknowledge and play with the notion of
interpretation (and multiple interpretations). Just as the field could be
interpreted in multiple ways depending upon who is engaging with it and
from what position. I want to make explicit to the reader my discomfort with
the notion of a singular truth by deliberately aiming to provoke multiple
interpretations’ (Research journal notes, 18th March 2011).

In order to convey the dynamism of interpretation, I have drawn upon the ‘Choose Your
Own Adventure’ novel approach. Choose Your Own Adventure books were devised as a
form of experiential learning and described as ‘interactive fiction’ (Scaffetti 1986). They
were written using a second-person narrative. The reader adopts the role of the central
character and makes choices that determine what happens to that character and how the
story ends (Scaffetti 1986). The idea behind the books was originally developed by the
lawyer Edward Packard. Packard took the idea to a small publishing house looking for
innovative children’s books run by Raymond Montgomery.

‘Packard and Montgomery were determined to make the books feel “real”.
Whereas most children's literature comes out of an educational tradition,
which requires “good” choices to result in victory and “bad” choices to
result in death, they wanted to keep the reader guessing. “My intent was to
try to make it like life as much as possible”, Packard says. “I didn't want it
to be a random lottery but I didn't want it to be didactic so that if you always
did the smart thing you always succeeded. I tried to balance it”... “There's
no way we could have programmed a moral ending for every story line”,
Montgomery concurs. “Life isn't that way. Choose Your Own Adventure is
not that way. Choose Your Own Adventure is a simulation that approximates
the choices that we face in our lives’’ (Hendrix 2011).

Much like the Choose Your Own Adventure books, this thesis brings together snippets
from a story in such a way that you can choose which route to take and how the story
ends. These are moments from my research journey. How you choose to navigate through
these moments will influence how you make sense of this research journey. The aim has
been to capture moments in time, whether these are personally mine (such as extracts
taken from my research diary) or those of others (and reflected in field-data), and make
connections between these moments in ways that give them further meaning. The way that you navigate through these moments is intended to reflect both the complexity of research and of experience. Our experiences intersect between wider contexts and personal subjectivities, and this thesis tries to separate these out and then reconnect them in ways that allow new meanings to be made.

2) Developing Volume A

Volume A examines the research process. It is divided into three methodological explorations - a) research approach, b) research practice and c) working with field data. In considering how to write this volume I felt that it was important to convey the messiness of doing research, whereby the research process is emerging all the time in response to encounters or ideas the researcher and the research participants might have. I also wanted to communicate the complex and challenging choices that the researcher has to make, particularly while in the field. Therefore, this volume integrates extracts from my research journal. I have done this in order to capture my thinking and decision-making throughout the research process. Often this journal is used as a starting point for further reflections on the way I chose to carry out the research. The journal at times was used to document my emotional responses during the research. In doing so it reflects recent calls to acknowledge the role of emotions in academic research (see for example Moser 2008; Punch 2012; Widdowfield 2000). This literature suggests that the researcher’s engagement with their own emotions during fieldwork influences their understanding of the field site. In concurrence with this perspective, the journal is used as a form of data to complement other generated data. Therefore within Volume A, links will be made to my journal to reflect the interdependent nature of doing research and the development of research findings.

I have separated different aspects of the research process within the three explorations. The first exploratory aims to capture the philosophical positions that frame this research. In addition, the development of the research questions is examined in Methods Exploratory A. The second exploratory, Methods Exploratory B, looks at the practical aspects of doing the research. This section aims to emphasise the relational and situated dimensions of doing research. Finally, Methods Exploratory C considers my approach to analysing data. I reflect upon the importance I put upon developing analytical methods that responded to the data generated. As the research methods were developed with the research participants, it was not possible to predesign an approach to analysis. Therefore,
this exploratory also examines how an analytical framework emerged as I experimented with different ways of working with the data.

3) Developing Volume B

The chapters which make up Volume B are representations of moments during fieldwork. These vignettes are taken from a range of sources: videos and images from research workshops, interview and focus group transcripts, fieldnotes from participant observations and research workshops, videonotes of dramatic performances and films by children, scripts for assembly presentations written by children. Each vignette is categorised within a different layer of experience. These layers were formed through an ongoing thematic analysis of fieldnotes from participant observations in the early stages of the research. They were refined through focus groups with the children from the school about their experiences of emotion education. These focus groups used the video footage and photographs from the den-building workshops as a starting point for the conversation. Each of the emerging layers shared a similar focus, how children came to understand and negotiate emotion in relation to themselves, others and the school setting. For example, at times the children’s judgements about emotion would frame how they acted, at others a child’s perception of another as an emotional being would limit how they acted towards them, or a child may use emotive language in order to be heard in social encounters. These layers of experience, which initially were named in relation to their social characteristics (sites; roles; beliefs; interactions; and identities), were renamed to indicate their connectivity to space (districts; landmarks; edges; paths; and nodes).

The names of these layers are borrowed from Kevin Lynch’s book ‘The Image of the City’. Lynch was interested in the legibility of cities - the ease with which people navigate a city - from the perspectives of city users. He drew upon people’s hand-drawn ‘mental-maps’ to define five physical elements of the city: districts; landmarks; edges; paths; and nodes. These five elements, he stated, were fundamental to a cities legibility and therefore how people navigated the city: Districts are large sections of the city with a common character; Edges are perceived boundaries, for example walls or shorelines; Landmarks are objects that are used by individuals as reference points, such as a building or sign; Paths are the channels through which individuals navigate the city; Nodes are the focal points of an individual’s journey through the city, such as the individual’s destination, and are often situated on the intersections between two paths (Lynch 1960). While Lynch was interested in how individuals used and perceived the physical
environment, it is also possible to consider these five elements as socio-emotional dimensions of spatial experience. For example, interactions are staged within spaces (districts), bounded by socio-emotional conventions (Edges), and navigated by children who are socially positioned in different ways (landmarks). The children negotiate their own routes through their interactions (Paths) as they appropriate, resist or transform their ascribed emotional identities (Nodes). Socio-emotional interactions always take place within a site and setting; this context inevitably shapes the direction of the interaction. For example, how an individual engages with others at a funeral would be different to at a wedding. It is possible to understand the emotional conventions, which can be mapped onto any setting as socially constructed (Hochschild 2003). Therefore, the layers of experience, which I have developed, aim to examine the different ways that emotions are understood and negotiated by children within the SEAL school setting.

Lynch’s five elements provided a useful way for me to extend and solidify the themes that were being drawn from my data in order to examine the role of emotion in children’s socio-spatial practices in a school setting. In addition, they helped me to examine the interconnections between children’s emotional performances and the school setting. At the time I was also looking for a way to organise my thesis. I liked the way that Lynch’s five elements endeavoured to capture the individual’s experience of a city, the whole story, by examining constituent parts, moments from the story. I wondered if I could draw on his framework to create a similar account of the individual’s experience of emotion. In drawing upon Lynch, I wanted to highlight the interconnected nature of each of these layers. The mental-maps of cities, used in Lynch’s research, are representations of different elements that, together, form the city and which may change over time, and in doing so change the city itself. (Lynch 1960) Layers of experience can also be understood in this way, as interdependent and interconnected. Lynch’s terms offered a helpful means of representing a whole story by focusing upon it’s constituent parts. However, in contrast to Lynch, my focus of analysis was children’s socio-emotional practices. In particular I was interested in focusing on these practices to examine the ways that children ‘perform’ (Butler 2010) emotions and how these performances are distinct to the context in which they are situated. With this as my focus, Lynch’s five elements became metaphorical descriptions of the different dimensions of children’s experiences and expression of a multiplicity of emotions which emerged through analysis of field-data (see descriptions below). The emotions that I focused upon were those that were highlighted by adults and children at the school as particularly positive or negative.
4) Connecting the chapters

When I began to put together this thesis, I aimed to develop a number of cyclical narratives that link up moments from Volumes A and B. Each narrative was intended to illustrate a pairing of roles that children have taken in their social interactions with their peers. I drew upon Wetherell’s list of ‘affect performances’, which she suggests ‘come in conventional pairs’ (2012, pg. 86). She describes these as are 1) accusation and defence, 2) provocation and laughter, 3) intimidation and fear, 4) startle and surprise (2012, pg. 86). The intention was to construct each narrative around the accounts presented in Volume B which examine how children negotiate the changing affect terrains in different sites and at different times and to consider how these intersect with others throughout the volume. These intersections were intended to be representative of how relational affective practices constitutes what Ahmed (2004) terms affective economies. From Ahmed’s (2004) perspective, ‘feelings do not reside in subjects or objects, but are produced as effects of circulation’ (pg. 8). She states that ‘emotions ... produce the very surfaces and
boundaries that allow the individual and the social to be delineated as if they are objects’ (Ahmed 2004, pg.10). In this way, children’s relational affective practices are shaped by and produce the socio-emotional conventions specific to a school setting. Children negotiate a tapestry of conventions, which change in different settings and with different people. While these conventions may be reproduced they can also be transformed. The act of providing opportunities for the reader to break narratives and connect with others, was intended to reflect how children can simultaneously negotiate multiple emotional landscapes. As I have reflected here, these narratives were generated through the analysis of children’s socio-emotional practices. Whilst they were a useful way of organising Volume B into a number of cyclical stories, it became difficult to connect these to moments from Volume A.

It was nevertheless important for me to ensure that links were made between Volumes A and B. While Volume B represents the field-data, this needs to be related back to the process of doing the research and engagements with literature. These links between Volumes A and B reflect the important relationship between generating, interpreting and representing data. However, Volume A did not easily align with Wetherell’s affective pairings. Therefore, I changed the role of the connections between the different chapters. These connections reflect my own movements in the research process. For example, you might read a vignette in Volume B and then be directed to another. In doing so, you will gain a sense of the connections that I made between different extracts from the field data and how these then allowed new insights to emerge. You might find yourself moving between chapters in Volume A, which reflect how different aspects of my thinking in terms of the research design responded to others. In addition, Volume A makes links to Volume B to reflect the relationship between my experiences of doing the research and the ways that I have made sense of field data. This reflects Pink’s (2009) perspective that our experiences in the field are data in their own right. These links to other parts of the thesis come at the end of each section. Here you will find one or more boxes that reflect on one aspect of the section you have just read and relate this to one part of another section in the thesis. If you are interested in reading this other section you can turn to the page at which the section begins. This section and page number are indicated in the box.

5) Drawing upon literature

Throughout the study I drew upon literature at various stages. Therefore, this thesis does not include a conventional literature review. I reviewed different sets of literature during
the research process, which responded to questions or considerations that were raised at certain moments. For example, an emerging theme during fieldwork was around children’s management of their emotional responses. This led me to engage with literature on emotional labour. This example illustrates how I chose to foreground the data throughout this doctoral study. Ridley (2012) states that a literature review is an important part of the research process; ‘in a literature review ... you are describing the bigger picture that provides the background and creates the space or gap for your research’ (pg. 6). In contrast to this guidance, I did not use literature to identify a ‘gap’ within which to situate my research. I wanted the focus of the research to come out of the data, rather than a literature review. This approach is recognised in grounded theory, where there is an emphasis on findings stemming from the data and not pre-conceived ideas (Charmaz 2006). In contrast to grounded theory, I do not hold that data can be interpreted from an objective standpoint. For me, engaging with literature during analysis enabled in-depth engagements with the research data. Therefore, the literature I engaged with responded to themes that emerged for me during fieldwork and data analysis. I found that my interpretations were revisited, questioned, renewed and extended through these oscillations between literature and the data itself. I have used literature as a tool to help me find my way through the research process, and make meaning of my experiences in the field, engagements with the research participants and the research data. In contrast to Boote and Biele’s (2005) argument that ‘a researcher cannot perform significant research without first understanding the literature in the field’ (pg. 3), I suggest that an emergent engagement with literature offers broader scope for transdisciplinary perspectives to inform both the research process and emerging findings. I found the freedom of not being ‘located’ in a field of study opened up opportunities to oscillate and make links between disciplines to provide unique theoretical interpretations of children’s school experiences. Drawing upon abductive ethnography (Magnani 2005), which ‘embraces serendipity and allows intuition to guide the fieldwork’ (Bajc 2012, pg. 73), this engagement with theory was guided by my intuitive responses to the data. The structure of this thesis aims to capture some of this process. It aims to provide an honest and messy account of the research process. In doing so I challenge the notion of certainty in research and the need to recognise the partiality and uncertainty of research, by ‘inscrib[ing] into our research some absences and fallibilities’ (Rose 1997, pg. 319). As you find your way through this messy thesis, you will jump between children’s stories, my own stories and theoretical and empirical literature and build your own meanings.
Context: Politics and Practice

This section provides a contextual introduction which frames the two volumes that follow. It will provide a recent history of the role of emotion in education leading up to the present day. This section also examines how emotions are conceptualised within education and identify why it is important for new ways of thinking about emotion to enter this field. In addition, this section will briefly introduce the field site and research participants.

1. Emotions in Education

Where are we now and how did we get here?

Emotions are increasingly recognised as an important dimension of learning within mainstream education in the UK (Ecclestone 2004). The dominant conceptualisation of the relationship between emotions and processes of learning comes from a psychological paradigm. Emotions are regarded as an essential ally, which need to be shaped through proper attention to aid the learning and development of individuals (Goleman 1996, Seligman 2002, Snyder and Lopez 2007). These theories of emotion were developed at the same time as education began to move towards practices that focused upon the emotional development of the child. In 1997 the White Paper on Excellence in Schools outlined the governments aim of supporting all schools to become Healthy Schools (DfEE 1999, pg. 2). In addition to physical health, a child’s emotional health was made a key priority - ‘a healthy school ... promotes physical and emotional health by providing accessible and relevant information and equipping pupils with the skills and attitudes to make informed decisions about their health’ (DfEE 1999, pg. 2). Since this initiative, activities such as ‘Circle Time’, which aims to increase children’s ‘self-esteem’ and ‘positive behaviour’ (Mosley 1996), are being used in schools. In 2005 these kinds of practices were integrated into an initiative entitled SEAL (social and emotional aspects of learning). ‘SEAL is an explicit, structured whole-curriculum framework for developing all children’s social, emotional and behavioural skills’ (DfES 2005a, pg. 5). The SEAL policy persuades the reader that every child has the potential for emotional vulnerability,
which could lead to serious mental health problems in adult life. As a means of prevention children can develop skills in order to manage their emotions, thus resulting in better behaviour, more effective learning and the capacity to contribute to society in the future (DfES 2005a). As I read these texts, I became alerted to the potential for these approaches to be used as discrete tools of discipline, which aim to shape the conduct of the individual child in accordance to psychological discourses around emotional expression. While some teaching practitioners celebrate the approaches, they are also criticised for their emphasis on the individual (Smith 2009, Ecclestone and Hayes 2009), adopting a mechanistic view of human emotion and behaviour (Smeyers et al 2010, Suissa 2009) and as techniques of control (Millei 2005, Riette 2009).

In this section I will describe a recent history of education to highlight shifts in the ways emotions have been considered. I will begin by reflecting upon the student-centred approaches to education in the 60s and 70s. I will continue by showing how these ideas were dispelled through the 1988 Education Reform Act, which introduced a national curriculum and standardised testing. My historical narrative will culminate with an overview of the recent return to policies and practices that aim to consider both the emotional and intellectual dimensions of learning. I will highlight agendas from the last labour government such as ‘National Healthy School Standards’ programme and the ‘SEAL’ resource. I will also outline labour’s personalised learning agenda. I will suggest that these policy initiatives, in contrast to the rhetoric, actually sustain the values underpinning the 1988 Education reform Act.

a) Emotions and ‘student-centred’ approaches: from individualism to normative development

An interest in emotions and education is evident from ancient times in the work of Socrates who was ‘concerned with a kind of care of the self’ (Smeyers et al, 2010, pg 4). However, in Western society ‘emotion has more often than not been seen as a force, energy, or expression that needs to be contained or channelled in some way’ (Boler 1997, pg. 205). In the 1960s and 70s this view of emotion was challenged by psychotherapists due to the perceived dangerous lack of consideration of the client’s frame of reference in the techniques of psychoanalysis. The work of Rogers (Rogers 1995, 2003a, 2003b, 2004a) drew attention to the importance of individual experience. He argued for a ‘way of being’ with people that listened to and valued their internal, emotional experiences. In this sense the emotional landscape of the individual, as experienced by the individual,
was perceived by the therapist as both valid and trustworthy, and the therapeutic process occurred as the individual became open to and accepting of this inner experience. The work of Rogers marked a shift in practices of psychology in therapy, education, industry and the community framed upon the potential of individuals (APA 1973, pg. 71).

This humanist potential movement played an important role in the development of education and influenced the student-centred approach to learning, particularly in the US. The experience of liberation felt by clients engaging with person-centred therapy – through experiencing their potential, coming to like themselves, discovering that the core of their personality was positive and being open to and accepting of their own experience (Rogers 2004a, pp. 73-107) – was argued to be replicable within education practice. The person-centred approach in education was to focus attention upon the relationship between teachers and students, incorporate feelings into the learning process and shift the locus of learning onto the learner (Rogers and Freiberg 1994). Rogers suggested that individual curiosity, and tendency towards learning, should direct the learning process.

Other theories from development psychology also influenced the development of student-centred approaches in education. For example, Vygotsky, a soviet psychologist, and Bruner, an american psychologist, were influential in the development of social constructivism in the early and mid 20th century. For both of these theorists social interaction is essential to the learning process. From a Vygotskian perspective, ‘learning must be viewed in the context of the person’s culture and the tools and aids that exist in that culture’ (Smith, Cowie and Blades 2011, pg. 544). In his own words, he argued that ‘human learning presupposes a specific social nature and a process by which children grow into the intellectual life of those around them’ (1978, pg. 88). Vygotsky was particularly interested in the ‘role of language as a tool for learning through complex processes of social interaction in children’s communities’ (Smith, Cowie and Blades 2011, pg. 544). He suggests that ‘the child begins to perceive the world not only through his [or her] eyes but also through his [or her] speech’ (1978, pg. 32). Language is a means through which cultural communities represent the social world. It therefore is also a resource that guides how children interpret and make sense of the world around them. While there is a more recent interest in social constructivist learning theories, only elements of Vygotsky’s ideas were transferred to a Western context in the 1960s. According to Kozulin (1990), these were the elements that were most ‘compatible’ to such a context. These include ‘notions of the unity of cognition and behaviour, and the social origin of individual behaviour’ (Kozulin 1990, pg. 5). Burman (2008) demonstrates how Vygotsky’s and Bruner’s ideas were selectively interpreted to reify a cognitivist
constructivism, most prominently associated with Piaget. Piaget was interested in ‘the mechanisms of biological adaptation ... and the analysis of logical thought’ (Smith, Cowie and Blades 2011, pg 443). He aimed to understand how children think. Through observations of children’s problem-solving activities, he proposed a number of identifiable stages through which specific aspects of development occurs. Burman argues that Piaget’s ideas were amenable to ‘incorporation within apparatuses of social regulation’ and that the common ground between Piaget and Vygotsky is a ‘commitment to science and progress’ (Burman 2008, pg. 250) (i.e. Piaget was interested in cognitive development, and Vygotsky in social transformation). This, Burman (2008) argues, brought these two diverse traditions together. However, she argues that the tensions between naturalism and cultural intervention continue to play out within education today (Burman 2008).

It is possible to argue that this tension between a view of the child, on the one hand, as needing freedom to follow their innate developmental capacity, and on the other, requiring direction from adults, is also influenced by humanist and behaviourist traditions. For example, evident in Rogers’ work is a struggle with and within a behaviourist tradition. Rogers problematised the dominance of the behaviourist paradigm at the time he was promoting a person-centred approach (see for example Rogers 2004b). His fear was that ‘the developing behavioural sciences may be used to control the individual and rob him of his personhood’ (Rogers 2004a, pg. 360). He argued that behaviourism reflected Skinner’s subjectivities about what was valuable and what was not (Rogers 2004b). For Rogers, all ‘scientific’ endeavours were influenced by the researcher’s subjectivity (see for example Rogers 2004c). He called for values to be made explicit, so that they can be accepted or rejected by individuals. Objectivity (and the notion of a singular truth) plays a powerful role in the relationship between politics and social institutions. In doing so, the values which underpin political initiatives become hidden. However, I do not think that the constitution of values is simply a personal choice, as Rogers suggested. Rather, values are produced through complex interactions between social, economic and political forces. Therefore while values are produced through time they are also always in flux and thus it can be difficult to identify the complex arrangement of values that are in operation at any given time.

During the time that Rogers was developing his theory of learning, others were influential in promoting approaches to education centred around the individual child in the UK. In 1963, the labour government minister, Sir Edward Boyle, commissioned a report to consider primary education and the transition to secondary. The Plowden Report was
published in 1967 and emphasised the importance of ‘student-centred’ approaches to learning and referenced Piagetian theory in particular. The report made links to emotions in number of ways that were akin to Rogers’ theories: as constructed both biologically and environmentally and, more specifically, in relationship to others; that emotions give meaning to experience and emotions should not be suppressed but understood. The report also held positions in conflict with Rogerian theory – emotions were to be ‘handled … in constructive ways’ (CACE 1967, pg 67) and, through doing so, a person’s moral development could be shaped (I will return to the link between emotions and morality later). Despite these differences the report legitimised a student-centred pedagogical approach to educating the whole person and, although not implemented fully, had a marked effect upon the conceptualisation of education and was influential in changes in local authorities’ attitudes and teachers’ practice (Darling 1994). Teachers were considered ‘facilitators’, their role was to support learners to construct their learning process.

The perceived egalitarian focus of ‘progressive’ education was soon to be criticised by political lobbyists. The focus upon personal development was claimed to erode the role and responsibility of the family within a child’s development (Demaine 1988). In addition, the rise of ‘soft subjects’ was seen to deviate from the objective of education – the pursuit of knowledge – in favour of a curriculum that was related to individual relevance, and consequently, as the critics argue, mediocrity (Demaine 1988). The increases in educational responses to multiculturalism, through, for example, the anti-racist curriculum, were accused of disparaging Britain’s cultural heritage and indoctrinating against Western values (Quicke 1988), especially in regards to what constituted intelligence.

These criticisms, from neo-liberal and neo-conservative perspectives, were incorporated in the Education Reform Act of 1988. The focus of the act was to ‘give more power to the parents by giving them the right to choose the education which they felt was the most suitable for their children; and to reduce the power of the LEAs and their self-appointed ‘experts’ and other educationalists’ (Quicke 1988, pg. 6). Under this guise the Act introduced a National Curriculum and a National Examination System deemed objective and rigorous, through which schools’ progress could be measured and monitored and results accessed by parents. In this way, concerns about children’s emotions were removed from educational debate and replaced with concerns about children’s academic achievement. Through focusing upon monitoring and assessing learning against a curriculum it was claimed that parents would be in a better position to make informed
choices about where their child should be schooled. The Act was influenced by neo-liberal ideals but rooted primarily in the neo-conservative concept that a ‘free-market’ would lead to the security of the authority of the state and the institutions that constitute civil society (Quicke 1988). This has influenced an education system which was assessed according to output and therefore an increased focus upon achieving objectives and targets.

In recent times learning and teaching approaches in schools, and especially primary schools, demonstrate a concern for the development of children’s creativity and well-being. For example, in 2002 the labour government launched its programme Creative Partnerships (CCE No Date). The programme was developed in response to the report ‘All our Futures: Creativity, Culture and Education’ (NACCCE 1999), which argued that a focus on children’s development of literacy and numeracy was not enough to ‘meet the challenges that face education’ (pg. 5). In this report a creative and cultural education is posed as essential to Britain’s economic prosperity and social cohesion. In addition, the whole-school approach to education advocated is associated with raising children’s aspirations, motivation and self-esteem. The programme, which ended in 2011, supported partnerships between creative practitioners (artists, architects, etc) and schools across England (CCE No Date). The introduction of the Creative Partnerships programme corresponded with an explicit focus on ‘social and emotional learning’ demonstrated in educational policy. This built upon existing non-statutory practices including Personal, Social, Health and Economic Education (PSHE) and Citizenship education. In 1999, emotional health and wellbeing became one of the four core themes from the National Healthy School Standards programme and was assessed as part of the spiritual, moral, social and cultural awareness framework by Ofsted. It was claimed that this programme raised the profile of PSHE and Citizenship education as a whole school issue (HDA 2002). In response, a range of activities to enhance children’s self-esteem have been developed. For example, Jenny Mosley has developed the Quality Circle Time approach, which incorporates a range of games and activities to support a sense of community in classrooms and shared moral values (Mosley 1996). Another example are peer-mediation programmes, whereby children are trained to support others to resolve disputes in a collaborative way (Baginsky 2004). Other practices have also become more widespread, for example ‘Philosophy for Children’ encourages learners to freely express their ideas and opinions about philosophical questions, or ‘Assessment for Learning’ techniques tailor assessment criteria to the learner. Additional practices in schools have specifically focused upon supporting learners to express their emotions, such as ‘worry boxes’ where
Children can confidentially share their personal concerns with adults by writing them down and posting them in the worry box. Other initiatives focus upon children’s emotional and social development, such as nurture groups for children characterised as having Special Educational Needs (SEN) and Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties (EBD). Central to the nurture group approach is the development of trusting relationships between children and adults and children engage in a short-term focussed intervention strategy (Bishop 2008). In 2005 many of these initiatives were brought together and promoted through the ‘Social and Emotional Aspects of Learning’ national strategy. SEAL was the key framework for social and emotional development in early years, primary and secondary education in England until 2011 and change from a New Labour government to a Conservation and Liberal Democrat Coalition. However, since this time SEAL has continued to inform educational practice within primary school settings. These initiatives demonstrate how children’s emotions are increasingly recognised as an important dimension of academic learning. While an active interest in emotions in education presents many opportunities, it is also important to recognise that the way emotion is conceptualised within these new discourses is situated within a wider socio-political context of neo-liberalism.

An explicit focus on social and emotional development of individuals aligned well with the Personalised Learning Agenda, which was introduced soon after SEAL in 2007 and focused upon student choice. The UK policy aspiration for personalised learning, as set out in the Teaching and Learning in 2020 Review, is described as a ‘highly structured and responsive approach to each child’s and young person’s learning, in order that all are able to progress, achieve and participate’ (DCSF 2007, pg 8). The agenda claimed that schools need to increasingly respond to ‘a knowledge-based economy where it will be possible to compete with developing and global markets only by offering products and services of high quality, matched closely to customers’ needs’ (DfES 2007, pg 8). This agenda has been criticised for its basis, which is said to be situated ‘less in educational theory, more in contemporary marketing theory’ (Hartley 2007, pg 629-630). As Hartley argues:

‘Personalisation is associated strongly with the notions of ‘choice’; that is to say, of choosing that which is thought to accomplish personhood. There is an affinity, therefore, between consumerism and personalisation’ (Hartley 2007, pg 630).

While personalisation reflects a student-centred rhetoric, such rhetoric also works to legitimise the contemporary political climate of neo-liberalism. The incorporation of
psychological theory from an individualistic perspective actually reinforces neo-liberal values. Critical psychologists argue that psychological theories have been used to support a wide range of political agendas (Billington 2000; Burman 2008; Henriques et al 1998; Rose 1999). In terms of SEAL, it seems that psychological theory and political agendas together work to transform student-centred theories into normative conceptualisations of child development. Burman suggests that ‘child-centred pedagogy subscribes to a naturalised, individualised model of childhood which confirms social privileges and pathologises those who are already socially disadvantaged’ (2008, pg. 260).

b) Power, empowerment and the SEAL curriculum

The SEAL curriculum is accompanied by a democratic rhetoric. It is claimed that SEAL relinquishes adult control, as children are taught techniques to regulate their emotional-behaviours, and foster children’s voice, as they are encouraged to express their feelings (DfES 2005a). However, critics of such approaches have argued that such curricula are associated with a rational-scientific discourse of emotion which supports new forms of governance, as children learn to self-manage their feelings and actions according to pre-determined values (Boler 1999) and become more open to intensified regulation (Millei 2005). Others suggest that the rise of so-called ‘therapeutic’ educational practices will lead to lower aspirations as children become increasingly constrained by their own so-called emotional vulnerabilities (Ecclestone and Hayes 2009) and over-introspection (Craig 2007). Sussia (2009) also argues that these new approaches do not allow children to explore morality through reflecting upon their experience. Rather, she suggests, children are expected to unquestioningly incorporate a set of pre-conceived moral values into their practices both in and beyond school.

Emotional education draws upon theories of emotional intelligence (Weare and Gray, 2003), defined as ‘the ability to perceive accurately, appraise and express emotion; the ability to access and/or generate feelings which facilitate thought; the ability to understand emotion and emotional knowledge; the ability to regulate emotions to promote emotional and intellectual growth’ (Mayer and Salovey, 1997:10). Through emotional education practices children are taught social and emotional skills, which are thought to help them handle their emotions in ways that will influence their ‘personal, career and scholastic success’ (DfES 2005a, pg. 48). The objectives associated with teaching these skills as part of an emotional curriculum, namely Social and Emotional Aspects of Learning (SEAL), is for children to:
• be effective and successful learners;
• make and sustain friendships;
• deal with and resolve conflict effectively and fairly;
• solve problems with others or by themselves;
• manage strong feelings such as frustration, anger and anxiety;
• be able to promote calm and optimistic states that promote the achievement of goals;
• recover from setbacks and persist in the face of difficulties;
• work and play cooperatively;
• compete fairly and win and lose with dignity and respect for competitors;
• recognise and stand up for their rights and the rights of others;
• understand and value the differences and commonalities between people, respecting the right of others to have beliefs and values different from their own.

(DfES 2005a, pg. 7)

The qualities listed above are presented as achievable outcomes following the implementation of an emotional curriculum, which ideally permeate all of children’s activities throughout the school day. The curriculum is separated into five areas: self-awareness; managing feelings; motivation; empathy; and social skills. Each of these is associated with a set of skills (DfES 2005a). The children acquire these skills through ‘seven whole-school themes, each consisting of an assembly to launch the theme and teaching ideas and materials for class-based follow-up in each year group’ (DfES 2005a, pg. 5). The SEAL curriculum also provides ‘resources for small-group work with children who need extra help to develop their social, emotional and behavioural skills’, ‘activities for families to use at home’ and ‘staff development activities and information sheets’ to support each theme (DfES 2005a, pg. 5). The curriculum implies that children who develop these skills will not only make better learners but are also more likely to enter adult life happier and with a higher chance of success. It is from this perspective of ‘care’ that SEAL is positioned as an antidote to our society’s mental health pandemic.

… Children with emotional and behavioural problems are prone to mental illness problems in later life, and have increased likelihood of school exclusion, offending, antisocial behaviour, marital breakdown, drug misuse, alcoholism and mental illness in adolescence and adulthood. Conversely, those with high levels of emotional and social competence do better in
Emotional education practices are increasingly welcomed and promoted as an important shift towards a democratic and emancipatory vision of education. Colverd and Hodgkin (2011) associate emotional education with an ‘inclusive classroom’ and ‘with a continuing emphasis on individual difference … leads all pupils to succeed in the fulfilment of their academic goals and in their development of positive attitudes to themselves and others’ (pg. 2). Indeed the Weare and Gray report (2003), which influenced the development of the SEAL curriculum, states that environments that encourage participation and autonomy are an important aspect of successful emotional education practices. The SEAL curriculum guidance document claims that emotional education practices lead to ‘unity’, ‘equality’ and ‘equal responsibility’ (DfES 2005a, pg. 51).

From a contrasting perspective, the type of child represented in social policy takes the form of an ‘adult-to-be … [who is] … denied full citizenship status through the imposition of ‘care’ regimes that control what children can do’ (Birch et al, 2008, pg. 87). From this perspective, it has been claimed that children are recognised as having a ‘duty … to improve and civilize themselves for the benefit of the social health of the community’ and that related practices are ‘an attempt to stimulate the growth of citizens in the making' (Rose 1999, pg 124). Rose (1999) argues that the ‘extension of social regulation to the lives of children … [relates to the] … threat which they pose now or in the future to the welfare of the state’ (pg. 125). Emotional education, it is argued, has been aligned directly with the threat of immorality and a lack of social discipline amongst young people elsewhere (Boler 1999). These perspectives tend to be associated with the perpetuation of social inequalities, in relation to class (Rose 1985, 1999), gender (Boler, 1999) or both (Colley 2006).

These two perspectives on emotional education sit in opposition to one another. On the one hand children are perceived as having increased agency over their learning, on the other, children are subjected through education journeys guided by what is deemed by adults to be in their best interests. The practitioners that I have spoken to and who implement approaches that encourage children’s self-regulation do not comment upon such a tension. As children’s actions at school are increasingly expected to be self-
governed, traditional associations between schools and institutional control appear to subside. In emotional education the teacher is conceptualised as a facilitator of children’s self-control rather than a disciplinary figure. Research has shown how everyday practices can become highly institutionalised (Antaki et al., 2007 and Finlay et al., 2008). While this research focuses on residential homes for people with disabilities, it shows how everyday routines can constrain choice. Wetherell (2012), reflecting on children’s practices in school playgrounds, agrees and suggests that ‘normative episodic sequences build not just the ‘small’ worlds of children’s playgrounds, but also the affective environments of entire institutions’ (pg. 84). She suggests that ‘despite government policy and forms of best practice designed to foster inclusion and empowerment (enabling ‘choice’ and ‘voice’), the established everyday routines [of institutions] significantly undercut ... actual choice’ (pg. 84). It seems that government rhetoric can be difficult to put into practice. As Burman (2008) argues ‘the child’s active engagement in the production of their own knowledge, can also function as a tactic of recruitment that both renders the child more subject to regulation and makes it harder for them to escape surveillance’ (pg. 269).

The section above has shown that emotions are an explicit focus of mainstream education today. An increased interest in the role of emotion in academic learning led to the development of the SEAL curriculum in 2005. I presented an historical account to examine the roots of this current interest in emotion. I suggested that Rogerian theory changed how emotions were valued in western society. Emotional experience was seen as a valid and trustworthy means of understanding an individual’s interactions with their environment. These perspectives influenced student-centred approaches to education. In addition, Piaget and Vygotsky played a critical role in the development of these approaches. I argued that Piaget’s focus upon natural development conflicts with Vygotsky’s interest in cultural intervention. The debate as to whether a child needs freedom to develop in their own or direction from adults is also reflected in the tensions between Rogers’ humanism and Skinner’s behaviourism. I suggested that these tensions are evident in child-centred pedagogy today. The 1988 Education Reform Act challenged progressive educational approaches and, informed by the belief that a free-market would help sustain the authority of the state, introduced a national curriculum and standardised testing. In recent times, concerns for children’s emotional health and wellbeing is reflected in educational policy and practice. I suggested that SEAL attempts to make connections between children’s emotional wellbeing and successful academic learning. In this way, emotions are now conceptualised as means through which academic success can be achieved. I have suggested that this framing of emotion is amenable to a political context framed by the principles of neo-liberalism. I then examined how this plays out through the SEAL curriculum in terms of the conflict between children’s agency and adults’ control. Turn to Context 1.2. (pg. 29), where I argue that the SEAL initiative, in contrast to its student-centred rhetoric, actually sustains the neo-liberal values underpinning the 1988 Education reform Act.
Context: Politics and Practice

This section provides a contextual introduction which frames the two volumes that follow. It will provide a recent history of the role of emotion in education leading up to the present day. This section also examines how emotions are conceptualised within education and identify why it is important for new ways of thinking about emotion to enter this field. In addition, this section will briefly introduce the field site and research participants.

1. Emotions in Education

Delving Deeper: Student-centred rhetoric and emotion in education

As I have shown the development of student-centred education has had a significant role to play in the recent recognition of emotions in education. However, here I am interested in how a student-centred rhetoric works within educational policy. More specifically, I will focus upon the ways that Carl Rogers theoretical contributions to the human sciences are evident within contemporary educational policy. Rogers is often neglected in accounts of educational history and yet he has influenced the development of student-centred learning approaches today (Smeyers et al 2010). In addition, Hough (2006) aligns the recent interest in emotional intelligence as an educational goal with the person-centred approach. However, Hough argues that the principles behind emotional literacy approaches are hijacked by teachers and schools, and thus become programmes of social control. He feels that a greater focus upon the values and beliefs of the person-centred approach would help to change this. Hough’s argument fails to recognise how the person-centred approach has influenced a concern for developing children’s emotional skills in the first place. I consider SEAL to be an almost inevitable series of re-interpretations of Rogers’ writings.

Therefore my aim is to examine the uptake of Rogers’ theories in recent political agendas. In particular I am interested in the amalgamation of person-centred theory, developmental psychology and behaviourist psychology. I suggest that these contradictory perspectives
are brought together through contemporary child-centred pedagogy (as set out in initiatives such as SEAL). Burman (2008) suggests that these tensions are experienced by teachers, who ‘encounter an untenable conflict between the mandate for non-interference to promote independence, and her institutional position as reliable for children’s learning’ (pg. 264). In the sections that follow, I will highlight four key person-centred concepts developed by Rogers which are reflected in the SEAL policy documents (Actualisation; Conditions; Personal Power; Full Potential). I will suggest that this use of person-centred theory provides a rationale for SEAL, which works to legitimise behavioural techniques which intend to shape children’s development in distinct ways. In the later parts of this section I will situate these endeavours to shape children into particular types of adults, irrespective of the children’s biographies, within wider social forces such as labour market demands. Given that psychological understandings are part of our everyday lives (Madsen and Brinkmann 2010), the aim of this analysis is to explore how psychological discourse is embedded within these new educational regimes. Therefore, this analysis will help in later stages of the research process, as I aim to make connections between policy and practice.

a) ‘Actualisation’

Rogers suggests that all living organisms, including humans, have the tendency to actualise (2003a, 2003b, 2004a). By this he means that regardless of the environmental conditions, all living organisms will move in a direction towards increasing complexity.

*In every organism ... there is a natural tendency toward a more complex and complete development ... whether the environment is favourable or unfavourable, the behaviours of an organism can be counted on to be in the direction of maintaining, enhancing and reproducing itself.* (Rogers 1995, pg 117 - 118)

Rogers states that ‘the actualising tendency, when operating freely, tends toward an integrated wholeness in which behaviour is guided as much by the experiencings within as by the consciousness that flutters over these experiences’ (Rogers 2003b, pg. 250). This reflects how he valued personal reflexivity, and an awareness of the relationship between the inner experiencing self and society (Rogers 2004d). When the individual is open to all of her/his experiences then, Rogers suggests, her/his behaviour will be constructive (2004d). However, for Rogers this openness was only ever a theoretical
(rather than achievable) state of being. In addition, Rogers’ actualisation tendency describes a process through which an individual negotiates the social world. Whilst he associated inner drives with the actualising tendency (‘the urge to expand, extend, develop, mature’ (Rogers 2004a, pg. 351)), these inner processes are in relationship with a world beyond the self. Rogers’ categorisations of inner and outer worlds and the associations he attributed to these dimensions inform his view of personal power. For Rogers, personal power stems from an awareness of the relationship between our inner selves and outer worlds. The emphasis here is upon the individual to change their situation. This focus upon the individual makes person-centred theory amenable to neoliberal agendas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Intended learning outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| The Green set explores feelings in greater depth with an exploration of more complex and mixed feelings. It helps children to consider the subtle differences between feeling proud and boasting. | Knowing myself  
I accept myself for who and what I am.  
Understanding my feelings  
I can tell the difference between showing I am proud and boasting.  
I know that boasting can make other people feel inadequate or useless.  
I can explain how I am feeling even if I have mixed feelings.  
I understand that sometimes the feeling part of my brain takes over and I might make mistakes.  
I can understand how my strong feelings might build up and how I might be overwhelmed by my feelings. |
| There is an exploration of risk-taking and of the balance between safety and risk. Opportunities are provided for children to consider how and when they should stand up for themselves and when they should listen to their peers. Children are helped to understand how they might be overwhelmed by their emotions. They explore strategies for managing strong feelings. | I can recognise when I am beginning to be overwhelmed by my feelings and can use a calming-down strategy.  
I know that if I have once been overwhelmed by my feelings I might easily ‘lose it’ again another time.  
Managing my feelings  
I can use some strategies to help me when I feel useless or inadequate.  
I can feel positive even when things are going wrong.  
I can avoid situations that are likely to hurt my feelings or make me angry.  
I can recognise when I am feeling worried.  
I know how to do something about my worry.  
I know when and how to stop and think before I act.  
I can disagree with someone without falling out.  
I can cope when someone disagrees with me.  
I can stand up for what I think after listening to others and making my own choice.  
I understand that the majority view is not always right.  
I can behave in an assertive way using appropriate body language and tone of voice.  
Making choices  
I can make a judgement about whether to take a risk. |
Maslow developed the term self-actualisation to describe Rogers’ theory of the ‘fully functioning person’ (Rogers 2003b, pg. 98). Definitions of actualisation are now often synonymous with the notion of full-potential. For example, Ryckman (2000) states that the actualising tendency ‘involves developing potentials that make us more worthwhile human beings’ (pg. 463). Therefore, reaching our potential, from Ryckman’s perspective, is the end goal of actualisation. The association between self-awareness and proper functioning is evident within the SEAL curriculum. Within this curriculum a key goal is for a child to become aware of her/his feelings (see Fig. 1). Doing so is directly linked with behaviours that are deemed ‘positive’ within a school setting.

The transformation of a theoretical construction of personality into a set of universal learning outcomes is problematic. Figure 1 shows that the SEAL curriculum is very prescriptive about what types of feelings they should and should not express (for example, being proud is fine but boasting is not) and how they should manage the emotions they should not express (for example, using a calming down strategy when feeling overwhelmed). The values that frame how children should exert their own self-control, which children seem to be encouraged to internalise, become an important tool through which power operates. The focus of the SEAL curriculum therefore appears to encourage children to ‘perform’ in the ‘right’ ways, which reflect a specific set of values that have been argued to favour white middle class values (see for example Gillies 2008). As Burman (2008) argues, ‘while self-control and self-direction are central to the child-centred pedagogy, it becomes apparent that obedience is a covert outcome of it, since children are considered to be more willing to obey rules if these appear to arise out of their own deliberations and choices’ (pg. 269) This detracts attention from asking questions such as ‘why are we asking children to perform in these ways?’ or ‘what are the wider implications of asking children to perform in these ways?’

b) ‘Conditions’

Rogers found that when a client experienced counselling as therapeutic, a range of conditions which focused upon the relationship between the therapist and client were being met.

*Individuals have within themselves vast resources for self-understanding and for altering their self-concepts, basic attitudes, and self-directed behaviour; these resources can be tapped if a definable climate of facilitative*
psychological attitudes can be provided. There are ... conditions that must be present in order for a climate to be growth-promoting ... These conditions apply ... in any situation in which the development of the person is a goal.

(Rogers 1995, pg 115)

He developed six conditions relating to the quality of the relationships between the client and therapist:

*For therapy to occur it is necessary that these conditions exist.*

1. That two persons are in contact.
2. That the first person, whom we shall term the client, is in a state of incongruence, being vulnerable or anxious.
3. That the second person, whom we shall term the therapist, is congruent in the relationship.
4. That the therapist is experiencing unconditional positive regard toward the client.
5. That the therapist is experiencing an empathic understanding of the client's internal frame of reference.
6. That the client perceives, at least to a minimal degree, conditions 4 and 5, the unconditional positive regard of the therapist for him, and the empathic understanding of the therapist.

(Rogers 1959, cited in Tudor et al 2004, pg. 38)

The word ‘conditions’ is now used in education policy. For example, The Children’s Plan: Building Better Futures (DCSF 2007) states that the SEAL programme ‘offers a whole-school approach to developing social and emotional skills [and] helps schools create the climate and conditions which promote the development of these skills including activities to engage parents’ (pg. 71). This statement also reflects the role of the school to support parents, as children’s successful development is often associated with children’s home lives. For example, in the Independent Review of the Primary Curriculum (DCSF 2009), it is states that ‘children from impoverished environments use less than half the number of words spoken by their more advantaged peers’ (pg. 58). The child’s access to literature within the home is positioned as the problem; ‘unbeknownst to them or their families, children who grow up in environments with few or no literacy experiences are already playing catch up when they enter kindergarten and the primary grades ... ‘when cultural traditions and the feelings of others are never experienced, there is less understanding of what other people feel (Wolf 2007, cited in DCSF 2009, pg. 58). We can see here that
literacy experiences within the home are also associated with children’s development of empathy. A case study from practice then illustrates how teachers can work with parents to support reading within the home. This example demonstrates how parents and carers are implicated in the development of children within educational policy. The SEAL programme targets parents and carers as key figures; ‘parents and carers are the key to developing children’s social, emotional and behavioural skills’ (DfES 2005a, pg. 24). While schools are expected to establish ‘conditions’ that support children’s development within the school setting, they are also expected to promote these ‘conditions’ to parents and carers so that they can be provided within the home. Burman (2008) argues that ‘child-centred approaches ... tend to subscribe to notions of compensatory education and cultural disadvantage or deprivation by assuming that there is something wrong or missing in the child’s background’ (pg. 269). Therefore environmental ‘conditions’ are associated with specific effects. In this way Rogers’ ‘conditions’, which he argues facilitate growth but do not direct growth (Rogers 2003a), are now associated with particular developmental trajectories. Interventions are therefore targeted at the pathologised socially disadvantaged.

We also see the re-interpretation of these ‘conditions’, for example unconditional positive regard has become ‘praise’ (Smeyers at al 2010) and empathy has become ‘active listening’ (as described in Fig. 4). In this way Rogers’ relational conditions seem to have informed a range of techniques acquired by educational practitioners to demonstrate unconditional positive regard or empathy. This is reflected in the example shown in Figure 2, of a staff training activity to develop active listening skills. Here the teacher acquires a range of verbal and non-verbal techniques.

A focus upon establishing and sustaining particular ‘conditions’ in order to herald specific outcomes, shows how normative assumptions regarding development enter into child-centred pedagogy. Burman (2008) argues that a ‘failure to see child development as socially constructed rather than biologically unfolding leads to an ignorance of the ways the models reinscribe particular moral values’ (pg. 273).

c) ‘Personal Power’

Power is a reoccurring theme in Rogers’ work. Recognition of the client’s agency is seen to be integral to the development of the therapeutic relationship (Rogers 2003a, 2003b,
Rogers advocated the client’s capacity for ‘personal power’. In this way, the person-centred approach is ‘politically centred on the client’ (Rogers 2003b, pg. 14).

“The politics of the client-centred approach is a conscious renunciation and avoidance by the therapist of all control over, or decision making for, the client. It is the facilitation of self-ownership by the client and the strategies by which this can be achieved; this placing of the locus of decision-making and the responsibility for the effects of these decisions’ (Rogers 2003b, pg. 14).

Activity 2: listening skills

Time
30 minutes

Resources
None

What to do

The ability to be an active listener is fundamental to work in the area of social and emotional learning and emotional well-being. You might have already carried out work as a whole-school staff in this area, and some of you might have received training in counselling, but spending a little time honing your skills might still be useful.

Work in threes. Each threesome should appoint:

an observer;
a communicator;
a listener.

The communicator should think of an incident or story that they are happy to share that has some emotional overtones. They should tell the listener about the incident.

The listener should avoid eye contact with the communicator, fidget and deliberately fail to listen.

The participants should then switch roles. The activity should be repeated but this time the listener should use non-verbal means to show they are listening. For example, they should make appropriate eye contact, sit in an ‘attentive’ way and nod or use facial expression to show they are interested.

The participants should switch roles again but this time the listener should use non-verbal and verbal means to encourage. This might include:

encouragers – for example, ‘I see’, ‘really’, ‘I understand’;
reflection – repeating important phrases to show that you understand and have listened;
summarising – reflecting back the content of what has been said using different words to help clarification;
paraphrasing – reflecting back the hidden meanings or feelings – for example, ‘I guess when he did that it made you feel angry’;
questioning – asking questions for clarification – for example, ‘How did that make you feel?’; ‘What happened then?’.

Figure 2: An example of a staff training activity (DFES 2005b, pg. 10)
Power in person-centred counselling has been conceptualised not as something that the therapist holds over the client but as an inherent dimension of the dynamic relationship between the therapist and client (Proctor 2002). Power is negotiated between the therapist and the client over the course of the therapeutic relationship. While part of the therapist’s professional role is to reflect upon and consider how power is played out within this relationship, power is conceptualised as relational and situated rather than as owned by one individual and not the other (Proctor 2002).

Person-centred practitioners have explored the complexities of power within the therapeutic relationship from the perspectives of class (Kearney 1996) and discriminatory practice (Lago and Smith 2010). This work engages with how therapy is situated within a wider social context. Such an exploration is missing from contemporary child-centred pedagogy. Within a child-centred pedagogy, the locus of analysis is the individual. Within these educational contexts, societal patterns of difference are more likely to be hidden (Burman 2008, pg. 266). For example, in the extract from the SEAL curriculum describing intended learning outcomes (see Fig. 3), the child is expected to learn that ‘it is up to me to get things done’. This is defined as fostering ‘goal-directed behaviour’ whereby children set themselves ‘targets’ and find ways to meet them and overcome ‘obstacles’. These objectives reflect a focus upon the production of self-reliant individuals. This has direct parallels with the notion of individualism advocated by Rogers, which promotes self-empowerment. However, these learning outcomes are not defined by the child. Children are expected to accept these targets and develop independent strategies and methods to achieve them. Therefore while the SEAL curriculum advocates self-ownership the locus of decision-making is external to the child.

Burman suggests that ‘the progressive strands of individualism within modern Western societies, such as equal rights and social reform movements, coexist with, and are rooted within, the development and expansion of capitalist free-market economies (pg. 266). This complex relationship between education and economic demands is evident within contemporary child-centred pedagogy. For example, the development of children’s ‘resilience’ is defined as an intended learning outcome within the SEAL curriculum (see Fig. 3). Resilience is associated with greater academic and career success. For example, Floyd (1996) argues that resilience was an important factor in the academic and success of African American students from impoverished backgrounds. This research implicates the individual as responsible for her/his future social inclusion. Clarke (2006) in her research which examines how mothers are positioned as responsibility for their children’s social inclusion, claims that the government’s use of primarily individual approaches to
social exclusion ‘risks sliding into a moral discourse that blames [individuals] for poor outcomes’ (pg. 699).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Intended learning outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| This theme provides opportunities for children to explore learning and the skills and dispositions that make an effective learner. With help they identify six key learning skills. | Knowing myself  
I know the skills and attributes of an effective learner.  
I can try to develop these skills.  
I know what some of the people in my class like or admire about me.  
I can recognise when I am using an excuse instead of finding a way around a problem.  
I can recognise and celebrate my own achievements. |
| Goal-directed behaviour is explored more fully and opportunities are provided for children to set a goal and to plan to meet it in a systematic way. | Setting a realistic goal  
I can set myself a goal or challenge. |
| Children explore the importance of taking responsibility for their learning and behaviour and think about when they might be making excuses. | Planning to reach a goal  
I can make a long-term personal or learning plan and break it down into smaller, achievable goals.  
I know that it is up to me to get things done by taking the first step. |
| Children are encouraged to look to their longer-term future and their dreams and aspirations and to use these to help them to make long-term plans. | They think about the importance of resilience in overcoming obstacles in order to reach a goal. |

Figure 3: An example of learning outcomes listed in the SEAL curriculum (DfES 2005d, pg. 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Intended learning outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Children will revisit common responses to unwelcome change and develop their ability to empathise with others. They will consider how and why people’s responses to change might differ in relation to different personal histories. They will explore the idea that negative feelings about change do not last for ever and that often initially unwelcome change can have unforeseen positive consequences. | Knowing myself  
I am aware of common responses to difficult changes, and that they are sometimes similar to our responses when experiencing loss.  
I can tell you some of the good things about me that my classmates like and value. |
| The issue of responsibility is revisited. In Year 6, children have the opportunity to identify, understand, explore and manage a range of feelings they may be experiencing in relation to secondary transfer. They have further opportunities to explore the links between feelings, thoughts and behaviour, and to consider their own needs, including the importance of belonging within a group. | Understanding my feelings  
I understand how it might feel when a change takes you away from familiar people and places.  
I can tell you my ‘soe spots’.  
I can recognise when I might over-react because someone has touched a ‘soe spot’.  
I recognise that my behaviour is my responsibility, even when someone has touched a ‘soe spot’.  
I know that it is natural to be wary of change, and can tell you why.  
I know that all feelings, including uncomfortable ones, have a purpose and give us information.  
I understand why I behave the way I do sometimes when I feel uncomfortable. |

Figure 4: An example of learning outcomes listed in the SEAL curriculum (DfES 2005e, pg. 1)

d) ‘Full Potential’

Rogers describes the process of therapy as one of ‘realising potential’ and identified key similarities in his clients experiences of realising their potential: coming to like themselves, discovering that the core of their personality was positive and being open to
and accepting of their own experiences (see Rogers 2004a, pp. 73-107). While Rogers identified these common experiences shared with him by clients, he resisted writing about therapy in terms of outcomes. He felt that therapy, and indeed learning, should not be outcome driven. For him, this would cloud the primary focus of therapy - the quality of the therapeutic relationship. However, the shared experiences of Rogers’ clients bear similarities to those identified as objectives within the SEAL curriculum (see Fig. 4).

The objectives focus upon coping with change and transitions. These demonstrate particular assumptions about children’s emotional experiences. For example, it is assumed that children will be ‘wary of change’, and this is described as a ‘natural’ response to change. These kinds of descriptions limit the possible ways that children could engage with and speak about their emotional lives. Perhaps change would be more familiar to some children and not others. It is therefore unlikely that the significant emotion for all children during periods of change would be wariness. The focus upon social and emotional aspects of learning is framed upon a particular understanding of the positive and negative role that emotions play in academic achievement. For example, it is assumed that ‘students who are anxious, angry or depressed don’t learn … when emotions overwhelm concentration, what is being swamped is the mental capacity cognitive scientists call ‘working memory’ (Goleman 1995, as cited in DfES 2005a, pg. 8). Emotions are a means of advancing the cognitive. It seems that SEAL is framed upon assumptions about what success should look like and the kinds of emotional experiences that promote or constrain the achievement of success. These assumptions are reflected in the SEAL curriculum’s learning objectives, which the child has limited scope to question and challenge.

e) Paradigmatic conceptualisations of emotions and SEAL

Person-centred theory is reflected in the rationale for SEAL. However, the approach that the SEAL curriculum advocates is objective focused and prescriptive. In this way it differs heavily from approaches advocated by person-centred practitioners, which counters Hough’s (2006) view presented earlier in this section. Hough argued that educational approaches such as SEAL were hijacked by teachers to become programmes of social control. In contrast to this I have suggested that these approaches are fundamentally designed to direct children’s development according to values identified and defined externally to the child. While I do not believe that it is possible to predict
how children will engage with a particular curriculum or institution, these values need to be identified and unpicked.

In this section I will explore the values that underpin SEAL by drawing upon Boler’s ‘rational’ and ‘pathological’ paradigmatic conceptualisations of emotion (1997). To do so I will examine the conjecture set out in the SEAL guidance document (DfES 2005a) that emotions are the primary mediator of human behaviours, attitudes and values. I will use this to argue that one of the overarching aims of the initiative is the modification of children’s conduct through attending to children’s emotions. I will suggest that social hierarchies and power relations may be perpetuated through the rules relating to emotional expression that the curriculum sustains.

As I have shown, Rogers’ theories have had a lasting impact upon emotional dimensions of education. For example, Smeyers et al (2010) argue that ‘unconditional positive regard has become dominant in thinking on pastoral care in education’ (pg. 5). However, I also explored how important aspects of Rogers’ theories also seem to be neglected. For example, the view that growth/learning is a process that involves living organisms and their environments is not addressed. Rather, SEAL emphasises changes in the child to fit the traditional unchallenged environmental conditions of schools, such as ranking by ability or grouping by age. Rogers’ aimed to challenge what he stated was a prevailing view ‘that the essence of persons is dangerous, that they must be taught, guided and controlled by those with superior authority’ (Rogers 1995, pg. 201). This view is still reflected in SEAL policy today, for example, through an emphasis upon the damaging effects of childhood emotional vulnerability:

‘… children with emotional and behavioural problems are prone to mental illness problems in later life, and have increased likelihood of school exclusion, offending, antisocial behaviour, marital breakdown, drug misuse, alcoholism and mental illness in adolescence and adulthood.’ (DfES 2005a, pg 50)

This view fits into a ‘pathological paradigm’, one of Boler’s four descriptions of ‘paradigmatic approaches to the study and conceptualisation of emotion’ (1997, pg 204). Pathological discourses emerge historically across the sciences, informed by medicine and biology, psychology, social sciences, and neurosciences. The pathological discourses often assume a normative model of “emotional equilibrium.” Individuals are passively vulnerable to emotions which affect us like naturalized weather fronts over which we
have no control (Boler 1997, pg 205). However, the conceptualisation of emotions which frames SEAL also suggests that preventative measures can be taken to avoid the risk of emotional vulnerability:

‘…those with high levels of emotional and social competence do better in school, at work, and in their personal life. The development of emotional and social competence and well-being can reduce mental health problems of young people and their teachers, e.g. depression, anxiety, suicide, eating disorders, stress.’ (DfES 2005a, pg 50)

This relates to a ‘rational paradigm’ (Boler 1997, pg 205), which has underlined psychology since the late 1800s through the belief that moral order ‘could be constructed, shaped, organised and re-educated through disciplining the body, imposing habits and regulations’ (Rose 1985, pg. 26). Rational discourses about emotion ‘often overlap with or include scientific discourses which codify, categorize, and/or universalize emotions’ (Boler 1997, pg 205).

The work of Mayer and Salovey, who developed the notion of ‘emotional intelligence’ (1997), has placed emotions within the realm of the scientific and quantifiable. They conceptualised emotions as controllable. The extent to which an individual can control their emotions will support their ‘successful management of life tasks such as learning, forming relationships, solving everyday problems, and adapting to the complex demands of growth and development’ (Ellias et al, 1997:2). This perspective of emotion runs parallel to discourses of morality within contemporary psychology and particularly that which influences educational policy (Goleman 1996, Layard 2006) and in particular the field of positive psychology (Snyder and López 2005 and 2007, Seligman 2002). Martin Seligman, the founder of the recent field of positive psychology, stated that 'nowhere else in the world have [my] ideas been so taken up by public policy as in the UK. There's a real buzz here about the politics of well-being' (cited in Suissa 2009, pg. 205). Positive psychology has a significant role of play in identifying ‘virtues’ to which children in education should aspire, such as ‘courage, future-mindedness, optimism, interpersonal skill, faith, work ethic, hope, honesty, perseverance’ (Seligman, 2005, pg. 4). These new branches of psychology make clear that such virtues (which can be demonstrated through a person’s behaviours) are assumed to be more valuable than others. The view that these qualities are visible through how a child behaves is also evident from the SEAL guidelines. For example a whole school system is encouraged to catch positive behaviours and reinforce these qualities.
'The resource offers … a potential whole-school or setting focus for noticing and celebrating positive behaviours (for example, one week ‘catching children being kind’ or another ‘catching children resolving an argument well’). This includes the whole school or setting community – children, parents/carers, caretaker, office staff and lunchtime supervisors, as well as teachers/practitioners and teaching assistants – who can all nominate a child for celebration using the usual school or setting system' (DfES 2005a, pg 12-13).

Weare and Gray – who devised the foundations for the SEAL initiative through their report ‘What Works in Developing Children’s Emotional and Social Competence and Wellbeing?’ – also infer that emotional vulnerability lies at the heart of problem behaviour (2003). One of the ‘general principles’ for ‘ensuring the effectiveness of SEAL programmes’ is to ‘link work on behavioural and emotional problems with work on emotional and social competence and well-being’ (DfES 2005a, pg 44). SEAL is concentrated upon behaviour modification, through regulating children’s emotional expression according to preconceived ideas about what counts as good or appropriate. It neglects to consider the social inequalities that lie behind these assumptions and might be perpetuated through their application in education. The section that follows aims to further examine the role that values play in the production of education policy in relation to emotion. While an active interest in emotions in education presents many opportunities, in the following paragraphs I will argue that the way emotions are conceptualised within these new discourses is situated within a neo-liberal paradigm of individualism.

f) Emotions, neo-liberalism and the free-market

In 1988 The Education Reform Act gave rise to a new language within the education sector, whereby parents are termed as ‘consumers’, education a ‘commodity’, and teachers as ‘producers’ (Demaine 1988). This terminology highlights a paradigm shift in education towards a free-market agenda. Ball describes the current technologies of policy framed within management and marketing practices more familiar in the private sector as ‘performativity’.

‘Performativity is a technology, a culture and a mode of regulation that employs judgements, comparisons and displays as means of incentive,
control, attrition and change - based on rewards and sanctions (both material and symbolic). The performances (of individual subjects or organisations) serve as measures of productivity or output, or displays of ‘quality’, or ‘moments’ of promotion or inspection. As such they stand for, encapsulate or represent the worth, quality or value of an individual or organisation within a field of judgement’ (Ball 2003, pg. 216).

Ball (2003) explores performativity in relation to teacher’s practice – his research shows that teachers experience a kind of ‘values schizophrenia’ (pg. 221) that creates tensions between personal values and beliefs with indicators and measures of ‘productivity’. This research can also be seen as an indicator of how a performative agenda repositions the site of risk so that teachers ‘think about themselves as individuals who … improve their productivity [and] strive for excellence’ (Ball 2003, pg. 217). This ‘self-regulating, regulation’ is promoted through a pretence of autonomy (Ball 2003, pg. 217). For example, in 2007 the personalised learning agenda repositioned responsibility for success with the individual learner as it aimed to take ‘a highly structured and responsive approach to each child’s and young person’s learning’ (DCSF 2008, pg. 5). However, choice is not value-neutral:

‘Learning outcomes and success criteria are also made explicit so that the pupils know not only what they are intended to learn but also how they will demonstrate their achievement’ (DCSF 2008, pg. 21).

The emphasis was less upon learner participation and more upon the assimilation of learners to a prescriptive rationale for learning, which was linked to the demands of ‘employers, who are clear about the skills their businesses need and value’ (DfES 2006, pg 8). It has been argued that the new psychological interventions both in education and beyond legitimised this agenda (Parker 2007) through persuasive arguments claiming that they fostered agency:

‘Psychological descriptions of individual action are often enthusiastically taken up by those who have most to lose from those descriptions; and those who benefit from persuading people that a problem can be reduced to the way someone thinks or feels also, quite understandably, really believe in psychology themselves. Psychology is an increasingly powerful component of ideology, ruling ideas that endorse exploitation and sabotage struggles against oppression’ (Parker 2007, pg. 1-2).
As examined in Context 2.1. SEAL offered a psychological perspective that supported a personalized learning agenda. It seems that the SEAL initiative served learners according to the same measures and indicators, as well as judgements, of personalisation. It makes claims that by providing children with the skills and techniques to manage emotional expression they will be both more successful at school, in terms of academic achievement, and be of greater value to the labour market:

‘Emotional and social competencies have been shown to be more influential than cognitive abilities for personal, career and scholastic success, so they need to be central to schools and learning to increase school effectiveness’ (DfES 2005a, pg 48).

Influential to this focus upon children’s emotional regulation was the increased importance of emotional labour within an ever more service-orientated work environment (Hochschild 2003). The requirement that workers manage and express their emotions in particular ways within the service industry appears to be influencing education. For example, through the SEAL curriculum children were expected to develop ‘emotion skills’ which will promote ‘greater education and work success’, especially as ‘work and workplaces increasingly focus on social and emotional competencies, with increased emphasis on teamwork, communication, management skills’ (DfES 2005a, pg. 48). These skills are also positioned as a remedy for the mental health problems perceived to be facing contemporary society (Seligman 2005).

This link between emotions and value in terms of labour, and hence the economy, is highlighted in the influential Layard report ‘Mental Health, Britain’s Biggest Social Problem?’ – ‘Mental illness is one of the biggest causes of misery in our society – as I shall show, it is at least as important as poverty. It also imposes heavy costs on the economy (some 2% of GDP) and on the Exchequer (again some 2% of GDP). There are now more mentally ill people drawing incapacity benefits than there are unemployed people on Jobseeker’s Allowance’ (2005, pg 2). This perspective mirrors political concerns in the late 1800’s of a demise of ‘moral order’ attributed to an increasing pauper class and the associated assumption that this would limit the state’s strength to succeed in political and economic struggles with other states (Rose 1985). The Layard report supports the view that the capacities of individuals are of great concern to the state, as each individual is deemed to affect the ‘quality’ of the state’s population as a whole. In the later 19th century the quest for quality became less of an issue for medical experts in terms of health and more of an issue for psychologists in terms of intellect (Rose 1985).
The Layard report suggests that an individual’s mental capacity correlates to their contribution to the state. Perhaps this concern also situates the SEAL initiative.

**g) Conclusions**

As we have seen, Rogers’ work raised the profile of emotions as an important aspect of learning. However, the current reframing of his ideas through the SEAL initiative emphasises change in individuals to fit the traditional social hierarchies and power relations evident in school. In Rogerian theory, the emphasis was upon the interrelationship between the individual and their environment, and through doing so it sought to challenge the culture of education. Instead, I have argued, SEAL is situated within two paradigms – the pathological and the rational. Firstly the pathological paradigm views individuals at risk from emotional vulnerability. Secondly the rational paradigm claims that these risks can be prevented. These paradigms have been supported through the development of the concept of emotional intelligence, which has brought emotions into the realm of the scientific and quantifiable, therefore alluding to the idea that emotions have a rational basis – which the new sciences, such as positive psychology, seek to codify and measure. Through doing so they claim to ‘have discovered that there are human strengths that act as buffers against mental-illness’ and seek to ‘create a science of human strength whose mission will be to understand and learn how to foster these virtues in young people’ (Seligman 2005, pg. 4). However, these new sciences are deciding which virtues are deemed worthy of investigation and thus defining which emotional behaviours are good and appropriate and which are not. SEAL reinforces these assumptions through positive reinforcement of ‘correct’ emotional responses and expression. In doing so it neglects to consider the power relations these approaches may be perpetuating.

The Education Reform Act of 1988 marked a shift towards a free-market agenda, with an increased emphasis upon productivity. This target driven approach, described by Ball as performativity, repositions the responsibility for success from the state to the individual. Ball described this shift in terms of teachers. However, the personalised learning agenda also shifts the locus of responsibility to the individual learner and is described in terms of autonomy. Conversely, choice is not value-neutral and is heavily linked to a prescriptive rationale for learners framed around the needs and demands of the labour market.

Likewise SEAL is also orientated towards supporting students’ development in ways that are of greater value to the labour market. I explored how judgements of what is deemed
valuable may be made in terms of mental capacity by reflecting upon the discourses from the report, ‘Mental Illness, Britain’s Biggest Social Problem?’, by Richard Layard. This perspective offers a link back to the rational and pathological paradigms that dominate the current political discourse around emotions. As the Layard report shows, mental capacity is not only judged in terms of intelligence, but also in terms of mental illness. This report calls for action to be taken to prevent mental illness and enable people to return to employment (Layard 2005). SEAL claims to offer a form of prevention. Framed by the notion that emotions are the primary organiser of thoughts and behaviour, it offers the idea that through the control of emotional expression it is possible to modify the conduct of the individual. Consequently, the focus of SEAL is upon shaping the traits of the individual through using rules about emotional expression as ‘mechanisms of power’ (Foucault 1991, pg 138). In the current ‘therapeutic state’ – whereby therapeutic discourse frames civic society (Ecclestone and Hayes 2009; Furedi, 2009) – the pathological and rational paradigms are also sustained more widely within modern society, whereby actions, attitudes and behaviours of others are considered through an emotional predisposition (Ecclestone and Hayes, 2009). The SEAL initiative bears resemblance to common discourses about emotions and appears to be welcomed by many as a shift towards the ideals of emancipatory and democratic education.

These discourses offer a starting point for this study. Lacking in these debates around the nature of emotions and the school’s role to integrate emotions into learning is the voice of the child. This study is interested in how schools are responding to the current discourses about emotions, and significantly what this means to children. It will focus upon children’s meaning-making through their participation in a SEAL school.

This thesis aims to question notions of control and agency within emotional education practices by engaging with children’s practices in a SEAL school. The intention is to explore how power and empowerment are enacted, or played out, in children’s school lives. Through engaging with the micro-practices that constitute children’s lives, I aim to also look at how these are situated within wider contexts. Scheff suggests that emotions offer an opportunity to examine the relationships between the micro and macro spheres of social life (1997). This is demonstrated in Scheff and Retzinger’s (2001) examination of the role of shame in the constitution of social bonds. While shame is experienced within the body, the interactions between an individual and wider society shape the personal meanings s/he attaches to this experience. The individual’s inner experience of shame signals when her/his social bonds are threatened (Scheff and Retzinger 2001). I assert that through the analysis of the relationship between children’s emotional responses and wider
contexts, we will be in a better position to engage with their emotions. Burman argues that ‘if we are really to become interested in children’s emotional experiences, rather than in trying to manage them or make uncomfortable emotions disappear, then we have to engage with them, and with our own responses to them’ (2008, pg. 277). In order to move towards this, it is important to begin to understand what prevents these kinds of engagements from occurring.

If, as Scheff suggests, emotions are implicated in the constitution of social order, then emotions must play a role in children’s social interactions. Educational initiatives encourage children to manage their own emotions in the name of social cohesion. For boys at school this may involve working on their feelings of anger in particular. This example reflects how intervention strategies are tied up with gender, class and race. In this case an association between anger and masculinity seems to be at work. These kinds of interventions lead to ‘unwanted’ emotional responses being dismissed rather than explored. For example, the increased focus upon equality and inclusion in schools does not sit comfortably alongside the techniques that children use to negotiate status and recognition within their interactions, which can include violence and oppression. Perhaps then emotional responses that signal children’s struggles for social recognition tend to go unnoticed in order that the idealism of social equality is promoted. Missing from techniques that aim to encourage children to self-manage their behaviour in particular ways is a consideration of emotional exchanges as an important means for children to sustain, contest or redefine their own and others’ social positions at school. Therefore, emotions need to be analysed beyond the theoretical frameworks of cognitive and psychobiological science and behavioural psychology. Rather, an alternative way of seeing emotions could offer new explanations. A socio-spatial view of emotion considers how emotions are integrated within the structuring processes through which people give value and meaning to their relationships.

The section above argues that cognitive and psychobiological science and behavioural psychology cannot adequately examine how people negotiate the socio-cultural norms and values which frame how emotions are understood in specific contexts. Turn to Context 1.3. (pg. 47), where I describe the SEAL school in which this doctoral study was located. This site provided an opportunity to further explore the arguments developed in the section above by engaging with children’s experiences and perceptions of emotion in a SEAL school setting.
Context: Politics and Practice

This section provides a contextual introduction which frames the two volumes that follow. It will provide a recent history of the role of emotion in education leading up to the present day. This section also examines how emotions are conceptualised within education and identify why it is important for new ways of thinking about emotion to enter this field. In addition, this section will briefly introduce the field site and research participants.

1. Emotions in Education

Introducing the School and Participants

The research was carried out in a junior school in Sheffield. This school is described as a Wave 1 SEAL school. It was one of the first wave of primary schools in Sheffield to apply the Social and Emotional Aspects of Learning (SEAL) initiative. The school has received recognition by Ofsted for its commitment to children’s social and emotional development as well as invitations to share their approaches to SEAL at local and national conferences.

The SEAL agenda is described by staff as the foundation for many of the school’s embedded approaches to emotional education. The school integrates a range of practices and activities under the umbrella of emotional education throughout the school day, including registration, playtimes, class-based lessons and assemblies, and extends them into the home, through set homework or training for parents and carers. These practices and activities include:

- The school’s ‘core values’. These guide how teachers allocate rewards to children. These core values are: we are respectful, caring and polite; we are always ready to learn; we are determined, we persevere and we are resilient; we respect difference and diversity; we work together co-operatively; we have a voice and we listen to others.

- A range of reward opportunities for those students who have ‘achieved’ the school’s core values, such as a ‘praise pod’, weekly awards assemblies, peer-led SEAL certificate nominations and in-class reward systems.
• Records of children’s playground conduct written by lunchtime supervisors and shared with teaching staff. These help teachers to relate playground incidents with children’s classroom behaviour.

• The feeling barometer. Every morning and afternoon, during registration, the children share with their teacher and class a number to represent how they are feeling on a scale of one-to-ten. A member of staff tracks these numbers and, if it seems appropriate, will offer the children with low scores a one-to-one session.

• One-to-one sessions for children who may be having a difficult time, to talk to an adult about how they are feeling.

• A weekly SEAL lesson and SEAL assembly. In these activities children are encouraged to, for example, develop more expansive vocabularies of emotion, learn techniques to control emotions, identify emotional expression through body clues or describe the positive and negative feelings in relation to events. In addition, SEAL homework is set for children to complete with the support of their parents and carers.

• The school council. Children from each year group and the integrated resource nominate themselves for the position of school councillor and are then selected by teaching staff to represent their class and communicate issues they or their peers may have.

• A ‘peer-mediation’ scheme. Through this scheme a group of Year 5 and 6 children (ages 9 - 11) participate in conflict resolution training to enable them to support their peers to overcome disagreements during playtime.

• Each teacher also incorporates SEAL activities and techniques into their daily routine. For example, after playtime a teacher might ask the children to name others who helped them enjoy their playtime.

• School staff receive training in emotional education approaches, such as conflict resolution. Training events are also provided for parents.

• In addition to these in-school initiatives, the school offers a residential in an outdoor activity centre in Year 5, to support the children’s development of a range of social and emotional competencies, such as collaborative working and communication skills.
Within this school, the data collection focused upon one class of Year 5 children (aged 9 to 10), as they had experienced SEAL throughout their time in primary education. In addition I spoke to the headteacher, SEAL coordinator and Year 5 classroom teacher in order to relate their perspectives with those of the children. Nine children from the Year 5 class were invited to participate in research workshops from October 2010 to June 2011. These nine children also engaged their peers in research activities such as interviews. However, the stories of the nine children formed the core of this research study. In addition two children, David and Sarah, chose to participate in a scrapbook club. I have also chosen to reflect something of their experiences within this thesis. At points within this thesis other children in the class will be included, and these children will be introduced as and when necessary. I have chosen to introduce the eleven young participants in their own words. On my first day at the school I was introduced to the class. After introducing the research project, I asked the children to write down ‘some things they would like me to know about them’. Their descriptions are below. While it is typical to provide a fuller account of the research participants, I would like you as a reader to get to know these children as you read the moments that I have chosen to share from fieldwork. All of the names below are pseudonyms chosen by the children. Any information given by the children that might make them identifiable has been changed.

Harry - ‘My hobby at school is maths. I have a cat called Martha. I live with Andrew my brother Jimmy my dad Kirsty my mum. I am 9. I like cricket, football’

Justin - ‘I do karata, swinging. I have got a dog 2 fish and a hamster. My favorite food is fish & chips’

Didier - ‘I like football and cricket and I like to watch f1. My favourite drink is pepsi max. and my best food is any like nice and I have no pets’

Fred - ‘I am 10 in 3 months and I used to have 20 but they died so my mum bought 2 albino gerbils. I live with me mum, my dad and my sister (and the gerbils). My favorite lesson is science’

Cheryl - ‘My hobbies are swimming, diving, dancing, singing, art, drama and football and lots more things and I also like to eat lots of chocolate and sweets and also I like healthy things like apple, bananas, grapes, melon and plums’

Lionel - ‘my frist (favourite) hoby is fishing. And my favrit lesen is math. And I have got 6 Dogs, my tow brothers, my frie (friends)’
Katie - ‘Hi I am 9 years old and my pet is call Lolly and my frer Game is call ting boodollo my best friend is call Elle and Jane and Katy and Anna and Alexandra’

Alexandra - ‘I live on a farm, I love animals. I ahve a guiniu pig called patchric, a rabbit caled pixie and another rabbit called Theodore. I love acting, I am in the [local] pantomim. I do it every year, I also sometimes I do jospeh and the tecneclel coloured dream coat a the [theatre]. I have a mum called Hannah, my dad is called Nick and an enoying brother called Julian also I have a half sister called Claire. I am 10 in october. I love pizza. I have a dog called moss he is 13 years old. some of favret colours are black and white. My best friends are isla and jack in the other class and anna who went live in astrala. We keep in contack by email. Thank you for reading :)’

Cathy - ‘I like to draw and I love Art I also like to sing and dance. I have 1 pet wich is a cat called charlie hes very lazy but very cute like me. I love chocolate and cake but [illegible] doesn’t. I love to read and I am 9, my birthday is on 23rd February I share a birthday with my dad and my grandma but grandma is dead now its extremely rear so when I was born I was on the news’

David - ‘I would like you to know that I like swimming, dancing’

Sarah - ‘My main hobbies are horse riding and jumping on a horse. I am 10 years old and my birthday is on the 19th October. I live with my mum and the cat. My parents divorst when I was little but I still visit my dad at weekends. I have 5 best friends called Naomi, Alexandria, Shelly, Emma and Rachel’

The section above has introduced the school in which this research study was located. I have briefly described the emotion-orientated initiatives and practices within the school. In addition, I have introduced the research participants. Other ways of thinking about emotion need to be drawn upon in order to develop a research methodology that enables me to engage with the ways that children make sense of their own emotions and those of others as they inhabit a school which places a strong emphasis on the development of emotional skills. In Methods A:1.1. (turn to pg. 52) I introduce the concept of emplacement and how this has informed a research methodology that enables my elicitation of children’s socio-emotional practices.
Volume A
Methods Exploratory A: Research Approach

This exploratory introduces my methodological considerations prior to beginning fieldwork. The aim of the research was primarily to engage with what it was like for children to be part of SEAL school. As I was essentially interested in children’s experiences and perceptions, I sought to define these two terms. To do so, I drew on the concept of emplacement. A key consideration of this research was how emotions were implicated in children’s experiences, therefore I consider the relationship between emplacement and emotion. This theoretical exploration (Methods A:1) informs the development of principles which were used to guide my fieldwork process (Methods A:2). These principles include approaches to building relationships in the field, the role of reflexivity in the research process and the development of research questions.

1. Researching Emplacement

A conceptual understanding of the social role of emotion may complement my research methodology, which has so far considered how engagements with place help the researcher to situate children’s personal accounts of their experiences of emotional curricula. Through the research process I envisage the development of an ethnographic approach that creates opportunities for the researcher to engage with the interrelationship between places and the social circulation of emotions. (Researcher’s reflections, January 2011)

This extract from my research journal was written at the start of fieldwork. Initially the study sought to explore how emotional curricula shapes children’s social interactions in different school spaces and the ways they speak about themselves and their peers. However, as the research progressed, the emphasis moved beyond looking directly at emotional curricula and instead began to focus more upon children’s agency to construct their own meanings of emotion within a school using such curricula. This shift in focus, which came out of building relationships with the children participating in the doctoral
study, shaped my research methodology. I sought to find a way to conceptualise the relationship between children’s emotions and their spatial agency.

*How can I develop a research approach that creates opportunities for the researcher to engage with the dynamic interrelationship between children’s emotions and places? (Researcher’s reflections, January 2011)*

In this section, I will introduce the concept of emplacement, which has offered me a way of thinking about space as produced through socio-emotional life. From an emplacement perspective, space can be understood as ‘a product and process of socially dynamic relations’ (Leander and Sheehy 2004, pg. 1) and place as imbued with personal meaning. I will draw upon interdisciplinary work to consider place as *lived* by children through their inhabitation of space. This understanding shapes how I understand experience and perception. Children’s perceptions are embodied as they move through and negotiate space and place. For me, children’s interactions in and with localised spaces are a platform for engaging with their experiences and perceptions within wider socio-political contexts. I will draw upon interdisciplinary perspectives on emotions to further develop an understanding of space as socially produced and suggest that space both produces and is produced by emotional life. In doing so, I will suggest that the researchers’ emotional responses can provide insights not only into research relationships but also how these are constituted within wider social contexts.

a) Places as lived spaces

Space is predominantly described visually. We are familiar with describing the visual qualities of spaces as they are perceived – ‘that room looks really cosy’ or ‘that view is beautiful’. For Bourdieu, such personal ‘distinctions of taste’ are linked to the particular ‘social field’ for which that person has lived (2010). We are also familiar with particular spatial layouts – row-seating at the cinema or desk-clusters at the office. Foucault has reflected upon the how space has been rationalised in order to maximise productivity according to particular strategies of power (1991). Foucault’s reflections explore the relationship between space and body, whereby space becomes a mechanism to restrict the body’s movements and behaviours. However, other arguments position the body as a means for agency, able to challenge such forces through ‘kinaesthesia’ – feeling the body move (Noland 2009). In bringing these perspectives together, they reflect the significant relationship that exists between space, experience and perception. For example, an
individual's enactment of space can give clues as to her/his relation to social fields (Bourdieu 2010), and how s/he is subjected by strategies of power (Foucault 1991) and actively modifies these subjections (Noland 2009).

In recent years cross-disciplinary attention has been given to the way that people construct meaning as they inhabit and produce space and place. This work highlights embodiment (Christensen and O’Brien 2003; Casey 2001), movement (Ingold 2007; Vergunst 2010), emotion (Davidson and Milligan 2004; Davidson, Bondi and Smith 2005), affect (Wetherell 2012), and the senses (Pink 2009) as integral to the way that individuals experience space and place. Ingold developed the concept of ‘wayfaring’ (2007) to describe how people negotiate their surroundings and leave marks on the landscape. He describes the ‘inhabitant … [as] … one who participates from within, in the very process of the world’s continual coming into being and who, in laying a trail of life, contributes to its weave and texture’ (Ingold 2007, pg. 81). The inhabitant leaves ‘traces’, which Ingold (2007) defines as ‘any enduring mark left in or on a solid surface by continuous movement’ (pg. 43). A trace could be the fossil of an extinct creature, or the track left by an animal or a wheeled vehicle regularly using the same route (Ingold 2007). Traces are inscribed on or in physical space. Ingold’s analogy can also be used to consider how people shape the non-physical dimensions (social, cultural, political, etc) of space. This connects with Casey’s description of place as an ‘event’ with a ‘gathering power’, which is ‘lived’ through ‘the experiencing body’ (as cited in Pink 2009, 30). In this way, place can be understood as a process through which both physical and non-physical dimensions of space are constituted. For Casey (1996, 2001), place would not exist without people to live it.

Prendergast and Forrest (1998) suggest that ‘bodily expressions are learned and defined within a social context’ (pg. 157). For example, a boy may stand on a chair so that he is higher than his peers. Through doing so the boy may gain attention from his peers at that moment of time. In this example the socio-cultural norms of social organisation (i.e. of how to use body and gesture to gain authority) is enacted by the boy through his inhabitation of space. As the boy inhabits and experiences space he becomes entangled within an historically constituted dynamic meshwork of wider socio-cultural norms and values. As Pink, a sensory ethnographer, states, ‘the lived immediacy of the 'local' as constituted through the making of ... places is inevitably interwoven, or 'entangled', with the 'global'' (2009, pg 33). This perspective is particularly pertinent in research about children’s lives. Kjorholt (2003), a researcher interested in children’s cultural worlds, argues that research about children’s lives is commonly situated within the micro and
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separated from larger societal contexts. She suggests that children’s ‘social practices are
developed within the complexity of available contemporary discourses on childhood’
within wider society’ (Kjorholt 2003, pg. 262).

b) Space, place and emotions

The co-constitutive relationship between people and place is defined by Pink as
emplacement (2009). To be emplaced ‘attends to the question of experience by
accounting for the relationships between bodies, minds and the materiality and
sensoriality of the environment’ (Pink 2009, pg. 25). Pink calls for researchers to
‘acknowledge their own emplacement as individuals in and as part of specific research
contexts’ (2009, pg. 25) in order to engage with other people’s emplaced experiences.
These experiences of emplacement can be understood as ‘emotionally textured’ (Milligan,
Bingley and Gatrell 2005, pg. 57). Davidson and Milligan (2004) address the
interrelationship between emotion and place and argue that emotions can only be
understood within a context of place, which they describe as the ‘emotio-spatial
hermeneutic’ (pg. 524). In their view, ‘meaningful senses of space emerge only via
movements between people and places’ (pg. 524). They suggest that ‘an exploration of
the diverse senses of space … [may leave us] … better placed to appreciate the
emotionally dynamic spatiality of contemporary social life’ (Davidson and Milligan 2004,
pg. 524). In terms of research, this suggests that emotions are entangled with researchers’
emplaced experiences during fieldwork. Through reflecting upon and through emotions
we might better recognise how the spaces and places we inhabit through our research
shape our practices and, in turn, how our practices also influence these spaces and places.
For me, this awareness has potential to improve our understanding of the field, and in my
case the emotional spatiality of children’s experiences and their placemaking practices.

Emotions are increasingly considered as socially constructed (Barbalet 2001; Bendelow and
considers how emotions ‘work’ within specific contexts. For example, Hochschild
metaphorically describes the role of emotion within social interactions as a ‘gift
exchange’ (2003). She draws upon the example of ‘owing gratitude’ to illuminate this
metaphor further. She asks ‘what does it mean to owe gratitude?’ and answers ‘what
seems to be owed is a ‘sincere display’’ (pg. 77). Hochschild (2003) uses the term ‘feeling
rules’ to describe the socially constructed norms which guide how people present and
exchange emotion. It is through these rules that people understand when gratitude is owed
and when it isn’t and how to perform gratitude through the expression of emotion. She suggests that ‘feeling rules’ shape how people ‘work’ upon their emotions to present themselves in particular ways and change how they are feeling. These rules are not only culturally specific (Barbalet 2001), but are also sited within spatial localities. I suggest that emotional reflexivity connects the researcher with the processes through which feeling rules are sustained, contested or transformed within these localities. Coffey (1999) reminds us that the researcher’s identity is shaped through fieldwork. Therefore, as the researcher spends more time in the field site their practices can be influenced by these socio-cultural norms. Emotional reflexivity can support us to be aware of how we adapt the ways we manage and express our emotion in these contexts. It is integral to a research methodology which aims to better understand children’s socio-emotional practices. Engaging with my own emotional experiences provides insights into the feeling rules that frame such practices.

While emotional reflexivity can bring the researcher closer to understanding how the field site influences the rules that frame the management and expression of emotions, it also facilitates an understanding of the relatedness of people’s emotional lives. This connects with conceptual understandings of emotions as intersubjective and experienced in relationship with others (Bondi 2005, Pile 1991). Within this work emotions are viewed as ‘located’ in both bodies and places and constructed though the ‘relationality’ between people (Davidson, Bondi and Smith 2005). For example, Bondi (2005) states that ‘what we experience as our own emotional life’ can give us insight into the flow of emotion between bodies, minds, spaces and places (pg. 442). She suggests that through psychotherapeutic supervision, she re-encounters the emotional geographies that bind her relationships with clients during psychotherapy. Through engaging with her own felt experiences it is possible for her to explore the circulation of emotion between her and her clients, or what she describes as the ‘betweeness of emotion’ (pg. 443). Concepts of counter-transference within the field of psychotherapy also consider how engaging with the emotional responses of the therapist and client can facilitate a contextualised understanding of their relationship. Counter-transference considers how emotional responses are situated within an intersubjective context. As Pile (1991) states, from a counter-transference perspective, ‘intersubjectivity … is the terrain on which problems between the analyst and the patient play themselves out … And this is no longer assumed to occur in isolation from wider social relationships; but fundamentally constituted within them’ (pg. 462). He suggests that researchers can draw upon this understanding to build research relationships through which both researchers and research participants ‘try to
come to an understanding of what is taking place around them’ (pg. 459). Therefore researchers’ emotional responses can provide insights not only into research relationships but also how these are constituted within wider social contexts.

The section above introduced the concept of emplacement and how this has informed a research methodology that enables my elicitation of children’s socio-emotional practices. My interest is in understanding the ways that children’s emotional lives play out in the many dimensions of school spaces and places. Through participating in children’s enactments of space and engaging with their reflections about how they use school spaces, I can build an understanding of the role of emotion in children’s spatial practices. Building on this, in Methods A:1.2. (turn to pg. 58), I explore a ‘spatial’ research approach which seeks to engage with children’s ‘wayfaring’ (Ingold 2007) and ‘placemaking’ (Parnell and Procter 2010) practices. This approach is based upon the premise that children’s emotional interactions in and with localised spaces are a platform for exploring how emotional life is influenced by wider socio-political contexts.

The methodology outlined in the section above recognises my own emotional responses as epistemologically productive in the research process. I suggest that reflecting upon and through emotions has potential to improve the researcher’s understanding of the field, and, in the case of this doctoral study, the emotional spatiality of children’s experiences and their placemaking practices. Turn to Methods C:2.2. (pg. 193) to engage with my reflections upon the role of emotional reflexivity during fieldwork. I describe in detail my emotional engagements with video data generated during the den-building workshops and explain how doing so improved my understanding of children’s worlds. Through focusing upon three distinct clips I show how my emotional responses give presence to my movements through the data. In doing so, I reflect upon moments when meaning-making is entangled with prominent memories I have of the field and hidden shifts I make towards interpreting data.
Methods Exploratory A: Research Approach

This exploratory introduces my methodological considerations prior to beginning fieldwork. The aim of the research was primarily to engage with what it was like for children to be part of SEAL school. As I was essentially interested in children’s experiences and perceptions, I sought to define these two terms. To do so, I drew on the concept of emplacement. A key consideration of this research was how emotions were implicated in children’s experiences, therefore I consider the relationship between emplacement and emotion. This theoretical exploration (Methods A:1) informs the development of principles which were used to guide my fieldwork process (Methods A: 2). These principles include approaches to building relationships in the field, the role of reflexivity in the research process and the development of research questions.

1. Researching Emplacement

Engaging with the Personal, Social and Spatial

Emplacement is understood as a process through which people become a part of and influence the spaces of everyday life (Pink 2009). Coming from the view that emotions are integral to the production of personal, social and physical space, this section suggests that our ‘emotional geographies’ (Davidson et al 2005) do not start and end but are entangled within every aspect of our lives. Engaging with the geographies of emotion involves seeing emotion as ‘located’ in both bodies and places and constructed through the ‘relationality’ between people (Davidson, Bondi and Smith 2005). For Hargreaves (2001) this means engaging with the ‘patterns of closeness and distance in human interactions that shape the emotions we experiences about relationships to ourselves, each other and the world around us’ (pg. 1056). This conceptualisation of emotion frames the focus of this doctoral study. This doctoral study engages with children’s multiple and shifting understandings of emotion within a school setting. I am interested in how children’s performances of emotion are tied to this locality. In addition, I consider how children interpret their emotional experiences by drawing upon the discourses available to them. Within the doctoral study as a whole, I pay particular attention to children’s agency as ‘wayfarers’ (Ingold 2007) and how they shape the emotional geographies of the school. In
this section, I will outline why I am interested in how children come to make meaning of emotion through their interactions within the spaces and places of school. I will suggest that children contribute to the emotionality of spaces through their wayfaring and placemaking practices. I show how my view of children as social agents frames the development of research methods which aim to promote children’s intersubjectivity.

a) Agency, emotion and children’s placemaking

Through my previous research in the field of Architecture I developed an interest in children’s ‘placemaking’ – a term I have used to describe the process of enacting place. This stemmed from my interest in using space as a learning resource. My research explored children and young people’s intentional production of learning spaces. I became intrigued as to why children were placemaking. Although not explored in depth, I found that 1) motivation to learn, 2) power-relationships and 3) the expression and regulation of emotion, influenced children’s placemaking practices. Through observations and interviews with children, I was able to gain an understanding of how social hierarchies were constituted in spaces and places. Children’s placemaking it seemed was a valuable platform for understanding wider social relations (Research journal, January 2011).

This extract from my research journal articulates my interest in engaging with children’s placemaking practices in order to understand the social and culture contexts within which they were located. It describes my early reflections on the relationships between agency, power and emotion, revealed in children’s enactment of space. Through this previous research, I defined placemaking in the following ways.

Firstly, placemaking can be interpreted as the enactment of space. For example, how children choose to use their chair and desk during a lesson. Secondly, placemaking is the creation of a new space. The process of producing space can encourage children to critically reflect upon spatial conventions (i.e. in a classroom you should sit quietly on your chair at your desk). Perhaps participating in placemaking practices with children can provide a means for me to access their experiences and perceptions at school? (Research journal, January 2011).
Placemaking, as I have defined it, relates to the architectural concept of ‘spatial agency’ (Awan, Schneider and Till 2011), which provokes ways of thinking about how architecture can be collaboratively produced. Spatial agency is about viewing buildings as ‘socially embedded networks’ rather than as solely physical and material ‘objects’ (Awan, Schneider and Till 2011). Thus, in order to understand spatial agency it is necessary to engage with the social production of space and place. This research aims to capture this process through engaging with children’s wayfaring and placemaking practices, which in Methods A:1.1. I suggested were ‘emotionally textured’ (Milligan, Bingley and Gatrell 2005, pg. 57).

b) Researching children’s placemaking

To explore children’s placemaking, I used research methods which encouraged children to express their experiences across different school spaces. This position is underpinned by a view of children as social agents who act upon and shape the world around them (Christensen and James, 2008, Christenson and O’Brien 2003, Danby 2002, James at al 1998). This is explored further in Methods A:2.1. At the start of the fieldwork process I identified two research methods to engage with children’s agency as wayfarers and placemakers.

The first is participant observation. This method will allow me to experience how children inhabit their school spaces (and how they encourage me to inhabit them). Through these observations I can engage with children’s placemaking as and when it occurs. The second is den-building workshops. These workshops will provide opportunities for children to create dens, which describe SEAL activities at school, and enact them through drama. Here they will re-present how they inhabit space and place. A key focus within my fieldwork will be how I use emotional reflexivity as I move through the field (Research journal, January 2011).

These methods were developed and extended throughout the research process. New methods, including film and scrapbooks, were integrated into the research process for those children who were more comfortable working on their own or in pairs rather than in a larger group. The process of developing these methods is described in detail in Methods Exploratory B. In Methods Exploratory A I focus more specifically upon the principles that underpinned the development of these methods.
This research aims to engage with the interplay between local practices and wider socio-political contexts. Kjorholt (2003) argues that ‘studies of children’s places of play and social practices should not only give insights into children and their practices, but also should represent a valuable viewpoint for studying the society and the culture that provide the framework for the play’ (pg. 162). For example, the use of den building as a research method reflects Kjorholt (2003) argument that den-building enables children to ‘construct an exclusive territory – a place to belong – by positioning themselves within accessible discourses’ (pg. 262). For Kjorholt (2003), children’s den-building reflect political events and global society. As explored in more detail in Methods B:2.4., I suggest that children drew upon socio-political discourses to guide the spaces they built and how they built them during the den-building workshops. In doing so I thought that the children would make connections between the focus of the study, the role of emotion and spatial agency, within wider socio-political contexts including, for example, gender, class, race and religion.

c) Drawing upon ethnographic approaches

I have drawn upon ethnographic approaches to develop a research methodology that considers how children’s personal meanings can provide insights to wider discourses that play out in children’s everyday lives. Developed within interpretivist and interactionist traditions, ethnography values the multiplicity of perspectives garnered through research which carefully considers the relationship between research participants and the researcher(s) (Geertz 1973). Ethnographic research can be mapped within a history of qualitative research, which prioritised the discovery and description of ‘what particular people do in their everyday lives and what their actions mean to them’ (Erickson 2011, pg. 43). Qualitative inquiry emerged from the enlightenment possibility that social process could be mapped and verified drawing upon the modes of inquiry developed in the physical sciences. In contrast to the search for causal laws, the german philosopher Wilhlem Dilthey (1883/1989) advocated an alternative approach which centred upon understanding meaning and action in everyday life (Erickson 2011). It is suggested that these ideas influenced sociologists and phenomenologists but were particularly influential in the mid-20th-century during the ‘hermeneutical turn’ (Erickson 2011). Prior to this turn, ethnography was a term that was already in use and described research which captured ‘descriptive accounts of the life ways of particular local sets of people who lived in colonial situations around the world’ (Erickson 2011, pg. 44). The accounts of those living in these communities were seen as more trustworthy than the reports of
travellers or colonial administrators (Erickson 2011). With the hermeneutical turn came a shift towards describing everyday life in ways which captured the ‘subjective orientations’ and ‘meanings perspectives’ of those whose lives were being researched (Erickson 2011, pg. 45). Such an approach prioritised locally constructed meaning and sought to understand how this was constructed differently across various cultural contexts. This sits in opposition to the enlightenment perspective and a search for causal laws. However, a positivist paradigm was evident in the ways that these methodologies gained legitimacy within academic institutions. Erickson (2011) charts how qualitative inquiry has moved away from such paradigms and has critically argued against the ‘omniscient narrator… with an apparent neutrality’ (pg. 56). More recently qualitative research encourages researchers to consider their own positionally within the research process and reflexively engage with the role they play in the research process (Coffey 1999). Within much of this this work the research relationship is brought into focus.

Notions of research validity have shifted alongside an increased recognition of researchers' subjectivities. Traditionally, ‘validity in qualitative research involves determining the degree to which researchers’ claims about knowledge correspond to the reality (or research participants’ constructions of reality) being studied’ (Eisner and Peshkin, 1990 as cited in Cho and Trent 2009, pg. 320). More recently, Cho and Trent (2009) suggest that two very different responses to the question of validity have been developed. The first they define as ‘transactional validity’, which is ‘grounded in active interaction between the inquiry and the research participants’, and the second as ‘transformational validity’, which ‘challenges the very notion of validity, even a constructed one’ (pg. 320). Transactional validity approaches include the use of methods that allow research findings to be checked and developed with research participants. In addition, Cho and Trent (2009) situate triangulation - the use of multiple methods to overcome the deficiencies of a single method (Denzin 1989, pg. 236) - within this approach. Cho and Trent (2009) argue that ‘transactionalists privilege the research account and employ strategies such as triangulation and member checking to bolster its integrity’ (pg. 324). From a transformationalists’ perspective, where meanings are viewed as socially constructed and multiple, then ‘the question of validity in itself is convergent with the way the researcher self-reflects, both explicitly and implicitly, upon the multiple dimensions in which the inquiry is conducted’ (Cho and Trent 2009, pg. 324). Richardson (1997) proposes an approach to validity that centres upon self-reflexive research practice. For Richardson the self is always present within the texts produced by researchers, even when the self is suppressed. She asks ‘how do we nurture our own voices, our own
individualities, and at the same time lay claim to ‘knowing’ something?’ (pg. 2). In response to this question, she suggests an approach of ‘crystallisation’ - where the process of constructing personal interpretations ‘combines symmetry and substance with an infinite variety of shapes, substances, transmutations, multidimensionalities, and angles of approach’ (p. 92). Tracy and Tretheway (2005) suggest that the self is multidimensional, consisting of ‘different shapes depending on the various discourses through which they are constructed and constrained’ (pg. 186). Cho and Trent (2009) suggest that Richardson is seeking to change the relationship between the researcher and the researched and the researcher and their work. For Cho and Trent (2009) it is this dimension of Richardson’s approach to validity that make it transformational. Therefore ‘valid’ research is that which seeks to change. If the self is understood as dynamic and multidimensional then it can be suggested that the identities of both the researcher and the researcher participants are changed through the research process (Coffey 2009). Validity within this study is centred upon the endeavour to recognise my own subjectivities as I engage with and represent the meanings constructed by children within a school context. In this way my own subjectivities are intentionally articulated throughout this doctoral thesis.

The representations collated within this doctoral thesis are a reflection of the intersubjective nature of knowledge I bring to the doctoral study. From this perspective ‘social realities and ourselves are intimately interwoven as each shapes and is shaped by the other in everyday interactions’ (pg. 125). From this perspective writing can also be seen as an intersubjective act. Cunliffe (2008) reflects, ‘I’m sitting at my computer writing this article, which an observer would see as an ostensibly solitary and individual activity, but there’s a whole history of conversations with colleagues, students, friends, myself, reviewers, authors and texts that play into my writing’ (pg. 130). This reminds me of how, when I have written about the children involved in my research, I am taken back to the conversations and experiences I had with them during my time at their school. Within ethnographic research with children a particular emphasis is given to the intersubjective relationship between adults and children as research is lived (Christensen 2004; Christensen and James 2008; Christensen and Prout 2002). This perspective was reflected in my own framing of the research relationship from the start of this doctoral study.

I enjoy the feeling that comes when I understand someone, and when they understand me. Reflexive listening is integral to making sense of how ideas are constituted with others. For me, listening is a demanding process that
involves a careful non-judging sensitivity to oneself, others and the world around us. It is through listening that we learn in relationship with others. It is in this realm that I aim for this research to take place (Research journal, January 2011).

This excerpt from my research journal shows my commitment to developing listening relationships. I had begun to articulate an understanding of ‘reflexive listening’, which acknowledges my own presence in the unfolding nature of research relationships. As the ethnographers Atkinson and Hammersley (2010) suggest, the researcher’s presence influences how the research participants present themselves through the research process. They use the term ‘impression management’ to describe the way that a researcher may interact with the field in order to become trusted. However, through this study, I seek to move beyond unilateral accounts of the research relationship, which are at risk of representing research participants as passive in the construction of the research relationship. Coffey (1999) recognises the active nature of the research relationship, ‘not only do the relations of fieldwork facilitate the research and generate the data, they also help to define our experiences and understandings of fieldwork itself’ (pg. 42). In line with this perspective, I suggest that a critical reflexive engagement with our own relational emplacement is central to an understanding of validity, as reflexivity opens up an understanding of how the processes through which our interpretations are constituted and can allow for a crystallised understanding of subjectivity.

The section above has suggested that emotions bind the personal, social and spatial. I believe that emotion plays a role in the production of self and society and the spaces in which these come into being. I have suggested that engaging with children’s placemaking is a platform for gaining insight into how children contribute to the emotionality of spaces and places. This doctoral study has built upon my previous research in the field of architecture, which examined children’s placemaking practices. This previous research showed that emotion was integral to children’s spatial agency. Methods A:1.1. (turn to pg. 52) outlines how place, space and emotion have been conceptualised in this doctoral study and further develops the standpoint that children’s placemaking is emotionally textured.
Methods Exploratory A
2.1
This section suggested that children’s placemaking practices are framed by both their personal meanings and wider societal structures. I introduced briefly the methods I have developed to engage with children’s placemaking and outlined the importance of challenging power hierarchies and promoting intersubjectivity in my relationships with children. I outlined how these methods were influenced by principles from ethnographic research approaches. This engagement with ethnography is explored further in Methods A:2.1. (turn to pg. 66), as I reflect upon the relationships developed with children during the fieldwork for this doctoral study. I will explore how these interactions offered insights into children’s cultural worlds. In addition, I describe some of the challenges I faced in listening to and representing children’s views.

Methods Exploratory B
2.4
This section has described the development of research methods that enable both the researcher and participants to make links between local practices and wider discourses. Drawing on Kjorholt (2003) I suggested that children would draw upon socio-political discourses to inform their den-building. Through building dens I hypothesised that the children would make links between the focus of the study, the role of emotion and spatial agency, within wider socio-political contexts. The ways that children used den-building to communicate what was significant to them about their experiences of SEAL is examined in Methods B:2.4 (turn to pg. 138).
Methods Exploratory A: Research Approach

This exploratory introduces my methodological considerations prior to beginning fieldwork. The aim of the research was primarily to engage with what it was like for children to be part of SEAL school. As I was essentially interested in children’s experiences and perceptions, I sought to define these two terms. To do so, I drew on the concept of emplacement. A key consideration of this research was how emotions were implicated in children’s experiences, therefore I consider the relationship between emplacement and emotion. This theoretical exploration (Methods A:1) informs the development of principles which were used to guide my fieldwork process (Methods A: 2). These principles include approaches to building relationships in the field, the role of reflexivity in the research process and the development of research questions.

2. The Fieldwork Process

Engaging with Children: Building intersubjective relationships

This study is situated within a junior school in which emotional education permeates children’s activities. The basis of the research approach is to make meaning of what happens at the school through interacting with a range of social actors throughout the school day. As Coffey (1999) states ‘fieldwork is not accomplished in isolation from the physical and social setting’ (pg. 25). With my emphasis upon the self (in relation to the social) as a source of knowledge, participation within the school is integral to the way I generate theory. Insights can be gained from engaging with how the researcher ‘actively engages in identity construction and recasting’ through the intimate relationships they build in the field (Coffey 1999, pg. 26). I find this particularly valuable in childhood research, which needs to consider the complexity of attending to children as individuals within their collective space of childhood.

‘How might childhood researchers hear, at one and the same time, children speaking both as individuals, with their unique and different experiences, and the collective inhabitants of that social, cultural, economic and political space that in any society is labelled as “childhood”?‘ (James 2007, pg. 262).
Emmerson et al (1995) state that ‘in order to fully understand and appreciate action from the perspective of participants, one must get close to a participant in a wide cross-section of their everyday activities over an extended period of time’ (pg. 10). It is this ‘deep immersion’ that develops the ethnographer’s ‘sense of place’ (pg. 10). The ethnographer’s closeness enables the interpretation of voices which considers how voices are situated within socio-cultural contexts. James (2007) suggests that children’s perspectives can provide a ‘unique contribution to our understanding of and theorising about the social world’ (pg. 262). Situating children’s voices offers a way of listening to individual perspectives and at the same time addressing children’s shared social position within society.

In this section, I explore how I have engaged with children’s perspectives in research prior to this study by drawing upon action research approaches. I will reflect upon how the fieldwork during this doctoral study shifted from a participatory approach, inspired by the rhetoric of action research, to an interpretative approach, informed by auto-ethnography and ethnography. I will then suggest that this shift also paralleled changes in how I conceptualised children’s ‘voice’. I began to understand ‘voice’ as always mediated as opposed to the notion that people have a singular ‘true’ voice. This re-conceptualisation of voice also influenced my role within the research workshops. I ceased to attempt to be ‘non-directive’ and rather sought to find ways to acknowledge and respond to the children’s interests as they emerged. In reflecting upon my role I also engage with the tensions I experienced in facilitating these workshops, as a result of situating myself in tension with the school’s systems of regulating children’s behaviour in accordance to particular norms and values endorsed by the school. In acknowledging my presence in the research activities, I began to view my role as one of providing opportunities for children to have agency within the research process through noticing and responding to what was significant to them.

a) Engaging with children: moving from participatory to interpretative research

To access children’s multiple perspectives I built upon my previous experience in action-research. This study was designed to approach research with children through some of the principles outlined in Kemmis and McTaggart’s (1990) definition of action research as ‘collaborative self-reflective inquiry’.

Emmerson et al (1995) state that ‘in order to fully understand and appreciate action from the perspective of participants, one must get close to a participant in a wide cross-section of their everyday activities over an extended period of time’ (pg. 10). It is this ‘deep immersion’ that develops the ethnographer’s ‘sense of place’ (pg. 10). The ethnographer’s closeness enables the interpretation of voices which considers how voices are situated within socio-cultural contexts. James (2007) suggests that children’s perspectives can provide a ‘unique contribution to our understanding of and theorising about the social world’ (pg. 262). Situating children’s voices offers a way of listening to individual perspectives and at the same time addressing children’s shared social position within society.

In this section, I explore how I have engaged with children’s perspectives in research prior to this study by drawing upon action research approaches. I will reflect upon how the fieldwork during this doctoral study shifted from a participatory approach, inspired by the rhetoric of action research, to an interpretative approach, informed by auto-ethnography and ethnography. I will then suggest that this shift also paralleled changes in how I conceptualised children’s ‘voice’. I began to understand ‘voice’ as always mediated as opposed to the notion that people have a singular ‘true’ voice. This re-conceptualisation of voice also influenced my role within the research workshops. I ceased to attempt to be ‘non-directive’ and rather sought to find ways to acknowledge and respond to the children’s interests as they emerged. In reflecting upon my role I also engage with the tensions I experienced in facilitating these workshops, as a result of situating myself in tension with the school’s systems of regulating children’s behaviour in accordance to particular norms and values endorsed by the school. In acknowledging my presence in the research activities, I began to view my role as one of providing opportunities for children to have agency within the research process through noticing and responding to what was significant to them.

a) Engaging with children: moving from participatory to interpretative research

To access children’s multiple perspectives I built upon my previous experience in action-research. This study was designed to approach research with children through some of the principles outlined in Kemmis and McTaggart’s (1990) definition of action research as ‘collaborative self-reflective inquiry’.

Emmerson et al (1995) state that ‘in order to fully understand and appreciate action from the perspective of participants, one must get close to a participant in a wide cross-section of their everyday activities over an extended period of time’ (pg. 10). It is this ‘deep immersion’ that develops the ethnographer’s ‘sense of place’ (pg. 10). The ethnographer’s closeness enables the interpretation of voices which considers how voices are situated within socio-cultural contexts. James (2007) suggests that children’s perspectives can provide a ‘unique contribution to our understanding of and theorising about the social world’ (pg. 262). Situating children’s voices offers a way of listening to individual perspectives and at the same time addressing children’s shared social position within society.

In this section, I explore how I have engaged with children’s perspectives in research prior to this study by drawing upon action research approaches. I will reflect upon how the fieldwork during this doctoral study shifted from a participatory approach, inspired by the rhetoric of action research, to an interpretative approach, informed by auto-ethnography and ethnography. I will then suggest that this shift also paralleled changes in how I conceptualised children’s ‘voice’. I began to understand ‘voice’ as always mediated as opposed to the notion that people have a singular ‘true’ voice. This re-conceptualisation of voice also influenced my role within the research workshops. I ceased to attempt to be ‘non-directive’ and rather sought to find ways to acknowledge and respond to the children’s interests as they emerged. In reflecting upon my role I also engage with the tensions I experienced in facilitating these workshops, as a result of situating myself in tension with the school’s systems of regulating children’s behaviour in accordance to particular norms and values endorsed by the school. In acknowledging my presence in the research activities, I began to view my role as one of providing opportunities for children to have agency within the research process through noticing and responding to what was significant to them.

a) Engaging with children: moving from participatory to interpretative research

To access children’s multiple perspectives I built upon my previous experience in action-research. This study was designed to approach research with children through some of the principles outlined in Kemmis and McTaggart’s (1990) definition of action research as ‘collaborative self-reflective inquiry’.

Emmerson et al (1995) state that ‘in order to fully understand and appreciate action from the perspective of participants, one must get close to a participant in a wide cross-section of their everyday activities over an extended period of time’ (pg. 10). It is this ‘deep immersion’ that develops the ethnographer’s ‘sense of place’ (pg. 10). The ethnographer’s closeness enables the interpretation of voices which considers how voices are situated within socio-cultural contexts. James (2007) suggests that children’s perspectives can provide a ‘unique contribution to our understanding of and theorising about the social world’ (pg. 262). Situating children’s voices offers a way of listening to individual perspectives and at the same time addressing children’s shared social position within society.

In this section, I explore how I have engaged with children’s perspectives in research prior to this study by drawing upon action research approaches. I will reflect upon how the fieldwork during this doctoral study shifted from a participatory approach, inspired by the rhetoric of action research, to an interpretative approach, informed by auto-ethnography and ethnography. I will then suggest that this shift also paralleled changes in how I conceptualised children’s ‘voice’. I began to understand ‘voice’ as always mediated as opposed to the notion that people have a singular ‘true’ voice. This re-conceptualisation of voice also influenced my role within the research workshops. I ceased to attempt to be ‘non-directive’ and rather sought to find ways to acknowledge and respond to the children’s interests as they emerged. In reflecting upon my role I also engage with the tensions I experienced in facilitating these workshops, as a result of situating myself in tension with the school’s systems of regulating children’s behaviour in accordance to particular norms and values endorsed by the school. In acknowledging my presence in the research activities, I began to view my role as one of providing opportunities for children to have agency within the research process through noticing and responding to what was significant to them.

a) Engaging with children: moving from participatory to interpretative research

To access children’s multiple perspectives I built upon my previous experience in action-research. This study was designed to approach research with children through some of the principles outlined in Kemmis and McTaggart’s (1990) definition of action research as ‘collaborative self-reflective inquiry’.
'Action research is a form of collective self-reflective inquiry undertaken by participants in social situations in order to improve the rationality and justice of their own social or educational practices, as well as their understanding of these practices and the situations in which these practices are carried out… The approach is only action research when it is collaborative, though it is important to realise that the action research of the group is achieved through the critically examined action of individual group members’ (Kemmis and McTaggart, 1990: pg. 5).

The values which characterise their approach to action research framed my approach to participatory research with children at the start of this study.

Participatory research invites participants to be self-reflective through collaborative inquiry. Social and educational practice is explored with the view of supporting social justice in education. This study does not take an action-research approach, rather it draws upon some of the principles of action research to conducting research with children. This study reframes these principles through an ethnographic approach focused upon the ‘interpretation of the meanings and functions of human actions’ in a ‘particular social phenomenon’ (Atkinson and Hammersley 1994, pg 248) through ‘uncovering participants’ understanding of their social and symbolic world’ (Emond 2009, pg 124). (Research journal, January 2010)

While the research was intended to encourage children’s criticality and reflexivity, this did not happen to the extent that I imagined. My intention was for children to create collaborative accounts of their experiences and perceptions of emotion at school through den-building workshops. These were developed to support individual children ‘to create their own identities and allow other people to create theirs’ (McNiff and Whithead 2002, pg. 17). Whilst I was able to find ‘new ways of accommodating multiple values and perspectives… and recognising and suspending [my] own prejudices’ (McNiff and Whithead 2002, pg. 17), this was difficult to facilitate amongst the young research participants with one another. Particular voices were more dominant than others. Social hierarchies amongst group members made it difficult for some children to participate in the research alongside their peers. The well-established differentiation of individual children within particular social categories was difficult to challenge. I found myself being drawn instead to understanding how such categorisations were sustained through children’s social interactions.
The research shifted from an interest in encouraging children to be critical about these embedded judgements. I moved away from the transformative approach to research advocated by Kemmis and McTaggart (1990). I became drawn to interpretative approaches. Pile (1991) suggests that the principles of interpretive research is to build research relationships through which both the researcher and research participant ‘try to come to an understanding of what is taking place around them’ (pg. 459). Through working with children, I wanted to examine how children understood and positioned themselves and others through their social and situated interactions. I began to develop an understanding of children’s actions through reflecting upon the ways they engaged with others and with me during the workshops through keeping fieldnotes.

This data was as important as the physical den created by the children. The children’s representations of their experience, through the dens, sometimes conflicted with their experiences in interactions with others both during the workshops and beyond. The complexity of children’s relationships were often not communicated in the dens themselves. Rather the dens communicated children’s understanding of the SEAL-informed discourses about relationships. This insight challenged some of the assumptions I had made about children’s ‘voice’ before going into the field.

b) Children’s voice: addressing issues of power and representation

Research practice with children and young people can often focus upon supporting children’s ‘voice’ (Burke 2008, Thomson, 2008) and representing children’s ‘voice’ (Haw, 2008). My research process will provide opportunities for children’s ‘voice’ to influence educational practice at their school. Children will present their research to the wider school community. I will meet with school leaders and teachers to share the children’s accounts of their experiences and discuss emerging research findings at key stages in the research process. (Research journal, January 2010)

This extract described my aim to share children’s ‘real’ perspectives with adults. I hoped to elicit such perspectives through developing research methods which challenged the power dynamics of traditional adult-child relationships. The relationships I formed with the children were distinct from their relationships with teachers. However, children’s social positioning as ‘children’ and mine as ‘researcher’ were significant in the ways our relationships developed. Equally important, was the site in which our relationships were
developed. The context specific constructions of ‘childhood’ were influential in the interactions I had with children. Pile (1991) states that ‘intersubjectivity … is no longer assumed to occur in isolation from wider social relationships; but fundamentally constituted within them’ (pg. 462). This contests my assumption prior to fieldwork that people have their own autonomous voice and that research should aim to access this voice. Rather, I became much more interested in the social construction of types of voice within the school. The relationships I built with children offered a platform for thinking about voice.

The concept of children’s voice has been considered critically. James et al (2007) explores how socio-cultural constructions of childhood shape the different types of ‘voices’, such as ‘little angels’ or ‘little devils’, which children have available to them and can appropriate. Burke recognises the complexities of young research participants perceiving themselves as ‘children’. She states that the ‘frame of reference brought by the researcher – that they as children were the experts and the knowledge producers – did not sit comfortably alongside their own expectation of themselves as schoolchildren’ (Burke 2008, pg. 27). Within my research, I found that the children viewed themselves as experts only when they were drawing upon the knowledge and understanding that they had been taught by adults. Therefore their personal experiences of emotion in relationships with others were often not the focus of our conversations. Rather the children drew upon the ‘expert’ knowledge they had gained from adults to theorise the role of emotion within their relationships.

Other researchers describe the challenges they have faced in disseminating children’s critical ‘voice’. For example, Haw (2008) describes how a video she produced with a group of young people was met with ‘serious reservations’ by the school head teacher and governor representative, who felt that the participants should be explicitly positioned in the video as ‘having special needs, of low literacy, behaviourally challenging and atypical of the school population’ (Haw 2008, pg 205). Such typecasting of the young participants was a way of legitimising their critical perspectives, thus deferring the accountability of the school. Within my research the children were aware of the norms that framed how they should share their research to the wider school community. They knew how to present themselves in a way which was acceptable and would be celebrated by adults. However, this did seem to shift as the research progressed and the children developed ways of sharing their research which connected with the younger members of the school, such as short plays.
Rather than see the children’s re-presentations of ‘adult’ forms of knowledge as a problem, I drew upon these as a way to develop my understanding of the interactions that take place between adults and children. Children’s re-presentations offered an opportunity to explore how children appropriated the understandings of adults to rationalise their own and others’ emotions and behaviours.

I aim to stay attentive to the ways that adult values will be integral to childhood social experiences, and will also influence how the children decide to represent the research to the wider school community. In this sense I understand children’s voice as socially constructed. This moves away from much of the literature in childhood studies which views voice as the individual property of the autonomous subject. An unmediated voice does not exist. Rather, I understand voice as always situated and always social (see for example, Komulainen 2007). (Research Journal, February 2010)

Within this understanding of voice, it was also important to consider the relationships I built with children and the influence of the site in which this was developed and sustained.

I will reflect upon what frames my relationship with the children, and how this may impact upon what and how they choose to share their experiences and perceptions through the fieldwork process. (Research Journal, February 2010)

c) Building research relationships with children: moving beyond the idealism of ‘non-directive’ approaches

Before entering the field I aimed to develop a ‘non-directive’ approach to working with children.

I want to gain a sense of what is personally significant to them from their experiences at school. I want to leave enough scope for the children to choose how they represent these personal insights. I feel that it is important to limit my management of this process, both in terms of setting the agenda for how they ‘should’ be with one another as well as how they ‘should’ present their experiences and perspectives. If I try to manage their social interactions I will also restrict how they tell their stories. I feel concerned
that this approach may also at times cause conflict or distress. (Research Journal, August 2009)

However, upon beginning the den-building workshops (see Methods B:2.1. for an outline of the research stages) the term ‘non-directive’ misrepresented the research process. Rather, I needed to recognise my own presence as socially constitutive. While I did not set the same limitations on children’s behaviours as their teachers, I did aim to facilitate a particular kind of participation. The ways that the children engaged with the research workshops often ran counter to my expectations. The children’s actual engagement and my agenda at times came into conflict. Sometimes this was played out within planning meetings or workshops with the children.

I am finding it difficult to keep order during planning meetings with children. The meetings seem to take on their own direction and sometimes the points I wanted to cover can get missed. I feel very anxious about ‘directing’ behaviour through raising my voice, etc. My supervisor suggested thinking about myself as a ‘chair’, who has to bring order so that things can get done. I do have a research agenda and sometimes this will clash with what the children want to do. However, I would feel uncomfortable taking on this kind of a role. Perhaps the children could conduct the meetings themselves and plan their own workshops? (Research Journal, January 2011)

These tensions were used as points for reflection outside of the field. As in the example above, the tensions became starting points for reflecting on the development of research relationships. This is explored in more detail from an ethical perspective in Methods B: 1.4. At other times, these points of tension provided opportunities to question what I was ‘looking’ for through this research. In this way, the children’s responses to the research encouraged my research agenda to shift. In my quest to stay with the children and what was significant to them, I needed to loosen my own research agenda.

I do not see my research questions as fixed. This is part of an interpretive approach whereby the researcher goes back and forth between her or his fieldwork and questions. (Research Journal, July 2010)

At the same time, I wanted to feel that the research was moving forward and that theories were emerging. I was also conscious of the social norms of the research site. The children’s active and often noisy engagements during research workshops contrasted with how children were expected to behave at the school. My role became one of holding the
research together through careful negotiation of these different demands. The research process maintained a wholeness while responding to the children’s interests and teacher’s expectations. I felt that it was important to be reflexively aware of the processes through which the research was conducted and consequently how theories were emerging. In order to convey children’s experiences the research needed to be responsive to the children’s interests and the questions they were interested in exploring. As Christensen and James (2008) state researchers need to ‘adopt practices that resonate with children’s own concerns and routines’ (pg. 8). My role was to notice when the children communicated their own interests and find ways of responding to these in ways which did not compromise the research and acknowledged the concerns of teachers regarding children’s behaviour during the research workshops.

It was particularly difficult to reconcile the expectations of teachers regarding children’s behaviour. For example, a request by the teacher not to let one of the boys ‘out of my sight’ during the workshops affected our relationship. I began to manage what he could and could not do. My compliance with the teacher’s request worked to affirm the boy’s ascribed identity as a ‘troublemaker’ within the workshops. Two members of staff suggested I make sure that the children tidied up after they left my workshops. ‘You shouldn’t have to do that for them’ they said. Another told me that if anything should happen to the children whilst they were in my workshops, particularly when I was not in the same room as the children, then I would be responsible. I was also told I should use threats to encourage children’s ‘good’ behaviour. While resistant, I found myself shifting my practice to comply with the conventions and expectations of the school.

As I am picking children I get into ‘teacher talk’ asking the children who is sitting well and listening. I wonder about this afterwards and what impression it gives off to the children. (Fieldnotes, October 2010)

For instance, I threatened to send two children back to class in order to lower the noise levels. On another occasion, I asked the children to write a list of ground rules at the start of a workshop. These interventions were also met with resistance by the children. One of which threatened to walk out of the workshops in response to the ground rules. While this was a challenging place to be, my experience provides interesting insights into the process of institutionalisation. Teachers’ concerns became my own. I began to judge my own practice according to a socially constructed notion of what it means to ‘teach’ within the school context.
I also recognised that I brought to the research my own history and background which shaped how I chose to interact with children and adults, as did the children themselves. Christensen and James (2008) state ‘children's identities ... change across and within contexts, thus reflecting the way power relations, including those inherent to the research process, relationships and struggles are being reconfigured over time and across space’ (pg. 4). Therefore, through the research process my own identity and those of the children shifted and changed. For example, while my interactions with children had a different quality to teachers’ interactions with children, I also drew upon conventional ways of responding to children within a school context in response to my own concerns about how I may be perceived by school leaders and teachers. In addition, the children sometimes requested that I take this role. For example, about half way into the participatory research some of the children asked me to use rewards and punishments as a strategy for managing behaviour within the den-building workshops. It is clear that children’s engagement in the research activities will always be shaped by the children themselves, the researcher and the context in which the research is located. However, it is possible to create opportunities for children to have agency within the research process through the way that research activities are designed and the attitude of the researcher.

d) Creating opportunities for children’s agency within the research process

At the start of the research workshops I was interested in encouraging the children to model particular aspects of SEAL activities. This reflects my early assumption that experience could be revisited, as if it were a fixed phenomenon, and therefore represented by the children.

_During the first den-building workshop I tried to encourage the children to model particular parts of the awards assembly, which I was interested in knowing more about. However, I realised afterwards that I had interrupted what they were doing. The children very quickly completed my requests and would then continue with what they wanted to do. Early on in the research I felt that what the children were doing was different to what I had expected. I was trying to get them ‘back on track’. I am becoming less anxious about this. Instead, I see the children's ‘new’ directions as points for further reflection – a means to get the children talking, I need to facilitate post_
As the workshops progressed, the children shifted this focus and instead they modelled social scenarios which they felt were important for me to understand, such as bullying or welcoming a new person to the school. The children drew upon their knowledge, gained through their experiences, to depict these imaginary scenarios. The changing role that the den-building workshops played in the research drew me to reflect upon Cunliffe’s description of ‘intersubjectivity’ as emphasising ‘the pluralistic and fragile nature of our social realities and identities’ (Cunliffe 2008, 131). Perhaps it was not possible for the children to construct dens which directly reflected their experiences as I had intended. Rather they used the den-building workshops to present imagined scenarios. The children brought together their knowledge from their shared experiences in SEAL lessons to do so.

To complement the den-building, I developed additional research methods using filmmaking and scrapbooks for children to engage with in pairs or alone to share personal narratives of school life. Each of these methods is explored in more detail in Methods Exploratory B:2.

The methods allowed the children to shape how to use them to tell me about SEAL. The flexibility and multi-modal opportunities for expression embedded within the methods encouraged children’s agency in defining the direction of the research. In their research about children’s literacy practices in libraries, Pahl and Allen (2011) suggest that ‘perceptions of the meanings of literacy can be understood more from young people’s perspectives if they themselves construct and shape the methods used to explore these issues’ (Pahl and Allen 2011, pg. 191). Giving children the opportunity to construct the methods through which they could tell me about what it was like to be part of a SEAL school, then the way they themselves perceived SEAL could be better understood. As suggested earlier, the children seemed to find it much easier to explore the role of SEAL at their school in the den-building workshops by drawing upon the mechanistic conceptualisations of emotions and relationships they had been taught, rather than using personal narratives. In contrast to the den-building workshops, personal narratives were the focus of the children’s scrapbooks, which they used to tell me about their hobbies, possessions, friendships or achievements. Again, the children appropriated these activities. I had suggested that they use the scrapbook to describe what they do at school. Instead, they used it to tell me about themselves. The ways the children shaped these methods is interesting in its own right. It reveals how the children relate to different aspects of their experience. SEAL seems somehow impersonal in contrast to other aspects
of their lives such as hobbies and friendships. The language that children learn to use to speak about their emotions, formed through their engagements with the SEAL curriculum, seems to detach them from the complexities of their experiences. This is explored in Edges b:1. through an exploration of the language children draw on in order to speak about happiness.

In the section above I have explored the shift in this doctoral study from a participatory approach, informed by action research approaches, to an interpretative approach, influenced by both auto-ethnography and ethnography. I suggested that this shift aligned with changes in how I conceptualised children’s ‘voice’, which in turn influenced my role within the research workshops. I found ways to foster children’s agency within the research activities as I moved away from the idealistic notion of non-directive research. In Methods B:1.4. (turn to pg. 111) I examine this further as I reflect upon the development of research relationships over the course of fieldwork.

The section above examined the contrast between the aims and expectations of the fieldwork process and the real experience of doing research with children. In Methods B:2.1. (turn to pg. 118) I describe the research stages. Here I examine how each new stage of research changed in response to the stages that came before it. I also explore how the data yielded through the research methods informed the research focus. I describe how I moved from trying to understand the impact of emotional curricula upon children to engaging with the ways that children made their own meanings of emotion within the school setting. Within this transition I became increasingly interested in the ways that children ‘perform’ (Goffman 1990) emotion.

In the section above I have suggested that children draw upon the therapeutic discourses that frame SEAL in order to talk about emotion. However, these descriptions seem to make it harder rather than easier for children to talk about their lived emotional experiences. This is explored in Edges b:1. (turn to pg. 238) In this section I examine how children speak about happiness and the ways that this seems incongruent with the moments of happiness that they experience at school. I suggest that children are speaking about a notion of ‘proper’ happiness fostered through the ways that adults apply SEAL within the school. However, children’s experiences seem to go beyond this understanding.
Methods Exploratory A: Research Approach

This exploratory introduces my methodological considerations prior to beginning fieldwork. The aim of the research was primarily to engage with what it was like for children to be part of SEAL school. As I was essentially interested in children’s experiences and perceptions, I sought to define these two terms. To do so, I drew on the concept of emplacement. A key consideration of this research was how emotions were implicated in children’s experiences, therefore I consider the relationship between emplacement and emotion. This theoretical exploration (Methods A:1) informs the development of principles which were used to guide my fieldwork process (Methods A: 2). These principles include approaches to building relationships in the field, the role of reflexivity in the research process and the development of research questions.

2. The Fieldwork Process

Working With Judgement: Reflection, reflexivity and fieldwork

Throughout the research it has been important for me to address my own assumptions. This has encouraged theories to emerge which feel closely connected to children’s accounts. Charmaz (2006), an advocate of grounded theory, argues for ‘collecting and analysing qualitative data to construct theories ‘grounded’ in the data themselves’. She suggests that data should ‘form the foundation of our theory and our analysis of these data generates the concepts we construct’ (pg. 2). Grounded theory has been criticised for ‘oversimplifying complex meanings and inter-relationships in data’ (Thomas and James 2006, pg. 768). I agree that grounded theory offers an ‘approach’ to theory-building which isolates data from the processes through which it was produced. However, I take from grounded theory the importance of connecting my own interpretations of data to the contexts in which the data was produced. Therefore I advocate acknowledging how the self is entangled within the interpretation of data, whilst acknowledging that, as Rose (1997) states, our awareness of how our own histories and values are implicated in this process will always be partial. In addition, and in drawing upon Lassiter’s (2005) notion of collaborative ethnography, I believe it is valuable to discuss research findings with research participants. This section explores how our field relationships shape the
production of research data. Together we create situated data which is tied to our own histories as well as the sites in which our research takes place.

I am interested in the relationship between the production and interpretation of data and my own presence as a researcher within these processes. In Methods A:1.1. I draw attention to the interplay between emotions and place and have show how reflecting upon and through emotions can connect researchers with their relational emplacement during fieldwork. However, emotional reflexivity is only productive to the research process if the focus remains with the lives of the research participants (Rose 1997). Charmaz (2006) states that theory building ‘begins by being open to what is happening in the studied scenes and interview statements so that we might learn about our research participants’ lives’ (pg. 3). For me, being ‘open’ is not about keeping our judgements at a distance. This is not possible. Instead, being open is about the researcher’s reflexive engagement throughout the research process. Our own interests and judgements are entangled within processes of theory-building. Coffey (1999) argues that ‘in writing, remembering and representing our fieldwork experiences we are involved in processes of self-presentation and identity construction’ (pg.1). Therefore, interpreting and representing the field not only implicates our judgements but also our selves as researchers.

Through this study I became increasingly interested in the role of my own emotional reflexivity in theorising children’s emotional practices at the school. Emotional reflexivity encourages a personal engagement with the researcher’s adoption of socio-cultural norms associated with emotion. Coffey (1999) argues that field researcher’s ‘construction of self and identity in the field is … concerned with the acquisition and presentation of local and esoteric knowledges. In self-consciously seeking to acquire knowledge of social organisations and cultures the fieldworker may be involved in a more personal process of redefinition’ (pg. 27). Emotions play an essential role in the attribution of meaning to the actions of others, framed by socio-cultural norms that influence how events are perceived (Ahmed 2004). For example, a boy who hides behind his mother’s leg when meeting a group of unknown adults may be described as shy. In this example the child’s reaction to the event (to hide), is attached to an emotional cause (shyness), which then shapes the child’s public identity (a shy child). Griffiths (1995) states that ‘we are all puzzled by our own behaviour and use emotion words to try and increase our self-knowledge’ (pg. 104). In this way, an engagement with our own emotional responses are integral to examining the ways that social interactions are given meaning. Emotional reflexivity enables the researcher to make strange emotionally steeped interpretations of oursels, others and socio-cultural practices (see Methods C:2.2 for an example).
Emotional reflexivity connects us to our personal histories, embodied experiences in the field and the normative knowledges that pervade our research. Seeing emotions as epistemologically productive in these ways supports the view that knowledge is dynamic, rather than fixed, and is always being produced. Emotional reflexivity has enabled me to become aware of and move beyond my own positive and negative distinctions. This represents a shift in the way that I conceptualise the social world as a result of this study. Initially the study sought to explore how the values of emotional curricula are applied within the school and shape children’s understanding of emotion and their emotional exchanges with adults and peers. I have questioned my own efforts to explore the impact of an emotional curriculum. It was difficult to attribute children’s understandings and actions to a clear cause. In addition, I found that a focus upon impact involved categorising children’ experiences as positive or negative. Doing so, stirred a tension in me as these kinds of interpretations tended to connect my research with notions that children are passive. Yet, I maintained that children demonstrate agency over their own lives. As the research progressed, the emphasis moved beyond looking at the impact of an emotional curriculum and instead to children’s social construction of emotion within a school that adopts an emotional curriculum. This is explored in more detail in the following section. I consider how I moved between post-structural and post-modern perspectives over the course of fieldwork. The position I held before fieldwork was challenged by my experiences in the field (see Methods C:2.1). The section below offers a personal account of how it became possible for me to engage with foucauldian critiques of SEAL as a mechanism for power without devaluing the positive views held by teachers and children which positioned SEAL as a mechanism for empowerment.

a) Bringing together critical and celebratory perspectives

I came to educational research from a background in architecture. To be successful as an architecture student it is important for students to defend their architectural designs. I learnt to robustly defend my opinions even when facing very critical opposition. I have carried this with me into my educational research. At the start of the study, I found that I quickly formed strong opinions, particularly in relation to educational policy.

The current SEAL policy conveys the view that every child has the potential for emotional vulnerability, which could lead to serious mental health problems in adult life. As a means of prevention children can develop skills in order to manage their emotions, thus resulting in better behaviour, more
effective learning and the capacity to contribute to society in the future (DfES 2005). Through reading these texts, I became alerted to the potential for these approaches to be used as discrete tools of discipline, which aim to shape the conduct of the individual child in accordance to psychological discourses around emotional expression. While some teaching practitioners celebrate the approaches, they are also criticised for their emphasis on the individual (Smith 2009, Ecclestone and Hayes 2009), adopting a mechanistic view of human emotion and behaviour (Smeyers et al 2010, Suissa 2009) and as techniques of control (Millei 2005 and 2008, Riette 2009). (Research Journal, August 2009)

Prior to fieldwork, I expected to research how SEAL would be used by adults as a means to control children’s behaviours at school (see Context: 1.2 for an examination of SEAL as a mechanism of power). I aimed to critique the application of psychological theory through emotional education practices.

*The rhetoric of emotional education makes the control it encourages (which I see as having lots of issues relating particularly to class, race and gender) seem positive and acceptable.* (Conference Presentation, May 2011)

During the early stages of fieldwork I viewed emotional education as limiting children’s agency through teaching them to engage with and act upon their emotional responses in ways that were deemed acceptable by adult authority. Millei (2008) argues that these ‘techniques enable the individual to acquire knowledge about her/himself and to express her/his thoughts and feelings’ and thus puts children at risk of building ‘self-knowledge’ which then ‘becomes open for regulation … [so that the child learns] … to self-govern her/his feelings and act on her/his dispositions according to the norms and morals set up by guidance approaches’ (pg. 11 -12). One of the boys at the school, Didier, depicts emotion as an overwhelming force that requires understanding.

> Like your brain has loads of feelings in your head and … you have to think about lots of things and if you tell people then you can make them right, but if you don’t tell people you can’t make them right and you start worrying about things… (Didier)

Didier suggests that talking about feelings with others can help to contain them. This hints towards Millei’s (2005) inclination that children may act upon their emotions according to the norms of emotional education. From this perspective, Millei (2008)
argues that emotional education ‘makes children even more open to intensified regulation, and thus they become less powerful’ (pg. 14). In contrast, teachers and children shared their positive views of SEAL. Didier’s comment can easily be interpreted positively. For example, I agree that talking to people during difficult experiences can make you feel better about them. A group of boys told me that they felt cared for, as individuals, while they are at school. For this reason, they felt really lucky to be part of a SEAL-school.

Didier: It’s brilliant [to be part of a SEAL school]
Lionel: Because it’s a school what
Didier: actually cares about your feelings
Lionel: Some schools don’t even have that kind of stuff that we’ve got
Didier: Yeah, like we’re really lucky…

Later on, in the same conversation, the boys attribute their sense of happiness at the school with being able to share their problems with adults. Here Fred states that having the opportunity to talk about and resolve problems with adults encourages him and his peers to feel happy.

Fred: Cos we’re not hiding things and we can talk about it, it will get sorted out, and that’s making us happy.

Adults at the school also hold Fred’s view that children are welcome to talk through their problems. One teacher I spoke to described the school as a place where children could express themselves and their feelings. He felt this differentiates a SEAL-school from a non-SEAL school.

I think that [this school] quite rightly has being recognised as a SEAL school …it’s an environment where the children are allowed to express themselves and their feelings and [are] encouraged to do so at every opportunity from circle time to school council and it’s great really, that they get a chance to air their views. (Teacher)

Such accounts show how emotional education practices are perceived, particularly within the school itself, to relinquish adult authority and increase student voice. Children are perceived to learn how to make positive choices about how they conduct themselves both at school and within wider society. In the following extract, a teacher reflects upon how disputes between children can be used as an opportunity to encourage children to reflect upon their own actions and their relationships with others. Through supporting children to
reflect upon their experiences in these ways it is hoped that they will be able to self-regulate their responses in future similar incidents.

In a one-to-one or one-to-two group [I will ask] what did you say to him, that's probably why he might have reacted that way … You've got to work on sort of the strategies between them… get them to think about what they did that might have provoked that person, because they'll just see what that person did to them they won't even contemplate until you remind them well what did you do that might have, you know, provoked them or upset them or why do you think why he might have reacted in that way. (Teacher)

From this perspective, emotional education fosters social cohesion as children learn to take responsibility for their own actions by thinking about the impact they have upon others and the school community. The critical accounts of SEAL seemed to sit in opposition to the positive experiences of SEAL by teachers and children at the school. I wanted to find a way to mediate between these contrasting perspectives. I found that the concept of emplacement (as explored in Methods A:1.1) offered an alternative way of viewing emotional education. It allowed the multiple effects of emotional education, as perceived by different viewers from different viewpoints (including the researcher and the research participants) to co-exist.

Emplacement considers how children’s experiences at school are situated within the social, cultural, economic and political place of schooling itself. In doing so an emplacement methodology attends to experience and is concerned with the interdependent relationships between places and people. However, it also considers the lines and threads that connect children’s experience in school to their experiences in other places and spaces, such as the home or the park. As Casey states ‘lived bodies belong to places and help to constitute them’ and ‘places belong to lived bodies and depend on them’ (1996, pg, 24). The researcher will also draw upon their personal histories and relational emplacements as they build theories about the field. The place of school permeates our embodied practices and emotional lives and thus shape how we make sense of the lives of others. As Coffey (1999) states 'we locate our physical being alongside those of others as we negotiate the spatial context of the field' (59). As researchers, our practices are concerned 'with the positioning, visibility and performance of our own embodied self' (Coffey 1999, pg. 59). Attending to emplacement opens up the opportunity to engage with the presence of multiple experiences and perspectives, including our own. It is interested in comparing and contrasting these different accounts.
of the school setting. In doing so it becomes possible to examine the interdependence of binary oppositions. For example, a personal sense of liberation can be experienced within a hierarchical structure. This sense of liberation could in fact be an indicator of hierarchy, depending upon the individual’s social position. Emplacement helps to situate personal experiences within wider social, cultural, economic and political contexts.

The section above has described how the emphasis of this doctoral study moved beyond looking at the impact of an emotional curriculum and instead to children’s social construction of emotion within a school that adopts an emotional curriculum. In Context: 1.2. (turn to pg. 29) I analyse the SEAL curriculum by drawing upon theories of power and governance. Context: 1.2. describes the standpoint I adopted in relation to SEAL before beginning ethnographic fieldwork. I argue that SEAL could marginalise particular children as they are characterised against pre-defined judgements of what are ‘appropriate’ emotional responses.

The above section stressed the importance I have placed upon acknowledging how my own personal histories and relational emplacement shape fieldwork. In Methods A:1.1. (turn to pg. 52) I introduce the concept of emplacement and how this has informed a research methodology that enables my elicitation of children’s socio-emotional practices. The methodology outlined in the section also recognises my own emotional responses as epistemologically productive in the research process. I outline an approach to working with emotions in data analysis through identifying ‘moments’, ‘memories’ and ‘shifts’.

The section above described how my critical views of SEAL were juxtaposed with the celebratory perspectives adopted by both adults and children at the school. Emplacement offered a way to engage with the research participants perceptions and also situate these within wider contexts. I have suggested that research which explores emotional spatialities is an important platform for working between binary oppositions, such as control and agency. Methods C:2.1. (turn to pg. 180) explores how these ideas were developed into a theoretical framework.

The section above has suggested that the researcher’s emotions play an integral part in understanding the emotionality of children’s lives. Methods C:2.2. (turn to pg. 193) explores the role of emotional reflexivity in working with research materials. I draw attention to the interplay between emotions and place. In detailing the ways that emotions entered into my research, I highlight the value of recognising our emotional responses as valuable sources of data. I outline an approach to working with emotions during data analysis through identifying ‘moments’, ‘memories’ and ‘shifts’.
Methods Exploratory A: Research Approach

This exploratory introduces my methodological considerations prior to beginning fieldwork. The aim of the research was primarily to engage with what it was like for children to be part of SEAL school. As I was essentially interested in children’s experiences and perceptions, I sought to define these two terms. To do so, I drew on the concept of emplacement. A key consideration of this research was how emotions were implicated in children’s experiences, therefore I consider the relationship between emplacement and emotion. This theoretical exploration (Methods A:1) informs the development of principles which were used to guide my fieldwork process (Methods A: 2). These principles include approaches to building relationships in the field, the role of reflexivity in the research process and the development of research questions.

2. The Fieldwork Process

Research Questions: Framing the fieldwork around the familiar

This research is concerned with the role of children’s emotion at school and not SEAL. However, the fieldwork will need to be framed around things that are familiar to the research participants, such as SEAL activities. (Research Journal, November 2009)

From the outset, my research was interested in the role of emotion in children’s experiences at school. However, during the early stages I was unsure what I was trying to capture in using the word role. I felt that this would emerge through the research. Looking back, I think I was interested incountering traditional conceptualisations of emotion, which dismissed emotion as irrational and a barrier to masculinity and intelligence. As Seidler (1998) suggests, ‘within a rationalist tradition, men would often choose to live without emotions at all, treating them as ‘distractions’ that take them away from the path of reason. It is acceptable for women to be emotional, as this only confirms their weakness, and shows that they need men to be independent and self-sufficient’ (pg. 195). As the research developed I realised that I am interested in conceptualising emotion in a way which connects the self and society. Archer (2007) suggests that reflexivity influences how people position themselves and engage in society. She states that people’s
‘internal topographies ... choreograph how they also move around ... [the] ... social world and seek to position themselves within it’ (pg. 100-101). I believe that emotions are implicated in these socially orientated internal conversations. In addition, emotions bind a person to their environment, the people they meet, the spaces they inhabit and the culture they experience. Lyon (1998) suggests that it is through the study of emotion that social science can re-engage with the ‘place of the body in society’.

‘The study of emotion can provide an expanded understanding of the place of the body in society through a consideration of the agency of the body...
Our bodily existence means also that we exist in relationship to other material entities, that is, to other bodies and to the environment. An understanding of agency of the body in society thus comes through its intercommunicative and active functions’ (Lyon 1998, pg. 52).

The Social and Emotional Aspects of Learning (SEAL) curriculum offered a shared terminology used by teachers and children, upon which I could explore my understanding of emotion ‘as the basis of self, sociality, meaning and order, located within the broader sociocultural realms of everyday life’ (Williams and Bendelow 1998, xvii) and more specifically children’s school lives. The strategies and approaches used by the school as part of its the SEAL curriculum are outlined in Context 1.3. At the outset the research was framed by four research questions.

- What is the rationale for SEAL (from different perspectives) and how has this rationale developed over time?
- What are children’s experiences and perceptions of SEAL?
- How does SEAL effect children’s choices about how they conduct themselves in different aspects of their lives?
- How does SEAL effect children’s views of themselves and their relationships with others?

In these early stages, these questions were steered towards making links between the SEAL curriculum and children’s behaviour and sense of self. As the research progressed I realised the difficulty of identifying such causal relationships. In addition, I felt these question’s misrepresented my interest. Through my participant observations I became much more interested in the ways that children negotiated and managed their social interactions at the school. I explored how their practices drew upon the discourses of emotion that were available to them. However, in discussing the research with school
leaders and teachers, I found myself pulled towards predominant evaluative discourses relating to the impact of SEAL on children’s academic achievement, behaviour and self-esteem at the school. In order to keep hold of the research, I re-visited my research questions and aims.

Through my research I am examining the ways in which SEAL is negotiated, integrated and interwoven into school culture – at both a contextual and personal level – as it is applied within practice. SEAL is not the focus of the enquiry but is instead a means to access common discourses and practices around emotions in mainstream schooling... The research questions at this stage are as follows:

• What are children's experiences and perceptions of their role in systems to assess and monitor their own and others’ conduct at a SEAL school?
• How do their experiences and perceptions of that role affect how they view themselves, other people and the school?
• How do different actors understand the purpose of these systems at a SEAL school?

(Research Journal, November 2010)

These questions emerged from the thematic analysis of fieldnotes from two-months of participant observations in the field. As I began to understand how SEAL was applied in practice I became interested in how children were expected to conduct themselves at school and beyond, and how these expectations were enforced through particular systems and techniques (such as, rewards and punishments). The research questions at this stage were framed by my interest in the influence of these systems and techniques upon children’s sense of themselves and relationships with others.

Through my observations of SEAL practices, I am aware of a whole-school vision to support children to be happy. I am concerned by the view that happiness is manifested through children’s specific behaviours. The SEAL coordinator considers children's behaviour in terms of their inner emotional needs. The teachers therefore monitor children's happiness by asking children to share how they are feeling and observing and recording any changes in behaviour. It seems that the categories used to define, monitor and measure happiness are also used as criteria through which the children are judged by adults. (Research Journal, November 2010)
After conducting the first stage of research workshops with the children I developed an interim report for school leaders and teachers. At this time, I chose to broaden the research questions beyond systems of monitoring and assessment. I felt that the second set of research questions were developed in order to maintain, and perhaps defend, the strong criticisms of SEAL I had prior to entering the school. Perhaps I felt my criticality was challenged by the reality of the field. I did not find the repressive practice I expected to see, and instead found myself building relationships with teachers who deeply cared about their students. In sharing the research with the school, I wanted to offer a more balanced perspective. I realised that my research questions had become loaded with personal biases. The third revision of the research questions focused upon understanding children’s experiences and perceptions. The study’s focus shifted towards understanding children’s exchanges of emotion as an important means of organising their relationships at school. I became interested in how ‘feeling rules’ (Hochschild 2003) affect the ways that children see themselves and others. I could explore these interests through questions that explored children’s role at school, how they viewed themselves and others and how they understood emotions. The following questions framed the rest of the research process.

- What are children’s perceptions of their role in a SEAL school?
- How does their perception of that role affect how they view themselves and others?
- How do children understand the purpose of SEAL?

The collaborative approach I sought to adopt raised tensions between my own sense of what was important and the priorities of school leaders, teachers and children. I was interested in how a social and geographical understanding of emotion could affect the conceptualisation of emotion in schools, which was framed by the discourse of positive psychology. In contrast, the school leaders in particular seemed interested in using the research to evaluate the success of SEAL. However, other interests were also present. For example, the SEAL coordinator was also curious about how the children participating in the research viewed themselves and how this was shaped by the roles they played at school. The Year 5 teacher was interested in children’s collaborative practices and issues of personal ownership. I was unsure how to respond to these multiple interests. At the time, I remember feeling concerned that the school leaders and practitioners may have missed what I felt the research was about. However, I also recall my uncertainty of this myself in these early stages. Perhaps then I hesitated not because that they had not ‘got it’, but because the practitioners’ interests were value-laden.
The SEAL coordinator’s interests in children’s views of themselves were framed around a concern that their ‘emotional needs’ may not be being met. The Year 5 teacher’s interest in children’s collaborative practice seemed concerned with children’s sharing practices within the classroom and managing the conflicts these practices caused amongst children. In contrast, my interest was in ‘troubling’ (Butler 2010) the foundations of individualistic and pathological conceptualisations of emotions in schools. For example, I wanted to deconstruct the naturalisation of concepts such as ‘emotional needs’ and question why there was such a strong focus upon the management of children’s ‘conflict’. Throughout the research, I have wondered why it was so important for me to make ‘trouble’. I wanted to sustain my resistance of schooling. I found it difficult to find a common ground from which I could discuss the emerging findings with school leaders and teachers, even though they were very keen to be engaged. In addition, my resistance to using typical teaching techniques to maintain orderliness within my research workshops, while relished by children, sometimes caused conflict between me and the teachers. These conflicts, while polite and quiet in their performance, became personal areas of interest and in many ways steered the direction of the research.

I built strong relationships with many of the children. They invited me into their lives at school, their games, disputes, jokes, secrets. Yet, during the workshops this dynamic changed. I was both in charge and not in charge. I had provided the space and tools through which the research would take place and the intention was for the children to direct how the research unfolded. I found the workshops personally challenging, I experienced a sense of responsibility, strengthened through the interactions I had with both adults and children, which I wanted to resist. I am curious about how the research space was produced by me and the children together and why this space had such a different quality to their classroom. I am also interested in why I felt such guilt regarding the lack of control I felt I had within this space, given my intention to foster children’s agency as research participants. (Research Journal, March 2012)

My research questions were an important tool for ensuring the research maintained its focus. I could filter my felt experiences through my research questions. Tensions between my research agenda and the reality of the field found presence in my feelings. My felt participation in the emotional landscape of the school offered a platform for engaging with how children and adults were socially positioned. Returning to my research questions was useful when reflecting upon research workshops with children or
interviews with adults took an unexpected course, often leaving me feeling conflicted. The questions helped me to keep the research unified, even when I felt it had its own momentum and was being pulled in various directions.

While the development of the research questions helped to maintain a focus throughout the research process, I have not answered the questions directly in this thesis. The questions have framed how I have responded to the data generated through this research. These responses can be understood as themes, which 'capture something important about the data in relation to the research question, and represents some level of patterned response or meaning within the data set' (Braun and Clarke 2006, pg. 82). I have drawn upon my own positionality in deciding what constitutes a research theme. These decisions are explored in detail in Methods C.1.1, where I examine different stages of data analysis. I have developed research themes which do not act as an accurate reflection of the entire data set, but have been developed to provide a detailed account of the role of emotion in the construction of social hierarchies at school, explored from the theoretical perspective of emplacement.

While the view that emotions are essential to children’s sense of place has been a strong theoretical and methodological position maintained throughout the research, my interest in social justice developed through the analysis. I found that teachers and children were concerned with issues of social justice in education, such as combating bullying or including children with special education needs. However, the attention given to these issues by teachers, for example through bullying intervention programmes or religious education, seemed to hide the presence of more fundamental issues relating to the promotion of social justice. I have sought to engage with the ‘social ecology’ (Swearer and Espelage 2004) that establishes and maintains social exclusion in education. Goodwin (2006) suggests that issues of social justice are ‘lodged within the actions and stances that children take up in interaction with their peers’ (pg. 254). Drawing upon this view of social justice and its presence within children’s social interactions, this research is interested in how children’s presentation and exchange of emotion in children’s placemaking practices are articulations of power-relations. The three research questions guiding this study provided an interesting framework for engaging with the relationship between power, emotion and place.

- What are children's perceptions of their role in a SEAL school?
- How does their perception of that role affect how they view themselves and others?
How do children understand the purpose of SEAL?

I engaged with children’s perceptions of their role within a SEAL school from the perspective of power. For example, I became interested in how children associate roles of responsibility with particular emotional dispositions. The roles that children are given by adults, perhaps as a ‘peer-mediator’, or take up themselves in interactions, such as a ‘joker’ who makes other children laugh, influence how the children view themselves and other children. I became curious about children’s views about how they should respond emotionally in given situations. For example, a girl said that she wouldn’t cry even when she was being hurt by others. I wondered how these responses were tied to the children’s sense of who they are and how they should act. I became interested in the ways that children made judgements about others based upon their emotional responses and how these informed social hierarchies. The third research question was explored from an interest in engaging with children’s understanding of emotion. The curriculum imparts a developmental psychological view of emotion and associates particular emotional experiences with, for example, children’s lack of self-esteem, mental-health problems, academic failure (see Context 1.2 for further details). I was interested in how children appropriated this view of emotions at school. Throughout my research I have tried to be aware of how my preconceptions found presence within the development of the research in order to stay open to what emerged. I have reflected this commitment in the ways that I re-shaped my research questions. I did not want to fit my analysis into a pre-existing coding framework. Therefore my primary research questions were purposefully open. However, I was aware that my own ‘theoretical and epistemological commitments’ (Braun and Clark 2006, pg. 84) were reflected in my engagements with the data.

Above I showed how my research questions shifted, from a focus upon causal relationships to an interest in regulatory practice. In revisiting the questions in order to discuss the development of the research with school leaders and teachers, I became aware of how my own biases were present within the research questions. In neutralising the questions, I also experienced tensions between my ‘hidden’ biases and the reality of the field. I suggested that some of these tensions were fuelled by my resistance to school practices. In Context: 1.2. (turn to pg. 29) I analyse the SEAL curriculum by drawing upon theories of power and governance. This reveals how personal biases in relation to SEAL were developed before entering the field. These needed to be reworked during the fieldwork process.
In the section above I explored how I have used my research questions throughout the research process. I have shown that my concern with the role of emotion was prominent throughout the research. I viewed the SEAL curriculum as a common reference point through which I could explore the role of emotions in school life with teachers and children. In Context 1.3 (turn to pg. 47) the SEAL activities that take place within the school are described. These activities were used as a starting point for exploring emotion.

Engaging with the tensions between my personal biases and the reality of the field became an integral part of the formation of research themes. Through these engagements I used the research questions to maintain the focus of the research, while still providing scope for meanings to emerge. In Methods C:1.1. (turn to pg. 158) I explore how emerging research themes were developed over the course of fieldwork and the ongoing analysis of field data.
Methods Exploratory B: Research Practice

Methods Exploratory B examines the practical aspects of the research process. This includes ethical considerations (Methods B:1). Ethical practice was an important aspect of this research, which is reflected in the amount of space allocated to the discussion of ethics in this thesis. I focus upon identifying the research site and working with research participants, and in particular how I framed the research and built research relationships. This exploratory also looks at the research design and the development of research methods (Methods B:2). I wanted the research design to be flexible in order to respond to the field and its participants. I therefore reflect upon how the research methods were extended and developed in collaboration with the research participants.

1. Ethical Considerations

Identifying a Research Site

The fieldwork was situated in one primary school. I decided to work with a school which embedded the principles of SEAL across a range of formal and informal learning activities as this would be a platform from which I could explore the role of emotion within a school setting. I chose to focus the research in one school setting so that I could get an in-depth sense of how SEAL was applied in practice and negotiated by children. The project was advertised to Wave-1 SEAL schools chosen with the support of the Inclusive Learning Service at Sheffield City Council. A number of schools were selected on the basis that they had developed the SEAL programme since it was launched in 2005 and continued to show a strong commitment to embed the curriculum. A representative from the local authority felt the nominated schools were committed to reflective practice and would therefore take an active interest in the research and, potentially, draw upon it to further develop their own SEAL programmes. Six schools were contacted via email and invited to participate. Each was made aware that their expression of interest would be followed by an interview with a SEAL representative. A description of the project, its aims, duration and the expected commitment from schools, was provided for each school at this stage (see Appendix A). They were aware that on the basis of the information gathered at interview a school would be selected to take part in the research. The schools
were informed that the interview was a means to see if the school married with the aims of the research, and not a means of evaluating their SEAL programme.

Two schools responded to the invitation and I met with the SEAL representatives from each school to discuss their approach to SEAL and introduce the aims and objectives of the research. The selected school was chosen for a number of reasons, which I noted in my research journal.

- School staff show a strong commitment to SEAL as a whole-school agenda and the aims of SEAL underpin the school ethos and values.
- The school serves a catchment area that includes children from both working class and middle class backgrounds. It also has children from ethnically diverse backgrounds.
- The school leadership team has a strong interest in supporting children with special educational needs, and makes their inclusion one of their key priorities.
- The SEAL coordinator and head are very enthusiastic about the creative nature of the research and showed a commitment to accommodate the workshops and support the children to share the research process through assemblies and twilight session.
- The SEAL coordinator and head feel that the research, which offers them an opportunity to access children’s experiences and perceptions of SEAL, could be of benefit to their development of SEAL in the future.

(Research Journal, September 2011)

This approach to identifying a research site worked well. I raised awareness of the research within the local authority and representatives from Sheffield City Council maintained an active interest throughout the research process. Although the SEAL consultants are no longer in post following the public spending cuts in early 2011 under the coalition government, I have made contact with others from Inclusion Learning Services and research findings have been disseminated to these individuals through a final report (see Appendix F).

Inviting schools to participate and outlining the selection procedure had an unexpected effect. When I met with the two interested schools, both used the interview process to showcase the practices at the school. Both schools seemed to treat the selection process as a competition. The SEAL representative from the selected school described a sense of
‘privilege’ as a result of being selected to participate. The school’s selection, she seemed to feel, reflected positively on the ethos and practice at the school. While this initiated a positive research relationship and much enthusiasm for the research, I also felt I was put in a position of trust, where I would relate what the school does to others in a positive way. I chose not to disclose my critical position at the time, which viewed SEAL as a strategy of power, and instead presented positive feelings regarding the school’s practices. I have reflected upon how I worked through this elsewhere in the thesis (see Methods A: 2.2). I chose to be open about what the research would entail at the interview stage and this proved to be very helpful. It led to a conversation regarding expectations; I felt that the school had an understanding of what the research was about and how it would be conducted. Although there were difficulties along the way, in particular the requirements of the research and the expectations of the school would sometimes come into tension and I had to find ways of working to resolve some of the issues that came to light (this is explored in Methods A:2.3 in relation to the development of research questions). However, during moments of tension (which also offered interesting insights from a research perspective), I also felt that the SEAL representative was always encouraging of the research and, alongside the school leaders and teachers, made time for the children to participate in research workshops and adults to attend reflective sessions to discuss emerging research findings. I felt that the way the research was introduced to the school fostered this encouragement and continued engagement.
Methods Exploratory B: Research Practice

Methods Exploratory B examines the practical aspects of the research process. This includes ethical considerations (Methods B:1). Ethical practice was an important aspect of this research, which is reflected in the amount of space allocated to the discussion of ethics in this thesis. I focus upon identifying the research site and working with research participants, and in particular how I framed the research and built research relationships. This exploratory also looks at the research design and the development of research methods (Methods B:2). I wanted the research design to be flexible in order to respond to the field and its participants. I therefore reflect upon how the research methods were extended and developed in collaboration with the research participants.

1. Ethical Considerations

Engaging Children in Research

In this section I will reflect upon the ethical issues of engaging children in the research process. I consider ethics as a responsive process and that each research situation will present its own unique ethical questions (Sikes 2006). I reflect upon the unanticipated complexities involved in selecting and inviting children to contribute to a series of research workshops. I explore how my response to this situation had implications for me as a researcher. I suggest that ethical questions therefore also need to consider the demands and challenges that the researcher can face during research.

The data collection focused upon one class of Key Stage 2 children, as they had experienced SEAL throughout their time in primary education. The school leaders decided which class they felt would be best to include in the research. They appeared to do this based upon the attitude of the teacher, who they felt was quite relaxed and would welcome the project. I was invited to introduce the project to the class of Year 5 children (aged 9 and 10) through a presentation. I developed an interactive presentation, which used objects as metaphors to communicate what the research was interested in exploring. The fieldnotes below describe this introduction.

I ask for some ‘helpers’ to help me explain the project. The children sit with their backs straight and very quietly. I pick a girl, Cathy. I give her a hat to
I conducted participant observations for around two-months and got to know many of the children in the class well before inviting some of them to participate in research workshops. Nine children were invited to be part of a core research group. It was intended that this core group would self-select to take part and that if a large number of children signed up they would be picked at random. However, after participating in activities with the class for a number of weeks, I realised that there were specific children whom I would like to know more about. I decided to select the workshop participants myself, based upon criteria that I established:

- Their social group and status within the class and the school. I wanted to select children who represented different facets of these social hierarchies.
- Children whom I had seen as being particularly accommodating of SEAL and those who also showed significant resistance.
The children who had been given strong identities by teaching staff, such as mature, vulnerable, over-energetic, diva, sorted, strong, etc.

The final decision was also based, in part, on group dynamics.

(Research Journal, November 2010)

I recall feeling very nervous about selecting the research participants. A research colleague said to me, ‘you’re going to have to be careful about how you justify that, because you are essentially cherry-picking’. At the same time, I felt I had a strong rationale for selecting the core participants. They reflected my emerging research interests generated through the participant observations. I was more concerned about the approach I would take to inviting the children to participate and managing the disappointing of those who were not invited. The class teacher felt it was important for the whole-class to know about the research workshops. I agreed to give a short presentation to the class (see Fig. 6). I shared my concern with the class teacher about disappointing the non-selected children. He felt that I should tell the children that those who have been selected have been picked from a hat, as the children are familiar with this way of doing things. I shared this suggestion with a colleague, also an educational researcher, who, like me, felt uneasy about presenting a false account of how children had been selected. It was also the view of the SEAL representative, Kathryn, that the children needed to learn to manage their disappointment. She felt I could be open about why different children had been selected. I chose to take this approach and explained that children had been selected to represent the different friendship groups in the class and their involvement in different aspects of SEAL.

I gave a short presentation to the whole class about what this core group were likely to do and who would be part of it (for more about the content of the presentations and participant recruitment please refer to Methods B:1.3) This was the first time the children would hear about the workshops and therefore I wanted the presentation to foster their interest in participating.
I was prepared for some disappointment from the children who were not chosen. Throughout the presentation I made an effort to let the rest of the class know that they would still be part of the research process, through whole-class workshops or interventions, led by me and/or the research group. Many of the children were happy about this, but some were disappointed. In the next stage of the research I aim to find alternative ways to enable the few children who seem to have felt upset by my decision to feel more included in the research process. (Research Journal, November 2010)

In response to the children’s disappointment the class teacher interjects.

… the class teacher tells the children not to worry if they haven’t been chosen, as they will still have a part to play. He explains that it is like when a film is being made and people have different roles. He says that the children not part of this group are like the cast and will play an important part. I follow this up by saying, ‘that’s exactly right, so you will be filmed in interviews in the playground or around the school’. (Fieldnotes, 20th October 2010)

I stuck with this commitment and arranged opportunities for other children in the class to participate through two lunchtime clubs, including a film-making club and a scrapbook-making club. While the children who participated in these research activities enjoyed doing so, some children seemed disappointed because they were not selected to be part of the core group and asked to be more involved.

This process has led me to reflect upon what it means to be ethical when we do research with children. Being ethical is of course about avoiding undue harm to others during the research process (Morrow 2008). In this research I wanted to avoid situations which caused upset or distress for the children involved. However, there were times when,
despite all my best efforts, this was unavoidable. As Sikes (2006) suggests ‘each research situation generates its own ethical questions and issues that demand their own, unique answers’ (pg. 106). While I tried to find ways to respond to the children’s sense of unfairness, I could not undo the upset that the children had already experienced and seemed to carry throughout the research process.

I came to recognise their upset as part of much wider narratives of exclusion; their responses to me could only be understood within a wider understanding of their experiences at the school (this is explored in more detail in Node a:3 where as part of the section I examine how an adult perception of David as emotionally vulnerable leads to his exclusion from school activities). There have been other instances when children’s distress in the research workshops have opened up new opportunities for understanding their emplacement. While it is important to work towards avoiding harm, I often found that I was compelled to respond to children’s tears by trying to make things better for them and attempting to change how they were feeling.

Towards the end of the fieldwork, David, who participated in the scrap-book workshops but was not part of the SEAL squad became upset when he found out he had not been invited on a picnic in a local park to mark the end of the project. This picnic was suggested by the SEAL squad as a way of celebrating their contributions to the research. David did not seem to understand why he had not been invited. He began to cry. I chose to sit beside him and listen to his point of view. I was overcome by a feeling of guilt, which shaped how I responded to his tears by trying to make this situation better for the boy. Where did my guilt come from? Would I have felt such guilt if David had been an adult? Earlier in the research David had become upset because he had not been selected to be part of the SEAL squad. In response, I organised the scrapbook workshops for him and other children who wanted to be more involved. The guilt I felt then seemed to resurface now. Upon reflecting on this situation I can associate my feelings with a sense of responsibility for the boy’s happiness. With this duty upon my shoulders, it was difficult for me to allow space for David to cry. In trying to make him happy, I was differentiating being tearful from being happy and aligning myself with the school’s view that children need to be made happy. My felt response to David was entangled within socio-cultural norms present within the school and wider society. (Research Journal, December 2011)
In my experience of engaging with adults in research I have not had the same sense of responsibility for their emotions. While I would offer comfort to an adult who was upset I would not try to change their emotional experiencing in the way that I felt I should in my interactions with children. I feel that as an adult, I can at times be drawn to the role of protector when working with children, which works to reinforce the differences between adult and children that result in their restricted participation in society (see Methods A: 2.1. where this is explored in the context of building research relationships with children). Perhaps then ethics with children is not ‘only’ about ‘not making them cry’, as I was once told by a fellow researcher. Rather, being ethical is perhaps more about treating children’s emotional responses as opportunities to gain important insights into their own experiences and offering the time and space to listen, instead of, as I sometimes did, try to make their difficult feelings stop because I positioned myself as responsible.

I originally invited eight children to participate in the research workshops. However, after the first workshop had taken place I decided to invite one more girl, whose experiences I felt were important to engage with. Some of her close friends were taking part in the workshops and she felt strongly that she should also participate. My hesitance to involve her originally was to do with how she tended to dominate interactions with her peers. I was concerned she may have a negative impact on the group dynamics and perhaps prevent some of the other children from participating. The final selection of nine children was above the number I had anticipated I would work with, which was six, because I was concerned about representing a diversity of children. I also wanted each child to have a close friend within the group. However, the group size had implications.

I feel that the workshops could be more successful if I had a smaller group. By successful I mean that I would be in a better position to observe the sessions. I am currently called upon frequently to assist children in their disputes. This also causes some difficulties for me in defining my role and the responsibilities I have for the children. At times, I feel the children expect me to arbitrate in the same way that a teacher would. (Research Journal, March 2011)

I recall feeling very conflicted during the research workshops. My fieldnotes reflect the emotional work that fieldwork involves. Coffey (1999) describes Whyte’s confessional account of research, ‘he admits to a lack of confidence, and to incompetence and ignorance. He presents a narrative of learning by trial and error, of getting by, learning from mistakes and surviving in the field’ (pg. 122-123). This account of the researcher’s
self-criticism resonates with my views of my own research practice throughout fieldwork. Conducting the research in a school also inflamed much of my self-doubt. Schools are evaluative sites, in which teachers are regularly scrutinised against prescriptive guidelines of best practice. I felt vulnerable within this setting, as I broke the conventions of classroom practice through my research. I have been left wondering how ethics can move beyond its focus upon a duty of care for research participants and also consider a duty of care towards the researcher. While the ethical application process, which involves completing a form which is then reviewed by senior colleagues, invites applicants to reflect upon this, I found it difficult to foresee how I would be affected by fieldwork. Perhaps open accounts of the personal challenges that we face in doing research would help new researchers to consider the ethics in relation to themselves.

Morrow (2008) states that ‘theories, methods and research ethics are interconnected.’ She argues that ‘ethics questions weave their way throughout research, and are not separate questions that need additional consideration’ (pg. 52). Ethical considerations throughout this research have been driven by a theoretical standpoint of children as competent social actors (James et al 1998). However, I have shown how socially constructed understandings of the adult-child relationship found presence within my practice with children and sometimes made it difficult for me to ‘listen’ to children’s accounts. My concern to ensure children did not experience distress required a great deal of my own emotional labour. While this research raised questions about what an ethic of care towards the researcher looks like, it also suggested that ethical research lies in building mutually supporting relationships with our research participants. As I came to see children as competent emotional actors, I found that our relationships moved beyond adult-child power relations where the adult takes whole responsibility for the child’s emotional well-being.

As this study was concerned with emotions, children engaged deeply with personal issues throughout the research and at times this caused children to become upset. The above section has raised issues around how we engage with children in ways that move beyond the adult’s sense of responsibility to protect the child and instead engage in listening relationships with children and endeavour to hear their stories, even when this is difficult. In Methods A:2.1. (turn to pg. 66) I reflect upon the ways that I related to children in the research workshops. I describe how I found ways to foster children’s agency within the research activities.
The above section has shown how I drew upon the expertise of educational practitioners at the school in thinking about how to invite children to participate in the research workshops. I reflected upon the opportunities and challenges that resulted from the approach that I opted to take. The ethical dimensions of introducing the research workshops and gaining children's consent to participate is explored in further depth in Methods B.1.3. (turn to pg. 103). Here I explain the methods I used to try and ensure the children felt fully informed about the research and their role in it.

In the above section I reflected upon an occasion when, David, one of the young research participants became upset about not being involved in some of the research activities. I suggested that David’s distress could only be understood within the context of his continued exclusion from school activities. I have shown therefore that engaging with David’s distress, rather than trying to make it disappear, generated new understandings to emerge. David’s experiences of his exclusion, amongst others, are in part explored in Node a:3. (turn to pg. 309) where I suggest that emotionalised gender norms influence the ways that children participate in and negotiate
Methods Exploratory B: Research Practice

Methods Exploratory B examines the practical aspects of the research process. This includes ethical considerations (Methods B:1). Ethical practice was an important aspect of this research, which is reflected in the amount of space allocated to the discussion of ethics in this thesis. I focus upon identifying the research site and working with research participants, and in particular how I framed the research and built research relationships. This exploratory also looks at the research design and the development of research methods (Methods B:2). I wanted the research design to be flexible in order to respond to the field and its participants. I therefore reflect upon how the research methods were extended and developed in collaboration with the research participants.

1. Ethical Considerations

Setting the Scene and Gaining Consent

After three weeks of participant observations, I selected a group of nine children to participate in research workshops. Here I describe the process of gaining children’s consent to participate in the research. I considered this to be an opportunity to set the scene. I wanted the children to feel that they felt fully informed about what the research was all about and that they had time to ask questions and decide whether or not they wanted to participate.

Prior to the observations consent was gained from the headteacher to observe the daily activities of the Year 5 children and their teachers at school. In addition the headteacher and teachers who would directly participate in the research through interviews and focus groups also completed consent forms. They were made aware of the aims and objectives of the research and how the research materials would be used (see Appendix B for information sheets and consent forms).

The roles the selected nine children would take in the research workshops were introduced in a presentation to the Year 5 class. This presentation was intended to communicate what the children would be doing as part of these research workshops and why. I also wanted the children to feel positive about participating (the rationale and
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impact of introducing the workshops in this way is further explored in Methods B:1.2). I built upon the notion of the researcher as a detective, which is how I referred to myself on the first day that I met the children. In my presentation, accompanied by slides, I described the participants’ role as ‘detective assistants’.

...I’m at a point in my detecting where I need a little bit of help. I explain that I can only find out so much... I have chosen a group of eight children to be my detective assistants. The children all sit up straight (this is what they do when they want to be chosen!) I explain that although this group will be helping me, I will still be coming into the class and doing workshops and activities with everybody ... [I read out the names] ... and start my presentation. I tell the children that ... we will have only about two workshops each half term and then some assemblies too ... [because] ... I want all of you to know what is going on. I continue, the group will be thinking about what it is like for them to be part of SEAL school and what it is like for other people too. I explain that, therefore, they will have to interview other children in their class, as part of their role... (Fieldnotes, 20th October 2010)

After introducing the children’s role in the research and outlining why I would like some children to take part, I introduce what the children will be doing in the workshops. Again accompanied by slides, I introduce the types of activities the children will be doing, including den-building, scrapbooks and filming. At the end one of the girls who has been selected to take part raises her hand and tells me it will be fun. The teacher stresses that it will be serious too.

The things that the detectives will do include some den building; when other people go inside your dens they will find out about your ideas... and give their own ideas too... The detectives will explore what it is like to be part of a SEAL school through making diaries or scrap books, using pictures, collage, drawings, or writing... Justin tells me he has done a scrapbook before. I tell him that’s good because he will probably be very good at that then... And finally you will make films about what it is like for you to be part of SEAL... You will also share what you find out with the school... You will share things with your class, with the rest of the school through assemblies and also with presentations to teachers... Katie puts up her hand, she says, ‘I think it is
going to be fun’. Yes, I hope it will be fun. JT also adds, ‘but it is also very serious too’. (Fieldnotes, 20th October 2010)

Following the presentation I invited the selected children to have a conversation with me in the library, which is situated next to their classroom. I explain that there are certain forms I need them to fill in and some letters I need to give them for their parents.

After the presentation I met with the selected children and discussed the details of the research and their involvement in it. I explained why it is important for me that they understand what the workshops are all about. I think it is important that a child’s decision to take part in the workshops is based upon their own informed reasons. This also means that they have to be clear about a range of details including, for example, my role in the research activities, how meanings and knowledge may emerge, when and where the activities will take place and what will happen to the information that has been recorded. The key points I addressed were outlined in an information sheet compiled for the children (see Appendix B). (Upgrade, 24th January 2011)

The information sheet was handed out to each child and used to guide the conversation and I talked the children through it, point-by-point.

The first section on the information sheet was titled ‘why’. I explain that the research at Nook Lane is important because, I have been told by [the local authority] that Nook Lane is a school that is very good at SEAL. Therefore the research at Nook Lane will help other schools to improve their SEAL... I say that the role they play in this research is really important because the things they find out and tell me will be used to help this school get better at SEAL but other schools too. I explain that I will share what they find out to other schools around England to help them get better. They look really shocked and excited about this prospect – ‘really, so other schools will learn from us’. (Fieldnotes, 20th October 2010)

Upon reflection I wonder if I overly stressed to the children the local authority’s perception that their school is praised for it’s application of SEAL. Throughout the research the children did not speak negatively about the school’s application of SEAL activities and the majority were keen to share their enthusiasm for the curriculum. However, this positive attitude also seemed to reach beyond the research project and was
perhaps an embedded expectation of actors at the school to have a positive outlook. At times I found it difficult to pose a negative view; this felt like a step outside of the norm (I have examined how this positive ethos is sustained with the school in Edges b:1). I wonder if I could have done more to encourage a critical perspective from the children by presenting the research differently. Yet at the same time I felt that asking for criticality would have been a controversial way to develop the project, as SEAL is positively encouraged by the school. In these ways the school’s values entered into my research.

Educating Emotions
Information sheet for Students

1) **What?**
I would like to invite you to take part in some research with me. I want to know all about SEAL activities at your school.

You will take part in workshops with some of your classmates and me. We will make dens, films and tell stories to share what we think about SEAL activities.

2) **Why?**
It is important that activities at school are right for children. By thinking about SEAL activities together, we can find out if it should be different. Then your school and other schools may change or improve SEAL in the future.

3) **When?**
You will take part in about 15 workshops from November until May.

4) **What will I get out of it?**
You will have a good time, get to know other people better and learn lots of new things.

5) **Will you show the research to other people?**
The results of the research will be shared with other people at presentations, in books, magazines or on the Internet. We will not tell other people you took part.

Photographs and film will be taken during the project. We may also need to use some of the photographs or film at presentations, in books, magazines or on the Internet. We will ask your permission before using any photographs or film.

6) **Can I drop out?**
If you don’t want to take part in the workshops anymore, that’s OK. Just talk to Lisa.

Figure 6: Children’s Information Sheet (also see Appendix B)

*I then tell the children that the next bit is really important and they need to listen very carefully. I tell them that I will take photos and film of them during the project. I explain that I might use these photos and films in presentations that I make to other schools about the research. I ask them if they saw the photos of the children in the presentation I gave in class. They say they do, I tell them that I will use photos of them in presentations similar*
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I might use their photos in books or articles for magazines. They seem quite amazed at the idea that this research might be published in a book. I say that if I am going to use a photo I will ask them... I explain that I have ‘consent forms’ for them to fill in where they will say whether or not they want me to take photos. I tell them that even though they fill that in they might have photos taken which they still don’t like and don’t want me to use and so I will always check with them if I am going to use a particular image... [When they are filling in the consent forms, one of the girls] puts her hand up. She says she doesn’t mind being filmed or photographed but doesn’t want this to go on the Internet... I ask her to note that on her form. (Fieldnotes, 20th October 2010)

Figure 7: Children’s consent form

I told the children that during the workshops they can tell me if they do not want particular photos or film of them to be shared with others. This control over their image seemed important to the children. This discussion also seemed to set a precedent for their involvement in the research; their decisions mattered. However, it was not always possible to consult the children before using their image and at times I have to make decisions on their behalf. In some cases children did not want images to be used that present them in a way which is inconsistent with the school’s expectations. For example, one of the girls asked me to ‘not show that bit’ because her mum ‘doesn’t want it to be
shown’. On another occasion one of the girls asked me to edit the moments when she talked about sex in one of our focus groups. I also found that the children wanted to protect their peers. For example, a boy asked me not to show a moment when one of his peers was angry during a workshop. Allowing children to have this autonomy over what was shared and what was not, proved valuable in helping me to make sense of what the children perceived as acceptable and unacceptable behaviour (see Edge a:1 for an account of children’s perceptions of anger). As these moments were useful analytically I was sometimes left with the difficult decision of how I represent these instances in a way that respects the children’s requests for confidentiality. As I present research, I want to maintain the individuality of the young research participants. However, I also want to avoid presenting them in ways that they would not want to be seen. While the children are aware that the school name and their name will not be used when the research findings are published, they have been cautious about how their ‘deviant’ behaviours are shared and in some cases have asked me to delete video or images that they are unhappy for others to see.

When presenting aspects of the doctoral study in academic journals, I have been confronted with difficult ethical decisions. This has been a key consideration when such papers are framed around video-data which shows children behaving in ways that deviate from the school’s expectations. As e-journals are increasingly open to including video-data in web-based versions of a paper, I had to consider how best to present this data. While the videos created by the children provide a multi-sensory depiction of who they are individually and collectively, they also present the children in deviant ways. In such cases, I have shared stills from the video and provided detailed textual descriptions of the video footage. Even though the camera moves at a fast-pace, making it difficult to identify the children in the video, the children’s voices are very clear. Voice has a powerful presence; our voices are uniquely our own and an important part of our identity. As voices are converted to textual transcripts the individuality of the research participant becomes more distanced. Within such papers, I have provided film stills and rich descriptions to compensate for the fact that my reflections are detached from their very connectedness to moving images and sounds. This account shows that while I have the option to present the video footage in the online version of this paper, as both children and parents gave their consent, ethical decisions go beyond formal ethical review procedures (Sikes and Piper 2010).

In one instance the process of gaining parental consent also seemed to reduce one child’s sense of choice. I provided information and consent forms for parents as well as children
The children were also told that their names and other personal data, which may identify them, would not be used in any accessible or publicised documents relating to the project. The children asked if they could decide their own ‘fake names’ to be used in research reports and publications. (Upgrade, 24th January 2011)

The children welcomed the use of pseudonyms. In a research meeting which took place a few weeks after this initial introduction, it was one of the children’s priorities. The children carefully considered their fake names, choosing names of celebrities, including singers, footballers and comedians, or cartoon characters by whom they wanted to be represented in my writings.

I then move onto the last section of the information sheet, ‘Can I drop out?’ I explain that they can drop out if they don’t enjoy it, or don’t want to do it any more. I tell them that they don’t have to give me a reason; they just say they don’t want to do it anymore. Katie says, ‘I don’t think I’m going to drop out’. Another child adds, ‘no way’. I also tell them that if they decide they don’t want to be filmed or photographed anymore that’s fine too and they can just tell me. (Fieldnotes, 20th October 2010)

The approach I have taken to gaining consent set the scene for the research. My intention was to use the consent process to demonstrate to the children their rights and responsibilities during the research process. The children referred back to this conversation at different stages, for example, asking me not to use a particular bit of video footage or asking to change their pseudonym. However, because I felt they had taken on board these issues around consent, I found that I rarely referred back to them as I had intended to. Rather, I quickly found myself passing responsibility onto the children for sharing issues regarding the research. While many did do so, I wonder if I could have
made space within the research process to remind children of this initial conversation regarding ethics. However, at the same time, it seemed that the workshops had a momentum that I felt hesitant to interfere with (see Methods B:2.4). The children seemed to reinterpret the project and moved it beyond my original expectations.

Methods Exploratory B

1.3

In the section above I outline how I introduced the research to children before gaining their consent to be involved. The ethical implications of introducing the workshops to the children in the ways that I did are explored further in Methods B:1.2. (turn to pg. 95) Here I reflect upon the ethical issues of engaging children in the research process. In particular, I examine the complexities involved in selecting and inviting children to participate in research. I suggest that ethics is an ongoing process, and that ethical dilemmas emerge throughout the research process.

Methods Exploratory B

2.4

Above I have reflected upon the way that consent was gained from the children also offered an opportunity to discuss our research relationship. I felt that most of the children developed a sense of agency over the course of the research. I suggested that the children reflected what was significant to them and enabled their standpoint to frame the direction of the enquiry. The ways that children directly shaped the research methods is explored in Methods B:2.4 (turn to pg. 138). Here I suggest that involving children in the development of relevant and meaningful research methods supports them to communicate their perspectives.

Edges a:1

In the section above I have explored how allowing children to share their views about what material would be shared within the school and beyond, proved valuable in helping me to make sense of what the children perceived as acceptable and unacceptable behaviour. I also suggest that this presented certain ethical dilemmas. The moments when children actively resisted the school rules were, for me, often the most illuminating pieces of research data. Edge a:1 (turn to pg. 232) analyses children’s perspectives on anger. This shows how the SEAL curriculum guides their understanding of appropriate and inappropriate behaviour. It illuminates why children wanted me to be so secretive about any expressions of anger within the research workshops.

Edges b:1

I suggested that the way I chose to introduce the research to the children may have restricted the scope to engage with any criticisms that they may have had of SEAL. This is also related to the positive ethos that is cultivated at the school, where optimistic and positive attitudes are encouraged. Teachers associate this ethos with the promotion of happiness, I explore this culture further in Edges b:1. (turn to pg. 238), where I reflect upon the ways that children speak about happiness and how such emotion talk distances them from their lived experiences.
Methods Exploratory B: Research Practice

Methods Exploratory B examines the practical aspects of the research process. This includes ethical considerations (Methods B:1). Ethical practice was an important aspect of this research, which is reflected in the amount of space allocated to the discussion of ethics in this thesis. I focus upon identifying the research site and working with research participants, and in particular how I framed the research and built research relationships. This exploratory also looks at the research design and the development of research methods (Methods B:2). I wanted the research design to be flexible in order to respond to the field and its participants. I therefore reflect upon how the research methods were extended and developed in collaboration with the research participants.

1. Ethical Considerations

I have begun to reflect upon the role of my own emotional experiences during fieldwork. I have found that my emotions are an important tool for engaging with my presence in the field, as I move through it and relate to its members. To do so I have drawn upon a databank of emotional responses, selected from fieldnotes reflecting on my experience, to look at the role of emotions when dancing between different types of movements and rhythms.

(Research Journal, December 2010)

This quote from my research journal reflects my interest in my presence within the field and how I built research relationships. Coffey (1999) suggests that social actors ‘provide the interactional context in which we shape our field roles, and ultimately our identity, certainly during fieldwork (and often beyond)’ (pg. 42). She argues that ‘good ethnographic practice, data collection and analyses rely upon genuine empathy, trust and participation’ (pg. 47). Coffey reflects upon the importance of friendship in fieldwork, she suggests that friendships can heighten the researcher’s awareness of the tensions present within the field. In contrast, Atkinson and Hammersley’s (2010) suggest that ethnographic researchers need to be wary the research field becoming over-familiar, which can stem from building very close relationships. It is difficult to define when our relationships with
research participants become ‘too close’. Maier and Monahan (2009) also suggest that ‘the issue of balancing closeness and detachment transcends various phases of the research process, from establishing initial contact with research participants to publishing one’s findings’ (pg. 3). The notion of closeness is rarely explored in research with children, rather childhood researchers have focused upon children’s active participation.

Recently much work has been done to re-position children as participants rather than objects of research (Greig et al 2007, James et al 1998, James and Prout 1990, Christensen and James 2008, Tisdall et al 2009). This work suggests that children have their own accomplished abilities which are different to those of adults and therefore researchers need to develop methods which resonate with young research participants (Morrow 2006). While, from my own experience, I know that emotional experiences can be difficult to capture in words, I also found that children were taught a specific vocabulary for naming and reflecting upon their emotions. I wanted to move beyond this learned language and explore children’s lived experiences. This research study has therefore explored the potential of visual and material methods. These methods have been developed alongside children (see Methods B:2.4). While the use of visual and material methods feature prominently in research with children (see for example Clark and Moss 2011, Greene and Hogen 2009, Thomson 2008), it is important to avoid ‘any artificial boundary-in-principle between research with children and that with adults ... [as this] ... would lead researchers back to misleading and reified ideas about children’ (Christensen and James 2008, pg. xv). I have explored elsewhere critical considerations of the concept of children’s ‘voice’ in research (see Methods A:2.1). I suggested that school children presented themselves as ‘experts’ when they were drawing upon adult knowledge and understandings. While it is important to challenge assumed differences between children and adults, within this doctoral study it seemed that adults’ perspectives at times framed what was deemed acceptable and what was not and informed how children chose to share their research with the school community. The gaze of adults within the school setting is reflected in the following extract which considers how the research materials produced by children could be shared with the school community.

_I wonder if the children’s den will be valued by adults when it is shared with the wider school community. The children are very proud of their creation and I hope that it is received by the school community in a way which values the children’s attachment to their den. How could the dens be shared with the school – should they be displayed in a way which encourages other people to engage in their value (as if they were an installation in an art_
While some researchers have explored ways of challenging the power relationship between adults and children through adopting the role of ‘least-adult’ (Mandell, 1988), others recognise power as ‘inherent to research [and thus] emphasised that research is a practice that is part of social life rather than an external contemplation of it’ (Christensen 2004, 166). Christensen sees power as embedded in the process of ‘doing’ research (2004). The presence of power between adult researchers and children is different from those between two adults. I am interested here in exploring relational closeness with children in a school setting. Such relational closeness acknowledges the place of power within our relationships with children. Drawing upon Christensen’s (2004) view, for me power does not rest within categories such as adult or child, but sits within ‘the social representations of these that we make, negotiate, work out and work with in social life’ (2004, pg. 167). She advocates becoming a ‘strange’ adult, who is seriously interested in understanding how the social world looks from children’s perspectives but without making a dubious attempt to be a child... [This] requires a shift towards engaging with children’s own cultures of communication, including the context and timing of communication, which are often key to this process’ (Christensen 2004, pg. 174).

I will explore how the closeness that Christensen is alluding to challenges the traditional power-hierarchies between adults and children. However, it is possible that through ‘thoughtful consideration children and adults may enter into joyous, intersubjective, meaningful relationships’ (Lahman 2008, pg. 282) which escape the tendency to ‘other’ children. I suggest that as the researcher develops close relationships with the children, power also plays an important part in how the children sustain this relationship and their sense of its authenticity. Children seemed to utilise strategies of power in an attempt to assess the trustworthiness of my relationship with them. For example, children actively pushed the traditional boundaries that guide how they relate to adult teachers, in their engagements with me. I felt they were trying to gauge what kind of adult I was by creating opportunities for me to take a disciplinary role.

Christensen and Prout (2002) also reflect upon a similar ethical dilemma of research with children - ‘during the first few weeks in the school setting some children had tested out
the authenticity of [the researcher’s] promise of not repeating their words by expressing views or behaving in ways that the teachers might find problematic or would even condemn’ (pg. 486). They suggested that the children were trying to find out whether or not their behaviour would be reported back to teachers. In my own research, I felt the children did not view me as they did their teacher. For example, on one occasion I was asked by a teacher to request that the children return to class, one girl who was resistant to leave told her friend ‘Lisa doesn’t care’. This girl’s comment represents her awareness of my resistance to discipline her behaviour according to the teacher’s expectations. Mayall (2000) suggests becoming an ‘unusual’ type of adult in order to engage with children. However, as an unusual adult I found myself drawn into ethical dilemmas. For example, at times children would make conversation with me, an adult, as a way of avoiding a request given to them by their teacher. In these situations, I suggested that the children listen to their teacher, while also feeling concerned that not listening in these moments may influence my relationships with the children.

These situations conflicted with my sense that it was important to engage with children when they asked me to. I wanted to respond to their invitations for me to participate in their world. However, I did find myself at times in popular demand. The children’s engagements with me were reflective of much broader social hierarchies amongst children. It seemed important to the children to make an impression upon me and be accepted by me. The children responded in a similar way when a new girl joined their class part way through the project. Girls described their eagerness to become her ‘best friend’. However, the children’s attempts to build an allegiance with me was sometimes at a cost to others. Some children told me that their friends had said that I did not like them and would ask me if this was true. While others would publicly exclude particular children from our games. I felt implicated in children’s construction of social hierarchies. James (1996) describes a similar form of participation, ‘as I watched and listened to the children interacting with one another and with me, they literally enacted for me (and for each other) the structuring processes through which their friendships are given form and meaning’ (pg. 314).

In my research I found myself situated between children’s and adults’ starkly contrasting social practices. At the school adults felt that it was their role to intervene in children’s social practices, including the ways they managed their relationships with their peers. For example, one of the teachers I spoke to felt that it was important, when in conversation with children to ‘refer back if I can to what we’ve talked about previously and always remind them of these strategies and techniques’. Later in the interview he suggests that
the children’s role is to try and engage with these strategies and techniques, for example to ‘try and put themselves in that calm place to, at least try and use some of these count to ten, or try to understand what’s causing the other person to be upset’. When children seemed to be experiencing uncomfortable emotions, I felt an obligation to intervene. At times I did so, for example on one occasion I invited an excluded child to join a game I was playing with other children. However, my emotional engagements with children seemed to have a different quality to those between teachers and children. For example, I found it important to listen attentively to children as they were sharing their stories. Through her ethnographic research with children, Christensen (2004) describes how she ‘became aware of the importance of ‘looking and listening’ when the children asked me to. I developed a determination not to let myself be interrupted by something or somebody else’. She suggests that this is ‘a practice that often runs contrary to institutional assumptions that talk between adults takes precedence over talk with children’ (Christensen 2004, pg. 169). I also continued to listen to a child even when our conversations were interrupted by adults. I found that my focus upon children sometimes meant that my conversations with children would take precedence over conversations with adults. If I was in conversation with an adult but a child wanted to ask me something, I found myself asking the adult to wait while I listened to the child’s question. As I built relationships with children I experienced an uneasiness from teachers, who suggested that I ‘just step back and observe’ because this would be ‘fascinating’. On reflection, I wonder if I could have responded to the teacher’s unease in better ways. Perhaps, I could have explained the rationale behind my research approach, which is that understanding children’s lives involves participating with them in their lives.

While Lahman (2008) argues that ‘even the most understanding, sensitive, early childhood researcher cannot fully achieve a relationship that is not Othered, between adult and child, researched and researcher due to inherent differences’ (pg. 286), I do think it is possible to establish meaningful (but not power free) relationships with children when power dynamics are addressed. Nutbrown (2011) suggests that ‘children’s words, drawings, and images as well as the children themselves can become the objects of research if dynamics of power are not recognized, acknowledged, and addressed’ (pg. 7). She argues that researchers see children as ‘otherwise’ - as holding ‘a different kind of wisdom’ (pg. 11). The perspective that engaging with children wisdom(s) should be central to the endeavours of childhood researchers also resonates with my position that children should be engaged as critical and reflexive partners in the research process. Within this position I also found it important to recognise that interpersonal power was a
dynamic process present within relationships (Proctor 2002), I was therefore interested in the ways that interpersonal power would ebb and flow between me and the children as our encounters within the school unfolded. Within this study I found that my attempts to relinquish children’s possible perceptions that I had ‘institutional power’, by taking the role of an ‘unusual adult’ (Christensen 2004), often placed me within difficult terrain. In seeking to build professional relationships with adults and close relationships with children I was confronted by a range of ethical dilemmas regarding my research practice. For Christensen (2004), being ‘a different sort of adult ... inevitably involves a delicate balance between acting as a ‘responsible adult’ and maintaining the special position built up over a period of time. In everyday routines this is not too difficult to accomplish but it can be testing in some circumstances’ (pg. 174). I found the balance between being a responsible adult and maintaining a special position particularly difficult during research workshops when I was confronted with decisions about whether to step in or to step out of situations as they were unfolding. My approaches were sometimes also met with caution by teachers who were concerned that the children lacked respect for me as an authority adult.

Methods

Above I explored notions of power in research with children. I argued that power relationships are dynamic. Therefore, I do not think that power resides with the one individual over another. In research with children I suggested that power dynamics are negotiated by both the adult researcher and young participants. Therefore, I advocate building meaningful relationships with children. In Methods A:2.1. (turn to pg. 66) I examine this further from the perspective of children’s voice. I suggest that in research with children we need to look beyond the notion that children have a singular voice. Rather I suggest that children have multiple voices, that can only be understood within the context in which they are expressed.

In order to engage with children’s emotional experiences, which I suggested can be difficult to communicate verbally, I used visual and material research methods. Above I suggested that such methods are increasingly used within research with children as they are seen to be ‘child-friendly’. However, in assuming that such methods will appeal to children, we may be at risk of developing methods that are relevant to some children and not others. In Methods B:2.4. (turn to pg. 138) I argue in favour of developing flexible research methods that provide opportunities for children to share their perspectives in ways that they feel comfortable.
In the above section I suggested that children’s emotional lives are difficult to capture in words. This is specifically relevant to a SEAL school, where a particular language and vocabulary is adopted for talking about emotion. Therefore, I argued that visual and material methods open up alternative ways of considering emotion. In Methods C:2.2. (turn to pg. 193) I draw upon video-data to show how this can be analysed in ways which aid our understanding of children’s socio-emotional practices.
Methods Exploratory B: Research Practice

Methods Exploratory B examines the practical aspects of the research process. This includes ethical considerations (Methods B:1). Ethical practice was an important aspect of this research, which is reflected in the amount of space allocated to the discussion of ethics in this thesis. I focus upon identifying the research site and working with research participants, and in particular how I framed the research and built research relationships. This exploratory also looks at the research design and the development of research methods (Methods B:2). I wanted the research design to be flexible in order to respond to the field and its participants. I therefore reflect upon how the research methods were extended and developed in collaboration with the research participants.

2. Spatial Research: visual, material and dialogical methods

Research Stages

This section provides an overview of the fieldwork process and the various research stages in the field. The research process responded to the field, research participants and emerging research findings.

Fieldwork began with a series of participant observations to engage with a wide range of school activities involving Year 5 children. The aim was to get a sense of how the children participated in and negotiated all aspects of school life. I also wanted to engage with the history of SEAL at the school, how it had been applied and developed since it was initiated in 2005.

As I anticipated, SEAL was not just a lesson scheduled in each week to talk about emotions. Rather, it had been embedded across the school, and the influence of SEAL could be found in almost every aspect of school life. This initial stage enabled me to make sense of where and how SEAL and its accompanying discourses could be found in practice. I also spent a lot of time getting to know the children through participating in activities with them, for example dining with them at lunchtime, joining in their games at break times, making artworks with them during art lessons. I also spent time getting to know the staff, predominantly through sitting and chatting with them in the staff room.
After a series of participant observations over a three week period I began to narrow my focus (see Methods B:2.2 for details of the participant observations) . At this stage in the research process I was particularly interested in methods of monitoring and assessing emotion, children’s role in these systems and children’s perception of the rationale behind them. I conducted semi-structured interviews with the SEAL coordinator, the Y5 teacher and head teacher, in order to build upon these interests further. These interviews helped to contextualise my observations and emerging questions by connecting the practices I had seen with the specific agendas and aspirations, values and beliefs held by different actors at the school (these interviews are described in Methods B:2.3).

In the first stage of the research, I became increasingly interested in the ways that children were instructed by adults to use the school’s spaces as a tool for managing particular feelings. I also noticed that children could be seen to be reclaiming spaces through their outward expression of emotion. For example, a boy would spin excitedly on a swivel chair while working in the library and in doing so he contested the adult notion that a library should be a calm space for calm bodies. Building on from these observations, the participatory research with children sought to explore the interplay between children's socio-emotional practices and the production of space. Soon after the interviews were completed, the participatory research began with a series of den-building workshops. I selected a group of nine children to take part in these workshops. The children named their research group as ‘The SEAL squad’. The aim of the workshops was to give children an opportunity to describe, in their own way, their experiences and perceptions of SEAL. The children were also given a video-camera to film the workshops. There was one video camera amongst he group and so the children who wanted to use the camera took it in turns to do some filming. The intention was to begin with an introductory workshop, at which the children would familiarise themselves with the resources available and the techniques they could use to construct a den to describe their experiences and record the workshops. However, the children took to the method very quickly and were so pleased with the den they had created in the one and half hour workshop, that I considered it as the first research workshop. The children then participated in an analysis workshop, at which I presented edited video footage from the first workshop to prompt conversations and engage with their views about the different parts of the den and what they represented. This was followed by an assembly presentation led by the young participants to share their research process with the wider school community. The cycle of three workshops - building, analysis and sharing - took place over one half-term. The children participated in two more cycles over two half-
terms. The aim was for each cycle of workshops to concentrate upon one particular aspect of SEAL, chosen by the children. The first set of workshops focused upon school reward systems and the children created a physical representation of a weekly assembly called ‘Sparkle and Shine’. The theme of the second and third workshops were chosen by the children and focused upon ‘Bullying’ and ‘Making New Friends’ respectively.

Over the duration of the workshops I continued to observe Y5 activities. However, I increasingly became more selective about the activities and sites that I observed as research themes emerged through the workshops with the children. The observations enabled me to continue to relate the children’s stories from the workshops to their everyday practices at the school. The children also asked to conduct interviews with their peers, which they recorded with ‘Flip’ video cameras. This footage was edited by the children in a week-long lunchtime editing club and shared at a celebratory film screening event for the children. These activities prompted some of the children to write and direct their own plays. These were captured on the video cameras and incorporated into the films or performed at the whole-school assemblies. In addition, a scrapbook making club was established for children from Y5 who wanted to participate in the research but were not part of the SEAL squad (all of the participatory research methods developed with

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week beg.</th>
<th>Observation Schedule</th>
<th>Workshop Schedule</th>
<th>Assembly/Feedback Schedule</th>
<th>Interview Schedule</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17 Oct 2010</td>
<td>Observations x 2 (Y5)</td>
<td>Meeting with workshop participants –uely (240) &amp; workshop assistants (240)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Oct 2010</td>
<td>Observations x 2 (Y5)</td>
<td>Analysis workshop 2b</td>
<td>Analysis workshop 2b (Intro to movie maker)</td>
<td>Interview with seal coordinator</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Oct 2010</td>
<td>Observations x 2 (Y5)</td>
<td>Meeting with workshop participants</td>
<td>Group interview with Y5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Nov 2010</td>
<td>Observations x 2 (Y5)</td>
<td>Analysis Workshop 1c</td>
<td>Analysis Workshop 1c (School Mission)</td>
<td>Interview with Head</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Nov 2010</td>
<td>Observations x 2 (Y5)</td>
<td>Meeting with workshop participants</td>
<td>Group interview with Y5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Nov 2010</td>
<td>Observations x 2 (Y5)</td>
<td>Meeting with workshop participants</td>
<td>Group interview with Y5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Dec 2010</td>
<td>Observations x 2 (Y5)</td>
<td>Meeting with workshop participants</td>
<td>Group interview with Y5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Dec 2010</td>
<td>Observations x 2 (Y5)</td>
<td>Meeting with workshop participants</td>
<td>Group interview with Y5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Dec 2010</td>
<td>Observations x 2 (Y5)</td>
<td>Meeting with workshop participants</td>
<td>Group interview with Y5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Jan 2011</td>
<td>Observations x 2 (Y5)</td>
<td>Meeting with workshop participants</td>
<td>Group interview with Y5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Jan 2011</td>
<td>Observations x 2 (Y5)</td>
<td>Meeting with workshop participants</td>
<td>Group interview with Y5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Jan 2011</td>
<td>Observations x 2 (Y5)</td>
<td>Meeting with workshop participants</td>
<td>Group interview with Y5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Feb 2011</td>
<td>Observations x 2 (Y5)</td>
<td>Meeting with workshop participants</td>
<td>Group interview with Y5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Feb 2011</td>
<td>Observations x 2 (Y5)</td>
<td>Meeting with workshop participants</td>
<td>Group interview with Y5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Feb 2011</td>
<td>Observations x 2 (Y5)</td>
<td>Meeting with workshop participants</td>
<td>Group interview with Y5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Feb 2011</td>
<td>Observations x 2 (Y5)</td>
<td>Meeting with workshop participants</td>
<td>Group interview with Y5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 April 2011</td>
<td>Observations x 2 (Y5)</td>
<td>Analysis Workshop 1c</td>
<td>Analysis Workshop 1c (School Mission)</td>
<td>Interview with Head</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 April 2011</td>
<td>Observations x 2 (Y5)</td>
<td>Analysis Workshop 1c</td>
<td>Analysis Workshop 1c (School Mission)</td>
<td>Interview with Head</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 April 2011</td>
<td>Observations x 2 (Y5)</td>
<td>Analysis Workshop 1c</td>
<td>Analysis Workshop 1c (School Mission)</td>
<td>Interview with Head</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 April 2011</td>
<td>Observations x 2 (Y5)</td>
<td>Analysis Workshop 1c</td>
<td>Analysis Workshop 1c (School Mission)</td>
<td>Interview with Head</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 April 2011</td>
<td>Observations x 2 (Y5)</td>
<td>Analysis Workshop 1c</td>
<td>Analysis Workshop 1c (School Mission)</td>
<td>Interview with Head</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 8: Data collection schedule
The findings from the workshops with the young participants were shared with school staff at regular intervals throughout the research process using short interim reports, see Appendix E for interim reports. These reports were used as a research tool, as they provided an opportunity for feedback from school leaders and teachers. I also found that the act of writing the reports helped me to connect my research to practice and also ensure the situatedness of my analysis within the places of the school and its members. At the end of the fieldwork and analysis the school received a final report. This report was discussed with school leaders and teachers at the school.

From the outset of the doctoral study I have had a keen interest in the bridging of research with practice and have therefore created a range of opportunities for this research to be disseminated to children, young people and practitioners. The research has been shared at an event as part of the ESRC Festival of Social Sciences entitled ‘Children, Young People and Research’. Here the children involved in my research presented the research process to children and young people, policy-makers, educational practitioners and researchers. In addition, I have produced a poster to share the research findings with a young audience entitled, ‘The Invisible Boy: exploring anger and exclusion in a primary school’ (see Appendix G). The final project report has also been disseminated to educational researchers and practitioners regionally and nationally.

The section above has outlined the research stages. As mentioned I began the fieldwork with a series of participant observations. I suggested that this helped to familiarise me with the field site. I also stated that the participant observations helped to refine the focus of the research. These aspects of the observations are described in more depth in Methods B:2.2. (turn to pg. 123) I also explore how my attention shifted over the course of the observations, from an initial focus upon emotion management to considering the emotional dynamics of children’s friendships.

After the participant observations, I conducted semi-structured interviews with the SEAL coordinator, the Y5 teacher and head teacher to further consider the ways that children’s emotions were monitored and assessed at the school. Above I suggested that these interviews further contextualised my observations. In Methods B:2.3. (turn to pg. 130) I describe how the interviews responded to the findings that had emerged through the participant observations. In addition, I consider how power dynamics shape the interview process.
The above section has stated that the participant observations and structured interviews gave rise to research themes that attended to the role of emotion in the ways that children were instructed by adults to use the school’s spaces and also how children seemed to produce new identities for these spaces. The next stage of research aimed to consider these themes in more depth by engaging with children’s perspectives. In Methods B:2.4 (turn to pg. 138) I describe in detail the participatory research conducted with children. This includes den-building workshops, focus groups, assemblies, filmmaking and scrapbook workshops.
Methods Exploratory B: **Research Practice**

Methods Exploratory B examines the practical aspects of the research process. This includes ethical considerations (Methods B:1). Ethical practice was an important aspect of this research, which is reflected in the amount of space allocated to the discussion of ethics in this thesis. I focus upon identifying the research site and working with research participants, and in particular how I framed the research and built research relationships. This exploratory also looks at the research design and the development of research methods (Methods B:2). I wanted the research design to be flexible in order to respond to the field and its participants. I therefore reflect upon how the research methods were extended and developed in collaboration with the research participants.

2. **Spatial Research: visual, material and dialogical methods**

**Participant Observation: Experiencing children’s places**

> ‘*I am actively intervening, I needed to be conscious of how and to what extent I should be participating without treading on toes, and at the same time support my own needs and aspirations for the research*’ (Research Journal, 30th September 2010)

My approach to participant observations was reflexive and responsive. The observations offered an opportunity to engage with the children and what was meaningful and significant to them. I participated in school life by following the children's lead, waiting for their invitations to participate. I was purposefully unassuming about what I may glean from the participant observations. Initially I found I was drawn to the ways that children’s emotions were managed within the classroom context. I paid particular attention to how space was used by teachers and children to manage emotion. Over time my attention shifted. I became interested in the emotional dynamics of children’s friendships. As the children interacted with me and involved me in their social worlds, they, as James has also noted, ‘literally enacted for me (and for each other) the structuring processes through which their friendships are given form and meaning’ (James 1996, pg. 314). A reflexive
critique of my experiences, and particularly emotional experiences, as a participant observer was an important part of understanding the role of emotions in children’s constructions of their friendships. This focus emerged through the process of participating in school life and the dimensions of the children’s experiences that I was drawn to. In revisiting the fieldnotes after fieldwork had ended I found myself interested in the moments when children’s emotions seemed significant to their construction of meaning as they interacted in an with the spaces of the school. This section outlines the changing role of observations in my research. I will reflect upon the process of ‘inscribing’ (Geertz 1973) my fieldwork experiences through fieldnotes. The section highlights the significance of my actions and practices in the field site upon the research process.

The approach to participant observation I used was informed by interactionist and interpretivist understandings which frame ethnographic methodologies. Through observing and participating in children’s activities I engaged in their interactions with people and places and through doing so began to understand their life-worlds. My approach was influenced by Emmerson at al (1995) who state that:

... in order to fully understand and appreciate action from the perspective of participants, one must get close to and participate in a wide cross-section of their everyday activities over an extended period of time… Indeed, it is exactly this deep immersion – and the sense of place that such immersion assumes and strengthens – that enables the ethnographer to inscribe … detailed, context-sensitive, and locally informed fieldnotes (pg. 10).

An important aspect for me in this approach has been the process of building relationships. I paid particular attention to how the children facilitate the process of coming to know me, as they invited me to participate in their world, make decisions about what they felt was important to tell me or involved me in negotiations with adults.

Engaging with the children’s active encounters is giving me clues as to what is significant to the children. I also find that I am gaining an awareness of how children call upon what is meaningful to them as they negotiate such encounters (Research Journal, November 2010).

At the same time, I recorded these encounters within the context of space and produced diagrams to show where children were located within different spaces and physical features that impacted upon how they occupied the space (see Fig. 9). I also took photographs of objects directly relating to emotion within the space, predominantly signs.
I also noted how children moved through their surroundings. I was curious about the changing patterns of children’s interactions, (including those with me, their peers and school staff), in different spaces of the school. Attending to these different dimensions of experience I felt brought me closer to what Emmerson et al (1995) describe as ‘deep immersion’.

The ethnographer seeks a deeper immersion in others’ worlds in order to grasp what they experience as meaningful and important. With immersion, the field researcher sees from the inside how people lead their lives, how they carry out their daily rounds of activities, what they find meaningful, and how they do so... Immersion in ethnographic research, then, involves both being with other people to see how they respond to events as they happen and experiencing for oneself these events and the circumstances that give rise to them. (Emmerson et al 1995, pg 2)

In the early stages of the research I observed and participated in a wide range of children’s everyday school activities. These included a range of SEAL activities (whole-school assemblies, in-class activities such as circle time, out of class activities such as peer-mediation or school council) and other activities across different school spaces such as the dining hall, staff-room, playground or classroom. In addition, I accompanied children for part of a week-long residential trip to an outdoor pursuits centre. As I became a part of school life, I also became aware of the tensions that my presence created.

The perception of ‘observations’ in school is strongly associated with assessment and methods used in teacher training or by school inspectors. To make the observations seem less daunting, I framed them as ‘having a look at what is happening’ and ‘getting to know the children’, while stating clearly that my focus was upon the children’s interactions and not the quality
of teaching. However, the teacher seems to have been uncomfortable with my presence, often apologising for his ‘car crash’ lessons, or explaining that I shouldn’t expect to see anything special at the start of term, rather teaching at this stage in the academic year is all about ‘crowd control’. I shared his nervousness too. I was conscious that my presence was a distraction to the children. They found my role – which focused upon them – as something very exciting. Children were eager to explain to me how things worked in their school. However, their explanations would often come at times when the teacher wanted them to listen. Sometimes the children seemed to engage me in conversation at moments when they wanted to bypass the teacher’s directions. The teacher was also clear that he wanted to ‘use me as a teaching assistant’ to the children. He also, for example, let me know that it would be OK for me to discipline the children, i.e. if I witnessed something that I did not approve of, he often encouraged me to take a more authoritative role with the children (Research Journal, November 2010).

The differences between the ways that the teacher and children drew on me as a resource created tensions regarding my role within the class. My understanding of the role of the ‘ethnographic researcher’ was distinctly different to the teacher’s desire for me to assist in the delivery of his lessons. I felt concerned about my presence in the classroom, I did not want to make things difficult for the teacher and gave considerable attention in regards to when I should step in and when not to, in order to reinforce his classroom expectations. I felt that I had to learn to negotiate these classroom rules. Pink (2009) suggests that as researchers we should attend to our own emplacement during research and that doing so is epistemologically productive. Therefore reflecting upon how I learnt to ‘fit-in’ while still wanting to maintain a presence as a ‘strange adult’ (Christensen 2004), was an important component of my fieldnotes and subsequent analysis.

The act of reflection was an integral part of my fieldnote writing process. My field journal was used in two ways, to first write descriptive accounts of my experiences and observations, but also to write reflexive accounts exploring my emplacement at the school. The fieldnotes produced during the first three months of participant observations were primarily descriptive. I drew upon Carspecken’s (1996) notion of ‘thick descriptions’ in my writing of these initial fieldnotes. These are descriptions that 'capture a lot of detail' (Carspecken 1996, pg 46) and include speech acts, body movements, and body postures. He also outlines methods he used when he writes up fieldnotes, including providing contextual information at the start of fieldnotes, highlighting verbatim speech.
acts in italics, using a low-inference vocabulary, using brackets to signify observer comments and providing simple diagrams to capture rooms layouts and positioning of people (pg. 46). During fieldwork I used a notebook to make ‘jottings’ (Atkinson and Hammersley 2010); these were rarely taken during the participant observations, and were instead taken when I was on my own away from both teachers and children. On the occasions when I chose to take jottings during observations, I found that teachers would sometimes seem uncomfortable. In addition, children would want to know what I was making a note of and seemed concerned if they thought I was writing about them. In attempting to follow the method of writing fieldnotes outlined by Carspecken (1996), I found that I became anxious about writing ‘good’ fieldnotes. Therefore I began incorporating reflexive accounts within my fieldnotes, in order to use the act of writing fieldnotes as a means of defining my research focus. I began to experiment with different ways of writing fieldnotes. Punch (2012) suggests that ‘field diaries’, which capture the ‘emotional, practical and personal challenges’ of fieldwork, are important to the processes of interpreting the data and writing-up the research. She argues that these dimensions of fieldwork are often missed in methodological accounts as they are perceived to be unscholarly. For her, ‘a possible way forward ... is to consider a more explicit and systematic use of field diaries. Recording and analysing field diaries may enable some researches to scrutinise their personal challenges and emotions in relation to the research process as well as the ways in which they may shape interpretations of the data generated’ (pg. 87). Punch sees the field diary as distinct from fieldnotes based on observations. In contrast, my field journal interwove descriptive and reflexive accounts of fieldwork.

It is important for me describe my activities in the field. This includes reflecting upon how I make decisions about what I do and do not do, which I have found are often guided by my emotional response to situations. I am finding it useful to consider the emotional dimensions of fieldwork...

Descriptions of children’s emotions are also an important component of my fieldnotes. However, these descriptions are based upon my interpretations of their movements, use of language, facial expressions, etc. Over time, I hope to seek ways to engage with the children’s descriptions of their own emotional responses in relation to others (Research Journal, November 2010).

Engaging analytically with emotion is particularly complex. As Bondi et al (2005) state, ‘clearly, our emotions matter ... the emotional geographies of our lives are dynamic ... whether joyful, heartbreaking or numbing, emotion has the power to transform the shape
of our lives, expanding or contracting our horizons, creating new fissures or fistures we never expected to find ... how do we articulate and negotiate such complex emotional landscapes?’ (pg. 1). Within the school setting, the children seemed to understand emotion within the context of an explicit curriculum. I soon became aware that the language through which children spoke to adults about their emotional experiences reflected that of the curriculum. To develop these ideas further I proposed two classroom based workshops to the teacher. He felt that these could take the slot of his allocated SEAL lessons. The first workshop aimed to further examine children’s understandings of the ‘Feeling Barometer’ scale. Each morning and afternoon during registration children would score themselves between numbers 1 and 10 to articulate how they were feeling. In order to access this, I created worksheets for the children to complete (see Fig. 10 for an example). These included a number between 1 and 10. Next to the number the children were asked to describe a situation that would make somebody that number. The worksheet also included space for them to draw a picture of this situation.

![Figure 10: Example of the worksheet used in the first classroom based workshop](image)

![Figure 11: Example of the worksheet used in the second classroom based workshop](image)

The second classroom workshop was framed around a model-making activity. Children were asked to create out of Plastecine the people and objects of the Sparkle and Shine awards assemblies. These assemblies happened every Monday and awards were given to children who had been nominated by their classroom teacher. One child was nominated from each class. Once the children had built their model, they were asked to fill in a card
for each figure of a person they included in their model (see Fig. 11 for an example of this card). This card prompted the child to write down who they were and what they were both doing and feeling during the Sparkle and Shine assembly.

While the ways that children made meaning of the SEAL curriculum was important, I also became interested in the many moments when children’s expression of emotion, whether through words, gesture or movement, did not seem to correspond so easily with these understandings of the curricula objectives. It seemed therefore that the children’s emotional lives were not simply shaped by the SEAL curriculum as I had at first supposed. The focus of the participant observations changed after around one-month into fieldwork, I became intrigued as to what was made possible for children as they seemed to express emotion in particular ways. I was curious as to how children’s expression of emotion seemed to be tailored towards who else was present and the space they were in, thus shedding light on the role of emotion in the ways that children negotiated school life.

The fieldwork began with participant observations. As mentioned in the section above the classroom teacher seemed nervous about the prospect of being observed. He asked to meet to discuss my initial observations at the end of the first week of observations. This initial meeting with the classroom teacher and SEAL coordinator prompted regular meetings over the duration of the research. The role that these meetings played in the development of the research is explored in Methods B:2.3. In this section I also describe my approach to interviews and focus groups with adults and how these were used to inform the research findings.

The section above has described my approach to participant observations and the role this method has played in making sense of the fieldsite. The role of these observations changed over the course of fieldwork. This also impacted upon the approach I took to writing fieldnotes. I reflected upon the way that I documented children’s expression of emotion, by focusing upon words, gestures and movements in social interactions. The ways that these observations have influenced my findings is demonstrated in Edges b:1. where I explore children’s emotion talk. Here I suggest that children learn a particular language for understanding and talking about emotion that actually distances them from their lived experiencing.
Methods Exploratory B: Research Practice

Methods Exploratory B examines the practical aspects of the research process. This includes ethical considerations (Methods B:1). Ethical practice was an important aspect of this research, which is reflected in the amount of space allocated to the discussion of ethics in this thesis. I focus upon identifying the research site and working with research participants, and in particular how I framed the research and built research relationships. This exploratory also looks at the research design and the development of research methods (Methods B:2). I wanted the research design to be flexible in order to respond to the field and its participants. I therefore reflect upon how the research methods were extended and developed in collaboration with the research participants.

2. Spatial Research: visual, material and dialogical methods

Engaging with Adult Perspectives: Interviews and focus groups

This section outlines how I engaged with adult perspectives during fieldwork. This included a series of interviews with the Headteacher, SEAL coordinator and Year 5 teacher in the early stages of the fieldwork process. I will show how simple tasks within a semi-structured interview format helped to provide richer data than questions alone. This section also shows how both formal and informal meetings with adults helped to shape the research findings. They provided an opportunity to discuss the emerging research findings with adults. I will suggest that these meetings grounded my findings, connecting them back to the school setting and the perspectives of adults. In the final part of this section, I will draw upon fieldnotes from one of these meetings to explore how relational power dynamics are negotiated by different actors. Hoffman (2007) suggest that power shifts in interviews and focus groups are themselves important data. She states that ‘the interviewer’s performance of emotional labour demonstrates the power of the interviewee within the interview relations’ (pg. 325). I will draw upon this view in order to give value to the meeting’s emotional landscape and show how engaging with this can provide an insight into relational power dynamics.
a) Using tasks during semi-structured interviews

After six weeks of observing the Year 5 class across a range of activities throughout the school day, I interviewed the headteacher, SEAL coordinator and Year 5 teacher. The interview questions were framed to engage with their understandings of the rationale behind SEAL. I also asked questions that related to the themes emerging from the observations (see Appendix B for the interview schedule). The overarching aim of the interviews was to connect these observations with the specific agendas, aspirations, values and beliefs held by members of staff including those in leadership and practitioner roles. At the time of conducting the interviews, I was particularly interested in the discourses that adults drew on to make sense of children’s emotional experiences. The school used a technique called the ‘Feeling Barometer’ to measure children’s subjective well-being. The scores given by children to rate how they were feeling were monitored and reviewed by the SEAL coordinator and children with consistently low scores might be seen as needing some support. During the interviews, I gave the interviewees two sets of fictional scores (see Fig. 12) and said that these were the scores given by two children over a period of a week. These scores were fictional. I asked the interviewees to describe what they thought may be going on for the child in the two scenarios. In addition, I asked how the school would respond in these two situations. This task allowed the interviewees to talk quite freely about their understanding of emotion in relation to children. I found that the task supported a conversational and non-confrontational interview approach. The introduction of the tasks seemed to change the nature of the interview. Within different interviews I chose to do the task at different times, and connected it to what we were discussing. Also, the task was a way in to many of the questions. The questions I had prepared were examined in our discussion, but I rarely had to ask the questions directly.

b) Developing research findings in conversation with adults

Before starting fieldwork, I had planned to share, discuss and develop the emerging findings with adults at the school. However, I had not expected this process to be initiated by the Year 5 teacher. After the first week of participant observations he asked me to share my initial reflections. I agreed to do so and this created opportunities for further reflective conversations about the research. Some of these were spontaneous and others were arranged in advance to discuss the interim and final research reports I produced during the study. The formal meetings involved the SEAL coordinator and Year 5 teacher. The Headteacher also attended some of these meetings. I saw these meetings as an
opportunity to gain an insight into their perspectives on the children’s experiences. Their perspectives, which at times differed from my own, helped me to understand the context in which this research was situated, as the quote below from my research journal reflects.

My views as to the implications of the findings seemed to sit in tension with those of school leaders and teachers. Therefore, I had to find ways to disseminate the research findings in ways that they would want to hear and understand. I drew upon the language used by educators to communicate where I was coming from. Over time I began to integrate academic terminology (such as ‘emotional labour’ or ‘feeling rules’) to illustrate key theories from the field of the sociology of emotions. I found it important to ensure these terms were well-defined, and once understood they were important in framing concepts for considering emotions from a sociological perspective as well as a psychological one within the school. Over the course of the research, I noticed a shift in the ways that the members of staff engaged with the research findings. For example, in a discussion about the final report the SEAL coordinator and Year 5 teacher began to critically explore how they prioritise children who express their emotions in certain ways.

Figure 12: Feeling barometer task

‘Writing the interim reports and meeting with staff members to discuss them are proving to be very helpful. They keep me grounded; both allow me to reconnect with the places and people that constitute the school. This stops me from getting caught up in my own biases and judgements’ (Research Journal, January 2011).
‘I felt the SEAL coordinator was beginning to question the rationale behind rewarding those children who express in emotions in certain ways, and particularly for roles such as School Council member. She also suggested that the SEAL curriculum perhaps implies that ‘emotional crisis’ has status and that children ‘get something out of having a need’. The Year 5 teacher, Mike, felt that perhaps there are times when children just need to ‘shut-up and get on with it’, and this was in response to the findings which show that children’s disputes seem to serve a social role, and reflect how the children are learning to negotiate the complex power relations that are embedded within school life’ (Fieldnotes, June 2012).

The extract above follows a discussion about how vulnerable identities are increasingly valued within contemporary society, and how this might shape children’s subjectivities. The SEAL coordinator reflects upon how emotional crises are given status. The teacher’s solution to this over-attention is to be much more relaxed about children’s emotional experiences. These responses seem to reflect the more widespread question of whether schools should or should not engage with children’s emotions. For example, Furedi (2009) argues that the values underpinning education today, which he suggests are predominantly emotional and social, need to change and that ‘schools need to be orientated towards the task of providing subject-based knowledge to children’ (pg. 215). This way of thinking about knowledge and emotion as binary opposites was also reflected later in the same meeting.

‘The SEAL coordinator felt that parents think that their child ‘should be happy all the time’ and ‘don’t want to displease their child’, and at the same time some children ‘want closure on every issue’. These were positioned as challenging issues facing teachers who found themselves being expected on the one hand by parents to take the role of the ‘bad cop’ and by children to have a role where they always ‘meet their needs’. They felt that these challenges sometimes took away from their role as a teacher, because it takes up so much time to work with children in a way that considers their emotions’ (Fieldnotes, June 2012).

However, I would argue that emotions have always been implicated within schooling, and that we need to pay attention to how emotions work within schools and the implications of this for children. The responses from school leaders and teachers to my findings have helped me to consider how I disseminate the findings to those working within education.
For example, a finding might be that ‘at the school, engaging with children’s emotions is viewed by some teachers as separate to the act of teaching subject knowledge’. In doing so, I am drawing attention to a way of thinking about emotion and knowledge that can be taken for granted within schools. This example demonstrates why it is important to engage school leaders and teachers in the development of research findings. New findings were generated from drawing upon the insider understandings which were available to school members as they made sense of the ways that I had interpreted the children’s experiences. It is through these conversations that I became aware of what I was taking for granted in the way that I interpreted and represented the research.

c) Engaging with emotional landscapes

Here I explore the relational power dynamics during these meetings. I draw upon fieldnotes from the first meeting to suggest that reflecting upon and through my own emotion can be helpful to understanding these relational power dynamics. For example, Blee (1998) suggests that while researchers may try to develop a rapport with research participants through drawing upon emotions, ‘respondents may [also] attempt to create emotional dynamics that serve their strategic interests’ (pg. 395). I will pay particular attention to my own nervousness which seemed to be present during many of my engagements with the educational professionals at the school and speculate on what this reveals about these relationships.

At the start of fieldwork the Year 5 teacher asked if I could share some of my reflections from the first week of observations. I felt that he wanted some reassurance from me. He seemed nervous about having me observe his lessons, even though I had tried to emphasise that my focus would be upon the children and their interactions. We arranged to meet over lunch. Prior to the meeting I prepared a spider diagram to capture some of my areas of interest (see Fig. 13).

*We sit in a small room next to the canteen. The SEAL coordinator tells the Year 5 teacher that this week we are doing ‘Friendship Tokens’ - and she reminds him to use this language with the children. She tells me that the Y6’s are being trained for ‘Peer-Mediation’ – explaining that this is something that they were very keen to do. Next year, she explains, the Y5’s will be trained too. I show them both the spider diagram of where I am at so far. I explain that I have focused my attention on the children’s interactions and*
relations, and their actions and choices - what I have noticed seems to share some common ground in that they are all ‘Techniques … for being Healthy and Happy’. Some of these techniques – I state that I am not sure if this is the right word yet – are initiated by the school or by children themselves...

(Fieldnotes, September 2010)

The start of the meeting seems to reflect how we have come with different agendas. The SEAL coordinator introduces the friendship tokens\(^1\), but this seems to be for my benefit. She then continues to tell me about the peer-mediation scheme\(^2\). Her keenness to communicate what the school is doing seems to be a reflection of her enthusiasm and passion for these initiatives - which she also suggests is shared by the children. She seems to want to stir these same positive feelings in me as she talks about the school. Her positivity shaped the way that our relationships developed over the course of the research and the ways that I interacted with her. I found it very difficult to discuss emotional education from a critical perspective with her. The positive emotional exchanges that took place between us involved the expression of delight, wonderment, excitement and passion in relation to emotional education. These exchanges shaped how I learnt to express emotion within the school more widely. However, at the same time I was wary of the SEAL coordinator’s positivity (perhaps because of the inauthenticity of my own) and this very much shaped how I interpreted not only her responses to questions but also the emotional practices of other school leaders and teachers. I wondered if others experienced the same constraints about what they could and could not say about SEAL.

\[I\text{ start with core values. I say that I am interested in how these will be embedded over time. I then say that I am also interested in rituals (the Year 5 teacher makes a joke about my use of this word – implying the word is inappropriate because of its religious connotations). I say that I am interested in when and how a ritual starts and closes for children – or the idea that there are rituals in rituals. I then move on to reflect upon my}\]

---

\(^1\) At the start of the school year, friendship tokens are rewarded to children who do friendly things, such as opening the door for a member of staff or helping a teacher to carry materials and resources.

\(^2\) Peer-mediators receive conflict resolution training. During breaktimes, they will work in pairs to look out for children in the playground who might be having a disagreement. If they do see a dispute they invite the ‘disputants’ to mediation, during which the peer-mediators ask questions and listen to both parties point of view in order to identify the cause of the dispute. They then work with the disputants to support them to find their own way to resolve the conflict. This is part of a much wider ‘peer-mediation’ scheme that has been developed across primary schools in Sheffield.
curiosity around how language is appropriated by children. The teacher says that he is really interested in this. He explains that he tries to use the children’s words in his lesson, yet he doesn’t want them to use this language in their literacy practice. The SEAL coordinator says that they need to learn when a language is appropriate and another isn’t. The teacher says that he is aware that he sometimes uses adult language by mistake and then he has to explain this (I thought this was a purposeful teaching technique!) I add that I am specifically interested in the language of SEAL - feeling that I need to keep this focus to the conversation. (Fieldnotes, 24th September 2010)

In contrast to the SEAL coordinator, the teacher’s comments communicate a sense of his interest in the research as he relates the research to his own experience. While the teacher draws upon his own experience as a teacher in response to my own interests, I seem to reinforce my own agenda within the conversation. For example, I almost discount the teacher’s interests in children’s language as I reiterate my own interest in how children appropriate SEAL language. I am trying to give my views credence within a meeting that I felt very nervous about. Regardless, his interest in the relationship between my research and his practice seems to continue, and he focuses in particular on the rules of what is appropriate and what is not in teaching practice. For example, he speaks about the
conflicts that he faces as a teacher when he questions whether he should use the children’s language in order to build a relationship with the children but then tell them not to use it in literacy practice. The SEAL coordinator seems to position herself as an advisor to the teacher, and offers a simple solution to his dilemma. She is seen as a SEAL advisor by many members of staff, and the teacher told me that he would often consult her when he was unsure about how best to support children in his class.

From looking back at these fieldnotes it seems that we responded to the meeting in different ways. The SEAL coordinator seemed to act as an advocate for the school and an advisor for the teacher. In addition, the teacher made connections between the research and his practice, but also seemed to seek reassurance about his own practice. I was much more focused upon how I was presenting myself, as an ‘intelligent’ researcher. My priority was to present some insights that were seen to be both useful and interesting and did not appear judgemental. Within the encounter we were each presenting ourselves in different ways, and emotions were embedded within these performances.

The section above has described the role of interviews and meetings with adults at the school within the research process. An important aspect of this doctoral study has been engage with different perspectives. However, this has always been with an emphasis on understanding children’s experiences. The research methods developed to engage with children’s perspectives are explored in Methods B:2.4. (turn to pg. 138). The adults perspectives has helped to understand the children’s accounts as situated within and drawing upon institutional discourses of emotion.

Hoffman (2007) argues that understanding the relational dynamics of interviews ‘enables the researcher to be better equipped to learn more about the interviewee and the topic of the interviews, as well as the interview dynamics’ (pg. 343). In addition, as explained in the section above I found that engaging with the emotional landscape of this meeting supported my own understanding of how social relations are constituted in the specific institutional domain of the SEAL school. From these interviews, I could see the benefit of reflecting on and through my own emotional experiences to support the development of research findings. This later was integral to developing an analytical framework for interpreting research data. This is explored in depth in Methods C:2.1. (turn to pg. 180).
Methods Exploratory B: Research Practice

Methods Exploratory B examines the practical aspects of the research process. This includes ethical considerations (Methods B:1). Ethical practice was an important aspect of this research, which is reflected in the amount of space allocated to the discussion of ethics in this thesis. I focus upon identifying the research site and working with research participants, and in particular how I framed the research and built research relationships. This exploratory also looks at the research design and the development of research methods (Methods B:2). I wanted the research design to be flexible in order to respond to the field and its participants. I therefore reflect upon how the research methods were extended and developed in collaboration with the research participants.

2. Spatial Research: visual, material and dialogical methods

Ricoeur’s (1990) theory of ‘narrative identity’ highlights how people’s lives and identities are entangled through acts of storytelling. Stories connect people’s experiences to the worlds in which they take place. While not originally conceived in this way, the research methods have enabled children to use stories to tell me about their lives. The methods encouraged children to situate their stories within the places and spaces of schooling. Before I started fieldwork I proposed using ‘spatial research methods’ to examine children’s ‘placemaking’, how they ‘change, appropriate and shape’ space (Parnell and Procter 2010, pg. 79), from the position that ‘space is formed through the rhythms of those who use it’ (Vergunst 2010, pg. 387) and ‘emotionally textured’ (Milligan et al 2005, pg. 57). As the children engaged with these methods, they centred them upon the act of storytelling. The children’s stories became an essential means for me to engage with the emotional ‘spatiality’ of childhood. The term ‘spatiality’ is used by Keith and Pile (1993) to ‘capture the ways in which the social and spatial are inextricably realised in one another; to conjure up the circumstance in which society and space are simultaneously realised by thinking, feeling, doing, individuals and also to conjure up the many different conditions in which such realisations are experienced by thinking, feeling,
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doing subjects’ (pg. 6). In this section I consider each of the spatial research methods I developed in turn - den-building, film-making, play-writing and scrapbooks - as ways for children to tell their stories. These methods, which encouraged children to express their experiences in a variety of ways and develop ways of telling that were relevant to them. Common to the research methods developed with the children was the act of making and the production of visual and material artefacts. I found that the children wanted to tell their stories in a range of ways, drawing upon a variety of visual and material modes. The methods I used aimed to engage with the multi-modality of children’s experiences (what they see, hear, feel, touch, think, say etc) of schooling. As the research developed children began to find their own ways of telling their stories using their own symbolic systems. In doing so, they called upon their own cultural and biographical narratives and particular sets of discourse to give ‘meaning to … experiences in social and material interactions’ (Pink 2009, pp 28-29).

a) Den-building as a research method

In this section, I describe the rationale behind den-building as a research method. I draw upon visual and material methods that encourage children to use multiple modes for expressing their experiences. I suggest that den-building overcomes some of the challenges of engaging with children’s perceptions of place, which Rasmussen and Smidt (2003) state go ‘beyond words’. Den-building creates opportunities for children to draw upon different modes of expression to represent their multi-sensory and embodied experiences. I suggest that through den-building children interlaced the focus of the study, the spatiality of emotions, within wider socio-political contexts including gender, class, race and religion. I will describe how I intended to structure the workshops, what they would entail and what would constitute as ‘data’ at the start of fieldwork and how this changed during the fieldwork process. These changes came about in response to the children’s increasing direction over and autonomy within the research process. Therefore in this section I will also explore how the den-building workshops led to other activities including film-making, scrapbooks and play-writing.

The den-building workshops were designed to position the children as researchers of their own experience and give them the opportunity to represent their experiences through the collaborative act of building a den. The act of making is commonly used in research, particularly with children and young people in different ways such as video, drawing, photography (see for example, Pahl and Allen 2011, Burke 2003, Piper and Frankham
Through making, I believe it is possible to communicate aspects of our experience, which can be distinct from intellectual objectification. Visual research methods are increasingly recognised as a valuable approach in ethnographic research practice (Pink 2004) and participatory research practice with children and young people (Thomson 2008). Although used in many different ways, the visual is often defined as a prompt for self-enquiry, and in particular to understanding oneself in relation to the social. For example, Leitch (2008) shows how impromptu drawings can provide ‘insights into [children’s] own emotional and behavioural process and how various social and educational factors reinforced or provoked these patterns’ (pg. 47). In this sense, the production of the visual – or, in terms of these den-building workshops, the physical creation of a visual space – becomes a symbolic representation of reality, which can be used to access and explore one’s own experiences and perceptions.

The den-building workshops I developed were also influenced by theories and approaches from drama. Veale (2009) has commented upon how using drama in research practice can encourage understanding of the sociology of the self through ‘facilitat[ing] the process of knowledge production, as opposed to knowledge gathering’ (pg. 254). Boal’s (2000) theoretical understanding of theatre is particularly relevant to research interested in place and space. Boal developed ‘revolutionary theatre’ as a tool to critically engage individuals and groups in Latin America with their social world. His intention was ‘to change the people, “spectators”, passive beings in the theatrical phenomenon- into subjects, into “actors”, transformers of the dramatic action... in short, to train [her or] himself for real action’ (2000, pg. 122). Boal recognised the value of the social construction of knowledge through the dramatic action of the body, whereby participants come to recognise their own and each other’s subjective experiences to produce new shared meanings grounded in the examination of place. And thus, the physical environment – or the stage for dramatic action – becomes a facilitative tool to connect individuals with their experiences. The den created by the children can also be viewed as a stage upon which they can explore and share their experiences and perceptions. In addition, I believe that the process of creating a den, both created and brought to life through the lived body, will not only stimulate conscious intellectual perceptual processes but a whole range of other perceptual dimensions of individual experience – including the corporeal, sensorial and emotional.

Using visual methods and engaging the body recognises the challenge of accessing and verbally articulating experience and perception, particularly that which remains tacit. As Pink (2009) states, ‘although it is possible to speak or write about [emplaced knowing],
such knowing might be difficult to express in words. This is one of the challenges faced by the sensory ethnographer seeking to access and represent other people's emplacement (pg 34). As the children created their dens they were able to represent their experiences through many modes – including colour, sound, texture, movement, shape and form, language and more. They directed their den-building process, making their own choices about what to represent and how, using their own symbolic systems. In doing so, they called upon cultural and biographical narratives and particular sets of discourse to give ‘meaning to … experiences in social and material interactions’ (Pink 2009, pp 28-29).

The workshops were originally designed to be delivered in sets of three. Each set was designed to include: Workshop A) creating a physical representation, Workshop B) analysis of what was created, and Workshop C) sharing the findings with the wider school community (see Fig. 14). Between these workshops I met with the children for short planning meetings, in order to make decisions about how the workshops would run and what resources they might need. Each of these workshops, and how they evolved over the course of the research, are described below.

a.1) Building the Dens: Representing experiences and constructing fictional scenarios

During ‘Workshop A’ the children created a den to represent their experiences of SEAL. I wanted to give the children choice over which SEAL activities to represent. I constructed pre-fabricated wooden frames to be used as a scaffold for their creations, which would be animated with materials from a ‘Prop-Box’ (including fabric, plant pots, bamboo sticks, boxes, etc) and their own bodies (see Fig. 14).

How the children went about creating their space and which props they used and how they used them I left up to them. This flexibility supported the view that experiences, competencies and practices will differ from child to child (Emond 2009).

The first den created by the children represented the physical characteristics of the space in which a SEAL awards assembly occurs. The children were asked to think about different dimension of their experience, (including sounds, smells, thoughts, feelings, etc), to encourage them to explore and represent perceptions (see Fig. 15 for example). Throughout the workshops, the children began to appropriate the space they were creating, using their body as another means of symbolic representation. They used the objects they made (see Fig. 16) as props to communicate what happened during the SEAL
assemblies. I gave one of the children a video camera and asked them to take me on a
tour of the den to capture what their peers were doing and ask them questions about the
space they had created. The children also described what SEAL was to peers who were
capturing the workshop with a video camera. Different children used the camera
throughout the workshop and this was negotiated by the children themselves. I gave
another a child a still camera to capture things they felt were important about the den. I
felt that this photo and video footage would give me a unique perspective upon the den,
from the children’s frame of reference. I used the footage as a prompt for focus groups,
which I will describe in more detail in the next sub-section. Through this data I aimed to
gain insight into the significance of the symbols and modalities the children used to re-
create their experiences.

Children built two more dens that depicted fictional scenarios that have been taught
through the SEAL curriculum, rather than the spaces in which they were taught through
the SEAL curriculum (as I originally intended). The second den represented their views
about bullying and the third explored what it was like to be a new child arriving at a new
school and the difficulties of making new friends. These dens, while not depicting the
direct experiences of these children (as the first den did), represented how they made
sense of the emotional experiences of others through the discourses available to them.

Figure 15: An image showing a boy creating sounds on a stringed instrument to
accompany the Sparkle and Shine den. These sounds reflected the feelings he
associated with the assembly. A girl took this photo after being asked by me to
take photos of the things that she thought were important about the den.
Figure 16: A snapshot of the ‘Sparkle and Shine’ den taken by me and shows how children represented the symbolic objects (i.e. the prize boxes, Sparkle and Shine book, magic wand and stage are all represented in this den) which they see as a significant to the assemblies.

Figure 17: A snapshot of the ‘Bullying’ den taken by me to show the types of written and visual representations that the children associated with bullying.
The Bullying Den (see Fig. 17) communicated how the children defined ‘bullying’ and the different ways that a victim could make the bullying stop. The den was built with two areas, a blue area and a yellow area, to represent the contrasting feelings a child may have when they are being bullied and when they are not. The Making New Friends Den (see Fig. 18) explored the multisensory experience of coming to a new school (sights, sounds, feelings, etc) through a narrative. The children created a fictional story to accompany the den about a boy who attended a new school. When he got there he started to get bullied, but with adult support he resolved the situation and made new friends. These dens provide an insight into the social construction of ‘feeling rules’ (Hochschild 2003), which these children are applying to situations that they or their peers might find themselves in. The children also convey their understandings of how emotions ‘circulate’ between people (Ahmed 2004) within specific socio-spatial encounters. The social events, understandings and fictional scenarios the children choose to communicate in these workshops, when triangulated with observations of daily activities and focus-groups with the children (see next sub-section), provide insights into how emotion is constructed and embodied through their emplaced experiences at the school. In this way the den-building engaged with the interplay between local practices and wider socio-political contexts. Kjorholt (2003) argues that den-building enables children to ‘construct an exclusive territory – a place to belong – by positioning themselves within accessible discourses’ (pg. 262).
In addition to offering insights into the construction of emotion, the den itself was also appropriated by the children. The den was a physical structure that the children enacted through their social interactions, for example, a girl ducked in and out of the netting walls of the den as a boy was trying to capture her on the video camera. The children also appropriated the props they made to accompany the den in fictional role-plays with their peers. In these instances the children were collaboratively creating imaginary spaces. These filmed interactions, although not what I intended, also provide interesting data about the social role of emotion. They offered an insight into how children shape social space through the ways they present (Goffman 1990) an emotional self as they make choices about how they manage and exchange emotion. These events offered insights into the role of emotion in children’s interpersonal placemaking.
Video 1: Video footage from the Sparkle and Shine den-building workshop edited by me and used as a prompt to discuss the den with the children who had made it (this video can be viewed through the electronic version of this thesis on the disk provided).

a.2) Focus Groups: Prompting deeper engagements

The video-footage captured by the children was used as a prompt for focus groups with the children. I edited the footage into short films. Originally I had intended to involve children in this editing process. However, the children opted to create their own edited films with footage captured outside of these workshops (these films are introduced later in this section). For me, editing the video footage on my own allowed me to conduct an initial analysis of the den itself and how it was produced by the children. I was interested in ways that children interacted with one another as they made the den as well as their reflections on emotions and education (see video 1 for an example of this edited footage).

Once edited I watched the footage to develop a series of questions to ask the children to encourage their discussion of the den and their conversations captured in the film. Initially I drew upon the perspectives shared by children in the film about SEAL activities and asked children whether they agreed. However, the reflections below from my research journal describe some of the difficulties I experienced in using this approach.

*In my first focus group, my questions were framed around drawing upon the perspectives shared in the film and asking children their thoughts about these – however, this was potentially leading, i.e. ‘Didier says he is happy to*
be in a SEAL school, do you agree with Didier, are you happy to be in a SEAL school?’ While the discussion about this was interesting... I did not take into account Didier’s status (he is well-regarded by teachers at the school) and the children seem to know that he is likely to say what the school wants to hear (it is a bit of a taboo to be critical of SEAL) – perhaps the children’s responses (of complete agreement) were linked to that. In addition, my question was framed only around the idea of happiness – this immediately excludes discussions about other feelings. (Research Journal, November 2010)

As the focus groups developed I used more open questions to invite the children to comment freely on particular aspects of the den, i.e. ‘can you tell me more about what you made?’ I also wanted the children to choose when to comment and when not to, to respect their autonomy as research participants, and therefore I would ask ‘do you want to say anything about that?’ This open approach seemed to encourage the children to increasingly discuss things that were going on for them outside of the workshops. For example, in the focus group about the ‘Making New Friends’ den the children spoke in depth about a new girl joining their class. On another occasion, as part of a discussion on bullying, the children relayed stories from family members who had been victims of crime, for example, a mother who had their money stolen while on holiday abroad or an uncle who had been a victim of fraud. These discussions shed interesting light on how the children connect their experiences at school with those beyond school in their meaning making.

I found it important to share with the children some of how I understood what they had said in order to give them an opportunity to concur with or correct my interpretation. This seemed to have an unintended consequence of challenging the notion of the ‘correct’ answer.

In the first focus group with Alexandra I felt that she was attempting to present herself in the ‘right’ way... What she now says in the focus groups seems to have a different quality to it, perhaps more open/freer somehow. I wonder if the research process deconstructs the idea of a ‘right’ answer (or perhaps their view that as an adult - especially in a school context - that is what I am interested in)? The children seem less inhibited as the research progresses. (Research Journal, March 2011)
Below is another example of how the children seemed to feel that it was possible to challenge my interpretations of their dens.

The children seem open to challenging my assumptions, for example Cathy once said, I don’t mean that Sparkle and Shine is like a jungle, I mean that the den is like a jungle. This challenged my idea that the den was representation of Sparkle and Shine, rather it came to mean something else, a new place, as the children created it – it became an object in and of itself, as well as a representation. However, my misunderstanding also seemed to spark new reflections from the children. For example, Alexandra felt that it was possible to use the metaphor of a jungle to conceptualise Sparkle and Shine assemblies (Research Journal, December 2010).

The focus groups were also a good opportunity to capture the views of all the children who were part of the SEAL squad, as some were quieter than others during the workshops. During the focus groups, they each had their own time and space to contribute to the research. Providing this time for the children to reflect upon and tell me about what they had created outside of the den-building workshops seemed to encourage their active engagement in the research design. For example, through the focus groups the children seemed to better understand my research interests and found ways to respond to these by suggesting research topics at the end of each focus group. They also pro-actively asked questions about research methods they could develop, including films and scrapbooks (these will be explore in more detail later in this section).

a.3) Children’s Assemblies: Sharing their reflections with the school community

In the workshop following the den-building activity and focus group, the children developed assemblies to share their reflections with the school community. The children self-selected to take part in each assembly, and those who put themselves forward together developed an assembly presentation. I chose not to participate in the development of the content or structure of the assembly. However, I supported the children as they practised their assemblies and provided technical support. Initially, I considered these assemblies as a means for the children to share their views with the school community and catalysing change. However, they were of value to the research analysis process. The children’s presentations of the project to the wider school community were framed by what they thought the school would want to hear. The
children drew upon practices used by other teachers during their assemblies to encourage audience participation, such as asking questions. They also tried to provide ‘useful’ information to children, such as telephone helplines for children who may be being bullied. Their representations of the research became a political act. Kaplin (2008) also notes how public forms of expression become ‘enmeshed in the wider politics of power and representation’ (pg. 177). The children were taking on an ‘appropriate’ voice for the situation they found themselves in.

As the children developed their confidence as presenters they began to use plays to communicate ideas to the school community. These plays allowed the children to escape the adult conventions of assemblies. They used language not usually used in the school hall, such as ‘bumheads’ and ‘snotty girl’ as they acted out the role of a bully in their plays. The young audience found these phrases hilarious and at times the whole hall filled with laughter. This was quickly distilled as the teachers urged their classes to quieten down. The children’s plays therefore became political not because they felt constrained by adult conventions that dictate an ‘appropriate’ assembly but because they were breaking them. The children were making this place their own. The assemblies were videoed by children, and the footage used as a source of data.

a.4) Enabler, Observer, Constrainer, Facilitator? Negotiating my role in the research workshops

I aimed to take on the role of participant observer in the workshops and build a set of fieldnotes based on these engagements. Drawing upon the view of children as ‘social agents’ (James at al 1998), I very much wanted to step back and not get involved in disciplining or directing the children’s engagements. I wanted the children to develop their own approaches to research, as reflected in the following extract from my research journal.

‘Is the point of the workshops to develop children’s ‘research skills’, or does this put upon the children a particular conception of what research is (which belongs to me)? Rather, will the children derive their own methods/skills/ideas about research through engaging with and recording workshops in the ways that they choose? I do not want to ‘train’ children to do research. This approach would constrain their responses, both in terms of what they research and how they see the world through research… I am aiming for the children to both ‘give’ the data (through recording the workshops) and ‘be’
the data (through participating in the workshops)… What tensions may this create between their messy processes and the neat and tidy world of the school and how will we negotiate these?’ (12th November 2010)

During the workshops I often found it difficult to negotiate my role. I experienced a sense of obligation to the school and to the participants, which often exposed a tension to my position as a researcher. In particular I was aware of my significance to the children. I was someone they got on with, someone who challenged the conventions of adult-child relationships in a school setting. I felt that I ignited their curiosities and became somewhat of a celebrity very early on in the research process. The regard I received from children and the active attempts from many children to build a meaningful relationship with me, seemed to give rise to tensions between the core group and the rest of their class members. It seemed that the SEAL squad were seen by some to be especially privileged because they were working with me, leaving some children feeling unfairly excluded. I also found it difficult to negotiate the responsibilities I was expected to take on, both by children and adults. The young participants encouraged me to both manage and resolve conflict, often coming to me when they experienced injustice. Adults also expected me to manage the behaviours of the children. It was made clear to me that I should manage the noise levels during my time with the children. I was also encouraged to restrict some of
the children’s movements around the school. These tensions were never fully resolved and I often had to make in-the-moment decisions that attempted to reconcile my value for children’s agency and the school’s expectations of how children should behave at school and the role of the ‘adult’ in the management of children’s behaviours.

To provide an opportunity for children to engage in the research in a more informal setting I established a lunchtime club. This was also intended for those children in Year 5 who wanted to be more involved in the research. The club, which sat outside of the scheduled lesson times, was not tied to the same conventions as the den-building workshops. It felt much more acceptable for children to make noise and move freely around the school. Teachers’ expectations that I would manage the children also seemed to diminsh.

b) The Lunchtime Club: An enabling research environment

This club was established in response to my increasing ethical concern that some children in the den-building workshops were not able to fully participate. One boy in particular, Justin, was often excluded from participating in the den-building by his peers. They tended to reject Justin’s views and contributions to the structure. I also felt increasing pressure to manage the children’s interactions and foster a climate of inclusion and collaboration that did not seem possible for this particular boy. I remembered he had been interested in scrapbooks and therefore set up a lunchtime scrapbook club and invited him to help lead this. I also felt this was an opportunity to engage other Year 5 children in the research who wanted to be involved. Another boy called David was very eager to be involved in the research, but, like Justin, he was often excluded from activities by his peers.

Perhaps David could be a mini case study within the research to explore issues of exclusion. I have come to understand his eagerness to be part of the SEAL squad as part of a wider story of exclusion. Is he bringing out questions that need an additional bit of research?’ (Research Journal, January 2011)

The scrapbook club offered these children an opportunity to create something either on their own, in pairs or in larger groups.
Offering the club during lunchtimes also meant that children were not expected to ‘work hard’ or concentrate on the ‘quality’ of the work they produced. This took a lot of pressure off me. Prior to this club I had begun to feel a hesitancy from teachers, which seemed to reflect concerns that the children were causing trouble and messing around during our research sessions. The children’s enjoyment and playfulness during the workshops were, it seemed, interpreted by some members of staff as indicators that they were not taking the research seriously. It is also important to note that this perspective was not shared by all teachers, some did feel that the children’s energy was a reflection of their engagement. The structure of the school day and the expectations regarding how children should perform at scheduled times was evidenced through my emotional experiences of these different workshops. Whilst, I still felt anxious about how the lunchtime club was perceived by teachers, this was much less than during the den-building workshops.

These session were run as drop-ins. The children who attended were invited to create scrapbooks about their school day. I shared with them the information sheet and gave them the opportunity to ask questions before they filled in a consent form for themselves. A consent form was also sent to their parents. The group was relatively consistent over the two-week duration of the club. Initially I provided the children with clear guidelines about how to fill their scrapbooks (see Fig. 19). However, the children appropriated the scrapbooks in their own ways, revealing what was personally significant to them at school. The children’s scrapbooks have a particular emphasis on their friendships. Other scrapbooks also included drawings of some of the spaces and objects they associated with school. The children created video narratives with me about their scrapbooks. They directed the camera at their scrapbook and talked through each page as I asked questions. These videos have been used as data. How I have transcribed and interpreted this and other data is explored in detail in Methods C:1.2.

c) Filmmaking: Children as co-researchers?

The lunchtime club was also an opportunity for the SEAL squad to extend and edit the video footage collected during the den-building workshops. I provided laptops and FLIPcameras, portable handheld video-cameras, for the children to use in pairs in order to create their films. The children chose to create completely new footage based on the themes of the first two den-building workshops - the ‘Sparkle and Shine assembly’ and ‘Bullying’. They conducted interviews with their peers and recorded these on
FLIP cameras. These cameras were chosen because of their ease of use. The children could easily transfer their data from the camera onto their computer for editing. The process of editing for the children seemed to mirror my own processes of analysis. The children grouped and categorised their footage as they compiled their films. For some children this was carefully planned before filming and for others this emerged as they collected and collated their footage.

Once the children completed the editing process their films were screened to their peers in the SEAL squad. The children were given a feedback sheet to make notes about each others’ films (see Fig. 20). Based on their notes, they were then asked to vote for their favourite film. The creators of the film with the most votes were awarded a trophy in the shape of an Oscar.

The children’s films became a very important source of data. The edited films were transcribed and analysed alongside other data. Video extracts of some of these films are referred to in this thesis and can be viewed in the electronic version. The video-cameras continued to be a very important research tool, particularly for two of the girls. These girls chose to create a play as part of their film and recruited another girl to video them and also play the roles of the two adults (mum and teacher) in the film. Their play depicted the relationship between two girls, a bully and a victim (played by the two girls who initiated the play). The story reveals how the victim’s experience of bullying impacted on her relationship with both her mum and her teacher. It also depicts how quickly bullying can start and develop and the difficulties children face in stopping bullying from happening. After the film-making workshops the girls continued to create improvised plays captured on video. This footage became an invaluable source of data for exploring the role of emotion in children’s social interactions.

The children’s films were also a way for me to engage with the children’s understanding of the research and its aims. While the children directed their films, they were also creating them according to these understandings. This is reflected in my research journal notes.

*The children’s use of this method is shaped by me, the researcher. The children are making films for me - ‘I hope you like it Lisa’ and other phrases referring to me are uttered frequently in their films. Their film making practices consider me, my role as a researcher and research interests. Also, their interview approach seems to be informed by the interviews they have*
At the time of writing these notes I was concerned that the children were framing their videos around their understandings of my interests. In contrast, I now see this as reflective of the children’s commitment to the research project and what had become a shared research agenda. While the children produced different films using different cinematographic approaches, all of the films reflected the children’s commitment to convey their own and other children’s experiences of SEAL at school. Children continued to use the videocamera after the filmmaking workshops had ended. These videos continued to explore, in increasing depth, issues of bullying and friendship. However, the children also extended the research aims, as they chose to focus on particular aspects of SEAL and not others. In this way, I feel there were moments in the research process when the children acted as co-researchers. In these moments they appropriated the research according to their own interests and sought to ask questions of themselves and their peers to explore these interests by drawing upon a variety of visual and material modes of representation.
Video is increasingly used as a method in participatory research with children. Pahl and Allen (2011) state that ‘participatory research with children has grown with the use of visual and reflective methodologies that engage children seriously with the research process’ (pg. 192). Researchers use visual methods in a variety of ways. For example, Johnson (2008) describes how she taught children to use visual methods so that they could ‘become competent co-researchers [and] explore their place(s) in their primary school... by creating photographs and artwork’ (pg. 77). The elicitation of children’s voice is a common motivator in visual research. Noyes (2008) uses the visual to access the ‘unknown unknowns’ of children’s trajectories as learners. The children created video diaries to describe candidly their school lives, friendships and families in ways that went ‘beyond their well-established school behaviours’ (pg. 132). However, Kaplin (2008) suggests that ‘the power of such visual methods to represent ‘pure’ perspective is often overstated’ (pg. 177). He argues that doing so fails to take into account the context in which the visual was produced and therefore research participants should be ‘given space and encouragement to consider and articulate their meanings and intentions’ behind their visual representations (pg. 189). Visual methods are often seen as a means for children to communicate their perspectives in ways which can be accessed by adults (Pahl and Pool 2011). It was important for me, however, to connect children’s perspectives with the contexts in which they were shared. For example, I often felt that children’s positive accounts of SEAL reflected the discourses which were available to them within their school context. Birch et al (2008), in their exploration of children’s citizenship within hospital settings, state that ‘children themselves may also be setting limits to their own participation because of the powerful risk-averse discourse that surrounds contemporary English childhood’ (pg. 90). In my research, it seems that positive discourses become embodied by children through their experiences of feelings of pride and success when they are rewarded by adults (see Edge b:2). In the children’s films, it was rare that the children’s views about SEAL contradicted these discourses.

I wonder now if there could have been a way to encourage the children to reflect upon notions of control, in a way which problematised the ‘strategy’ adopted by the school, rather than feeling like they should support it. How do I know that they are supporting it because they ‘should’ - why should I criticise something they see as helpful? (Research Journal, May 2011).

The children’s praise for SEAL sat in tension with my own argument that positioned SEAL as a technology of power. This tension played out throughout the research process.
I felt that I needed to move away from a position fostered through my early literature review which drew on post-structuralist theories of power (see Methods C:2.1).

*I am interested in how children represent their experiences of emotion and how these representations are situated within a wider socio-spatial context in order to build a theoretical understanding of their experience (Research Journal, May 2011).*

The section above has explored the research methods developed with the children, including den-building, film-making, scrapbooks and play-writing. These methods have provided opportunities for the children to reflect how they have appropriated and negotiated their way through the SEAL school. A common thread through the section above has been how these methods have enabled me to explore children’s agency as a social and situated process. In addition, I discussed how I considered children’s autonomy as research participants and developed methods over the course of the research to facilitate different modes of expression. Methods B:2.3. (turn to pg. 130) explores how the children’s perspectives were shared with adults at the school through a series of reports. The adults’ responses to these were also used as a data source.

The section above has shown how videos were an integral source of research data. I described how this was led by the children. Initially, the video-data was to be used as tool for children to reflect upon the den-building workshops. However, the children chose to use videos to create their own films. In addition, children’s descriptions of their scrapbooks were captured with video. In Methods C:1.2. (turn to pg. 166) I outline how I transcribed and interpreted video data. In this section I also discuss the analysis methods used to interpret other data, including focus group transcriptions and photographs.

An important point raised in the section above, was how children’s autonomy over the research process, which meant that they showed me what was significant to them about their school experiences, informed the theoretical positioning of this study. In this way the development of the research methods with children also influenced the way that I viewed and interpreted the field. More explicitly, I highlighted how this initiated a move away from a post-structuralist notions of power to post-modernist accounts of agency. Methods C:2.1 (turn to pg. 180) explores how I have moved between these two paradigms and draws upon the concept of emplacement to reconcile the tensions between them.
I found that it was important to connect children’s perspectives with the contexts in which they are shared. In this way, I saw the research workshops as a situated event which could only be understood by attending to the research context. In this section I suggest that children’s positive accounts of SEAL reflect the discourses which were available to them within their school context. This is also related to the positive ethos that is cultivated at the school, where optimistic and positive attitudes are encouraged. I engage with this further in Edges b:2. (turn to pg. 247), where I reflect upon the ways that pride works to foster children’s regard for SEAL.
Methods C: Working With Field Data

Methods Exploratory C looks at the development of methods to support the analysis of data and the representation of the research. This Exploratory emphasises how the data and the analytical design are intertwined. I felt it was important to develop analytical methods that responded to the data generated. These could not be prescribed from the outset because I wanted children to be involved in the development of the research methods and inform what the research data would look like.

1. Processing Data

Phases of Analysis

This section will explore the type of data I have collected during the course of fieldwork and how I have worked with this. The data sources are outlined in Fig. 21.

![Diagram showing the types of data generated from research activities involving staff and students](image-url)
The fieldwork has been divided into two domains, the ‘natural setting’ and ‘workshops’. Fieldwork in the ‘natural’ setting included participant observations written up in the form of fieldnotes (see Methods B:2.2). Thematic analysis of initial fieldnotes helped to identify six broad themes (see below) which then framed the teachers’ interview questions (see Methods B:2.3). These interviews helped me to make sense of the discourses that adults drew upon to understand ‘emotion’. They also offered a way into understanding adults’ perceptions of the rationale behind SEAL related activities. The interview transcripts were analysed in a structured way, and I identified extracts that related to and further developed the six emerging themes.

a) Emerging themes

At this stage six broad themes were coming out of the fieldwork process: identity; site; interrelationships; assessment; representation; emotional landscape. An overview of these initial six themes is provided below. Over the course of the fieldwork these themes were developed and became the five themes introduced in the Reader Guide: Districts; Edges: Landmarks; Paths; Nodes.

**Site:** I have become interested in the relationship between space and action. Within the school there are a whole range of places with their own unique cultures, created by internal and external forces, and living and developing through social interaction. Does new psychological knowledge inform these places? Is this knowledge represented in the physical spaces of the school? The school appears to have adopted it’s own identity – a brand. This brand seems to be marketed by the school’s members through communication techniques, including spoken word, visual displays and reports. What vocabulary do the children use to describe the school’s identity? How do these descriptions influence the way they feel about attending the school, and their relationships with school staff? How does this branding influence the children’s perceptions of what behaviours and attitudes are favoured by the school?

**Representation:** This theme focuses upon how the messages from new psychological knowledge, which also inform policy, and are acted upon by the management team and teaching staff at the school, are re-presented by the children. From their experience of the application of these ideas, how do
they then understand emotion? What does this new understanding mean for how they understand the role of emotion in their own lives and the lives of others?

**Interrelationships:** This theme has emerged from my curiosity about repeated patterns of interactions between particular children. What is the significance of these patterns of relating? I do not intend to reduce social interaction to simplistic categories, but to make sense of the complexity of interactions between children. I am also curious to explore whether adults’ active interventions in children’s relationships then influence how children choose to relate to their peers. Do they try to model the behaviour of their teachers or do the opposite? I am also interested in the link between interaction and identity, how does one inform the other? Also, what is the relationship between social interaction and emotional experience?

**Identity:** This theme explores the ways that the actions and feelings of children are associated with ‘emotional identities’, or categorisations of emotional dispositions, in a SEAL school. I am curious about how these social identities are related to or produced by psychological discourses about children’s emotional development. I am also interested in how these identities then inform the ‘roles’ that children take at a SEAL school and vice versa. On another level, I am interested in how children respond to the social identity they have. Do they perceive themselves as having an identity? Do they actively reinforce it? Or do they react against it? How does identity inform the way that children relate with their peers?

**Assessment:** This theme is concerned with how children’s emotional responses are monitored at a SEAL school. I am interested in how the children perceive the purpose of monitoring emotional responses. Through using such monitoring procedures do children distinguish emotional responses into right and wrong or positive and negative categories? I am interested in the roles that children take and the strategies they use in monitoring their own and their peers’ emotional responses. Do these roles encourage the children to adapt their own emotional responses? If so, what do the children see as the benefits of doing so?
Emotional landscapes: How do the children negotiate the emotional landscape of school? Are these negotiations representative of how they are taught to understand emotion? Is there an incongruity between what the children are taught about emotion and their emotional experiences?

(Research Journal, April 2011)

These emerging themes were connected by my own interest in the role of emotion in the socialisation of children within a school setting. These themes were further developed through ‘den-building workshops’ with the self-named ‘SEAL squad’, nine children aged 9-10 of mixed abilities and backgrounds (see Methods B:2.4 for more on research methods developed with the young participants). After an introduction to the research and its aims, the children chose the topics that we would explore in these workshops (rewards, bullying and friendship). Through working collaboratively with the children I was able to focus more specifically on which aspects of their experiences were significant to the children themselves. Initially, the themes outlined above were refined through the thematic analysis of children’s focus group transcriptions. During these focus groups the children watched a video of themselves building one of the dens; as mentioned in Methods B:2.4, each den was related to a topic (awards, bullying or friendship) chosen by the children. During the focus groups, I asked questions to encourage the children to reflect upon the process of building the den and the reasons behind their choices. During this stage of the research my focus shifted from being about how the SEAL curriculum informs children’s understanding and management of emotion, towards how children draw upon emotion to socially organise their relationships within a school setting.

b) Conceptualising socialisation

Drawing upon Corsaro (1997), socialisation is understood as a process of negotiation and reproduction. In this way children draw upon cultural resources to construct and sustain their social relationships. However, I was cautious about making superficial distinctions between adults’ and children’s worlds. I believe that it is through the social construction of childhood as distinct from adulthood that these worlds are viewed as distinct and separate. While Corsaro attempts to explore children’s worlds, he tends not to address the role that ‘adult’ structures play within their lives, particularly within institutional settings. Over the course of the research I developed an analytical framework for examining the relationship between place, emotion and the socialisation of children (see Methods C:2.1
for an account of how this framework developed). This framework was developed to yield understandings of children’s agency as they negotiated the emotional landscape(s) of schooling. I found that much of this happened, not through the teaching of emotion, but as the children developed, negotiated and managed their relationships with both teachers and particularly with peers, and how these were framed and influenced by the structures that were in place within the school setting. I became interested in the ways that children used emotion in different ways across different school spaces to reinforce, resist or deviate from these structures. To explore this further, I drew increasingly on my fieldnotes from the research workshops, where I paid attention to how children were interacting with me and with one another. I also drew very heavily on the children’s films and plays, which captured their perceptions of the school structures and how these were negotiated by themselves and others.

c) Returning to the research questions

Throughout the process of developing both a set of emerging themes and an analytical framework, I regularly returned to my research questions. While I have said elsewhere that my research questions have allowed me to ensure consistency throughout the research process, I have not sought to present ‘answers’ to these questions in this thesis. The diagrams below show how I have linked my research methods back to my research questions, but they are not intended to suggest that the research methods and approaches to data analysis were developed with the intention of neatly ‘answering’ these questions. Rather the methods, and the data they yielded, developed through the fieldwork process and in conversation with children in order to best capture their school experiences. The questions framed the ‘gaze’ that I took when analysing the research data.

• What are children’s perceptions of their role in a SEAL school?

• How does their perception of that role affect how they view themselves and others?

• How do children understand the purpose of SEAL?

In addition to the methods shown in figures 22 and 23, I also used scrapbooks. These became a useful means to engage with the ways that children took on an identity at school and identified with others. Children worked alone or in pairs to produce their scrapbooks, which reflected their perception of themselves and others within the school context. The
children filmed their scrapbooks and talked about each page. The films, plays and scrapbooks were all transcribed in the same way, paying attention to the following: what the children chose to frame in their videos, their gestures, what they said, and my own emotional response to the footage. The analysis of the video footage led me to reframe the six emerging themes.

Figure 22: Diagram showing data sources to engage with children’s perceptions

Figure 23: Diagram showing data sources to engage with children’s views of the rationale behind SEAL

d) Selecting the data for the thesis
Whilst I worked with all the data in the stages of analysis, I have chosen to select particular extracts from the data to include in this doctoral thesis. These extracts are noted examples that I have selected to represent the themes that emerged through data analysis. The extracts of data I have chosen also reflect how I have worked across and between different types of data in order to make sense of children’s socialisation within a SEAL school. Therefore, the sections of this thesis that do engage with data move between fieldnotes, videos, drawings, focus groups, interviews in an attempt to provide a rich exploration of children’s lives. In addition, many of the moments I was drawn to were those that made me feel uncomfortable. Drawing upon Pillow (2003), who argues that it is important to engage with uncomfortable moments from our research, I found that this enabled new insights to emerge. For me, this involved a focus upon retelling stories of children who seemed to stir my own discomfort, often because their actions subverted and, even if momentarily, transformed the norms of schooling. An important aspect of this research for me has been to find ways to recognise the stories of children whose inner experiences and affective productions are under- or mis-represented within emotional curricula. Holding this as an intention, it made sense to follow Pillow’s (2003) call to represent the uncomfortable moments of fieldwork.

The section above has described the stages of research analysis. The stages of analysis each involve different sets of data. The first stage of analysis engaged with fieldnotes produced over the first six weeks of the study. While the fieldnotes were studied on a weekly basis in order to identify emerging themes, the analytical work began at the moment of making jottings within the school setting. The approach to producing the fieldnotes is described in more depth in Methods B:2.2. (turn to pg. 123) I reflect upon how this ongoing analytical work informed my approach to participant observations and producing fieldnotes.

The second stage of analysis involved the analysis of the adult interview transcripts. These helped to develop and refine the themes that had emerged through the writing and analysis of fieldnotes. In Methods B:2.3 (turn to pg. 130) I describe how the interviews responded to the findings that had emerged from the fieldnotes. While the interviews provided a useful insight into how school leaders and teachers drew upon discourses of emotion in their practice, the analytical emphasis was upon the data collected with children. The interview transcripts were later used to situate the children’s perspectives within a wider school context.
The final stages of analysis centred upon the data generated from the collaborative research with children. Through these workshops a range of data was collected including fieldnotes from the workshops, focus group transcriptions, children’s edited films, video and images of the dens, videos of children’s assemblies and children’s scrapbook videos. In Methods B:2.4 (turn to pg. 138) I describe in detail the participatory research conducted with children and this will provide insight into how this data was generated.

In the section above I have shown how emerging themes were generated through these ongoing analysis of fieldnotes and then refined through the thematic analysis of the transcriptions of the interviews with adults and focus groups with children. I described how the collaborative research with children changed my research focus, to understand the role of the emotion in the ways children socially organise their relationships. I suggested that the visual data provided important insights into the ways that children construct and sustain their social relationships. In Methods C:1.2. (turn to pg. 166) I explore how I worked with and between these different forms of data to generate research findings.
Methods Exploratory C looks at the development of methods to support the analysis of data and the representation of the research. This Exploratory emphasises how the data and the analytical design are intertwined. I felt it was important to develop analytical methods that responded to the data generated. These could not be prescribed from the outset because I wanted children to be involved in the development of the research methods and inform what the research data would look like.

1. Processing Data

This section explores and critiques the decisions I made regarding how to transcribe different types of data and effectively triangulate between video transcripts, fieldnotes, teacher interview transcripts and my own research journal. I explore how I brought together the different perspectives of children, teachers and my own to construct an understanding of the role of emotion in the socialisation of children within a school setting. Pink (2009) suggests that sensory ethnographers often do not make explicit how they went about analysing their research materials. This, she suggests, ‘implies that the analysis of experiential, imaginative, sensorial and emotional dimensions of ethnography is itself often an intuitive, messy and sometimes serendipitous task’ (pg. 119). Therefore I aim to reflect upon the data analysis process in an honest and transparent way. The analytical framework through which I made meaning of this data continued to develop as I explored the data. In constructing this framework, I came to position increasing significance upon the self in the interpretation of data. For me, this involved drawing upon my own felt responses during this process. In this section I start by briefly introducing the theoretical framework for the analysis of children’s emotional experiences. This overview is intended to help frame the sub-sections that follow, which explore how I have both transcribed and analysed auditory, and video data. Throughout I consider the process of transcribing data, as I understand this as an interpretative act. I draw upon the notion of ‘transduction’ (Kress 2010) to reflect upon how the data has been
represented in different ways through the different stages of analysis. Finally, I look at how the video analysis prompted a reconsideration of the emerging research themes.

a) Non-linearity, emotions and data analysis

As explored in Methods C:2.1, emotions do not operate in a vacuum disconnected from the outside world, rather it is difficult to separate our emotional selves from the people we know and the places we inhabit. I began to explore the role of emotional reflexivity in the process of making meaning of fieldwork. To do so I drew upon perspectives addressing the relational and situated nature of emotion from a range of disciplines including geography (Bondi 2005, Milligan et al 2005, Parr et al 2005, Pile 1991, Punch 2012), sociology (Hochschild 1998, 2003, Holmes 2011, Hopkins et al 2009, Prendergast and Forest 1998), culture studies (Ahmed 2004) and education (Gordon 2006, Hargreaves 2001) and connected these with Ricoeur’s (1990) deconstruction of the concept of linear time. For Ricoeur the present is situated at once in the past, in our interpretations of our histories, and in the future, in our expectations for the future. While Ricoeur is interested in the way that time is represented through narrative, I am interested in the non-linear nature of time as it is experienced by the body. Jeanette Winterston, a novelist, in her book ‘Why be Happy When you Could be Normal?’, reflects upon the ways that her literary work has ‘pushed against the weight of clock time, of calendar time, of linear unravellings. She suggests that ‘time’s domain is the outer world [and that] in our inner world, we can experience events that happened to us in time as happening simultaneously’ (2012, pg. 153). She describes the self as ‘non-linear’ and ‘uninterested in ‘when’ [and] much more interested in ‘wherefore” (2012, pg. 153). For me, emotion is one of the threads that connects our experience simultaneously to the past, present and future. Shields (1991) also suggests that emotions have imaginary geographies, and this is supported by Hargreaves (2001) who states that ‘we can feel distant from people who are right next to us, yet close to loves ones who are miles away’ (pg. 1062). Emotion is a means of assembling our present in relation to our past and our future and to others in ways that enable us to give meaning to the present. In terms of engaging with data, this understanding of emotion is reflected in the ways that certain moments from the data, whether small quotes or snippets of video, stay with the researcher while others do not. For example, I may watch a new piece of video footage and be reminded of a situation documented in my fieldnotes or a conversation with a child during a focus group. These threads between the data seemed to be generated through my emotional readings of the data. For example, if the data stirred a sense of sadness then I would reconnect with
engagements with other bits of data that stirred a similar response. In many cases, the emotional interconnectedness of the data was complex and often not easy to make sense of initially. Therefore, for me, valuing emotional reflexivity, and the intuitive self in the process of data analysis, is important in responding to Pink’s (2009) challenge of becoming more explicit in how we, as researchers, interpret our research data.

An overarching principle of the data analysis methods I developed was to acknowledge the role of the self in the analysis process. My personal history and relational emplacement within the school setting were entangled in the analysis process. This perspective has influenced both the transcription and analysis process, as I have attempted to track this emerging, personal and multi-sensory (almost intangible) process of meaning-making.

*The interpretation of data is not separate or distinct from both the collection and transcription of visual data. For example, I will make decisions about which moments from the video footage warrant detailed transcriptions and which ones do not. This will be heavily influenced by own experiences in the field both at the time when the footage was captured and at other times. Through the transcription process I am starting to analyse the data while reconnecting with my own experiences of the field (Research Journal, June 2012).*

b) Transcribing auditory and visual data

I see transcription as an important analytical process. The way the data is processed into a set of transcriptions impacts upon the meanings that can then be built from these transcriptions. Within the field of multimodality much attention is given to how meaning is remade as we move across different modes of representation. This process of transduction can happen when researchers remake auditory recordings into written transcripts. An important question to ask is what is lost and what is gained as data is remade in these ways. Bezimer and Mavers (2011) have developed ‘a social semiotic framework to account for transcripts as artefacts, treating them as empirical material through which transcription as a social, meaning-making practice (and changes therein) can be reconstructed’ (pg. 193). From this perspective attention is drawn to the ‘meaning-making principles, and the potentials and constraints of modes of transcription with the purpose of gaining analytical insights and developing theoretical arguments’ (pg. 193).
Drawing upon this view in my own research, I considered the production of transcripts as an analytical endeavour. I chose to integrate my own thoughts and feelings into interview and focus group transcriptions.

c) Working with Auditory Data

When listening to the auditory recordings I found myself attending to the memories and emotions that these triggered. These became important elements of the transcript itself. The example below shows how I wrote myself into these transcripts. In addition, I noted how things were said, where children were in the room and what they are doing.

*Katie comes into the hall, she looks upset*

*Project researcher: oh, oh, oh what is up?*

*Katie: It’s everybody except Alexandra and Katy, I just did a little mistake and they were all shouting at me and saying why did you do that and especially Cheryl said, err, ‘oh I forgot to say why she done that’.*

(Katie’s words touch me – Katie recently told me that she is dyslexic)

*Katie: And then Didier did a mistake and nobody shouted at him but everybody just shouted at me.*

(I remember, as she tells me this, that Didier is also dyslexic)

*I point to the script that Katie is holding*

*Project researcher: And what is this here?*

*Katie: That is what I did my mistake on. I only put … that, what is a mistake.*

(I feel concerned I may have to intervene, when I really don’t want to)

*Alexandra comes into the hall*

*Alexandra: Katie is doing her own script*

*Alexandra accompanies Katie from the hall, with her arm around her waist*  

(I feel relieved, I do not get involved)

*Focus Group (March 2011)*

After creating the written transcript of each focus group, I chose to create a ‘map’ of the transcript. This map-making was a way of processing the data in a way that enabled a further stage of analysis. These maps were predominantly textual, and were used as a way to further develop the emerging themes generated through the analysis of fieldnotes (see Methods C:1.1 for an overview of these themes).
Why am I trying to build meaning from the ‘total’ transcript? Perhaps I am doing this to validate my themes. Do the children’s responses in the interviews back up the themes developed? Or do I need to change the nature of the themes, or add new ones? Asking these questions requires connecting the observation findings with the children’s retelling of their experiences within the interviews. (Research Journal, July 2011)

Moments from the data were mapped against each of these themes and then linked back to my three research questions, as shown in figures 24 and 25. These maps were later used to identify recurring sub-themes and identify extracts to include in the findings section of the thesis to demonstrate these. Therefore the maps referenced the transcripts directly and became almost a reference tool for referring back to the transcript in subsequent stages of analysis. Therefore the transcripts themselves were covered with scribbled comments to reflexively critique my personal engagement with auditory data and the ways that I was constructing meaning through my engagements with it (see Fig. 26). These maps were also useful for looking for correlations between these transcripts and other data generated through the research.

Figure 24: Map of focus group transcript with references back to research questions
Figure 25: Detail of focus group map showing the theme of representation

Figure 26: Focus group transcript showing colour coding system
d) Working with video data

The video footage offered incredibly rich insights into the children's experiences and perceptions in ways that I did not anticipate. There were specific moments within the footage that I was drawn to more than others. Through transcribing the video footage into written videonotes I began to try and unpick how I was making these distinctions, in order to then engage in a critical internal conversation about how I was making sense of the data. I chose to describe the video-footage in words (without using adjectives) and at the same time record my personal responses to the footage (see Fig. 27 for an extract from these videonotes). As I reflected in the section above about auditory data, it felt intuitive to make notes of my own responses and the ways I was connecting the textual transcripts to other experiences within and, sometimes, beyond the field. I adopted a similar approach to working with video data. However, in working with video data this approach became more clearly articulated as an analytical method.

I need to refine/describe the process I am using to analyse the video data, which at this stage feels intuitive. In doing so I can then understand the process I am using and critique it. Perhaps it is related to emotional response? (Research Journal, May 2011).

Rather than framing the analysis around any set themes, as with the auditory data, I chose to interpret the video data in a different way. I drew upon the understanding of visual data analysis as a process of collating and critiquing sensed interpretations. Kress and Leeuwen (1996) use the term ‘reading’ to describe the role of the viewer as they interpret an image. The viewer reads the ‘grammar’ of an image to make sense of it as a whole (Kress and Leeuwen 1996). Reading a video or an image involves the interpretation of different grammars, or multi-sensory clues. For example, as I read a video (or make sense of it as a whole) I draw upon a range of ‘sensory clues’ (including my emotional responses). My transcriptions, or videonotes as I have defined them, became an attempt to re-produce these readings in words. Kress and Leeuwen (1996) state that we make sense of images through drawing upon previous encounters with images, and the knowledge they have acquired about how to read them. In reading video data, therefore, it is important to take into account how I am drawing on my experiences to make sense of the footage. As I watched the video-footage, I was careful not to make assumptions about how the children were feeling at the time the footage was recorded. To do so, I based my analysis upon the children’s ‘presentations’ (Goffman 1990) of emotion. Sometimes emotion is presented through words. For example, in one of the scenes a boy stated, ‘I’m
only messing around’, and in doing so communicated to his peers the emotional intentionality of his actions. In addition, emotion is presented in non-verbal ways, through a bow of the head or a smile for example. My interpretation of these gestures was not only based upon my own culturally specific and embodied knowledge of emotional exchanges, but also the knowledge I gained about the children and their experiences of school, through the relationships I built with them. In order to attend to this, I explicitly addressed my emotional responses in the process of analysing the data.

I drew upon Richardson’s view of writing as a method of inquiry as I transduced the video footage from the visual to the written mode. Richardson (2001) suggests that writing is a way of engaging with our own multiple and changing perspectives.

‘I write because I want to find something out. I write in order to learn something that I did not know before I wrote it. I was taught, though, as perhaps you were, too, not to write until I knew what I wanted to say, until my points were organized and outlined. No surprise, this static writing model coheres with mechanistic scientism, quantitative research, and entombed scholarship’ (Richardson 2001, pg. 35).

While Richardson is exploring writing in the context of representing research, her account of the role of writing also resonates with the approach I adopted to writing videonotes. These notes were not an attempt to refigure the video footage into a

---

**Video transcription 1**

Katy and Alexandra’s video – 7 minutes 24 seconds
Created February 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verbal communication / On-screen text</th>
<th>Notes – my responses / interests</th>
<th>Notes - setting, body position, movements, facial expression, music</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Text: Katy’s and Alexandra’s Sparkle and Shine Bullying Clip!</td>
<td>Interesting to note that Katie sees this a film for me – suggests that she has engaged with the idea that I learning from them. It is also worth noting her use of the word ‘enjoy’ – she is hoping that in some way I show an approval for the video through my enjoyment of it. Katie also present herself for camera, smartening her appearance as she speaks.</td>
<td>Music requested ‘Firework’ by Katy Perry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text: sparkle and shine is a great assembly</td>
<td>Katie: Hello my name is Katie Price, this is a film about TK and Beyonce Knowles. We are going to be learning about, er, Sparkle and Shine, so I hope you enjoy it Lisa.</td>
<td>Changing colours on background of slide</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 27: Example of videonotes. The highlight text corresponds to the central column which documents my emotional responses and interests.
transcription that I could then easily analyse. Rather, the construction of these videonotes was a means of engaging deeply with the data, deconstructing it to then make new sense of it. Therefore the act of writing these notes felt like one in which I was very present, a way of untangling the complexity of what I was seeing, hearing and sensing.

This processing is a way of deconstructing the video using words. My aim has been to re-describe what is going on through language (and without adjectives) so that I can see things that I could not see before. The aspects that I re-described included eye movements, body posture, body position and body gestures. These were explored in relationship to the site and setting in which the video was produced. Therefore, I was also interested in how the ‘act’ of filming influenced the video that was produced (for example, I am still referred to in the films - ‘hello Lisa… hope you like it’). The way that I processed the data also revealed my interest in exploring the relationships between these non-verbal modes communication, words and settings in order to convey particular messages (or presentations of self). (Research Journal, June 2011)

As I reflected upon these text-based representations, I began to see similarities in the types of moments from the video which I chose to expand upon in more depth. I listed these moments as follows.

- Reference to objects that were perceived as symbolic of ‘SEAL’
- Children’s expression of emotion
- Children’s description/presentation of ‘who they are’ (or appropriation of a schooled identity)
- Children’s positive representations of their school
- Interpersonal dynamics (children/children and children/teachers)
- Children’s use of adjectives to describe objects/experiences
- Descriptions of personal or other children’s feelings
- Moments that ignite my own curiosities or stimulate further questions (Research Journal, June 2011)

As I constructed these videonotes, moment-by-moment, emotional dimensions of my own meaning-making became apparent. In doing so I identified ‘emotion moments’ - moments when my own emotions seemed to come into play - for further analysis. I have found that once emotion moments have been identified they can be untangled to provide a context
beyond the data itself, which is invaluable in the process of interpretation. In this way emotion moments are a means to re-connect with the emotional landscapes negotiated by the researcher both within and beyond the field. Bondi (2005) states that ‘emotional geographies can be explored ... via what we experience as our own emotional life’ (pg. 442). As I ‘feel’ my way through data (which is unavoidable) I am also ‘re-encountering’ (to use Bondi’s term) these emotional landscapes – the relational flow of emotion entangled between bodies, minds, environments and places. Detailed accounts of these emotion moments were written and re-written to further deconstruct and examine the video footage. In this process, I maintained my presence within the transcription. The example below demonstrates how I wrote myself into these detailed videonotes.

Once close to Harry, Justin moves the camera towards the back of Harry’s head, up and over his head capturing an inverted image of Harry’s face. Moments later Justin knocks the hat from his head. Harry asks Justin to ‘pass’, in a low-pitched tone of voice. I feel this verbal gesture communicates his experience of Justin’s action as improper. I feel it represents Justin’s actions as moving beyond a boundary – or what I have come to understand as a ‘feeling rule’. Justin does not respond to Harry’s request, and he instead continues his engagement in the imagined place of the naughty corner (Videonotes: August 2011).

I am curious about the processes and patterns with which I draw upon emotion in these readings. In a way, I am feeling meaning. These meanings are always in flux; as I begin to articulate my emotion movements new meanings emerge. Felt meanings increase in complexity, or depth, each time I re-engage with the data. For me, it has been important to capture these processes and articulate the emotional threads through which interpretation is entangled (see Methods C:2.2. for a detailed example of this).

The videos were essential in relating the six emerging themes generated through the analysis of fieldnotes, adult interview transcripts and children’s focus groups transcripts (see Methods C:1.1 for an overview of these themes) to the children’s differing experiences and perspectives in order to avoid making generalisations about children and childhood. Children’s engagements with school are influenced by their own unique personal biographies. James (2002) suggests that children construct ‘different versions of ‘the self as child’ with which children engage in their everyday social encounters and which they are endeavouring to weave into a coherent narrative for the self’ (pg. 150). She argues that engaging with these different accounts is important to understanding
children’s ‘individual experiences of being socialised into the category ‘child’’ (pg. 150).
Following this line of argument my research avoids making generalisations about what it
is like to be a ‘child’ and the conceptual space of ‘childhood’. The extract below from my
research journal reflects my experience of how writing ‘stories’ that aim to capture and
talk between children’s multiple experiences can sit in tension with what is often seen as
‘useful’ research.

_The temptation to produce 'useful' research can often encourage researchers
to generalise. Rather, I am wanting to present multiple experiences and
perspectives... It is also impossible to argue causality, i.e. that SEAL does
this and that... This is a case study school, where certain things seem to be
going on... I can say that children's comments seem to echo... but I cannot go
further in making any definitive links. As researchers we sometimes sway
towards being grand theorists...!_ (Research Journal, July 2011)

The video transcripts enabled me to deconstruct the video in ways which also valued the
children’s decision-making practices as they took on the role of filmmakers. As I made
meaning of the video data I wanted to give value to these different ways that the children
chose to share their accounts of school life with me. For example, some of the children
chose to describe the spaces and objects of the school, others interviewed their peers, a
group of girls created improvised plays, other children interviewed me or spoke from
their own experience. This approach to analysis revealed new insights, particularly
around how children managed their relationships with others, which had not come from
engaging with the focus group transcriptions. This is reflected in the extract from my
research journal below.

_I want to respond to the videos in a different way to the focus group or
interview transcripts. I thought the videos would offer opportunities to see
different things and therefore I have decided not to use the filters I used to
interpret the transcriptions. I am interested in a different type of data, which
provided different clues – body language, setting, the ‘act’ of filming – and
needed specific attention. The next stage, now that I have begun to make
sense of these clues, is to relate these areas with the themes identified from
the observations and focus groups (Research Journal, July 2011)._
The process of interpreting the video footage was influential in re-framing the emerging themes. Prior to engaging with the video footage, these themes reflected my interest in the socialisation of children through adult-led strategies focused on children’s emotional management. However, the video brought forward a different way of viewing the children’s experiences, which gave primacy to children’s agency and their unique and personal engagements with the institution. It seemed that the strategies used by the school held different meanings for different children. I felt that the children were active ‘placemakers’ (Ingold 2007) - who influenced the places of school through their inhabitation of school. Therefore the themes shifted to emphasise children’s agency. The video footage revealed the ways in which different children came to understand emotion and how it works in relation to themselves, others and the school. I became curious about how these understandings highlight the different ways in which the children are learning about emotion through the different ways they inhabit the spaces of the school. For example, at times the children’s judgements about emotion would frame how they acted in a certain setting, at other times a child’s perception of another’s emotional identity would limit how they acted towards them, or a child may use emotive language or gestures in order to be heard in social encounters. However, the ways that children used emotion changed as they moved between different spaces and places. Therefore these themes, which I have since described as ‘layers’ of experience, increasingly reflected children’s emotional spatialities.

At this stage the previous six themes (site; representation; interrelationships; assessment; emotional landscapes) were reduced to four and the titles altered to reflect these new insights: beliefs; interactions; roles; identities (see below for a description of these different themes). I decided at this stage that both site and emotional landscapes were overarching concepts. With a central focus on children’s emotional spatialities, it seemed that I should be looking for different layers of children’s spatial experiencing. The remaining four themes were renamed to reflect this change of focus and were also connected directly to theory.

Beliefs: This layer of experience will explore children’s constructions of emotional beliefs. To do so I will draw upon Hochschild’s concept of feeling rules. Hochschild describes feeling as a form of ‘pre-action’ and that ‘a script or a moral stance towards it is one of culture’s most powerful tools for directing action’ (2003, pg. 56). She defines this script or moral stance as ‘feeling rules’ - shared beliefs that ‘guide emotion work by establishing the sense of entitlement or obligation that governs emotional exchanges’ (2003,
Feeling rules, as social and situated phenomena, are not the same in different sites, societies and cultures (Barbalet 2001). Emotions can instead be understood as constructed according to rules deemed appropriate to specific sites at specific times (Hochschild 2003). Moments from the video data suggest that the children construct feeling rules through their emplaced experiences within the case study school.

**Interaction:** This layer draws upon Hochschild again, and her notion of ‘emotion work’, to theorise children’s emotional exchanges and presentation of emotional selves within the case study school. Hochschild (2003) describes two types of emotion work; ‘surface acting’ is when ‘we try to change how we outwardly appear … [through] … body language’ and ‘deep acting … is a natural result of working on feeling; the actor does not try to seem to be happy or sad but rather expresses spontaneously … a real feeling that has been self-induced.’ (pg 35). The children have described how they have controlled their outward expression of emotion in order to hide inner emotions and appear to be shape their interaction in particular ways.

**Identity:** The focus of this layer is the relationship between children’s presentations of an emotional self and social identification. Jenkins defines social identification as an ‘internal-external dialectic of self-image and public-image’. He describes this as a process through which ‘individually, we identify ourselves, but we also identify others and are identified by them in turn’ (Jenkins 2000, pg. 8). Some of the children seemed to experience a tension between their ‘self-image’ – how they want to be seen – and their ‘public-image’ – how others perceive them.

**Roles:** In this final layer I look at how children draw upon emotions in order to influence the role of others within social situations. Children’s accounts of events to adults often include an emotional script that operates within the constructs of the school’s value systems. They seem to draw upon these narratives to gain favour as they share their stories.

(Extract adapted from an article draft, August 2011)
The section above has shown how the emerging themes changed through the analysis of children’s video footage. I suggested that the footage offered an opportunity to engage with what was significant to the children. In doing so the themes that were predominantly informed by my fieldnotes and adult interview transcripts changed to reflect these new insights. However, this was not the final time that these themes changed. As I began to configure this thesis, I felt these themes reflected a social rather than spatial focus. At this stage I drew upon the concept of the thesis as a metaphorical city. I therefore chose to change the titles of the themes to reflect this concept. I explore this in Preface:1.2. (turn to pg. 8) If you choose to return to the reader guide, you can then choose where to re-enter and continue your reading of the thesis.

In the section above I also explored how I engaged with auditory data in order to check the relevance of the emerging themes from observations against children’s perspectives on SEAL, and also to further develop the themes. The original six themes came about through the analysis of fieldnotes of six weeks of participant observations and transcripts of interview with adults. Methods C:1.1 (turn to pg. 158) describes these original themes and explores how they were constructed through the analysis of this data.

At the start of the section above I outlined a theoretical framework for the analysis of children’s emotional experiences. I suggested that emotions make geographical connections that move beyond the boundaries of physical space and linear time. I also argued that the researcher’s emotions are integral to the organisation of the research materials and analytical interpretations of these. As we engage with data, I have suggested that our emotions connect us to our personal histories, relational emplacement and imagined futures. Methods C:2.1. (turn to pg. 180) examines this analytical framework in further depth and explores how it has evolved over the course of the doctoral study.
Methods C: Working With Field Data

Methods C looks at the development of methods to support the analysis of data and the representation of the research. This Exploratory emphasises how the data and the analytical design are intertwined. I felt it was important to develop analytical methods that responded to the data generated. These could not be prescribed from the outset because I wanted children to be involved in the development of the research methods and inform what the research data would look like.

2. Developing an Analytical Framework

Place, Emotion and the Socialisation of Children: The beginning of an analytical framework

I am finding it difficult to define and articulate my analytical framework... When writing the initial proposal for this PhD I claimed that I would draw upon Grounded Theory, which supports an emerging framework. However, Grounded Theory seems to try to minimise the subjective dimensions of research. Whereas, in my data analysis my own thoughts, feelings, experiences in the field are ever present - 'I' am the one who is looking for something and my analysis of the data seems to be shaped by intuitive movements which frame this process. I want to recognise and talk about the 'I' in this process. I also want to see the world through multiple perspectives and this makes it difficult to have a rigid framework. Perhaps this is also about power and research. I am resistant to make these different perspectives ‘fit’ a ‘framework’. Perhaps then a theoretical framework can be understood as something which has multiple facets and can shift through the research process (Research Journal, July 2011).

The extract above from my research journal reflects my shift away from an analytical framework rooted in the principles of grounded theory. I found that different types of data needed different types of attention (see Methods C:1.2). Literature has played an
important role in building theory from the research data. I have drawn upon a range of literature at different stages in the research process to develop my own understanding of the role of emotion in children’s spatial practices within a SEAL school setting. In this section I explore how I have drawn upon literature as I have engaged with collected data, as an analytical tool. Ridley (2012) states that a literature review is an important part of the research process; ‘in a literature review ... you are describing the bigger picture that provides the background and creates the space or gap for your research’ (pg. 6). In contrast to this guidance, I did not use literature to identify a ‘gap’ within which to situate my research. Rather, I have used literature as a tool to help me find my way through the research process, and make meaning of my experiences in the field, engagements with the research participants and the research data. My engagement with theoretical literature in particular has been guided by intuitive response to the data. Drawing upon abductive ethnography (Magnani 2005), which ‘embraces serendipity and allows intuition to guide the fieldwork’ (Bajc 2012, pg. 73), in this section I examine the intuitive dimensions of working with data both during fieldwork and beyond. In particular I examine the relationship between emotion and intuition in the emergence of theoretical insights around field data.

a) Emplacement and Affective Practice

Theories of emplacement value the holistic nature of experience ‘by accounting for the relationships between bodies, minds and the materiality and sensoriality of the environment’ (Pink 2009, pg. 25). Within this conceptualisation of the relationship between experience and place, my own theoretical positioning began to emerge. I drew upon Ahmed’s (2004) notion of ‘affective economy’ to frame my analysis of children’s experiences within a SEAL school. Wetherell (2012) offers a concise definition of an affective economy - ‘how ‘affective value’ or ‘emotional capital’ come to be assigned to some figures and not others’ (pg. 16). She states that in this way ‘power works through affect, and affect emerges in power’ (pg. 16). This is reflected in Ahmed’s account of forming an impression.

‘To form an impression might involve acts of perception and cognition as well as emotion. But forming an impression also depends on how objects impress upon us. An impression can be an effect on the subject's feelings (‘she’s made an impression’). It can be a belief (‘to be under an impression’). It can be an imitation or an image (‘to create an impression’).
Or it can be a mark on the surface (‘to leave an impression’). We need to remember the ‘press’ in an impression. It allows us to associate the experience of having an emotion with the very affect of one surface upon another, an affect that leaves its mark or trace.’ (Ahmed 2004, pg. 6)

In this extract Ahmed considers emotions as a product of affective encounters. These encounters impress upon our bodies, and shape our embodied emotional memories.

‘Affective practice ... sets up relations between subjects and objects through their intertwined formations and constitutions. But we also need to locate affect ... in actual bodies and social actors... The concept of affective practice then, encompasses the movement of signs but it also tries to explain how affect is embodied...’ (Wetherell 2012, pg. 159).

Wetherell’s affect is ‘embedded in situated practice’ (pg. 160). Drawing on Ingold’s (2007) view of the inhabitant as ‘one who participates from within, in the very process of the world’s continual coming into being and who, in laying a trail of life, contributes to its weave and texture’ (pg. 81), affective practice can be understood as ‘entangled’ within place. Wetherell acknowledges the challenge of researching affective practices between people and across places. She states that ‘affective practice is continually dynamic with the potential to move in multiple and divergent directions. Accounts of affect will need to wrestle with this mobility’ (2012, pg. 13). However, within this complexity she argues that affect does have patterns.

‘The interrelated patterning of affective practice can be held inter-subjectively across a few or many participants. It can thread across a scene, a site or an institution and is spatialised, too, in complex ways. Intriguingly, an affective practice can be ‘held’ in a particular place’ (Wetherell 2012, pg. 14).

Affective practices are, by their very nature, difficult to separate into constituent parts. For example, I struggle to separate and name my own emotional experiences. As soon as I attempt to name how I am feeling, I find that whatever it is I am trying to name has shifted as a result of this very process, thus rendering it unnameable. Whilst these experiences can be difficult to put into words, patterns do emerge between them.

Wetherell writes about ‘the patterning of affective practice’ - the ways that the ‘body ... gets patterned together with feelings and thoughts, interaction patterns and relationships, narratives and interpretative repertoires, social relations, personal histories and ways of
life’ (Wetherell 2012, pg. 14). I aim to explore what binds, or connects, these different components together and how these are manifested within the SEAL school context. This doctoral study engages with moments from the field to reveal the ways that children’s affective practices become ‘patterned’ (Wetherell 2012) over time. This study explores how these very patterns, the repetition of particular practices, create ‘sticky’ associations (Ahmed 2004, pg. 45) which become embedded in children’s actions. Examining these patterns involves immersing myself within children’s school lives, in order to learn from them how emotion enters into their socio-spatial interactions.

Given that emotions are difficult to put into words, this doctoral study has developed multi-modal methods to engage with children’s emotional experiences. Through their active participation in the development of these methods children found ways to communicate their experiences in ways that were significant to them. Therefore the data generated was varied in nature. Due to this diversity the data could not be analysed through a fixed framework (as the analysis methods needed to resonate with each of the different data-sets). I found that intuition (guided by my personal history and relational emplacement within the school) became an important part of how I generated new insights from the data. The role of intuition in research is explored by Bajc (2012), who drew upon abductive ethnography to engage with her research about the Christian Millennium in Jerusalem.

‘The analytical process of abduction starts when we observe something surprising about a social activity or phenomenon that attracts our attention...

By noticing such surprising things, we derive strong intimations about reality without being fully conscious of it. These intimations, however, are not simply pure guessing; they are based on tacit knowledge, clues, or strong intuition about what the data are communicating. Our instinctual way of thinking is adapted to the living environment and shaped by our sociological and tacit knowledge. Guessing, instinct, or intuition become a kind of a hypothesis in which we have good faith but needs to be subjected to further examination. This examination leads us back to the empirical evidence, and if necessary, we collect additional data by going back to the field and then work with these data to create a theoretical narrative (Bajc 2012, pg. 82).

The sections that follow explore the role of intuition in this doctoral study. I will reflect upon how my theoretical engagements with data changed from a focus upon institutional
structures to considering children as social agents who actively engage with and shape the worlds in which they live.

b) Moving beyond post-structuralist perspectives

Post-structuralism doesn’t represent a multiple perspectives position and the idea that ‘reality’ is dependent upon where you are standing (Research, Journal, July 2011).

Prior to beginning fieldwork I engaged with literature examining the relationships between emotional education and power, such as Boler (1999) and Millei (2005). Drawing upon these perspectives I conducted a thematic analysis of SEAL policy documents. With a focus upon examining the role of child-centred rhetoric within the policy, I suggested that behind a guise of empowerment was a curriculum that promoted children’s self-regulation of behaviours in line with traditional educational values (see Context:1.2). At this point, I understood SEAL as a sophisticated mechanism of power, producing obedient students and employable citizens by working upon children’s emotions. Going into the field with such a strong position had its drawbacks. I found myself, at times, using the children’s comments to support my own judgements about the application of this policy in practice. In recognising this I became concerned that my standpoint was at risk of misrepresenting the children’s perceptions.

Throughout my time in the field, and now in data analysis, my negativity has been brought into question. I have built strong relationships with both children and adults at the school. I felt a sense of guilt as I sought out ‘data’ that matched my critical perspective (Research Journal, July 2011).

My guilt suggested there was more to seek from the data. I could not help but be struck by the children’s high regard for their school and their teachers. In addition, I saw value in the staff’s commitment to the well-being of individual children. Yet, I continued to encounter moments that stirred questions for me about the school’s emotion-orientated practices and issues of social justice in education. These practices seemed to be driven by particular values that worked to characterise and categorise children in hierarchical ways.

I also began to notice the diversity of children’s engagements with the SEAL curriculum. Given that children bring to school their own unique personal biographies (James 2002) then it would be implausible to suggest that they would respond to SEAL in the same
way. In response to this acknowledgement of children’s agency I returned more confidently to the notion of children as ‘inhabitants’ (Ingold 2007) who find their own unique path through school and in doing so change that setting. However, I wanted to find a way to consider power within this understanding of children’s spatial agency.

I want to maintain a critical perspective, but at the same time need to pay attention to the times when this swamps my selection and interpretation of data... Although I want to hear/see/feel children’s voices, I am still looking critically at the structures that have led to those voices emerging. I am situating their voices (Research Journal, July 2011).

These reflections were made at the end of the fieldwork. At the time, I felt that being critical was at odds with listening to children’s perspectives. I wanted to be ‘true’ to the children’s words by taking them at face value. However, I also felt that their words were, in part, a product of their situation and the explicit curriculum they were learning. Looking back, I recall also being concerned about the idea of establishing children’s authentic voices; what they ‘really’ think and feel. Now I do not view the notion of voice in the same way. Rather than seeking a true voice, I now hold the view that all voices are situated. It is the relationship between ‘voices’ and the ‘contexts’ in which they are shaped that has become an important consideration for me.

Trebbi (2008) writes about the idea of autonomy being about recognising the constraints to freedom, rather than the idea that it should be about not having constraints. She argues that individuals can be autonomous within constraints (Research Journal, May 2011).

I started reading more widely, drawing upon literature from sociology, social psychology, cultural studies and geography to further explore children’s agency within the school setting. I initially tried to understand children’s agency as moments of autonomy, but this didn’t feel right. What if control and freedom are interconnected - perhaps both inform the other? While the structures and procedures of institutions constrain and enable the actions of individuals, it is not possible to predict what different individuals will take from their engagements with these institutions. In addition, it is possible that their actions will shape these structures and procedures.

In the beginning, this research was a critique of the discriminatory dimensions of control based on historical configurations of norms and expectations. The questions I sought to ask were: What kinds of actions do
These enable or constrain? Which ‘types’ of child are they excluding? What I have come to see is the problematisation of particular character traits within the school setting – for example, David’s playfulness is disallowed, Alexandra’s helpfulness is seen as a problem, Justin’s energy is seen as risky, Katy’s strong sense of injustice is perceived to get in the way of teaching. The questions I now want to ask are: how can these children’s ‘problems’ (their personalities) be embraced? Can schools see a diversity of personality as a positive thing, and how can personalities be encouraged in the classroom? (Research Journal, June 2011)

Through this study I have come to see children (both individually and collectively) as social agents. They do not passively engage with the world around them – which Foucault’s (1991) discourse around power seems to imply, which suggests that people tend to be complicit in structures of power – almost as contributors – in order for power to be sustained. While Foucault conceptualises power as a force that is essentially hidden, after around three months into fieldwork I found that my focus upon uncovering ‘mechanisms’ (Foucault 1991) of power felt counterintuitive. For me, it provoked a devaluing of the children involved in my research and their social agency. Guided by intuition, I became curious to understand how children came to understand emotion within a school context and explore how these understandings were embedded within their socio-spatial interactions. While this emphasises children’s meaning-making, power is still an important component of my theoretical framework.

c) A socio-spatial perspective on emotion and power

Hochschild (1998) has described the field of the sociology of emotions as ‘a way of seeing’. She contrasts this way of seeing with a psychoanalytical conceptualisation of emotion. For Hochschild, a psychoanalytic view theorises people’s experiences from a lens of ‘narcissistic expectation’. The psychoanalyst, she states, ‘relies on the idea of personality structure … because psychoanalysis is a body of theory about individual human development’ (pg. 5). Psychology is interested in emotional injuries, how these manifest themselves in people’s behaviour and how these can be healed (Hochschild 1998). Boler (1999) also moves beyond psychoanalytical theory to re-connect emotions to a sociocultural domain. She is interested in how ‘inscribed habits of inattention describe the selectivity of our attention … [and] … are embedded in discourses and in educational practices and philosophies’ (pg. 16). Boler (1999) argues that the relationship between emotions and power continues to lack considerable attention because ‘emotions
are already discursively constructed as “private”, “individualised”, and “natural”, exceeding language and this sometimes beyond the reach of articulation’ (pg. 23). While hidden from academic discourses, emotions are increasingly recognised for the integral role they play in the constitution of social life. A sociological view of emotion extends psychology’s developmental view of emotion through examining the ‘sociocultural determinants of feeling’ (Boler 1999, pg. 5). I draw upon this view in this research to explore emotion as a dynamic and socially constructed terrain through which power relations are produced, reproduced and on occasion transformed.

Within the field of geography emotions are examined ‘in terms of its socio-spatial mediation and articulation rather than as entirely interiorised subjective mental states’ (Bondi et al 2005, pg. 3). This work views emotion as ‘located’ in both bodies and places and dynamically constructed through the ‘relationality’ between people and places and spaces (Bondi et al 2005). Through locating emotions it becomes possible to explore how emotion produces socio-spatial boundaries. For example, how children come to be ascribed emotional identities (i.e. ‘he’s got anger management problems’), the ways these identities are constituted through the spatial layout of emotion management (i.e. ‘you are angry, I think your need to go to your calm space’) and the emotional effects that children come to ascribe to certain spaces in relation to this (i.e. ‘I feel calm now I am in my calm space’). Drawing on Foucault’s (1990) notion of productive power, persons become subjects through the way that power is embedded within discourse. The way that emotion is referred to within education discourses works to categorise certain emotions as proper and improper, ‘framings that ultimately pathologise emotion and the emotional subject of education’ (Kenway and Youdell 2011, pg. 132). This points towards Ahmed’s (2004) notion of affective economies, which considers the social politics of how emotional capital is attributed to some people and not others. However, if we also consider emotion to be dynamically constructed through relationality, then this suggests that subjects can also resist and transform these emotional geographies. As Ingold (2007) suggests people ‘participate from within, in the very process of the world’s continual coming into being and who, in laying a trail of life, contribute to its weave and texture’ (Ingold 2007, pg. 81).

Goffman (1990) shows how it is possible to observe the production and transformation of subjects within the micro-levels of social interactions. He suggests that people ‘perform’ in ways that consider those they are interacting with and the situations within which these interactions occur. He states, however, that ‘performers’ may present themselves in ways which are not accepted by ‘audience’ members. In order to ‘save their own show’ (pg. 207) performers use their own well-developed ‘defensive measures’ and can also be assisted by audience members who take ‘protective measures’ to support the performer. Clark (1990) argues that these exchanges signify a micro-politics within which emotions
have a critical role to play. She suggests that emotion work is critical to the kinds of interactions that Goffman describes and influences how social hierarchies are formed and reformed. For Clark, emotions are important to the ways that people come to know their ‘place’ within social groups. In line with this Hochschild’s (2003) work suggests that emotions are integral to such performative politics. She suggests that ‘feeling rules’, the socially constructed norms which guide how we present and exchange emotion, shape how we ‘work’ upon our emotions to present ourselves in particular ways and change how we and others are feeling. However, a range of feeling rules can be present in one space at the same time and these can intersect or conflict. This is particularly evident in this study where moral codes embedded within children’s friendships, can often sit in tension with those encouraged by adults (see Landmark a:2)

A socio-spatial analysis of emotion allows scope for examining the politics of social interactions within these wider contexts. Doing so has allowed me to consider the ways that children learn to perform emotion in particular ways within the SEAL school setting. A socio-spatial analysis offers a way of thinking about how children’s subject positions are informed by their emotional identities. In addition, the ways that these positions both enable and constrain children’s use of school space in particular ways, which in turn works to reinforce their emotional identities. They also allow for the consideration of how the socio-spatial positioning of children requires them to engage in different types of emotion work as they appropriate, resist and transform the identities that have been ascribed to them. The following section will examine this further by thinking about social recognition in the SEAL school setting.

d) A socio-spatial analysis of recognition

I was walking through the dinnerhall. Sarah (age 9) approached me and asked if she could join the lunchtime research workshop today. I told her this would be fine. She accompanied me to the computer suite, where I had set everything up ready for the children to continue adding to their scrapbooks about school. She sits down at the table in the centre of the room. Once sat down she begins to tell me that some people are silly, she tells me that they tease her about her interest in Scooby Doo. From getting to know Sarah I know that she loves Scooby Doo. She collects lots of books, figurines and other merchandise relating to the television programme. She tells me that some children tell her that it is babyish to like Scooby Doo. ‘But it isn’t’, she says. She explains that people older than her watch Scooby Doo too. I say that they do, even if it is babyish why would it matter. She says, yeah, ‘if you
enjoy something then you enjoy it’. She asks me if I like Scooby Doo. I say that I do. She asks me who is my favourite character. We continue to talk about Scooby Doo characters (Fieldnotes March 2011).

This extract from fieldnotes reflects how Sarah’s peers deride her interest in Scooby Doo. They rationalise their perspectives by associating the cartoon with immaturity (“it is babyish to watch Scooby Doo”). These repeated acts of ridicule leave Sarah questioning her enjoyment of the cartoon (“people older than me watch Scooby Doo”). I demonstrate my value for Sarah’s interests by dismissing her peers’ comments (“even if it is babyish why would it matter”). This provides Sarah with an alternative narrative (“if you enjoy something then you enjoy it”). In this short encounter it is possible to see that while Sarah is resisting her peers claims, by constructing a rationale to legitimise her interest in Scooby Doo, she is also affected by their comments. Her attachment to Scooby Doo has been changed through these interactions with her peers. In this conversation with me Sarah is working with and between two conflicting experiences from home and school.

This account reveals the significance of social recognition in Sarah’s life. It reveals how emotions and power are implicated in children’s social struggles for recognition in school settings. The recurring mocking of Sarah’s interests by her peers has implications. It works to render Sarah as different to her peers, as ‘babyish’, which work to produce social barriers and limit the social networks that Sarah can access. For example, as other children entered the room they made derogatory comments directed towards Sarah, ‘I’m not staying if Sarah stays’. This reflects how interpersonal power relations are reproduced spatially. Such power relations need also to be understood within a school context, where age is seen to really matter. In this school maturity is rewarded through special privileges, for example Year 6 children in the primary school sit on benches at the back of the school hall during assemblies while all younger children sit on the floor. In this case institutional power influences how recognition is granted through the spatial representation of formal structures. However, institutional power also informs how children use recognition to manage and negotiate their social relationships. In Sarah’s case, she is able to resist her peers’ perceptions by drawing on her own values as a resource to minimise the potential effects of being taunted. I am also aware that Sarah has strong social networks beyond school, and in particular friendships that have formed through her engagements in other settings. While Sarah demonstrates resilience, these encounters still affect how she is socially positioned within the school and influence her school experience.

Moving to an educational perspective, the ‘struggle for recognition’ is recognised as integral to the ways that children learn about themselves in relation to others during their time in school. For example, a key ontological aspect of the socio-cultural learning paradigm is the view that the self is ‘formed in desire, conflict and opposition, in a
struggle for recognition’ (Packer and Goicoechea 2000, pg. 233). If we consider that recognition involves the formation of hierarchies (Clark 1990), then the effects of such hierarchies upon children’s learning is important to consider. Wouters (1992) suggests that it increasingly difficult to talk about such hierarchies as our morality is bound by discourses of social equality. Yet at the same time it has been argued that our feelings are bound up in how we ‘mark’ and ‘claim’ social positions in relation to others (Clark 1990), which in turn shapes our sense of self. For Goffman (1990) struggles of recognition are an integral dimension of the micro-politics of people’s interactions with others. In this way the interplay between emotion and recognition shapes interpersonal power dynamics. Whilst power is structured through interaction, it is also important to understand this is in relation to the institutional frameworks within which these interactions take place.

Honneth (2012) suggests that ‘institutions can be understood as embodiments of the specific form of recognition that subjects accord each other’ (pg. 84). In schools children’s emotional dispositions are increasingly interwoven in the way that they are ranked (Ecclestone and Hayes 2009). However, the ways that recognition works with institutions can be understood as a mechanism of power and reflective of traditional educational structures. As Honneth (2012) suggests ‘by promising social recognition for the subjective demonstration of certain abilities, needs and desires, [subjects] engender a willingness to adopt practices and modes of comportment that suit the reproduction of social domination’ (pg 90). For example, Gillies (2011) argues that the categorisation of certain emotions in schools as proper or improper reflects a class-based politics. She argues for the repositioning of boys who are characterised as having emotional problems by considering the emotional skills that they bring to their interactions developed through their specific socio-cultural and economic backgrounds. As Burman (2008) also argues children from different backgrounds will develop different skillsets and this is the same in regards to emotion. However, the diversity of children’s skills are not recognised in schools (Burman 2008). Through their time at school, children learn to negotiate this interplay between ways of performing emotion and gaining social recognition. However, at times they will step into emotional repertoires that are not valued by the school. It is this interplay that became the focus of my analysis.

e) Moving towards a theoretical framework

_The way in which we name our feelings makes them bound by constraints, i.e. what we think we know as ‘truth’ in regard to particular feeling states and what we think we know of as correct ways of feeling or displays of feeling (Research Journal, July 2011)_
At the start of this study I resisted ‘naming’ emotions. However, as the research progressed I began to realise the importance of addressing how emotions are categorised and defined within the school setting both by children and adults. Emotional behaviours seem to be coupled into binary pairings, for example bullying is the opposite of kindness. This pairing then informs a decision to teach children about kindness and reward children’s acts of kindness. In order to be aware of these connections it has been important to name the types of emotions that seem to gain attention within the SEAL school context. If we acknowledge Wetherell’s (2012) account of affective practices, as dynamic, shifting and difficult to break down into constituent parts, then by attending to the ways in which school members come to define particular emotions it is possible to see how these overlap or contradict with children’s lived emotional experiences. While the children learn to associate the sensations of their own and other children’s bodies with an emotional language, it seems more difficult for them to apply this language to describe their own lived experiences. While it is clear that emotion plays a role in their interactions, for example I can see when a child appears to be stimulated while interacting with others, it is very difficult to state what is actually happening here not least re-describing it using emotion words. It would be impossible to describe what the child is feeling (both for me and perhaps for the child) because it can be difficult to capture the richness of emotional experiences through language. This is why it has been important for me to make connections across different types of data. Fieldnotes offer insight into children’s use of space in their emotional encounters, whereas the children’s films capture children’s gestures during such encounters. Children’s videos of their dens convey the sensory aspects of their experiences, whereas the focus group recordings provide an insight into how they make and take away meaning from these experiences, thus allowing me to engage with the different dimensions of children’s emotional experiences.

I started the section above by looking at how I used literature to make sense of the policy framing the SEAL curriculum. I outlined how this early stage of the research process was rooted in critical literature examining the relationships between emotional education and power. I drew on this literature to develop the argument that SEAL could be understood as tool for control within schools. In Context:1.2. (turn to pg. 29) I examine the child-centred rhetoric of SEAL and argue that this sits in tension with behavioural and developmental perspectives of the role of children’s emotions. I argue that SEAL aims to shape children into particular types of adults, irrespective of their own personal biographies and trajectories.
The section above has described the development of a theoretical framework by drawing upon trans-disciplinary literature informed to intuitive responses to the data gathered and produced over the course of the research process. I have suggested that engaging with different types of data required the development of a range of ways of interpreting these varied data sets. These data and the methods that I used to make sense of them are explored in Methods C:1.2. (turn to pg. 166) In this section I outline how I worked with and between video transcripts, fieldnotes, teacher interview transcripts and my own research journal.

Above I suggested that the different types of data generated through fieldwork have allowed me different lenses from which to view emotion. Some of the methods enable me to consider physical space, whereas others bring my attention to gesture. In Methods C:2.2. (turn to pg. 193) I focus upon the analysis of a specific extract of video data to reflect in depth upon the role of emotional reflexivity during fieldwork. I look specifically at how my emotional engagements with the data provided opportunities to gain further insights into the emotional lives of children within the SEAL school.

As the section above developed, I examined how different sets of literature informed my analysis of the data produced with children in the field. I describe how I moved towards a socio-spatial perspective to examine the relationship between power and emotion. I argued that this relationship is constructed through children’s engagements in and with the various events that take place within at school. By drawing on socio-spatial conceptualisations of emotion, I suggest that multiple emotion rules can exist at the same time within the different spaces and places within a school. I draw on the example that the rules that frame children’s friendship can conflict with those held by adults. This example is explored in depth in Landmark a:2. (turn to pg. 264) where I examine the relationship between three girls to consider how their own sense of what is and is not moral is embedded within their social interactions.
Methods C: Working With Field Data

Methods C looks at the development of methods to support the analysis of data and the representation of the research. This Exploratory emphasises how the data and the analytical design are intertwined. I felt it was important to develop analytical methods that responded to the data generated. These could not be prescribed from the outset because I wanted children to be involved in the development of the research methods and inform what the research data would look like.

2. Developing an Analytical Framework

Emotional Reflexivity and the Interpretation of Data

*I am exploring the significance of my emotions through reflecting upon a metaphorical description of the fieldwork process – ‘dancing through the field’ – whereby I will conceptualise my actions as movements, which respond to the rhythms of the field and its members... For example, the decisions I make about how and when to act and when not to become entangled with the real events, practices and personalities in the field (Research Journal, December 2010).

‘People are compelled to employ an emotionalised reflexivity in order to behave ‘appropriately’ in the range of types of interactions they experience. They reflect and act partly according to their perception of how they and others feel within particular interactional contexts. The complex diversity of these contexts within contemporary life puts emotional reflexivity at the heart of everyday life’ (Holmes 2011, pg. 12).

Emotional reflexivity, reflecting upon and through felt experience, is part of everyday life (Holmes 2011). Holmes (2011) argues that emotional reflexivity is an important aspect of peoples’ negotiations of the increasingly complex social spaces of contemporary life. If this is the case then researchers need to take into consideration the role that emotion plays in the research process. In doing so I build upon recent calls to acknowledge the role of...
emotions in academic research (see for example Moser 2008; Punch 2012; Widdowfield 2000). While this literature suggests that the researcher’s engagement with their own emotions during fieldwork influences their understandings of the field site, missing is a more explicit exploration of how. For example, Punch (2012) acknowledges that ‘it is often not clear or easy to disentangle how the process of doing fieldwork impacts on the interpretation of our findings’ (pg. 92). Rose (1997) also suggests that we need to ‘inscribe into our research some absences and fallibilities’ (pg. 319) to recognise the partiality and uncertainty of research. In Methods C:1.2, I suggest that my own emotional experiences of fieldwork influenced how I engaged with children and built an understanding of their socio-spatial interactions in and with the field site. In this section I go further and critically examine how I embedded emotional reflexivity into the data analysis process. Through focusing on extracts from videonotes I show how acknowledging emotional responses provides opportunities to recognise, on the one-hand, how our personal histories influence our research engagements, and on the other, how the spaces and places we inhabit as researchers shape our thoughts and feelings. I outline an approach to working with emotions in data analysis through identifying ‘moments’, ‘memories’ and ‘shifts’. As I write myself into interpretations of data, my movements are given presence, thus encouraging a deeper exploration of how meaning-making is entangled with prominent memories I have of the field and hidden shifts I make towards understanding the data. In doing so I argue that emotional responses are valuable sources of data.

a) Moving with data: drawing upon my felt responses

_I have just started to engage with video-data, which captures children’s interactions with others, the den itself and the video camera. I am drawn to some moments in the footage and not to others. I need to unpick how I am making these distinctions, in order to then critically reflect upon how I am choosing to make meaning from the data (Research Journal, August 2011)._

To engage with the ways that my relational emplacement in the field and personal history beyond the field affected my interpretations of the research data, I wrote myself into detailed ‘videonotes’ representing the events occurring in the video-footage. This approach was informed by Geertz's (1973) concept of 'thick' description. My aim was to understand the contextual meanings that informed the children's practices. In writing myself into these notes I could identify emotion moments. At these moments I could
notice that my interpretations of the video-data were imbued with emotion. These moments became starting points to further examine the meanings behind the socio-emotional dimensions of children’s lives. I will reflect upon this analytical process through the videonote extracts presented below (the approach I took to writing these videonotes is explored in Methods C:1.2.). These notes accompany video footage captured during the construction of the ‘Sparkle and Shine’ den (see Video 2).

**Video 2: Video footage from a Sparkle and Shine den-building workshop captured by the children when I was not in the room (this video can be viewed through the electronic version of this thesis on the disk provided).**

At this time, I had been at the school for three months. This was my second workshop with the SEAL Squad. In a previous workshop the nine participants built the den. After doing so I asked them if they wanted to present the den to the rest of the school through an assembly. They wanted to do this and so we arranged this follow-up workshop. The children split themselves into two groups and worked in separate rooms. Five of the children chose to write a script for the assembly and the remaining four chose to add to the den in preparation for it to be displayed in the school. This group also decided to make props for the assembly team to use in their presentation. These children included Justin, who is diagnosed with ‘asperger’s syndrome’ and receives one-to-one support to help him manage his emotions and, at times, unpredictable behaviour, Cheryl, Justin’s girlfriend (on and off) who is described by teachers as a tomboy, Fred, an obedient peer-mediator for the school, and Harry, a close friend of Fred’s with a slapstick sense of humour and also a peer-mediator. I gave Justin the video camera to record what they were
doing. The videonotes describe my response to footage captured when I was not in the room (during this time I had been asked by the assembly team to watch the first part of their assembly). The footage shows two of the boys, Harry and Fred, refashioning plastic plantpots into hats for the presenters to wear during their assembly. Justin has the video camera. Cheryl is also in the room but is not filmed in this part of the footage. Justin begins by filming Fred making his hat. Harry is sat on a swivel chair in the corner of the room facing a full-length mirror hung on the wall. He is wearing his hat. He calls over to Justin, ‘come over to me in the "naughty corner"3’ (see Fig. 28). The naughty corner is not a real space, but a playful appropriation of the corner of the classroom initiated by Harry. Justin turns and approaches Harry, who is sitting with his back facing the camera. As he walks over to him he says, ‘at the moment Harry is in the very, very, very, naughty corner, because he has been hitting his head on someone else and he’s been slating other people’ (Fig. 29, 30 and 31).

Figures 28 (left) and 29

Figures 30 (left) and 31

---

3 The naughty corner is a commonly used term for a disciplinary technique, whereby a child is placed by an adult in a particular space, typically isolated from others, for a certain number of minutes as a punishment for misbehaving. The amount of time the child is told to stay in the naughty corner is based upon the perceived severity of the child's misdemeanour.
Once close to Harry, Justin moves the camera towards the back of Harry’s head (Fig. 31), up and over his head capturing an inverted image of Harry’s face (Fig. 32). Moments later Justin knocks the hat from his head (Fig. 33). Harry asks Justin to ‘pass’, in a low-pitched tone of voice (Fig. 34). This verbal gesture seems to me to communicate to Justin that he acted improperly and spoilt the role-play. I feel it represents Justin’s actions as moving beyond a boundary – or what I have come to understand as a ‘feeling rule’ (Hochschild 2003). Justin does not respond to Harry’s request. Harry bows his head, indicating again, I feel, that the role-play has ended (Fig. 35). Justin seems to me to be unconcerned and chooses to film the others who are in the room. (Videonotes, August 2011).

In Methods C:1.2 I suggest that in writing myself into videonotes I was able to identify how my feelings were informing my interpretations of the video-footage. This is reflected in this example, where my personal reflections appear to correspond with moments when Harry and Justin communicate emotionally through voice and/or gesture. In the extract above I identified a ‘boundary’ that I felt Harry communicated to Justin. I inferred how this affected Justin; I felt that he seemed unconcerned. However, Justin responded to Harry by ceasing to film him and instead turned the camera towards Fred and Cheryl. This extract focuses upon the ‘ending’ of an interaction between Justin and Harry. The full set of videonotes reveal the attention I gave to moments when Justin’s peers either...
facilitated the inclusion or exclusion of Justin within social events. The attention I gave to Justin was reflective of how I came to know him. I felt saddened by the way his teachers and peers described him as angry and unpredictable, and therefore an individual to be feared. As an outsider, I found the school community's characterisation of Justin to be incongruent to my experience of him. The way that Justin, at times, was outcast by others I found both frustrating and upsetting. These feelings stirred my interest in challenging the narratives that framed how Justin’s behaviours were perceived and instead I sought to understand his actions as they occur in relationship to others and within specific contexts. At the school, teachers interpreted Justin's actions by drawing upon an individualist conceptualisation of emotion purported by the SEAL curriculum. SEAL draws upon Goleman's (1996) conceptualisation of 'emotional intelligence'. From Goleman's perspective, 'aggression, violence, impulsivity and school disengagement result from an inability to recognise and address emotion' (Gillies 2011, pg. 187). Therefore a focus is placed upon how children learn to engage with, name and act upon their emotions in particular ways:

*SEAL Coordinator (F): ... you are allowed to be angry and you're allowed to be frightened and scared, it's what you do with it that counts.*

Gillies (2011) suggests that the emphasis put upon how children should manage their emotion isolates children's felt experience and emotional exchanges from 'social and political context[s]' (pg. 201). Driven by a desire to re-present Justin as something other than the ‘one to watch out for’, my research endeavoured to understand the social and situated dimensions of Justin’s emotional experiences.

In re-presenting Justin I found myself unhelpfully positioning fault with his teachers and peers. I was concerned about Justin's view of himself and therefore favoured him in my analysis. My interpretations, I realised, were as much a part of the individualist paradigm evident in the SEAL curriculum and present in the school. I found that my care for Justin detracted from engaging with his accounts of his school experiences and understanding how he negotiated school life. My research with Justin was implicated by the particular characterisations of Justin present at the school. This paradigm was also reflected, in a different way, during future den-building workshops, where I found myself watching over Justin and managing his engagements with others. As teachers increasingly encouraged me to adopt this approach, by telling me, for example, ‘don’t let him out of your sight’, I found my relationship with Justin shaped by their perceptions of Justin as a risk. The contradictory approaches I found myself using in research practice and then in analysis,
were responding to two different emotional positions. As I analysed the data, I was moved by a sense of sadness for Justin. Yet in practice, I increasingly sought to manage Justin’s behaviours in response to a fear of what might happen if he is given the same freedoms as his peers. Drawing upon other aspects of video data I identified moments when these two positions were present. In the two examples that follow I show how I have used these moments as starting points to better understand the wider social and political contexts that frame Justin's experiences at school.

c) Moving with data: memories

Coffey (1999) argues that what we do with our data is 'most definitely an emotional activity' (pg. 139). Coffey draws attention to the emotional qualities of data analysis. For example, she states that 'whether we hate or love our data ... the major task of data management and analysis can easily lead to paralysis and despair ... unpacking, rereading and rethinking our data can be panic inducing as well as intellectually stimulating and personally rewarding' (pg. 139). Whilst it is important to acknowledge the emotional labour of data analysis, I also suggest that our emotional responses to our research materials are reminiscent of our experiences in the field and can enhance our interpretations of it. Pink (2009) suggests that our experiences in the field inform how we interpret data. She advocates a sensory ethnographic approach which 'explicitly seeks to maintain (or construct) connections between the materials and the ways of knowing associated with their production' (pg. 121). In this way she suggests that the research materials should be treated 'as texts that can be evocative of the processes through which they were produced' (pg. 121). I explore this through the extract below. This is a later video recording from the same workshop introduced in the previous section. Again, I am not present at the time this was recorded. The clip captures an interaction between Justin, Harry, Fred and Cheryl. It is presented as a written transcription rather than a series of stills for ethical reasons. I have selected an emotion moment from my videonotes to accompany the transcription.

*Justin throws bits of materials across the room*

*Cheryl is holding the camera, it is pointed to the floor*

Harry: I’m lucky to have this helmet on. Justin don’t!

Fred: It’s dangerous

Harry: Justin, don’t

Cheryl: Justin, why don’t you like me anymore?
Justin: I do
Cheryl: You don’t
Justin (singing): My Harry told me…
*Harry leaves the room* (He comes to find me to tell me Justin is throwing things)
Cheryl: Why did you don’t like me?
Justin: I do like you Cheryl
Cheryl: You don’t love me anymore
Justin: I do
Cheryl: You don’t
Justin: Harry’s a bit of a crybaby.
Fred: No he isn’t…
Cheryl: Why don’t you love me anymore?
Fred: …He’s not even crying
Justin: Is this Katy’s?
Fred: Yes
Cheryl: Why don’t you love me anymore?
Cheryl: Is it recording?
Fred: Justin!
Cheryl: Is it recording?
Fred: Err, it says record, so yes
Justin: Oh that’s Katy’s, that’s Katy’s, watch
Cheryl: It’s recording
*Cheryl points the camera at Justin*
*Justin, smiling, hits Katy’s work with a wooden drumstick*

I find this encounter similar to the ‘pass’ scene, where Harry’s verbal gesture conveys to Justin that he has moved beyond a “feeling rule”. In this example, when Harry leaves the room and calls upon me, I think he is communicating a similar message. Yet, earlier in the footage, Harry encouraged Justin by chanting ‘ruin it, ruin it, ruin it’ after he threatened to damage Cheryl’s work. What is different about this interaction? Why does Harry intervene in a way that regulates Justin actions? When Harry goes to get an adult, Justin responds by naming Harry as a crybaby. Justin’s statement I feel characterises Harry’s call for adult assistance as over the
top and a reflection of Harry's vulnerabilities. Justin's comment I think is a means of detaching him from fault, rather it positions Harry as at fault for over-responding. Fred's perspective is different; he described Justin's behaviour as dangerous. The use of the word dangerous rattled me, I was reminded of the second-hand stories I heard where parents described Justin as a risk to other children. I wonder how these perspectives enter into his social interactions with his peers? Perhaps this public image of Justin constrains the way that he comes to be viewed by others. I wonder if children's felt experiences of Justin are both shaped by and shaping of his public image? (Videonotes, August 2011)

This extract demonstrates how my emotional responses to the video-data were redolent of my experiences in the field. In this example, Fred’s words, ‘it’s dangerous’, reminded me of teachers’ accounts of parents’ perceptions of Justin. I find it useful to trace these threads and articulate these connections. In doing so, it becomes possible to explore how emotions evoke past events, and are used by people as a means of categorising personal experiences. Ahmed (2004) explores how emotions can ‘stick’ and suggests that ‘emotions are crucial to the very constitution of the psychic and the social as objects, a process which suggests that the 'objectivity' of the psychic and social is an effect rather than a cause’ (pg. 10). In this extract, my emotional response brought forth memories of events when I felt Justin was portrayed unfairly. The past experiences also influenced why I looked for instances of what I perceived as Justin’s unfair treatment within the video footage. My concern for Justin motivated me to negatively interpret the actions of Justin’s teachers and peers. However, a contradictory emotional position was evident in my response to Harry, after he told me Justin was throwing things around the room. This is reflected in the following extract from my fieldnotes.

Harry comes to find me and tells me, ‘Justin has been throwing things’. I return with him to the room in which they are working. I sit on the desk and watch the children. Cheryl asks me to leave. Wanting to keep an eye on her and Justin, I tell her I am staying. She says that she thinks the other group are ‘messing’. I tell her that they are working really well together and that I want to stay here. Both Harry and Fred agree with me. Again she asks me to leave… I tell Justin and Cheryl, ‘it looks like you have finished, so it is time to go back to class’. Cheryl starts making a wand… Later in the workshop, I tell them that I think they have finished and should go back to class. I’m more forceful in my manner and they go back to class. Before Justin leaves
Harry’s accusations stirred my anxiety about what was happening in the other room and I decided to intervene. Upon hearing Harry’s complaint, I chose to sit in the room with the four children, effectively to keep and eye on Justin and Cheryl. I did not question Harry’s account; rather I was concerned about what Justin might be doing. While it had been agreed with the school that I was not responsible for disciplining the children and if this needed to be done I could call on a teacher, my decision to step-in was an instinctive one. I asked both Justin and Cheryl to return to their class. I did so in an authoritative manner.

Now, in writing this and articulating my concern, I can relate to Fred and Harry’s perception of Justin as dangerous. This account shows how contrasting perceptions can co-exist. On the one hand, I wanted Justin to be trusted and included by his peers, based upon the assumption that this would be ‘best’ for him. This was also based upon my analysis of fieldnotes that showed how Justin’s presentation of anger tended to follow moments when his peers had actively excluded him. Yet, in practice I could not help but worry about what Justin might do if he was left unsupervised and unmanaged. This embodied sense of worry was perhaps a symptom of my relational emplacement within the school. Engaging with the emotional dimensions of these judgements opened up opportunities to deconstruct them. In doing so, new ways of engaging with the data were made possible. I sought to defamiliarise my emotional responses and engage with their socio-cultural foundations. ‘Defamiliarisation’ is seen as ‘a useful tool in the study of everyday life’ (Hodgetts et al. 2010, pg. 105). Through doing so I gained new insights into how emotional identities are produced and sustained through social practice. For example, in a conference presentation preceding the full development of this chapter, I removed Cheryl’s voice from the video transcript. Her voice seemed to distract from what I felt was important – Harry and Fred’s view of Justin behaviour. However, in revisiting the video footage and listening to Cheryl’s interjections I could see the importance of Cheryl’s contribution to the maintenance of particular emotionalised gender relations over the course of the encounter. For example, Cheryl repeatedly asks Justin why he doesn’t love her anymore. My feelings towards Justin meant that I initially missed the significance of Cheryl’s role in this event. When I engaged with Cheryl's voice a new analytical frame opened up for me, which was concerned with children's construction of
emotionalised gender norms. This is a reminder that emotional responses influence what the researcher attends to in her/his interpretation of research materials.

d) Moving with data: shifts

During data analysis, I found that there were moments when my analysis shifted away from the data itself. In these instances, my interpretations of the data drew upon normative narratives within the school and beyond. This is reflected in the extract below, which describes my responses to a second scene in the video footage when the boys again draw upon the imagined space of the naughty-corner in their play.

My first response to this footage was one of alarm. At the time I experienced Justin as subjected to exclusion – he worked at a computer on his own outside of the classroom during lessons, he didn’t really have a friendship group, he was often in trouble with his teacher, he received one-to-one support to help him control his behaviour. When I first watched the video, I watched it with a ‘sense’ of Justin as a ‘victim’. My attention was drawn to the second ‘naughty corner’ scene… and Justin’s assertive command, ‘naughty corner now!’ (fig, 37). He points his finger to the naughty corner and directs Fred to join Harry. He tells him ‘and I mean no hat’ (fig, 38). Justin approaches Harry. Justin spits words at Harry – ‘you idiotic, horrible, disgusting...’ (fig. 39). I felt alarmed, but not by Justin’s authority. My emotional response was related to my anxiety about Justin’s experiences of being parented. I wondered, ‘is this what his Mum does to him?’ This was a massive leap away from the footage, and an ungrounded question to ask. What was it motivated by? My emotional response to the footage was fuelled by experiences beyond it – fearful feelings about ‘bad’ parenting. My emotions took me to a different ‘place’ – they synthesised a wide-range of my experiences in an attempt to make sense of Justin’s movements in the video footage. At the time, my emotions took me beyond what I could claim from this piece of data. This shift, while ungrounded, was also significant… My interpretations were restricted by an attachment to the question of ‘what is best for Justin’, rather than the question I really wanted to ask was ‘what is Justin’s experience?’ (Videonotes, August 2011)
My interpretation here shifted away from the video footage as I was stirred by my own judgements about behavioural reinforcement approaches to parenting. I initially assumed that Justin’s role-play depicted his experiences at home. However, upon closer reflection I began to identify links between my interpretations of Justin’s actions and discourses of the ‘bad’ parent present within the school. For example, training events were developed for parents to teach them practical strategies for resolving conflict in the home. In addition, the ways that parents spoke to their children was seen by teachers as a reason why children did not see themselves in positive ways. The role of the family in children's development was commonly discussed amongst teachers. However, these discourses also have a presence beyond schooling. For example, Burman (2008) argues that developmental psychology ‘contributes to and reflects dominant assumptions and debates about families’ (pg. 117). She suggests that ‘the family as the context for child rearing is central to social policy and welfare provision and is also the site for heated debate about social relations and social change’ (pg. 105). Gillies (2008) highlights how policy and practice focused upon children and families commonly have a ‘class specific focus’ and position ‘disadvantaged or ‘socially excluded’ families as failing their children’ (pg. 1079). The pervasive nature of psychological discourse is encapsulated by the term ‘psychologisation’. ‘Psychology has become the preferred method of neo-liberal policy makers, and society en masse, to explain an individual’s destiny in society’ (Madsen and Brinkmann 2010, pg. 186). Psychologisation suggests that psychological modes of understanding the self and other are implicated in people's everyday lives. My initial
judgements about the significance of Justin's behaviour were informed by psychological accounts of the role of the family in child development. Rather than neglecting this in-the-moment judgement as simplistic, I sought to explore its origins. I identified a connection with the SEAL curriculum, which associates ‘challenging’ behaviours with ‘social and emotional difficulties’ (Gillies 2011, pg. 189) often perceived by teachers to stem from children's family lives. As an adult I was expected to model ‘social and emotional skills’ in my interactions with children. In this way, I embodied the values and norms of the field site as I built my relationships with the research participants. My interpretations of behaviour were also, at times, influenced by modes of understanding that were prioritised by the school. As Coffey (1999) states 'we locate our physical being alongside those of others as we negotiate the spatial context of the field' (pg. 59). As researchers, our practices are concerned 'with the positioning, visibility and performance of our own embodied self' (Coffey 1999, pg. 59). The extract from my videonotes reveals how pervasive discourses can permeate our embodied practices and emotional lives and thus shape how we make sense of the lives of others. Engaging with the emotional dimensions of fieldwork can enhance how we interpret our research.

In examining extracts from videonotes above I showed how the articulation of emotional responses provides opportunities to develop research methodologies. In these accounts I drew attention to the interplay between emotions and place in order to show how reflecting upon and through emotions can connect researchers with their relational emplacement during fieldwork. In Methods A:1.1. (turn to pg. 52) I explore the concept of emplacement and how this has informed a research methodology that enables my elicitation of children’s socio-emotional practices. In addition, I engage with different perspectives of emotion to develop a rationale for emotional reflexivity in the research process and its importance in making sense of the emotional spatiality of children’s experiences and their placemaking practices.

The section above has suggested that my own emotional experiences are implicated in the processes through which I analyse data. I addressed questions of how emotions mediate research through focusing upon an approach to analysing video data. To do so I drew upon the notion that data analysis, regardless of the frameworks that we put in place, will always be influenced by our own ‘sensed interpretations’. In Methods C:1.2. (turn to pg. 166) I examine how I transcribed the video-footage in order to pay attention to such interpretations. I explore how I used writing as a tool to deconstruct the footage in order to take new meanings from it. The approach to working with video-data is also reflected upon in relation to other data-sets. The video-data offered insights that other data could not.
In detailing the ways that emotions entered into my research through the section above, I aimed to highlight the value of recognising our emotional responses as valuable sources of data. I outlined an approach to working with emotions in data analysis through identifying ‘moments’, ‘memories’ and ‘shifts’. While the section above focused on how I worked with this data, Paths a:1. (turn to pg. 275) presents my current interpretation of the ‘Come over to the Naughty Corner’ scene. Here I examine the ways that children’s expression of emotion can ‘impress’ upon others in particular ways and inform the ways that emotional exchanges unfold.
Volume B
Districts: A district is a bounded physical space in which specific social events take place, such as the headteacher’s office or the assembly hall. Vignettes relating to districts show how emotion works in different ways depending upon children’s perceptions of the ways of being that are valued in these spaces.

District A: Children’s Presentation of Emotion in Different School Spaces

The example presented in this section explores how, as children move through the school’s spaces and shape the events that unfold within them, they also move through different types of ‘emotional exchanges’ (Hochschild 2003) and work to present their emotional selves in associated ways. From receiving praise from the Headteacher in his office to playing with peers in the playground, the emotional selves that children present change as they respond to the site they are in, the people they are with and the activity they are doing. District-A introduces a range of sites within the school which the children discussed during the research workshops. The vignette presented explores how children’s presentations of their emotional selves relate to the ‘liminality’ (Turner 2008) of the events enacted in these spaces. The moments that follow are examples of how spaces and the rituals performed by actors within them produce and sustain an ‘affective economy’ (Ahmed 2004) through which ‘affective value [is] assigned to some figures and not others’ (Wetherell 2012, pg. 16). Initially I considered children to have their own unique peer cultures (Corsaro and Eder, 1990) with their own affective economies distinct from adults. However, the main aim of District-A is to explore how adults and children together appropriate, transform and construct an emerging affective economy specific to this unique SEAL school setting.

“No! You’ve done it once”

This district examines how children perform emotion in spaces away from the gaze of adults. I draw upon three examples to consider how gender identities are enacted within the informal spaces of the SEAL school.
In this section I consider the role that gender plays in children’s socio-emotional interactions outside of ‘formal’ learning spaces. I suggest that within these spaces children can challenge and at times transform the formal subjectivities they are afforded within the classroom context. However, in the examples shown, the children are enacting emotionalised gender norms. I will draw on three moments from my fieldnotes to examine these interactions. The first example is from an encounter between Justin and a boy called Troy in the ‘field’, a grassed area in the playground that children are allowed to use in good weather. Secondly, I draw on another encounter between Justin and Troy during a residential visit to an outdoor pursuit centre. The final example is a conversation between Justin, Katie and Cheryl in the dining hall.

The first encounter I will draw on is between Justin and a group of boys. This encounter occurs in the field, which is a space particularly valued by boys as it is closed for the majority of time during the school year. The grassed field is opened for children to use during the summer months when the weather is good. I only participated in activities in the field on one of my visits to the school. I noted in my fieldnotes that there were hardly any children on the playground; they had chosen to play on the field. The boys were playing football. As I enter the field I see Justin.

Justin is walking across the field where other children are playing football. He has a big bundle of grass. He shouts over to me. He says he is making a giant mound of grass, and asks if I want to come and see. I say OK. He says that it is going to be as big as the empire state building. I ask him how tall it is. He says he doesn’t know, but he thinks about 100 foot...

At first I thought that Justin was playing alone. However, I soon realise he is building the tower with a group of boys.

He places his clump of grass onto the mound. He is building it with Year 3 children, both boys and girls. One of these boys, Richard, is in a mainstream class and has Downs Syndrome. Troy and Jack, twin brothers from the same year as Justin are also there. Troy and Jack are both listed as having special educational needs and receive additional learning support and are also in the mainstream classes. They are in separate Year 5 classes; Troy is in the same class as Justin. As they are building the mound, Justin tells Richard, ‘No. You’ve done it once, now not again’. I do not know exactly what Richard has done. However, Justin has the tone of an authority figure. I later
hear him telling Troy that he can no longer help to build the mound. Justin’s voice gets a little louder as he continues to speak. He looks cross. I start to feel a little anxious. I back away from the situation, hoping that I would not be expected by members of staff to intervene... Justin lays on top of Troy. Troy is smiling as Justin is on top of him. Justin appears playful yet it also seems that there is a serious undertone to how he is interacting with Troy, which I can’t quite place (April 2010).

This encounter seems to afford Justin a way of being which would not be accepted by many of his peers. For example, in Paths b:2 I draw on a conversation between Justin’s peers, where two boys seem to agree that Justin ‘attacks people for no reason’. They also say that this happens sometimes ‘just’ because they won’t let him join in a game. Justin’s exclusion from these games seems to have particular significance for him. This is reflected in a drawing produced by Justin to describe what might have happened to somebody to make them a ’10′ (see Fig. 40). In the drawing below produced by Justin, he states that ‘he is smiling because ... they have let me join a game’.

![Figure 40: Justin’s drawing of himself at a 10](image_url)

During morning and afternoon registration children are asked to rate how they are feeling on a scale of 1 to 10. This drawing activity helped me to engage with children’s understanding of this scale. I introduce children’s ‘feeling barometer’ drawings in further depth as part of Edge b:1.
In this encounter Justin seems to take on a leadership role. My fieldnotes document the occasions when Justin disallows the contributions of others, firstly with Richard and then later with Troy. Justin reprimands Troy by lying on top of him. Whilst I recognise this moment as playful, I make a note of my sense that this is also serious. Perhaps this seriousness reflects my sense that the acceptance of Justin’s assertiveness seemed unusual. I wondered if this group, made up of children either younger than Justin or characterised as having special needs, afforded a greater range of ways of being than other groups that Justin had tried to ‘play a game’ with. While I am still uncertain as to how to make sense of this, and particularly because I have limited range of fieldnotes which capture Justin’s interactions with the children from this group, it does remind me of a conversation between Justin and Troy during a residential visit to an outdoor pursuits centre. Here Troy seems to be trying to impress Justin.

Troy and Justin are washing up the post at the sink in the kitchen. Troy tells Justin that he once threw an apple so far that it hit someone on the head. Justin tells him, ‘yeah right Troy’. Troy seems to try and qualify the distance, stating that he threw it one hundred yards. Justin still doesn’t seem to believe him. During washing up Justin also tells me he isn’t really into films like *Shrek* (*Shrek* is going to be shown on the TV later in the evening, as the night-time activity). However, earlier Justin told me how many times he had seen the movies. He tells me now that he likes films like *Fast and Furious*, explaining that they are funny too. He gives me an example, like when someone is left hanging out a car door held only by his ankles and he shrouts, ‘shit, shit, shit’. He tells me again, ‘that was really funny’. I am laughing at his story (November 2010).

This encounter seems to reflect Troy’s esteem for Justin. Justin is central to this encounter. However, as I noted in the encounter in the ‘field’, Justin also acts assertively with Troy. This is reflected in other incidents where Justin uses threats, such as telling an adult, when he is reprimanding Troy. While Justin is afforded respect in his relationship with Troy, something more seems to be going on here. Troy chooses to share a story with Justin which is centred on throwing. He claims that he can throw at a great distance. The language he chooses to use to tell this story reflects a particular notion of masculinity. However, Justin discounts his claim. He instead shares with me his preference for violent
films featuring fast cars and swearwords, rather than films like ‘Shrek’. This contradicts Justin’s comments about Shrek films earlier in the day. I would argue that at work within the ‘place’ that Justin and Troy are creating whilst they are stood drying dishes at the sink, is a construction of masculinity. As Troy describes what he can do and Justin what kinds of films he likes, it is possible to see how they are portraying a particular version of masculinity that they want to be associated with. For both boys masculinity is reflected in the body (‘threw an apple so far’, ‘hanging out of a car door held only by his ankles’). For Justin it is also embedded in speech (‘shit, shit, shit’).

Swain (2000) argues that ‘power is differentiated, with different meanings and versions assuming a particular dominance in certain localised sites’ (pg. 96). Building from this he suggests that different types of masculinities could be hierarchically prioritised in different ways across different sites and situations.

> There will not only be a variety of competing and frequently contradictory masculinities on view, but also a hierarchical ordering, with a hegemonic form gaining ascendancy over and above others, which are consequently marginalised (pushed to the edges) or subordinated (actively pursued and assaulted) (Swain 2000, pg. 96).

Within this short encounter between Justin and Troy a particular version of masculinity is enacted between them. This also seems to be reflected in their fight in the playground, when Justin is on top of Troy but Troy just laughs. In Node b:2 I show how a different version of masculinity, one of maturity, is attributed to Didier by the Year 5 classroom teacher. Perhaps then, as Swain (2000) suggests, versions of masculinity can change in different sites and settings. It would seem that these correspond to the emotional identities valued in different situations. In the presence of an adult teacher it seems that a very different emotional presentation of masculinity, one of maturity, is prioritised in comparison to the encounters between Justin and Troy which are outside of the adults gaze. Here the boys present themselves as physically tough, rather than, in the case of Didier, mentally tough.

Connell (1992) argues that ‘different masculinities are constituted in relation to other masculinities and to femininities through the structure of gender relations’ (pg. 736). The following extract reflects how boys and girls become defined as separate groups through

---

5 Shrek is an animation which draws on old fairytales, but reworks the characters within new stories. Shrek is the central character in the films, a large green ogre.
everyday mixed gender interactions. Again, I am interested in the ways that these binaries are created in the informal interactions in spaces beyond the formal teaching spaces. The extract is from an encounter between both boys and girls at one of the dining tables in the dining hall. This conversation begins soon after Katie, who within a classroom context is described by her teacher as a ‘quiet’ girl, and Cheryl, who is described as ‘assertive’, have managed to negotiate seats beside me. Didier gave up his seat so that they could both sit beside me.

The main topic of conversation is boyfriends and girlfriends. Over the table Cheryl vocally dumps Justin. Justin comes over and asks her ‘what's up?’ He then whispers, ‘Cheryl, just pretend’. He returns to his seat unsuccessful. He then asks Cheryl who was the boy she was going out with outside of school. She doesn’t answer. Some of the boys at the table ask her again. Justin tells the boys at his end of the table that she is just pretending and that there isn’t anybody. Cheryl then starts listing me the different people she has been out with; one boy she tells me she went out with for 10 seconds. She tells me that she kissed one of the boys at the table. He tells me not to listen, that she is just making things up. Cheryl tells me that he is just embarrassed. Katie then starts to join in. She tells me who she has been out with and who she has kissed and that she is now going out with Justin. Justin shouts to Katie across the table, you know I dumped you last night, well I didn’t mean it... Justin then asks the people on the table to put up their hands if they have kissed any of the girls on the table. Katie puts up her hand. She then says, oh girls, oops, no I haven’t done than. She then raises her hand again and says, yes I have, and she kisses her own hand. She says I’ve kissed myself. Then Justin asks, who on this table has kissed a boy. He doesn’t really get much of a response. One of the lunchtime supervisors who is passing by remarks, ‘you shouldn’t really be talking about things like this at your age’. Tom gets up to leave the table, he tells me he didn’t really like his food today (September 2010).

In this interaction, I would argue, that the children are aware of the gender strand of their identities. Thorne (1993), in her important work about gender play in schools, uses the term ‘borderwork’ to describe the social construction of gender boundaries with a particular focus on children’s play. She argues that these boundaries are ‘episodic’ and ‘ambiguous’ (pg. 84). The extract above reflects a playful encounter between the children, of which I play a silent but important role. It seems like the interaction is initiated by
Cheryl for my benefit, but then seems to take its own course. Thorne (1993) argues that power is an important dimension of children’s borderwork. She suggests that while girls start from a ‘one-down position’, they can adopt powerful roles. We can see in this encounter that the girls are stirring the boys’ discomfort in their discussion about kissing, and perhaps my own presence was significant in how this discussion unfolded. This is reflected in Tom’s closing comment about his dislike of the food today. It is possible to see that Cheryl, supported by Katie, are directing this encounter, and carefully working on the boy’s emotional responses in order to do so. Justin is the only boy who tries to turn the situation around. His interjections are directed towards the girls, in an attempt to have some directive control over the encounter. Cheryl in particular ignores him, thus countering his provocations. Katie does respond to one of Justin’s requests, but misinterprets what he has said. She then uses humour to stave off her embarrassment, and regain her powerful role within the encounter. Within this short interaction between the boys and girls, emotions play an integral role in shaping power relations. It could also be suggested that through this emotional exchange sexualised gender identities are enacted in particular ways.

The three examples presented in the section above show how emotionalised gender play affords the children to enact identities that within a classroom context would be neutralised. Thorne (1993) also recognises how gender boundaries have different levels of significance in different school spaces. She also acknowledges that adults most notably remember their gender-marked play. It seems that the moments of emotionalised gender play presented in this section are opportunities for children to subvert their formal identities. Within these ‘other’ spaces of the school, the children in these encounters seem to be afforded interpersonal power through these forms of play. I showed how Justin is afforded power as he enacts an emotionalised masculinity within his interactions with Troy. I also suggested that Troy performs a similar identity as tries to build his allegiance with Justin. However, Justin neutralises these attempts. While we can see how gender identities are reinforced through these interactions, I suggested that Justin was afforded an alternative identity when he was with Troy than when he was with other children. In other interactions Justin’s aggressive approach to play was interpreted by others as him ‘attacking people for no reason’. In Paths a:2. (turn to pg. 282) I draw on a conversation between Justin’s peers, where they discuss why they can sometimes find him difficult to relate to.
This section has shown that emotionalised gender play is integral to the ways that children negotiate interpersonal power. I have shown how Justin and Troy enacted a ‘tough’ masculinity in their interaction while they were drying the plates one evening during the week-long residential. I suggested that this is one particular version of masculinity that serves a purpose in this encounter. However, in other situations when adults are present different version of masculinity are prioritised, such as Didier’s maturity. I have also suggested that gender boundaries are reinforced through mixed gender encounters, such as the conversation that took place between boys and girls at the dining table. I described an incident when Cathy initiated a conversation that foregrounded sexualised encounters with the opposite sex and made some of the boys feel uncomfortable. This gender-marked discussion is doing powerful work. In Node a:3, (turn to pg. 309), I examine the ways that emotionalised gender identities are embedded in children’s interactions. I consider the association between maturity and masculinity. In addition, I suggest that Cheryl and Katie associate womanhood with a particular kind of emotionalised sexuality.
Districts: A district is a bounded physical space in which specific social events take place, such as the headteacher’s office or the assembly hall. Vignettes relating to districts show how emotion works in different ways depending upon children’s perceptions of the ways of being that are valued in these spaces.

District B: Limitations on children’s bodies in different school spaces

District-B examines how different school spaces, which adopt distinct functions, have associated expectations co-constructed by adults and children of how they should be inhabited. I will focus on how children’s practices and the ways they move their bodies are understood in relation to these expectations. Adults and children seem to interpret the movement of bodies by understanding the body as carrying an emotion, such as anger or care. The emotional identities that ‘stick’ (Ahmed, 2004) to particular bodies affect the experience of others who come into contact with them. The ways that different children impress upon others in turn shapes the ways they use their own bodies and in which spaces. The moments described in District-B focus upon children’s inhabitation of school spaces by focusing on children’s bodies and how their actions are perceived by others. The aim here is to trouble the assumption that specific emotional dispositions and not others should be prioritised in education. I suggest that opening up opportunities for children to express their emotions in different ways may afford those children who struggle to adopt the prioritised emotional dispositions different subject-positions.

“This is a grown up meeting”

This vignette centres around a school council meeting. I explore what types of voice are and are not heard by adults during these meetings.

‘A lot of [emotional education is about] encouraging children to be empowered, to have the language to resolve conflict and difficulties, and
express how they are feeling about a certain issue and ... to feel good about themselves’ (SEAL coordinator)

The association of empowerment with emotional education stirs the question of how empowerment is understood within this context and within this understanding who are seen as the empowered. Empowerment at the school is often associated by staff with ‘having a voice’. The expression of ‘voice’ is also seen to encompass the expression of emotion.

‘I think that [this school] quite rightly has been recognised as a SEAL school … it’s an environment where the children are allowed to express themselves and their feelings and [are] encouraged to do so at every opportunity from circle time to school council and it’s great really, that they get a chance to air their views.’ (Year 5 Classroom Teacher)

Hochschild (2003) suggests that the management and expression of emotion is tied to ‘feeling rules’, which are constructed in interactions with others and shape ideas about what an individual should be feeling in a particular situation and in what ways they should communicate their emotion to others. At school, when children express emotion with adults and peers they are together constructing feeling rules.

Feeling rules can be understood as context-specific and therefore the product of particular times and places (Barbalet 2001). Given this, a universal set of feeling rules by which people should conform does not exist, but instead feeling rules are representative of particular social, cultural, historical, political and economic forces present within specific contexts. Therefore, it is important to remember that the feeling rules present in the school, some of which are defined in the emotional curriculum and reworked by the school to form a set of ‘Core Values’, are connected to such wider forces.

Feeling rules change in different situations and with different people, for example the feeling rules that bound an informal encounter such as a group of friends playing ‘tig’ in the playground are different from those within a more formal encounter such as a School Council meeting. Children are capable of negotiating the diverse and emerging range of implicit and explicit feeling rules that guide how they should express emotion in different types of encounters in a variety of contexts.

Explicit feeling rules can be reinforced by children in the quest for authorship and recognition, particularly in encounters that blur the boundaries of informal and formal.
For example during a hands-on and playful activity in a classroom setting, a boy loudly reminded another of a well-known feeling rule, it is wrong to say rude things at school, in an attempt to stop a girl in the room from making rude comments. At other times when the boy has made similar attempts and yet that have failed to have an impact, he has asked an adult to intervene.

However, these explicit feeling rules can also be negated. For one of the girls, authorship is sought by shouting in order to get others to listen. Or, on one occasion, one of the boys participating in the research discredited his peer’s achievements to himself gain recognition. While such actions seem to stem from similar motivations, the ways that children go about gaining recognition can be quite different. When these children deviate from the actions they typically use to gain recognition, they tend not to be successful in doing so.

In encounters when children negate feeling rules, the focus of the interaction for the child is on the immediate effects of expressing emotion. In these moments emotional responses can have a fluidity to them and seem almost instinctive, in ways where the emotion feels purposeful to that moment and that child. However, for the children who express emotion in these ways and therefore negate feeling rules on a regular basis, the longer term effects can be more problematic. In Node b:2, I explore how David’s crying was perceived negatively by school staff. The ways that others responded to his tears seemed to be framed by emotionalised gender norms, which led to his increased exclusion from school activities and by his peers.

The children that both practise and reinforce the explicit feeling rules, tend to be more likely to put themselves forward and be selected for a position of responsibility at the school, such as school council member or peer-mediator. In addition, within their interactions with adults, it seems that children’s ‘voices’ are more likely to be heard when they conform to these perceived ‘right’ ways of managing and expressing emotion.

At the first School Council meeting of the school year, 8 children from mainstream classes and 1 boy from the integrated resource came together to share and discuss their views with two members of school staff about what should change in the school. I attended this meeting as a participant observer. The children came prepared with ideas based on their own and their peers’ reflections. The adults also invited the children on a walk around the school to communicate what they liked and what could be improved. Ryan, a ‘special educational needs’ child from from the integrated resource, was
particularly excited by this opportunity. On one occasion during the tour he taps Mr Davidson, the headteacher, on the shoulder repeatedly to get his attention.

*Mr Davidson says to him, ‘don’t keep doing that to me, it could get annoying’. Mrs Williams asks him, ‘what do you do if you want to speak’.*

*Ryan raises his hand to demonstrate what he should do. She says to him ‘you wouldn’t like it if he tapped you’. ‘I would’, Ryan replies. (Fieldnotes)*

Ryan continues to express his excitement through his gestures or the way he moves his body. He later jumps with his hand in the air and is told, ‘you don’t need to jump, we’ll always come to you’. These interactions involving Ryan, while they did not diffuse Ryan’s physical expression of his excitement, communicated a shared understanding of how children should use their bodies within these ‘grown-up’ meetings. Physical gesture in this situation was very closely associated with emotion. A still and quiet body represents a calm emotional state, which is prioritised in meetings that require children to engage in a serious adult-like manner. This example illustrates how feeling rules are embodied by children as they learn to use their bodies in particular ways in order to present an emotional state that seems to fit the conventions of the social situation, in this case a formal meeting. This resonates with Burkitt’s (1997) argument that emotions ‘are constituted by techniques of the body learning within a social habitus, which produces emotional dispositions that may manifest themselves in particular situations’ (pg. 37). He argues that ‘these techniques of the body are part of the power relations that play an important part in the production and regulation of emotion’ (pg. 37). In the case of the School Council meeting, the children are working on their bodies in ways that model what it means to be adult. This idealised notion of adulthood where emotions are contained within the individual and hidden from others. The ways that both the adults and children at this meeting responded to Ryan, reflects how the emotionless body is reinforced as the ideal.

While particular types of emotional engagements are expected from the children by the adults, it also appears that there are certain conventions that bound how adults engage with the children. During the tour, adults used a range of ways to communicate they had heard the children’s views, such as verbally communicating their support for a child’s perspective.

*George, from Year 5, says that books should be put back when they are used by children in the library. Hayley suggests that they ‘move the table so
people get used to putting books back’. Mrs William's responds, ‘don't give
them the excuse to dump it’. Mr Davidson, the headteacher, states ‘I like
things tidy’. (Fieldnotes)

However, when the children’s views came into tension with adult-orientated rationales,
the children were offered an alternative perspective to challenge their view.

Ryan suggests that at dinnertime ‘you should be able to sit with friends’. (the
children are allocated seats by the lunchtime supervisors). Mrs Williams
asks him, ‘isn’t it nice to sit with new people though?”. Ryan doesn't agree,
he says he always ends up sitting with girls and sites the Christmas meal as
an example. He explains that this is the reason why he has packed lunch.
(Fieldnotes)

In this case Ryan does not change his view but presents a compelling argument for why
the lunchtime protocol should be reviewed. Rather than discounting his view, Mrs
Williams suggests that they may change things for the Christmas meal as she tells Ryan,
‘we’ll have to think about how we do the Xmas meal then’. In acknowledging one aspect
of Ryan’s complaint, Mrs Williams also limits further discussion about changing the
seating system already used at lunchtime, which is adopted by lunchtime supervisors as a
way of minimising conflict.

These examples reflect some of the challenges of involving children in decision-making.
Children are encouraged to make decisions about the school’s operations but their
perspectives and those of adults can sometimes differ. Both positions draw upon
legitimate rationales, yet adult-orientated perspectives tend to be the ones that are taken
up. For example, one of the children on the tour suggests that all children should know
the code for the door of the ICT suite so they can get in there to use a computer when the
room is not in use. Mrs Williams says she is not sure about that idea and suggests that
maybe they will need to talk about that one. Therefore these kinds of decision-making
practices unintentionally work to reinforce the distinct social positions of adults and
children at the school.

Children are also active in sustaining their social position, this is not a one-way (top-
down) process. For example, in a conversation about the school’s new security gates the
children share how they feel they need to be kept safe from harm.
George from Year 5 says that ‘robbers can’t get into the school’... a younger girl adds to this saying that the gates mean that ‘the teenagers can’t get in’... ‘they used to make the Y3 children upset, calling them names and the dinnerladies didn’t used to say anything, and they were much bigger than us. With the gates it’s easier for us to be more safe’. (Fieldnotes)

Within these ‘grown-up’ meetings the children and adults together sustain a culturally constructed view of children as in need of protection through adult supervision. Those children who concur with this view of themselves tend to have their voices heard, whereas those who may challenge this, such as the child who suggested that all children should have access to the ICT suite, tend to be encouraged to take on an alternative position or told that will be discussed in the future. This also happens within the classroom context when children share their perspectives in SEAL lessons.

In a SEAL lesson the children are discussing techniques to help them calm down, so that their ‘minds are more open to good ideas’ and to ‘good thinking’ the teacher tells them... ‘You’ve got help yourself to win the game of learning’. The children then start sharing their techniques to calm down. Didier says that he ‘counts to ten’. Rebecca says ‘take a deep breath’. Maram suggests to ‘walk away’. Alexandra says ‘scream in a pillow’. Someone shouts out, ‘what’s she mean?’ The teacher explains that it is like when you want to scream to let out all your anguish... Justin adds ‘sometimes I play on my Xbox’. The teacher reminds the children that they are thinking about when they are at school. (Fieldnotes)

While Justin’s view is not directly challenged, and instead the teacher addresses the whole class, there is a sense here that computer games are not an appropriate suggestion. Beyond the classroom setting, teachers and parents share a concern regarding children’s gaming not only because of the game content but also because online gaming puts children at risk of being ‘cyber-bullied’. The teacher’s response to Justin’s contribution to the discussion is an example of how interactions between children and adults construct shared understanding of what are the ‘right’ ways to both manage and express emotion.
The section above suggested that children’s voices are heard in school-based participation activities when they were expressed in a conventional manner, which involves the child managing their emotions in particular ways (for example, children’s excitement and eagerness were expected to be suppressed during the tour as part of the School council meeting and calmness and patience were encouraged). The children who are supported to express their own views, are those who support adult-orientated agendas. These children are able to control their emotions in ways that align with the school’s explicit feeling rules. Working upon one’s emotions in these ways is describes by Hochschild as ‘emotional labour’ (2003). Path a:2. (turn to pg. 282) explores children’s emotional labour at school in more detail by examining how children talk about how they should perform emotion, and with a particular focus on the formation of ‘positive’ social relationships. This is contrasted with an example of how alternative ways of expressing emotion not promoted by the emotional curriculum, such as playful mocking, are important to the ways that children build friendships.

As well as recognising children’s emotion work, this section has also suggested that children express their emotion in ways that contradict the school’s feeling rules. Burkitt (1997) suggests that feeling rules cannot always explain how emotions are produced. He states that ‘feeling can often contradict and conflict with the rules of emotion in particular settings because of the relationships of the people within them’ (pg. 49, original italics). In response, he suggests that ‘social power relations involving class, gender, race, are intimately connected to social precepts and regulations, which play such a central role in the shaping of emotion’ (pg. 49). He argues that ‘the child develops the means of emotional expression which are used in the communication between individuals of his or her class or group’ (pg. 53). However, in a school setting the emotional dispositions learned in the ‘emotional habitus’ (Burkitt 1997) surrounding the child might sit in tension with the feeling rules cultivated by adults at the school. In these cases the feelings and behaviours of children who negate feeling rules on a regular basis can become problematised. In Node a:3. (turn to pg. 309) I examine how emotionalised gender norms intersect with the exclusion of a boy called David, who publicly cries more frequently than other boys. This is with the context of exploring how emotionalised gender identities are embedded within children’s social interactions.
**Districts:** A district is a bounded physical space in which specific social events take place, such as the headteacher’s office or the assembly hall. Vignettes relating to districts show how emotion works in different ways depending upon children’s perceptions of the ways of being that are valued in these spaces.

**District B: Limitations on children’s bodies in different school spaces**

District-B examines how different school spaces, which adopt distinct functions, have associated expectations co-constructed by adults and children of how they should be inhabited. I will focus on how children’s practices and the ways they move their bodies are understood in relation to these expectations. Adults and children seem to interpret the movement of bodies by understanding the body as carrying an emotion, such as anger or care. The emotional identities that ‘stick’ (Ahmed, 2004) to particular bodies affect the experience of others who come into contact with them. The ways that different children impress upon others in turn shapes the ways they use their own bodies and in which spaces. The moments described in District-B focus upon children’s inhabitation of school spaces by focusing on children’s bodies and how their actions are perceived by others. The aim here is to trouble the assumption that specific emotional dispositions and not others should be prioritised in education. I suggest that opening up opportunities for children to express their emotions in different ways may afford those children who struggle to adopt the prioritised emotional dispositions different subject-positions.

“He should be in the IR... because he has got angry problems”

This section shows how a perception, shared by both adults and children, that Justin cannot ‘control’ his body leads to him being seen as unpredictable. He is therefore feared and his exclusion from the classroom is welcomed by his peers.
This moment will examine how fear is a motivating factor in the exclusion of children from a classroom setting. I will explore how, by moving a child from the classroom setting to different school spaces (such as the library or headteacher’s office), the emotion of fear that seems to circulate in the child’s presence is also displaced. I describe these spaces as ‘outside’ spaces because they play a role in how children are positioned as outside the norm and characterises children in particular ways, whether as for example a high achieving or as a special educational needs students. I will suggest that the resulting absence of fear that comes from excluding a child from a classroom legitimises the decision to exclude children at particular times. I will explore how ‘outside’ spaces take on a role somewhere between the classroom and the integrated resource, a space purposefully established for children with ‘special educational’ or ‘behavioural’ needs. These ‘outside’ spaces are used in tandem with the classroom management strategies. I will suggest that mediatory spaces offer what is perhaps seen by adults as an inclusive approach to excluding fearsome pupils from the classroom setting. In this example, I will show how a boy, Justin, appears to welcome the opportunity to work in such spaces, and will opt to occupy them by drawing upon fieldnotes, children’s focus group transcripts and an extract from video footage captured by Justin. In addition, I will show that in these spaces Justin sits quietly and appears engaged with tasks; he uses his body in ways which are not read as potentially risky or dangerous and therefore he does not stir feelings of fear in others. At the same time, Justin’s placing in these ‘other’ spaces also reinforces a notion that he is different from his ‘normal’ peers.

The ‘outside’ school spaces, (here I will focus upon the library and later more specifically upon a computer desk), can be viewed as an extension to the classroom and take on the function of hosting children who may disturb the learning and teaching activities, thus aiding in the regulation of children’s bodies within the classroom according to given expectations. These may change depending upon the lesson or activity, for example, a ‘spellings’ lesson requires still, quiet bodies seated at a desk, whereas in ‘art’ children may choose to stand as they paint or chat to the person beside them. The entrance to the classroom is from the library space, which is shared by the Year 3 and Year 5 students. In total four classrooms can be accessed from this L-shaped space, which is host to books, soft chairs, a row of computers and a cluster of desks. On the walls outside each classroom are display boards with children’s recently produced pieces of work. On top of a chest of drawers are a number of awards received by the school. In one corner of the library is the school’s futuristic-looking praise pod, which also indicates that the library space is also used to reward good children as well as hosting others. This chair looks like
a golf ball cut in half with its centre hollowed out. It has a shiny white exterior and inside is padded and covered with a thick black fabric to form a comfortable seat. The library space is used by the Year 5 teacher to manage Justin’s behaviour in lessons and engagement with his work. On one occasion he explained to other teachers, how his student, Justin, was always so full of energy and, in order that this energy did not disrupt the rest of the class and his teaching, he would ask him to go to the library and seek out facts. Justin’s teacher, Mike, also makes it clear how much he likes him, yet at the same time finds that Justin’s high ‘energy’ levels make it difficult for him to be in the classroom for long periods.

Justin is a lovely boy says Michelle, the Y3 teacher. He speaks really nicely, she continues. Mike, Justin’s current teacher, says that he is just so ‘full of energy all the time’. The teaching assistant, Connie, thinks that to have that much energy must be knackering – perhaps finding a way to re-present what may be deemed as bad behaviour… Mike explains that Justin ‘just can’t stay in the classroom all the time’. He therefore sends him out to find facts from the library (Fieldnotes, 15th November 2010).

Justin’s exclusion from the classroom is perceived by his teacher as in his interests and the example above shows that the space and its resources are used to facilitate Justin’s engagement with his learning. In addition the space is also described by Justin’s teacher as ‘your calm space’ and on occasion Justin is asked to go to this space to calm down. An example of this is reflected in the following extract taken from my fieldnotes. Justin and Adam had a fight during playtime and their teacher is in the classroom discussing what happened. Adam was another boy who I was told that I should ‘watch out for’ when I started the research at the school. The Year 5 teacher is sitting on his swivel chair at the desk and the two boys are stood beside him.

The teacher asks Adam to leave the conversation. He is now just talking to Justin, who is proclaiming, ‘he brayed me’. Justin has been given a red card. The teacher asks him, ‘what’s your course of action?’ ‘Don’t know’, Justin replies. ‘Where do you think you can go to calm down?’ the teacher asks. He then continues, ‘the library, try that seat in the library’. The teacher then starts asking Justin about what choices he has got when he is angry. Justin starts crying and states, ‘he kicked me’ (he seems frustrated and wound up). The teacher says, ‘I’m sure it really hurt. Did you grab his hair? Do you think you hurt him?’ Justin replies, ‘he’s thinking he’s all like big and tough
and look at me’ (Justin is spitting out his words). He adds, ‘he hit me on the head.’ The teacher responds, ‘you need to go to your calm place’ ... He takes Justin out into the library. He rests the palm of his hand on his back as he follows Justin to the library... The teacher says ‘good choice Justin, good choice’ (Fieldnotes, December 2010).

The library appears to be a significant space in Justin’s experience of school, and was one of the few spaces he chose to video as part of his film about school (see Video 3).

The children were asked to create films to document their own and other children’s experiences of being part of a SEAL school (this method is described in more detail in Methods B: 2.4). Justin particularly focused on one of the displays above the row of computers outside his classroom. Justin is commonly sat at these computers on his own as he completes tasks set by his teacher.

While Justin’s exclusion from the classroom is perceived to be in Justin’s interests, there are other things at work here. The library space features more predominantly in Justin’s experiences at school than in his peers’. Aside from Justin, the computers are most commonly used by staff to prepare resources for lessons. The desks are also used by staff to create the school displays. The bookshelves are visited swiftly by children from the Year 5 class as they choose a book for guided reading on a weekly basis. Children are not
permitted in the library during breaktime and lunchtime. Amongst this, Justin’s regular placement in this setting is both unusual and significant. The space and the associations that Justin is encouraged to make with it help to form Justin's emplaced experiences. The space, as it has become a social instrument, works to firstly distance Justin from his peers, and secondly shape Justin’s behaviours.

On one occasion Justin works on the same task as his peers, but does so on his own at the computers outside of the classroom. The task is to create a set of instructions and is designed to enhance the children’s understanding and use of ‘instructive text’. Justin has written his instructions for making rhubarb crumble using a word formatting programme. He re-enters the classroom to ask the teacher, who is facilitating a lesson in the classroom, if he will look at his work. At this point the class have started a different activity. The teacher is listening to a small group of children who read extracts to him from a storybook.

Justin is working on his own in the library space on the computer. He comes in to see his teacher on two occasions to ask if he can see his work. Justin’s teacher is unable to leave. I ask Justin if I can see his work. He has created his instructions on the word processor using the Word Art functions. I tell him it is looking great. I pick out a mistake. I then ask how he has made the letters look so good. He shows me the Word Art tool and how to use it. His instructions are for making a rhubarb crumble. I ask him if he has ever made one. He says that he has. He also tells me what else he has made. I tell him it is making me hungry. He says, me too and tells me he likes food. He then starts hitting the keyboard keys with a pen. He tells me that sometimes he likes to do that – that it is really fun (Fieldnotes, 24th September 2010).

Justin is distanced from his peers; he completes his task in a different room and in a different way to them. Justin is clearly pleased by his efforts and wants to share his work with his teacher. The children have not questioned Justin’s use of the computer, nor have they asked if they can present their instructions in a similar format. Perhaps this suggests that Justin’s separation is a familiar occurrence. Subsidiary spaces seem to provide a false impression of inclusivity. While the computer does seem to be a valuable resource for Justin and engages him with academic tasks – for example, on one occasion when the teacher asked the class for their suggestions for things to do to calm down, Justin said that he ‘plays games on his computer’ to calm down – when he uses the computer in the library space he is also regularly separated from his peers.
Justin does not seem to be well liked by many of his peers because of their perception of the threat from ‘his’ anger. This perspective is reflected in the children’s comments about him during a focus group discussion.

_Harry_: Hardly any people in the class like Justin  
_Lisa (R)_: Oh really?  
_Didier_: He attacks people for no reason

The children here share their view that Justin is unpredictable. Justin’s anger seems to be a point of intrigue to his peers, who on occasions seem to push at him until they get a reaction. However, these stirrings are not always intentional acts. Justin’s anger is stirred when his peers’ resist involving him in what they are doing. However, as reflected in the quote below, the children can offer their own reasons as to why they don’t want Justin to participate in their games or activities:

_Harry_: He gets angry just when you just say there are too many people playing the game, because I said that and he chased after me.

Harry told Justin that he could not join the game because there were ‘too many people playing’. For him, this was a legitimate reason to deny Justin’s participation. However, Justin’s reaction was to chase Harry. This story is shared, by Harry, as an example of how Justin ‘attacks people for no reason’. If another boy enacted similar behaviours, Harry may not view them in the same way. This example demonstrates how identities can get _stuck_ to children at school. In the case of Justin, it appears that he has become a fearful object (as a result of his unpredictability). Ahmed explores how fearfulness can ‘stick’ (2004) to objects. As Ahmed suggests, ‘emotions are crucial to the very constitution of the psychic and the social as objects, a process which suggests that the ‘objectivity’ of the psychic and social is an effect rather than a cause’ (pg. 10). In doing so, she argues that the association of a feeling to an individual is an ‘effect’ of an interaction. In this sense anger does not reside in Justin, rather the naming of Justin as angry is an effect of how the contact with him is read by his others within the context of school. The characterisation of Justin as an angry boy influences children’s views about which spaces he should and should not inhabit at the school:

_Cheryl_: He should be in the IR (Integrated Resource)  
_Lisa (R)_: Do you think?  
_Harry_: Because He has got angry problems

The children’s comments suggest their view that the expression of anger is only allowed within the Integrated Resource Unit (IR), which is a facility at the school for children diagnosed with severe ‘special educational needs’ or ‘behavioural difficulties’. The
segregation experienced by these children is reflected in a boy’s comment during a school council meeting. A boy from the IR who is attending the meeting says that he thinks the boundary of their playground, a 3m high fence with a bolted shut gate, should be extended. To support his argument he states that children might be able to ‘escape’ over the fence at the moment. In this statement, he communicates his understanding that the IR children’s separation from the rest of the school is important. Other children also reflect that their separation is important to them too. For example, when the Headteacher asks a boy what he thinks about having an IR at their school, he says ‘well, it doesn’t really affect us … [but] it’s good because if they were in our lessons they would affect us’.

Throughout my time at the school I noticed that Justin spent an increasing amount of his playtimes with children in mainstream classes who were also diagnosed with ‘special educational needs’. One of these playtime encounters is examined in Districts a:2. I suggest that the way Justin positions himself and is positioned by others within this group affords him some agency. It is within this group that Justin’s inclusion is welcomed rather than denied. This also reflects the ways that friendship groups reproduce the categorisations at work within the school.

Justin’s teacher often invites Justin to leave the classroom to work elsewhere. When Justin seems to be overly energetic his teacher may send him to the library to seek out facts. At other times, when Justin has expressed his anger, he has been asked to go to the library to calm down. While the teacher’s encouragement for Justin to use the library seems to be attuned to how Justin is feeling, it also sustains a view that classrooms are spaces limited to those who manage their emotions accordingly.

In film-making and scrap-book lunchtime clubs (see Methods B:2.4 for more details), which I set up as part of the research process, Justin would sometimes play games on the school’s desktop computers rather than participate in the activities I had prepared. The setting for these clubs was the ICT suite. In this rectangular shaped room desktop computers are located on work-tops which frame the perimeter of the space. I arranged tables in clusters in the centre of the room, at which the children would create their films or scrapbooks. During the film-making club I hired laptops, which I positioned at these tables. I have come to understand Justin’s use of the desktop computers as him distancing himself from the activities and his peers. From his space on the high stool facing a computer, he could turn to face adults or his peers at a time of his own choosing and therefore self-manage the engagement he had with them. On many occasions, Justin’s decision to use the computer went almost unnoticed by his peers, who would, on most occasions, engage with the activities and, if not, would instead go outside to play. However, on some occasions Justin did choose to share some of what he was browsing on
the internet with his peer group. In the example below, the children have been asked to watch each other’s films and vote for their favourite. This award ceremony was organised during lesson time. The children whose film gained the most votes from peers received an award (in the form of an Oscar). Justin chose not to watch the films and instead removed himself from the group and sat at a computer.

Justin goes to the computer and he puts headphones on and starts to search the web. I don’t know what to do about this. I am disappointed in him, as I hoped he would participate in the screening as an audience member and show interest in the work of his peers. Didier keeps going over to see what he is doing and I ask him to sit down. I can understand the teacher’s conflict now – it is easier to leave Justin than try and get him to engage as I would the others. This works to further the sense that he is different to the others – yet he also initiates this difference for himself, i.e. he chooses to sit at the computer and not to engage in the films (Fieldnotes, 7th February 2011).

Justin’s decision not to participate is noticed by his peers on this occasion. I chose not to enforce upon Justin the expectations which, on this occasion, I imposed on others. I asked Didier to sit back down rather than stay standing beside Justin and looking at what he was doing on the computer. This acceptance of Justin’s choice posed a problem for me, as I had not only hoped that he would actively include himself in the activities I had prepared, but also because I chose to stipulate rules for how Didier should position his body within the space - sat upon a chair looking at the films on the projector screen - which did not apply to Justin. This tension is also evident in the teacher’s reflections of being seen by the children as a ‘fair’ teacher.

John and Timmy were talking during register and they are asked to stand up. John says that Angel was talking as well. The teacher, Mike, says that he did not see Angel and she would only stand up if he sees her. Shortly after Justin is asked to stand up as well. As Justin stands he starts hitting his fist into the palm of his other hand. He then starts making punching gestures, using the movements of a boxer and undercutting punches. He then stops and leans against the desk behind him. The teacher later in the day shares his reflections on this. He said that he gets worried about fairness, and that in this particular situation he didn’t want to get Justin to stand up, but felt that because he had asked John and Timmy to stand the children may judge him
as not being fair if he did not make Justin stand for talking during register
(Fieldnotes, 24th September 2011).

At the computer Justin has the appearance of someone who is engaged as a result of his still and quiet body and he is no longer fearsome; to a teacher he is unlikely to disrupt others with his energy, and to students his unpredictability is contained and they seem willing to engage with him at his request. Justin also chooses to use the computer to both complete tasks or distance himself from others. On one occasion when the teacher was asking the class for their suggestions for things to do to calm down, Justin stated that he ‘plays games on his computer’ to calm down. The computer seems to be an important emotional resource for Justin. It also appears to offer him a position from which he can govern rather than be governed. Therefore, while Justin’s use of the computer, whether in the library or the ICT suite, distances him, physically, from others and emphasises his differences, it also enables Justin to manage how he encounters others, whether by inviting a teacher to view his work or a peer to watch a video, and thus his inclusion as a non-fearsome individual. Perhaps, through managing his interactions with others through locating the computer as the object of attention, an object which for Justin also stirs in him feelings of calm, he is received by others in this more accepting way.

The section above drew upon examples from Justin’s participation in the research, both in terms of the data he produced and the ways that he engaged with the other young research participants, to examine how Justin’s ‘otherness’ is perceived by adults and peers. However, it was also suggested that Justin subverts this othering by enjoying the freedoms that his subject-position affords. In Methods B:2.4. (turn to pg. 138) I describe in detail the participatory research conducted with children. This includes den-building workshops, focus groups, assemblies, filmmaking and scrapbook workshops. I reflect upon how I tried to offer the flexibility for children to develop and transform these methods in ways that supported them to express their school experiences.

I have shown in the above section how the subject-position institutionally prescribed for Justin seems to influence the friendships that he can develop with others. In this way, children’s friendship groups can reproduce the social categorisations at work within the school. In District a:1. (turn to pg. 208) I look at a playground encounter between Justin and a group of friends, all of which have been diagnosed with ‘special educational needs’. This encounter also reveals how Justin is afforded an agency within this group that he doesn’t have when he tries to participate in playground games with children outside of this categorisation. Therefore while Justin’s belonging to this friendship group reproduces a certain subject-position of ‘different’, it also offers Justin an opportunity for inclusion and autonomy.
Edges: Edges represent feeling rules. These are how children’s come to make judgements about how they should and should not experience and express emotion through the discourses of emotion available to them. Edges often bound districts. The vignettes chosen to represent edges explore the ways that different emotional responses are constructed as positive or negative by the children.

Edge A: Feeling Rules and Children’s Understandings of ‘Negative’ Emotion

Edge A focuses on the emotions that the children conceptualise as having the potential to cause themselves or others harm in some way. In this way I examine how these conceptualisations of particular emotional states are understood by children in relation to their social and behavioural effects. Emotional repertoires can be understood as constructed according to rules deemed appropriate to specific sites at specific times (Barbalet, 2001). Therefore, at school particular emotional repertoires are judged in particular ways. These judgements seem to bind children’s verbal articulations of their emotional experiences, they form edges that constrain the way that they articulate and value their actions and reactions. Edge-A explores how children’s socially constructed understandings of ‘emotion’ are influenced by taught ‘feeling rules’. These rules are examined through analysis of the children’s descriptions of their own emotions, other children’s emotions and emotion itself.

“Anger has lots of feelings as well”

This section examines how a group of boys during a focus group discussion explore what anger is and why this is an important feeling to control.

Hochschild (2003) describes feeling as a form of ‘pre-action’ and that ‘a script or a moral stance towards it is one of culture’s most powerful tools for directing action’ (pg. 56). She defines this script or moral stance as ‘feeling rules’- a shared understanding of the
boundaries, or edges, that ‘guide emotion work by establishing the sense of entitlement or obligation that governs emotional exchanges’ (Hochschild 2003, pg. 56). Feeling rules, as social and situated phenomena, are not the same in different sites, societies and cultures (Barbalet 2001). Edge a:1 will examine how children and adults co-construct feeling rules in relation to anger with a SEAL school. I explore how children understand what they should ‘do’ with their feelings of anger and the ways they describe anger and how anger can influence how a person might behave. I will identify the types of responses children associate with anger and how feeling rules work to classify these responses as right or wrong within this particular school. I aim to reflect the significance of paying attention to the ways multiple children are constructing for themselves a rationale that then influences their interactions at school.

The statement below from an interview with the SEAL coordinator describes what she hopes the children learn from the SEAL curriculum. She suggests that while children have the right to feel what they feel, it is important for them to learn appropriate ways to act upon that feeling.

*SEAL coordinator: ... you are allowed to be angry and you’re allowed to be frightened and scared, it’s what you do with it that counts.*

In the extract below, Didier describes how anger can be a precursor to actions, which one may later regret. He indicates that the feeling of ‘regret’ reaffirms an understanding that it is not very good to lash out at someone.

*Didier: Your anger has lots of feelings as well, because if you lash out at someone you sometimes regret it and it’s not very good*

The feeling of regret has a ‘signal function’ (Hochschild 2003) and, as a signal, provokes a judgement about the action that came before it. In this way his feeling of regret works to reinforce a feeling rule that he should not express his anger by ‘lashng-out’ at someone. However, Fred’s response to Didier’s comment during the focus group also explains how actions that respond to feelings are not always intended.

*Didier: Your anger has lots of feelings as well, because if you lash out at someone you sometimes regret it and it’s not very good*

*Fred: It’s like something you don’t mean to do, but a bit like your feelings controlling you.*
Fred’s comment suggests that being able to act upon feelings in an appropriate way can be difficult, because the force of the feeling is what ends up ‘controlling’ the actions of an individual.

Didier and Fred’s reflections position emotion as something which acts upon individuals. Didier suggests that it is ‘anger [that] has lots of feelings’ not the individual and for Fred feelings work upon and control individuals. Perhaps, what they are getting at here is their view that emotion seems to affect the rational will of an individual to act in particular ways. In this way, they see the management of emotion as a means of controlling their behaviour in particular ways. At the same time, they also recognise the impulsivity of emotion. This relates to Burkitt’s (1997) argument that emotional dispositions are reflective of children’s socio-cultural backgrounds. He argues that these emotional dispositions ‘can appear in situations that evoke particular emotions’ (pg. 53) irrespective of feeling rules. For Burkitt, emotions are ‘to do with flesh and blood selves, actively bound in power relations and interdependencies, whose embodied expressions and feelings are to do primarily with the relationships between them’ (1997, pg. 53-54).

Didier continues the conversation. He connects Fred’s comment with the control of his body and the threat of getting told off.

*Didier: It's like your arms, like your arms are the main part of your body… If you touch someone on purpose they will just go tell on you … so that's why you've got to control yourself and your arms.*

Didier specifically references his arms, which, as the ‘main part of the body’, need to be controlled to avoid touching somebody else and getting into trouble. Didier associates the lack of control of his body with the consequence of getting told off by an adult. The language he uses - ‘they will just go tell on you’ – suggests that at school there is no real point to touching someone on purpose. He is learning what types of interactions are appropriate at school through systems of reinforcement. He is learning to judge action (as worthy of punishment or not), through his negotiations of behaviour reinforcement frameworks.

The extract below from an interview with the SEAL coordinator reflects her understanding of right and wrong ways for boys to respond to their feelings of anger.

*SEAL coordinator: ... in year 6 there [are] some boys you wouldn't expect naturally are quite reflective now and will say to you, “actually I used to get*
really angry really quickly and now I understand there [are] other ways that I can use my feelings, I don’t have to hurt people, I can walk away”.

Perhaps then children also stir within themselves feelings of regret through ‘deep acting’ – ‘trying to feel what [they] sense [they] ought to feel or want to feel’ (Hochschild 2003, pg. 43). Children’s feelings of regret are encouraged to follow their outbursts of anger. For example, on one occasion at the school a boy was encouraged by a teacher to ‘authentically’ demonstrate his regret to the recipient of his anger in exchange for forgiveness. These types of rituals suggest that feelings of regret are closely related to those of shame. Scheff (1997) suggests that ‘shame signals and generates alienation’ and ‘is a normal part of social control’ (pg. 74). In this way feelings do not always signal an ‘inner perspective’ (Hochschild 2003, pg. 30), but can also signal socially accepted ways of interacting with others at the school.

As children objectify anger they separate anger from people and their social contexts. Anger is instead defined as a force that can control action. The anger itself, as suggested by Didier, is the object of ‘lots of feelings’ and can affect people’s behaviour in unanticipated ways. As anger is understood as an unpredictable emotion and difficult to manage, those children who do express their anger seem to be feared by others. The expression of anger is considered the responsibility of the child, and therefore angry boys are reprimanded for their lack of self-control. District b:2 examines the implications of these views of anger for a boy, Justin, who is diagnosed as autistic and characterised for his ‘unpredictability’ – as one teacher stated, ‘you just don’t know what he would do’.

The possibility of getting told off, as in Justin’s case by the Headteacher, influences how Didier chooses to interact with others. For Millei (2008) this may be conceptualised as children consciously negotiating the system; ‘they are obedient because they use obedience as an intended strategy. They might know that praise or some joyful activity follows if they are ‘good’” (pg. 13). However, I have come to understand Didier as constructing edges (i.e. ways of judging action as worthy of punishment or not), through his negotiations of behaviour reinforcement frameworks. As I explore in more detail in Edge b:2, desirable emotional responses are encouraged through positive reinforcement frameworks, such as the Sparkle and Shine assemblies. Drawing upon the understanding that ‘children have to start from where they are socially positioned’ (Roche 1999, pg. 479), Didier is situated as a recipient of educational pedagogy that staff apply because they view it to operate in the children’s best interests.
…It’s our duty, if you like, our calling … to prepare children for a life out there where they may come against conflict or issues and they need to have the skills … in place to be able to deal with [that]… And I think that is what we are all about, preparing children for later life, preparing them for secondary school and beyond. (Headteacher)

This constructive process can be viewed from different perspectives. On the one-hand Didier is being encouraged to practise non-physical ways of responding to his anger in his interactions with others. Seen another way how he chooses to interact with others can be viewed as a personal endeavour to avoid reprimand and thus he is not responding in way which considers the other individual.

These reflections indicate the complexities of categorising not only emotional responses, but also educational practices as right or wrong. Rather, as Didier’s example has shown, they can be both. This exploration reveals the importance of considering how children are constructing for themselves a rationale that influences their interactions at school. This may also provide practitioners with an additional way of understanding the challenges they reflect upon, as shown in the extract below, in terms of encouraging children to apply principles of SEAL beyond the classroom setting.

‘Sometimes you can see a child reflecting on what you’ve talked about and using the techniques that you’ve talked about, how to calm down, and they do listen, but it’s like all advice it’s harder to apply ... and I think it takes some embedding into a child’s psyche... They’ve got to learn ... how to recognise their own feelings for a start, and what’s causing them to be upset so it does take a while, I think, to understand SEAL themselves’ (Teacher).

The reflections of the three boys in this section highlight the importance of understanding how different children construct a rationale behind how they respond to anger. Through doing so, we gain greater insight into the ways in which children apply what they are taught in their school life and beyond.
In the section above I explored how children construct feeling rules in relation to anger informed by their experiences at school. Lionel, Fred and Didier’s comments suggest that they accept the values attributed to action, which are upheld by the school’s reinforcement frameworks. Examining Didier and Fred’s reflections shows how they detach anger from individuals; they attribute anger and not the person as the mechanism through which action can be controlled. Fred also comments upon how difficult it can be to control your responses to anger. His reflections are a reminder of how important it is to recognise the overwhelming nature of anger and for adults to take this into consideration when they encourage children to regulate their emotions. These children’s reflections on anger suggest a sympathetic understanding of the complexities of anger. In District b:2, (turn to pg. 223) some of these children also articulate the challenges they face in building relationships with Justin who is understood by them as having ‘anger problems’. District b:2 reflects upon how these children learn to be fearful of anger, and the ways these feelings play out spatially.

In the section above I also reflected upon Didier’s description of how feelings of regret may accompany certain actions, and thus work to reinforce the value judgements associated with them. This can aid in understanding how what is felt ‘as deeply personal is affected by public systems of control’ (Griffiths, 1995, pg. 1). In this way feelings do not always signal, as Hochschild suggests, an ‘inner perspective’ (1983, pg. 30), but can also signal socially accepted ways of interacting with others generated within the place of the school. Didier offers an additional dimension to the conversation by drawing upon the significance of the threat of getting told off in managing his responses to feelings of anger. In Edges b:2, (turn to pg. 247) I examine how desirable emotional responses are encouraged through events such as the Sparkle and Shine assemblies. These events work to foster children’s feelings of pride. The feelings that are stirred in children who are rewarded during these assemblies are also significant in reinforcing feeling rules.
Edges: Edges represent feeling rules. These are how children’s come to make judgements about how they should and should not experience and express emotion through the discourses of emotion available to them. Edges often bound districts. The vignettes chosen to represent edges explore the ways that different emotional responses are constructed as positive or negative by the children.

Edge B: Feeling Rules and Children’s Understandings of ‘Positive’ Emotion

Edge B examines the emotional states that the children see as positive and therefore important to foster. I look at how children consider these positive emotions to be fostered by the adults and peers at the school, as well as how they understand them in relation to their social and behavioural effects. Emotional repertoires can be understood as constructed according to rules deemed appropriate to specific sites at specific times (Barbalet, 2001). Therefore, at school particular emotional repertoires are judged in particular ways. These judgements seem to bound children’s verbal articulations of their emotional experiences, they form edges that constrain the way that they articulate and value their actions and reactions. Edge-B explores how children’s socially constructed understandings of ‘emotion’ are influenced by taught ‘feeling rules’. These rules are examined through analysis of the children’s descriptions of their own emotions, other children’s emotions and emotion itself.

“I’m happy to be part of a SEAL school”

This section explores how children speak about happiness. I suggest that children learn a way of talking about emotion which is distanced from their real experiencing.
In this section I consider the language that children draw on to speak about happiness and how this relates to the moments of happiness that they experience at school. I suggest that children are speaking about a notion of ‘proper’ happiness fostered through the ways that adults apply SEAL within the school. I draw on interviews with adults and focus groups with children to explore how children’s relationships with adults encourage them to share their inner emotional experiences, and more specifically their ‘problem’ emotions. I will show how the children equate this practice to feeling happier. For the children the act of speaking about their ‘problem’ emotions offers them a feeling of resolution and an opportunity for them to feel better. I will then examine how children equate moments of conflict with unhappiness. This is examined using drawings produced by the children during a research workshop depicting positive and negative emotional experiences. I will suggest that these illustrations draw on the discourses of happiness at the school and seem distanced from their actual emotional experiences.

The school leaders and teachers who participated in this research shared a commitment to establishing opportunities for children practice talking about their emotions. One example of this is reflected in the headteachers commitment to setting up a Praise Pod. The Praise Pod was not used during my time at the school, but was established shortly after.

[The Praise Pod is about encouraging children to take] ownership of what they have done, and be able to talk about it and be in touch with their emotions, how they feel about what they’ve done, you know... “you found this really hard last week and this week you’ve achieved so much, how does that make you feel?” And then get their response... I think that is something which we can tune into the Core Values and SEAL and across school, you know that positive reinforcement culture and I think that will add to the kind of can-do positive ethos that is in school already. (Headteacher)

This quote reflects how children’s ‘emotion talk’ is heavily guided by adults. In the example of the kind of talk that could happen during a visit to the Praise Pod a child is asked specifically to reflect upon his academic achievements. This indicates that when adults encourage children’s emotion talk, this is concentrated around specific areas of their school experience, in this case academic success. However, if we consider the geographies of our lives to be imbued with emotion (Davidson et al 2005), then this means that many of children’s significant emotional experiences might not fit within the boundaries of emotion talk that are expected within the school. For example, children are emotionally invested in their friendships with others. The choices they make as they
negotiate their friendships are tied to their own and other children’s emotional responses. However, children’s talk about emotions in focus groups tend to reflect the structured type of emotion talk that is encouraged by adults. It was through using visual and material research methods that children found ways to express the embedded nature of emotion within their everyday lives (see Methods B:2.4 for more on these research methods). However, this does not mean that all of the visual and material data produced by children did not reflect school discourses (as I will show later in this section). The focus of this section is upon how children ‘talk’ about emotion and what this tells us about how they are intellectualising emotion.

The children’s reflections on being part of a SEAL school imply an understanding that feelings are commonly ignored within most schools. During a focus group, three boys shared their feelings of being cared about, as individuals, while they are at school. For this reason, they felt really lucky to be part of a SEAL-school.

Didier: It’s brilliant [to be part of a SEAL school]
Lionel: Because it’s a school what
Didier: actually cares about your feelings
Lionel: Some schools don’t even have that kind of stuff that we’ve got
Didier: Yeah, like we’re really lucky…

Later on, in the same conversation, Didier attributes ‘making things right’ with being able to share their problems with adults at the school.

Lionel: Like your brain has loads of feelings in your head and … you have to think about lots of things and if you tell people then you can make them right, but if you don’t tell people you can’t make them right and you start worrying about things…

Fred also states that having the opportunity to talk about and resolve problems with adults encourages him and his peers to feel happy.

Fred: Cos we’re not hiding things and we can talk about it, it will get sorted out, and that’s making us happy.

Adults at the school also hold Fred’s view that children are welcome to talk through their problems. Emotional education practices are perceived, particularly within the school itself, as a means to relinquish adult authority and increase student voice. In District b:1 I
problematise this notion of voice by asking the question of whose voice is prioritised. Across the school children are expected to learn how to take responsibility for making ‘positive’ choices about how they conduct themselves both at school and within wider society. In the following extract, a teacher describes a dispute between two children as an opportunity to encourage the children to reflect upon their own actions and how they may have informed the responses of others. Through encouraging these kinds of insights the aspiration is that the children will be able to self-regulate their responses in future similar incidents.

In a one-to-one or one-to-two group [I will ask] what did you say to him, that’s probably why he might have reacted that way … You’ve got to work on sort of the strategies between them… get them to think about what they did that might have provoked that person. (Teacher)

For this teacher interventions such as this, where children are encouraged to think about their own feelings and the feelings of others, are orientated towards promoting social harmony as children take responsibility for their own actions by thinking about the impact they have upon others and the school community. Conflict also features heavily in children’s accounts of what may prevent them from feeling happy. For example, children each morning and afternoon are asked to rate how happy they are on a scale from 1-10 (see Fig. 41). Each number is associated with a feeling word as follows 10) Amazing, 9) Fantastic, 8) Great, 7) Good, 6) Fine, 5) OK, 4) Fed up, 3) Sad, 2) Miserable, 1) Terrible.

Figure 41: Feeling Thermometer on display in the library
Figure 42: ‘A girl fell over and her best friend is being really mean’

Figure 43: ‘This is a picture of me being bullied by a Y6 child’
Figure 44: ‘You might be a ten when you’ve had a great playtime with your friends. Here I am having a great playtime maybe even getting a green card’

Figure 45: ‘She is feeling ill but someone has cheered her up by asking her if she wants to play. She says yes’
After three weeks at the school I asked the class of Year 5 children to draw images of what might have happened to them in order for them to rate themselves at different levels on this scale. Five of the seven drawings of low scores (4 and below) featured fall-outs between friends (see for example Figure 42 and 43). Whereas seven out of the fifteen drawings of high scores (6 and above) often reflected acts of kindness between friends (see for example Figure 44 and 45). These drawings show that friendships are seen by children to have an important influence upon how happy they are feeling. Their drawings also depict the children’s expectations of the kinds of ways that children should behave towards each other. The children position behaviour as wrong if it upsets them in some way (see figure 42) and good if it makes them feel better (see figure 45). This positioning of responsibility upon other children is also reflected in the classroom teacher’s reflections about how children don’t contemplate their own role within the situation.

...they’ll just see what that person did to them they won’t even contemplate until you remind them well what did you do that might have, you know, provoked them or upset them or why do you think why he might have reacted in that way. (Teacher)

However, I suggest that the children’s illustrations depict the discourses of emotion that are available to them. Emotional behaviours are framed by adults as right or wrong. According to Birch et al (2008) children draw upon adult discourses in the ways that they conceptualise childhood. Within the SEAL school there is strong emphasis on being a good friend and what a good friend is. This is reflected in the children’s written statements to show what they or someone else might do if they knew someone with a low score.

I am a friend I asked the person if she wanted to play because she was ill and upset. Now she is a 7, she was a 2.

I am a friend. If someone was a 4, I would come and try to make them happy.

If somebody was a 2 I would say are you OK and pat them.

I am a friend, I will play with him. I might invite them to my house.

I am a pupil. I will see if they are alright and if they’re not I will make them feel happy. I might get the teacher.
These statements highlight different approaches that children consider appropriate when a friend or peer is upset. These range from asking the child if they are ok to a more active intervention such as playing with them or inviting them to their house. However, children’s friendships seem much more nuanced than the children’s illustrations suggest. For example, fieldnotes from participant observations seem to reveal that children’s conflict is an integral part of how friendships and friendship groups are sustained. My participation in the interactions that took place between children revealed that children had an understanding of social structures embedded in their social practices that they could not yet put into words. For example, Landmark a:2 examines how a friendship group of three girls use conflict to sustain a social hierarchy within their group. I suggest that the children’s social practices reflect an emotional morality, framed by a specific ‘emotional habitus’ (Burkitt 1997) produced and reproduced relationally by the group members. This suggests that children are much more in control during these encounters than the teacher quoted above seems to presume. However, when children represent their interactions with peers to adults they seem to draw upon notions of right and wrong. Acknowledging to an adult one’s own responsibility within a given situation runs the risk of punishment and therefore it makes sense that this kind of openness would be avoided by children. The ways that children incorporate SEAL-based ways of knowing within their encounters with adults, challenges the assumption of some educational theorists (such as, Boler 1999, Carol 2007, Millei 2008) that children internalise the feeling rules of institutions. For example, Millei (2008) argues that ‘techniques [that] enable the individual to acquire knowledge about her/himself and to express her/his thoughts and feelings’ puts children at risk of building ‘self-knowledge’ which then ‘becomes open for regulation … [so that the child learns] … to self-govern her/his feelings and act on her/his dispositions according to the norms and morals set up by guidance approaches’ (pg. 11-12). However, children draw upon the emotional discourses available to them as they carefully negotiate their encounters with adults. This suggests that for some children their engagement with emotion through SEAL interventions is somehow distanced from their everyday lives. They are learning a way of talking about emotion, which for some children, they seem to draw upon most when they are in conversation with adults. However, for others the ways of being encouraged by SEAL seem to be much closer to their own social practices and views of schooling. This is explored further in Edges b:2, which looks at how a group of boys make sense of the school’s Core Values. The focus of Edges b:2 is upon children’s feelings of pride. I consider how these boys associate feelings of pride with following the school’s Core Values.
The section above focused on children’s emotion talk about happiness. I suggested that the language children use to speak about emotion is framed by the discourses of SEAL at the school. I suggested that it is also important to acknowledge those aspects of emotional experience that go beyond words. While I drew upon some examples from participant observations, which portray a different version of emotions to those that the children represent with words, I also developed visual and material methods (beyond the drawings presented in this section) to engage with children sensory and embodied experiences of SEAL. These are introduced in Methods B: 2.4. (turn to pg. 138). Here I suggest that involving children in the development of relevant and meaningful research methods supports them to communicate experiences that might be difficult to put into words.

In the section above I showed that adults perceive SEAL as a means of increasing student voice. Children are encouraged and feel that they can talk through their problems. For them, this is in part about feeling happier about the situations they are in. In addition, I have examined the ways in which children speak to adults about being a good friend as utilising SEAL discourses. However, it could be argued that learning particular ways of talking about emotion is vital to getting one’s voice heard. In District b:1. (turn to pg. 216) I problematise the assumption that SEAL facilitates student voice by asking the question of whose voices are prioritised. I draw upon an example of a School Council meeting to suggest that children’s emotional dispositions are integral to whether or not their voices are heard.

In the section above I also suggested that for some children the act of speaking about their emotions seems distanced from their lived experience of emotion. This seems particularly relevant for children such as Justin whose emotional dispositions come into tensions with those that are expected within a SEAL school. It is important to recognise that this is not the case for all children. Other children seem to be much more accepting of these expectations and take them on more as their own. This is explored further in Edges b:2. (turn to pg. 247), which shows that Fred, Lionel and Didier associate following the school’s Core Values with the feeling of pride. This contrasts with Justin’s experience, where following the school’s Core Values is much more of a struggle.

The above section has suggested that the ways children speak about being a good friend and the things that they would do if they saw somebody who seemed upset, do not capture the nuances of children’s friendships. I suggested that the friendship groups actually rely on conflict in order to be sustained. It seems that moral cultures are embedded in children’s social practices. Conflict allows friends to reinforce a morality that is specific to their friendship group. Building on this Landmark a:2. (turn to pg. 264) examines how a friendship group of three girls use conflict to sustain a social hierarchy and moral order within their group.
Edges: Edges represent feeling rules. These are how children’s come to make judgements about how they should and should not experience and express emotion through the discourses of emotion available to them. Edges often bound districts. The vignettes chosen to represent edges explore the ways that different emotional responses are constructed as positive or negative by the children.

Edge B: Feeling Rules and Children’s Understandings of ‘Positive’ Emotion

Edge B examines the emotional states that the children see as positive and therefore important to foster. I look at how children consider these positive emotions to be fostered by the adults and peers at the school, as well as how they understand them in relation to their social and behavioural effects. Emotional repertoires can be understood as constructed according to rules deemed appropriate to specific sites at specific times (Barbalet, 2001). Therefore, at school particular emotional repertoires are judged in particular ways. These judgements seem to bound children’s verbal articulations of their emotional experiences, they form edges that constrain the way that they articulate and value their actions and reactions. Edge-B explores how children’s socially constructed understandings of ‘emotion’ are influenced by taught ‘feeling rules’. These rules are examined through analysis of the children’s descriptions of their own emotions, other children’s emotions and emotion itself.

“You’re proud of yourself and you’re proud of what you’ve achieved”

This section considers how feelings of pride are stirred in awards assemblies and how this reflects the important role that rewards play in children’s school lives.

In this section I examine how children feel about the Sparkle and Shine assemblies, a weekly assembly that awards children who have done ‘good things’ the previous week.
More specifically these ‘good things’ are related to the school’s six Core Values\(^6\). I also consider children’s perceptions of how other people feel during these assemblies, including their parents, headteacher and teachers. I draw upon data generated through the model-making activity I facilitated with the class of Year 5 children to show how feelings of pride are most commonly attributed by children to the different people who participate in these assemblies. In addition, I present extracts from children’s videos about Sparkle and Shine to show that the children who have had the opportunity to be rewarded through these assemblies spoke about the pride they felt for themselves. While these children speak very highly about Sparkle and Shine, I also want to consider the meanings that these events have for the children who don’t get chosen. Before I consider the Sparkle and Shine ritual, I will first draw upon extracts from focus groups with the children to examine their perceptions of the school’s Core Values. My aim here is to suggest that these values are not easily accessible to the children. This is important because, as I will demonstrate, it seems that there are some children who wonder each week what they can do in order to be ‘chosen’ for Sparkle and Shine. Yet, I will argue, it is difficult for them to know what they should do because of the complexity of the frameworks that adults use to judge whether a child should be nominated for Sparkle and Shine.

a) Core Values: Interpretations and meanings

Every Monday children attend the ‘Sparkle and Shine’ assembly. One child from each class is recognised for their demonstration of the school’s ‘Core Values’ during the previous week. The child’s teacher writes comments to explain why the children has been nominated in the Sparkle and Shine Book. These comments are read to the school community, including parents. The child approaches the stage to stand beside the headteacher, who reads her or his comments, collects a certificate and chooses two small prizes from the Prize Box. At the end of the assembly the children are photographed together holding their certificates. Parents are also encouraged to take photographs. A photograph is displayed on the Sparkle and Shine Board in the assembly hall for the rest of the week. Sparkle and Shine assemblies, from the headteacher’s perspective, aim to foster children’s positive emotional behaviours, which are framed by the school’s Core Values. During my time at the school the headteacher felt that the comments by teachers about the children did not make explicit links with the school’s Core Values and he then

\(^6\) These core values are: we are respectful, caring and polite; we are always ready to learn; we are determined, we persevere and we are resilient; we respect difference and diversity; we work together co-operatively; we have a voice; and we listen to others.
asked teachers to integrate the language used to describe the core values within their comments.

One of the boy’s participating in this research made a video about Sparkle and Shine. Here he described the Core Values as ‘the key words you need to learn for Sparkle and Shine’. This demonstrates clearly the link that some of the children are making between these values and the awards assemblies. However, the boy’s description of the Core Values as key words that need to be learnt, contrasts with the headteacher’s description. For the headteacher the Core Values represent the ethos of the school and are described below as a powerful vehicle for emotional education.

…As it says on the tin, they’re the core, it goes at the centre of what we believe in, what we aspire to, what we are inspired by, I think that’s a powerful vehicle for, and it ties in nicely with a lot of the issues around SEAL. (Headteacher)

This positioning of the Core Values as underpinning a school ethos is also reflected by the Year 5 classroom teacher, who feels that these values support what he feels is the broader aim of fostering a caring and compassionate school.

I think we are just looking for this caring school and this compassionate school and one where every child is happy to learn. I suppose we could go along the lines of the core values which the school is currently employing this year and that’s a nice objective to have isn’t it that we care and we’re polite … that we persevere … it’s that nice ethos that nice culture … We’ll try and you know, try to get along with other, we’re cooperating and we’re just nice in mind to each other and we understand our own feelings…(Year 5 Teacher)

Some of the SEAL squad members decided to include the Sparkle and Shine assemblies in their films. Four films were created by the children which include this topic. Three of these include references to the school’s Core Values. In two of the films the child holding the camera asks a peer to either ‘tell me’ or ‘remember’ the six Core Values. These directives suggest an expectation that the Core Values should be memorised by the children. In the videos the interviewees who were invited to introduce the Core Values had to look at the display board which is located in the hall that lists these values (see Fig. 46). In addition, the interviewees read them in a monotone manner which is reflective of when they are read aloud during the assembly. At the start of Sparkle and Shine all the
children at the school have to read the Core Values in unison with the Headteacher. The children do not verse these in an articulate manner, many mumble their words or make sounds rather than speak words. The language of the Core Values is difficult, both in terms of how it is spoken but also it’s meaning. It seemed that a focus was put upon learning these values by rote rather than exploring meaning. However, in a focus group discussion with Didier, Harry, Lionel and Fred about the Core Values, these boys do seem to have quite a detailed understanding of the meanings behind these phrases.

Figure 46: The school’s Sparkle and Shine Board, displaying the Core Values

Didier: Well like determined you need to, like, try and do your best. If you can’t do, like, a maths sum, just keep, keep trying, and try and try again.

Harry: Yeah, cos if you give up then you’re just … not going to get any better really
Didier: Resilient means if you’re … walking and then something comes in your way

Harry: and it hits you on the head

Didier: You’ve got to be resilient and go somewhere else and persevere just means keep, keep, keep trying…

In this extract Harry and Didier are discussing the Core Value, ‘we are determined, we persevere and we are resilient’. The children’s phraseology is much more accessible, such as ‘try and do your best’. They also have a rationale for why this value is important, ‘if you give up then you’re not going to get any better’. The children’s reflections on this value show that the subtle differences between the words ‘determined’, ‘persevere’ and ‘resilient’ are difficult to articulate. Didier’s definition of resilient as ‘go[ing] somewhere else’ if you are met by an obstacle, also poses a contradiction with his definition of perseverance, ‘keep, keep, keep trying’. Making a decision about when it is best to stop ‘trying’ in one direction and take another route is a complex and moral one which will need to consider many factors, such as what is the situation, who is involved, what are the implications of my decision. Suissa (2009) reflects on her concern that positive psychology ‘attempt[s] to rule the realm of meaning out of education’. She argues that ‘to espouse teaching happiness as an educational aim without acknowledging this is, in an important sense, anti-educational’ (pg. 209). It does seem, that in the case of the Core Values, that these are important ways of being that are perceived to enable children to lead happier lives. For example, in an interview with the Headteacher he spoke about the importance of happiness in children’s lives.

‘I think that [SEAL] encourages [children] to be happy ... and I think that’s the most important thing for children, for them to feel happy and if they don’t feel happy, that’s when you start getting, you know, problems in terms of disengagement or possible behaviour problems, or children withdrawing into themselves or not feeling engaged with their learning, erm, parents getting worried, you know, if you’re not careful it can spiral out of control...

(Headteacher)

Many of the obstacles to happiness that he shared were related to the school’s Core Values. These included: ‘being ready to learn’; ‘children getting on with each other’; ‘encouraging them to peer-mediate’; ‘express how they are feeling’; ‘resolve their own conflict’; ‘be empowered’. Suissa (2009) argues that education should operate in the ‘realm of interpretation, meaning and value’ (pg. 219). However, much of this is lost
when normative values are imposed upon children. The values that are imposed are also loaded with adult meaning. For example, as I explored in District b:1, ‘having a voice’ is not simply speaking up but it is also about speaking in the right ways. This is again reflected in a comment from the headteacher where he links the notion of ‘empowerment’ with ‘having] the language to resolve conflict and difficulties, and express how they are feeling about a certain issue’. From this it could be suggested that having a voice is also about the type of language that a child chooses to use.

Suissa (2009) reflects on how ‘positive psychology’ is drawing ‘normative educational conclusions’ from research findings, which she shows are highly problematic. This is entering into schools not only through policies such as SEAL, but also through the personal interests of educators. For example, the SEAL coordinator recommend that I engage with the literature of Carol Dweck, a leading positive psychologist. Bearing this in mind then, the Core Values are not neutral statements. They are accorded meanings and values by those who established them, as I noted above from my interview with the Headteacher. While children are ascribing meaning to these statements, through the messages that they are given, it is possible to see complexities within their understandings. The perceived simplicity of the statements it seems could be easily challenged through a more questioning approach about what they might mean, and how these meanings then correspond to the children’s lived experiences. In the next part of this section, I will show that children attach a great deal of significance to the Sparkle and Shine assembly. Many children want to be nominated for Sparkle and Shine. However, I will suggest that it is difficult for children to know what they should do to be nominated.

b) Sparkle and Shine: Children’s experiences

Pride is an emotion that repeatedly comes up in children’s reflections on Sparkle and Shine. They not only attach the feeling of pride to their own experiences. These feelings are expressive of the meanings that children attach to their relationships with teachers and parents. This relates to Burkitt’s (1997) conceptualisation of emotion as ‘expressions occurring between people and not expressions of something contained inside a single person’ (pg. 40). For example, in the quote below from a focus group Lionel describes his feelings of pride in relation to his perceptions of what the teacher’s must be thinking about him.
Lionel: ...you feel proud then when all the teachers are chatting to each other and looking at you, because like they’re, going like that to you and looking at ya, then you feel proud about it because they are talking about you but not in a bad way, in a good way.

For Lionel then, pride is closely related to an experience of being recognised by others. In fact, Lionel cannot know what the teachers are thinking about him. However, the messages that children are receiving from adults during Sparkle and Shine are positive. In addition, Lionel’s film about Sparkle and Shine also reflects the important role that parents play in children’s experiences of pride.

Lionel: how do your parents feel when you’re up on stage?

Interviewee (M): They feel, err, great for what we have been doing in school and, err, proud of what we’ve been doing and learning and sitting nicely.

The role of parents is also discussed in a focus group discussion. Here the children are discussing the ‘special mention’, which is when positive comments written by a class teacher about a nominated child are read out by the Headteacher during the Sparkle and Shine assembly. I ask Lionel, who knows he has been nominated for the forthcoming Sparkle and Shine, what he would like to be read out about him.

Lionel: Er, good things
Lisa (R): Like what kind of good things
Lionel: Well I’d like my parents to be proud, so that would probably be - Lionel is a very nice, welcoming boy
Harry: respectful boy
Didier: And plus like when you’re in the book you get nervous of going up there...
Lionel: Yeah
Didier: ...so sometimes you just can’t, and you just keep thinking about, the way you walk, but it is fine
Harry: Smile
Didier: And then you feel proud of yourself
Fred: You feel proud of, you’re feeling proud
Lionel: Because your parents are going to be so proud, and they might cry and then you might feel so embarrassed
Harry: Yeah, X’s Mum cried
Fred: My mum didn’t
Harry: Yeah X’s Mum did

Lionel considers his parent’s feelings when he is asked to tell me what kinds of comments he would like be read out about him. He says that parents are ‘going to be so proud’. The children also notice when parents express this emotion through tears. While the boys seem to like that their parents feel these ways, they are also concerned about becoming embarrassed. If the parents express too much pride for their boy, then his feelings of pride could also be interwoven with feelings of embarrassment. Lionel also talks about feeling nervous about being on ‘display’, when everyone is watching them walk up onto the stage. The range of emotions that the children describe during Sparkle and Shine is worth noting. They suggest that emotion is multidimensional. The children’s feelings during this event are mixed, and this also seems to relate to the different relationships that they have with the people who are present, their peers, parents and teachers, and the perceptions of these different groups during the same event. For example, feelings of embarrassment are associated with their peers. They are feeling nervous about doing something embarrassing, such as walking oddly, in front of their peers. At the same time they are aware that parents could do something to embarrass them in front of their peers. This suggests that they consider their peers to be more attentive to such moments. In one comment about Sparkle and Shine, generated from a workshop with the class where children created plastecine models of different people at Sparkle and Shine and wrote a short passage about who they were and what they were doing and/or feeling, the proximity of the child to the headteacher seemed to be important.

I am in Sparkle and Shine. At Sparkle and Shine I felt really nervous sitting next to [the headteacher]

This suggests that emotions are experienced in relation to others. However, the way that the child is imagining these different ‘others’ to be emotionally engaging with the event of Sparkle and Shine also influences their own emotional experiences. Children’s accounts of how adults might be feeling reflect a perception that the adults’ attention is focused upon the children who have been nominated and in very positive ways.

I am [a teacher]. At Sparkle and Shine I come in and sit with the parents. I feel happy for the children that win.

I am [a teacher]. At Sparkle and Shine I am sitting with the teachers. I think they will be happy who I picked. I feel happy.
I am [a teacher]. At Sparkle and Shine I am just standing there feeling proud of my pupils.

I am [the headteacher]. At Sparkle and Shine I am feeling proud of my pupils.

I am [the headteacher]. At Sparkle and Shine I am ... feeling proud of other people, especially people in Y3 because they are new and they get praised a lot.

I am a parent. At Sparkle and Shine I like to watch my child be awarded. I sit down and watch and I’m feeling happy and I’m thinking proud. I watch people being awarded.

The stirring of positive feelings is seen to be an important part of the ritual of Sparkle and Shine assemblies. While some of the children describe how they ‘sit on the floor and watch people’ if they haven’t been chosen, others’ thoughts are on whether they will be chosen or how they could be chosen next time.

I am myself. At Sparkle and Shine I sit quietly and listen, thinking if I’m going to get chosen. I’m feeling happy.

I am [myself]. At Sparkle and Shine I wait until someone gets called out. You feel excited because you may get chosen. I am thinking of how I will get chosen.

I am [myself]. At Sparkle and Shine I sit nicely and wait for the helper to spread the stardust [NB: this is metaphorically thrown over children at the end of the assembly when the helper shakes the Sparkle and Shine wand. The children in the audience are encouraged to try and catch the stardust] so I might get in next time and I feel excited!

These comments show how some children sit on the floor of the assembly hall anticipating being chosen. The final comment suggests that a child is relying on stardust in order to be chosen next time. This comment connects with the ambiguity of the reasons that children give as to why someone might be chosen. Most commonly they state ‘for doing good things’. When I asked children to explain what these were, their thoughts included things such as ‘sitting nicely’ or ‘doing good work’. While the children associate the Core Values with Sparkle and Shine, they did not relate these back to why children would get chosen. Teachers also seem to adopt their own strategies when it comes to
nominating children for Sparkle and Shine. For example, the Year 5 teacher seems to see equity as important to the way that he selected children for Sparkle and Shine. He has said that it is important that awards don’t always go to the high achievers...

‘...because all the poorly behaved kids will know they’ll never get it, so if you can catch one, out of synch ... if you can catch one out of synch it makes them re-evaluate and rethink what they’ve got to do and it just spurs them on (Year 5 teacher).

He argues that the children are very aware of who is and isn’t receiving awards and also seem to encourage the teacher to be equitable in his awarding of children.

They are very perceptive of who’s receiving awards and who gets rewards, I mean I have a system of star of the day in the class and they can tell me in an instant who got it yesterday when I would struggle to remember some times, so I always listen out because I am in fear of giving it to the same child two days running (Year 5 teacher).

It seems that awards are an important part of children’s school lives. However, what seems to matter is who receives them and who doesn’t. While some children will hope to be chosen for the Sparkle and Shine assembly, this might never happen for them. This is made particularly problematic when it seems that the children do not know what is being rewarded (apart from ‘doing good things’). In addition, teachers seem to develop their own rationale for nominating children for awards. This section has shown that the Sparkle and Shine is a powerful emotional event for children. However, the ‘behind-the-scenes’ negotiations of who is rewarded and who isn’t might be of consequence to children’s ambiguity about why certain pupils are chosen and others are not.

In the section above I explored different individuals’ perceptions of the rationale and meaning of the school’s Core Values. I suggested that children’s interpretations of these values pose particular contradictions. This reflects the problems inherent in attempting to create normative statements about how a child should lead a happy life. Rather the decisions that shape people’s lives are relational and situational and of course imbued with personal interpretations and meanings. I also suggested that the Core Values reflect positive psychological discourses that have presence particularly at a leadership level. For example, in District b:1. (turn to pg. 216) I show that the Core Value, ‘we have a voice’, is saturated with an adult notion of the ‘right’ voice.
The above section presented Sparkle and Shine as an important event for the children, and as something they speak about very highly. It also seems to be reflective of the important role that rewards seem to play in children’s school lives. In particular, children’s reflections on the Sparkle and Shine assemblies show the significance for them in being recognised by adults. Through the example of the Sparkle and Shine assembly I have shown how children’s emotional experiences are reflective of the people who are present and the relationships that they have with them. In particular the child’s feelings correspond with their perception of other people’s emotional experiences during the ritual. This understanding of emotion as relational is explored in Node a:1. (turn to pg. 300) However, a slightly different slant is taken. In Node a:1 I examine the affective couplings, such as intimidation and fear, that children draw on in their representations of bullies and the victims.
Children, Schooling and Emotion

Landmarks: Landmarks are the socio-emotional positions that children attach to others or appropriate for themselves within their social interactions. These vignettes examine these positions and the roles that they play in shaping children’s social interactions. Landmarks are interesting because they can often remain constant when children move between districts and their associated edges. These landmark positions are pivotal to the preservation of children’s emotional spatialities.

Landmarks A: Children’s Emotion Work and Negotiation of Social Positions

This section explores how the children’s socio-emotional positions produce and are produced by emotional life. Children’s social positions act as landmarks. Children utilise these landmarks as they move through and shape their school. Emotions are integral to the ways that children hierarchically organise and differentiate the types of friendships they have. Children seem to stir emotions in others as a way of letting them know their ‘place’ with a friendship group. This section examines how different emotional terrains intersect and collide through children’s friendships. My main aim here is to question the necessity of teaching children how to manage emotions in their relationships by showing that children competently use emotion within their relationships. Rather I will suggest that an understanding of how children use emotion as they move through and shape the world is important in thinking about how emotions are addressed in education.

“I just did a little mistake”

This vignette explores how a girl’s tears, when shared with an adult, can influence the dynamics between her and her peers, even though the adult did not intervene in the situation.

In this section I will suggest that children’s strong expression of emotion (i.e. tears, screaming, shouting) can be understood as an important dimension of social interactions.
My main aim here is to demonstrate that children’s emotional expression is not only about communicating inner feelings, as is the way emotions are conceptualised in SEAL, but is also a performative act which deliberately shapes the direction of social interactions. Children’s expression of emotion is entangled within power relations and the appropriation, transformation and reconstruction of social hierarchies. The social roles that children attach to others, act as landmarks through which they navigate the socio-emotional landscape of the school. In this section I examine how children perceive the role of adults. More specifically, I consider how they implicate adults within their social interactions in influential ways. I will draw upon two noted examples to explore this in further detail. The first is from a focus group with Fred, Harry and Justin and examines the significance of a sudden interruption by Katie who is crying. The second example is of a playful encounter during a lunchtime club set up for the research project, which results in Cathy becoming upset and crying.

I will start by drawing on the moment during the focus group with Fred, Harry and Justin. Whilst I was conducting the focus group in the assembly hall, the other members of the research group were in another room, entitled the ‘group room’ for small group working activities, where they were preparing for an assembly to share the project with the rest of the school. Katie and Alexandra were developing a script for a play which was going to form part of the assembly. During the focus group, Katie interrupts and begins to tell me that her peers are treating her unfairly.

*Katie comes into the hall, she looks upset*

Lisa (R): oh, oh, oh what is up?

Katie: It’s everybody except Alexandra and Katy, I just did a little mistake and they were all shouting at me and saying why did you do that and especially Cheryl said, err, ‘oh I forgot to say why she done that’.

(Katie’s words are poignant to me – Katie recently told me that she is dyslexic)

And then Didier did a mistake and nobody shouted at him but everybody just shouted at me.

(I remember, as she tells me this, that Didier is also dyslexic)

*I point to the script that Katie is holding*

Lisa: (R) And what is this here?

Katie: That is what I did my mistake on. I only put … that, what is a mistake.
Katie’s retelling of events incorporates an emotional script, which moves me emotionally in a particular direction. Her account positions blame with her peers. It could be suggested that Katie is drawing on the discourses of SEAL in her account of what has happened. She describes a situation where she is being excluded on the grounds of her dyslexia. For example, the acceptance of ‘difference and diversity’ is one of the school’s core values. In Katie’s retelling of events, her peers are being unjustifiably unkind. However, Alexandra offers a different version of events.

*Alexandra comes into the hall*

Alexandra: Katie is doing her own script

*Alexandra accompanies Katie from the hall, with her arm around her waist*

*(I feel relieved. I do not get involved)*

Alexandra’s account changes the position of blame. Here Katie is described as being at fault. In Alexandra’s story, Katie is overruling the input of others as she chooses to develop the assembly script alone. Thorne (1993) suggests that children who are less powerful need to turn to adults as they have few alternative forms of recourse. However, she also suggests that teachers often dismiss children’s requests for intervention and can question such requests (pg. 77). In this example I would argue that sometimes the act of ‘telling’ is enough to influence the direction of a social encounter in ways that can be personally advantageous to the complainer. Initially, it could be suggested that Katie’s portrayal of her experience would encourage me to offer her some support within the group. Midway through her story Alexandra intervenes, perhaps in an attempt to prevent reproach for her and other members of the group. Alexandra uses a physical gesture to guide Katie from the room. I then do not hear of any problems, and return to see the group after the focus group to find that they have completed the play for the assembly. This example reflects others where children either threaten to tell an adult or leave the room to go and tell an adult and are then stopped by a peer. Predominantly I have witnessed these moments between girls, and they often take place after one of the girls has become upset. These moments can then change the socio-emotional dynamic of the group.
The extract below also reflects this. It is from a set of fieldnotes on a lunchtime club set up as part of the research so that the children had time to create their own films or make scrapbooks. This club was a response to children’s requests to be more involved in the research.

*I found that Justin really likes ‘making’ activities. Once finished he fills his time by developing his own games/challenges, which often have a high degree of risk involved in them. For example, he today found that he could open the packs of plastecine – which are shaped like a brick but comprised of long tubular strands of plastecine stuck together. When he flicks this brick on the air with momentum the strands come apart. He later threw some of the plastecine across the room and excitedly told me that ‘it didn’t even break’. These little challenges are his experiments. But of course, we are in the computer suite, and these experiments cannot happen in this space! I tell Justin that I do like some playfulness but we cannot throw things around the computer room. However, Justin starts to bang the plastecine on the table in blocks, I assume to test its strength. David begins to join in as well. I ask for no banging.*

Justin is experimenting with the plastecine, examining it’s properties. However, he is also beginning to subvert some of the rules that are attached to the computer space, which becomes a point of concern for me. This relates back to what kinds of emotionalised bodies are appropriate or not within a SEAL school, examined in District b:1. I suggest that the excited boy, who cannot keep his body still, is a potential source of concern for adults. I felt this way in this encounter and sought to try to settle Justin’s increasing excitement about the plastecine. Justin does respond when I ask him to stop and then uses the plastecine in a different way, but which is still incongruent with the rules of the space. He then returns to flicking the plastecine, as we see below. However, now other children become implicated in his activities.

*Justin then returns to his first game of flicking the plastecine block in the air. He does this in the direction of Katie and another girl. They are drawing in their scrapbooks. Katie screams. Justin is stood up, poised, ready to flick the plastecine. He asks me if he can do it. I say that he cannot. David is egging him on, telling him to do it and asking me if he can do it just once please. I ask Justin not to do it.*
Thorne (1993) describes how boys in the playground can often deliberately invade and disrupt activities between girls and this is something which girls will often relay back to lunchtime supervisors particular in situations where physical harm has occurred (pg. 78). While I am unsure as to whether Justin’s invasion was purposeful, here we can see that Katie cries out against Justin’s disruption of her and her friends activity at the table. Her scream is a feminised response to Justin’s actions. Her scream, an emotional response, also seems to ignite a playful encounter between her and Justin as well as David. For me, this suggests that Katie’s scream, while girly, invited a play exchange. The boys are now egging each other on to throw the plastecine, and implicating me in the process. Justin does not throw the plastecine, but does go on to disrupt what Cathy is doing while sat at a desk in the centre of the room. It now seems that both boys’ attention has turned to disrupting the girls’ activities, a form of ‘gender play’ (Thorne 1993).

_I cannot now remember the exact sequence of events but Justin comes behind Cathy and flicks the plastecine on to her head. Cathy was sat at the table working on her scrapbook. Cathy begins to cry. David is stood near her with some plastecine in his hand. I take the plastecine from David and say that I am putting this away. I stay surprisingly calm. Cathy leaves the room in tears._

Cathy’s response to Justin is to leave the room, I remember wondering if she was going to ask an adult to intervene.

_Cheryl and Katie go after Cathy. Cathy returns with them moments later (she has not informed a member of staff about what happened and is no longer crying). While she was gone, Justin said ‘it doesn’t even hurt’. He says it isn’t even as big a piece as this, and then he starts hitting his own head with it. When Cathy is sat down I ask Justin to apologise to her... He ignores me and just continues to tell her that it shouldn’t even hurt... Soon after this he decides to leave the club to play on the field (Fieldnotes, March 2011)._  

Cheryl and Katie’s decision to intervene resonates with Alexandra's decision to get involved when Katie was telling me her story. It seems that in both cases, the girls are stopping their peers from involving adults in the situation. They want to manage these moments themselves. This involved engaging with their peers’ emotions. For example, Alexandra puts her arm around Katie’s waist demonstrating that she will comfort her. In addition, Cheryl and Katie manage to cease Cathy’s tears. In the case of Cheryl and Katie
I know that they valued the space that the lunchtime club provided. It was somewhere that they seemed to enjoy and wanted to continue. They seemed to notice too that my interventions would not have the same repercussions as those from teachers and therefore seemed to welcome the lunchtime club as a space where they could employ different, and perhaps less constrained or managed, emotionalities. For example, I recall Cheryl telling Katie ‘Lisa won’t do anything’ when they were playfully resisting returning to class at the end of a research workshop. Therefore, in deciding to persuade Cathy to return to the computer suite without informing an adult of Justin’s behaviour, perhaps they were protecting this space and the emotional freedom it allowed them from an adult gaze.

In the section above I examined how children can sometimes draw upon adult assistance when they are in a heightened emotional state. Both Katie and Cathy went to seek an adult when they were upset by the actions of their peers. However, there is an awareness from their peers that this could result in unwanted consequences for them and other group members. For example, I suggested that Cathy and Katie both valued the lunchtime club and perhaps saw the involvement as an adult as a potential threat against what they seemed to value about the club. The moving towards and then against adults reflects the children’s different view of the role of the adult at the time. For example, when Cathy was seeking support the adult became an ally. However, when Cheryl and Katie wanted to protect the space of the lunchtime club the adult became a threat. These examples show how children can allow adults to move both in and out of their school lives depending on whether they are perceived as an ally or a threat. These stories show that this is something which at times has to be negotiated between children. Whilst I did not mention it in the section, Cheryl, Katie and Cathy are a small friendship group. However, Cathy is often undermined by Cheryl and Katie. It was interesting that in the situation noted in this section that Cheryl and Katie took on the role of the comforters; this is something that they do not do commonly. They typically become frustrated by Cathy’s tears (Cathy has a reputation for crying a lot amongst both adults and children at the school) and reprimand her for being mardy. The role that Cathy has within this group is further explored in Landmark a:2. (turn to pg. 264).

As well as examining the role that children allow and don’t allow adults to have within their social interactions, I also explored in the section above the ways that the children’s emotional responses shape how the encounters unfold. For example, I reflect upon how Alexandra’s act of putting her arm around Katie’s waist both works to comfort Katie and guide her out of the room. During the computer room encounter I reflect on how Justin becomes excitable and how this is reflected in the way he moves around the room. I describe too how this causes me to feel anxious. In District b:1. (turn to pg. 216) I examine how particular kinds of emotional bodies are deemed appropriate and inappropriate within the SEAL school. I examine interactions that take place between adults and a boy from the Integrated Resource (a separate part of the school for children diagnosed with ‘severe learning difficulties’) during a school council meeting to consider how certain types of bodies are seen to be problematic.
Landmarks: Landmarks are the socio-emotional positions that children attach to others or appropriate for themselves within their social interactions. These vignettes examine these positions and the roles that they play in shaping children’s social interactions. Landmarks are interesting because they can often remain constant when children move between districts and their associated edges. These landmark positions are pivotal to the preservation of children’s emotional spatialities.

Landmarks A: Children’s Emotion Work and Negotiation of Social Positions

This section explores how the children’s socio-emotional positions produce and are produced by emotional life. Children’s social positions act as landmarks. Children utilise these landmarks as they move through and shape their school. Emotions are integral to the ways that children hierarchically organise and differentiate the types of friendships they have. Children seem to stir emotions in others as a way of letting them know their ‘place’ with a friendship group. This section examines how different emotional terrains intersect and collide through children’s friendships. My main aim here is to question the necessity of teaching children how to manage emotions in their relationships by showing that children competently use emotion within their relationships. Rather I will suggest that an understanding of how children use emotion as they move through and shape the world is important in thinking about how emotions are addressed in education.

“Are you going to just leave me?”

This vignette explores the role that conflict plays in children’s friendships. I draw upon a group of three girls for whom fall-outs in the group are common. I show that these fall-outs serve a social role.

The SEAL curriculum classifies emotions as positive and negative. The teaching and learning approaches and activities it supports aim to foster children’s positive emotions. Through SEAL, representations of emotion, such as I feel scared or we feel excited, are
seen as subjective reports. In the extract below a teacher describes how children’s personal feelings can have negative and positive consequences depending upon how the children themselves respond to them.

‘We are allowed to feel scared because situations make you feel scared, but how do you react to your scaredness, are you proactive or do you just retreat into your shell, because it could stop some children doing new things or stopping them from having a really good quality of life, which is what it is about really’ (Teacher).

Crossley (1998) states that ‘emotion does not lie outside of the social world ... It is positioned squarely within it’ (pg. 19) and suggests that ‘emotions play a constitutive role in social life’ (pg. 17). Perhaps then, emotions are not only influential in children’s sense of personal fulfilment, as reflected in the teacher’s comment, but also play an intrinsic role in the production of the social world. This section will look beyond ‘negative’ and ‘positive’ views of emotion and will explore the role of emotion in the construction of social relations.

Crossley suggests that ‘emotions ... can be and frequently are judged rational or irrational according to their relationship to their context’ (Pg. 19). Building on from this it is also possible to suggest that people within the same environment can hold contrasting views about other people’s expression of emotion, as reflected in the following example.

_During lunchtime a boy, David, hides small icepacks from a lunchbox belonging to his friend, Ellie, around the classroom for her to find. Ellie laughs. David is excited and finds increasingly unusual places to hide them. A lunchtime supervisor, Beryl, asks David ‘not to move from his seat’ (Fieldnotes)._

Ellie and Beryl’s different perspectives of the same event are reflected in their emotional exchanges with David. David and Ellie’s emotional exchange communicates something of what their interaction means to each of them. For example, when Ellie laughs David seems to get more excited. Ellie’s laughter conveys her concordance with David’s humour. In contrast, Beryl’s response to David, to ask him not to move from his seat, asserts her status as an authority figure. Beryl and Ellie’s contrasting emotional responses reflect and sustain their different relationships to David, as authority figure and friend.
The role of emotion in the organisation of social relations, will be explored further by examining the changing dynamics between three girls who regularly socialise with one another - Cheryl, Katie and Cathy. The interactions that take place between these three girls are sometimes antagonistic.

One of the female teachers jokes that Cheryl, Cathy and Katie will get sick of each other before the end of the week-long residential at the outdoor pursuits centre. She tells us that keep on falling out – ‘I said to them that if they can’t work together they would have to be separated ... One of them always seems to be left out’... She tells us that they could all work really well as part of a bigger group during the problem solving activity and describes this as ‘weird’ since they could not get on in a small group (Fieldnotes).

The teacher here has observed that the children ‘keep on falling out’ when they are working in a ‘small group’. However, the girls continue to want to work together even after they have fallen out. The remainder of this section explores how these fall-outs play a significant role in the social organisation of the group.

Goodwin explores how girls’ ‘interactive rituals’ are used to negotiate social order. For example, she examines how girls ‘construct hierarchically organised and differentiated social relations’ through their conversations (Goodwin 2006, pg. 247-248). The construction of social order seems a significant part of these girls’ fall-outs. This is evident in the following extract from a focus group with Cathy and Katie.

Katie: Hello! This girl’s coming to our school tomorrow, she’s called Cathy and she looks very cool and I want to be her bestest friend in the whole wide world
Cathy: What about me Katie, I’m the other Cathy, are you going to just leave me?
Katie: I’m going to leave Cathy, this other girl, she’s called Cathy Perry
Cathy: So you’re going to leave Cathy for Cathy
Katie: Yes. Cathy (pause) I don’t know what her other name is, but she looks really nice, really pretty, really bubbly, really fantastic, really creative, really...
Cathy: She speaks Spanish
Katie: And she speaks Spanish, oh la contino
Didier: Uno, dos, tres…
Katie: Cuatro, cinco, seis…

Didier: Da da da dum

...

Cathy: Katie are you really going to be horrible and leave?

Cathy asks Katie if she is going to ‘just’ leave her for a new girl who is joining their class with the same name. Using the word ‘just’ implies that leaving would fail to consider the full extent of her actions. Cathy emotionally qualifies the act of ‘leaving’ by describing it as a ‘horrible’ thing to do. Her use of emotive language, which portrays leaving in a negative way, is perhaps used to communicate to Katie that this is a hurtful thing to say and/or do.

In contrast to David’s and Ellie’s interaction, Cathy’s and Katie’s seems to be about something beyond relational closeness. For example, Katie seems to actively avoid defining her relationship to Cathy as one of friendship. In the following extract Cathy is talking about how people sometimes ‘torment’ her and can be ‘mean’. In response Katie shares a very positive account of her school experience, which Cathy suggests she contributes to by stating ‘I’m Katie’s friend’.

Cathy: I feel happy with my friends ... except for some people, they torment me sometimes, but that’s only sometimes and erm, and, I just feel comfortable at the school, I feel really happy at the school sometimes, when you’re not being, when some people are being not mean

Katie: It’s been really nice in the school since I’ve been here, I’ve been liking all my friends here, well, and...

Cathy: I’m Katie’s friend

Katie: And I’ve got lots of friends here, especially Mr Collins, and Lisa, Didier...

Didier: Wooo!

Katie: We’ve got Cheryl, Didier, Fred, Didier, Mr Collins...

Didier: Shall we just put it everybody in the class

Katie: Everybody in the class have been very nice to me since I’ve been a bit of a …

Cathy: Does that include me?
Goodwin draws upon Garfinkel’s notion of ‘degradation rituals’ to describe the ways in which girls undermine those who break the social norms of a group or try to move above their social position within a group (2006, pg. 223). Perhaps Katie’s active choice not to name Cathy as a ‘friend’ can be understood in this way. Katie also makes a degrading reference to Cathy’s mum, who she describes as ‘really weird’ and implies that Cathy is also weird.

Cathy: My Mum Mrs Grange is a teaching assistant

Katie: She’s called Mrs Grange and she’s related to her cos she’s really weird

In doing so, Katie casts Cathy as having a ‘spoiled identity’ (Goodwin 2006). However, Cathy continues to show her allegiance to Katie. For example, at one point the children are talking about when they put red circular stickers on their heads and pretended to be Hindu. Didier describes this as offensive. Cathy agrees and adds, ‘but I wasn’t doing it, it was Katie, no it was Cheryl, it wasn’t Katie’.

Katie’s insult occurs despite Cathy’s earlier accusation that she was ‘mean’ for suggesting she was going to ‘leave’. Perhaps Katie’s response is a way of maintaining their distinct social positions. Katie’s insults follow Cathy’s attempt to use emotional manipulation to strengthen her allegiance to Katie. This is a resource that Cathy seems to draw upon more widely in order to manage her social interactions, but to little effect.

The power-relationship between Katie and the third member of the friendship group, Cheryl, is different to that between Katie and Cathy. Katie seems to look up to Cheryl. They are also so often together and show a kind of solidarity. For example, Cheryl once publicly declared that no-one likes her and Katie. The following extract, from the videonotes of a film created by Katie and Cathy about an awards assembly called ‘Sparkle and Shine’, shows how Katie’s interactions with the camera are guided by Cheryl.

In the opening scene of the film Katie and Cheryl are sat side by side. They have set up two chairs in the back corner of the computer room... As Katie says ‘Hello, my name is Katie Price’ she puts her hand to her chest. Cheryl introduces herself, ‘and I am Cheryl’, and makes the same hand action. Together they say ‘this is our film about Sparkle and Shine’. When they say ‘Shine’, Cheryl makes ‘jazz-hands’ and Katie does the same moments after. Cheryl leads the lines and Katie says some of them tentatively, except the
bits that she remembers they agreed to say, for example ‘Sparkle and Shine’. She mouths ‘I hope you enjoy’ and then turns her head to look at Cheryl as she finishes the sentence, ‘I hope you enjoy our film and we’ll talk to you back at the end’. As Cheryl says ‘back at the end’ she looks at Katie. Katie glances back to her. They then both look back at the camera to say ‘bye’ in unison. They say this in a cheerful tone while leaning their shoulders in towards each other and waving (Videonotes).

Within this film clip the two girls act in ways to communicate to the viewer a unified relationship. For example, at the end of the clip, as the girls say ‘bye’, they lean in to one another, a presentation of closeness. Both girls glanced at each other before doing so, perhaps to ensure they timed it correctly. Cheryl, however, seems to play more of an active role in directing the scene. At one point Katie doesn’t know what to say and looks to Cheryl for guidance. After Cheryl has spoken she looks at Katie to encourage her to join in before they together say ‘bye’. Cheryl’s closeness (or is it power?) to Katie is something that seems important to her and on one occasion, she gets annoyed when Katie decides to involve another girl, Ella, in the creation of their film.

Katie was filming today with Ella. They come back to put the video onto the film. They tell me they have got some videos. Cheryl is sat beside me at the scrapbook table. She says Ella can’t be in our film. Ella explains that she isn’t; that she just videoed Katie. Cheryl goes quiet. I accompany them to the computer to upload their footage. Cheryl comes over to the computer – she says that the film will be too long if they put their video on it. I ask her how long the video is. She says long enough. I ask her how long it is in minutes. Although this isn’t the point – Cheryl has no idea how long the film is or if it would be too long with Katie’s new footage. Later, when we are sat back at the scrapbook table I can see Cheryl glaring back at Katie and Ella as they are adding things to the film (Fieldnotes).

The allegiance between Cheryl and Katie influences their friendship with Cathy. The extract from fieldnotes below shows how Cathy can sometimes be excluded.

Cheryl and Katie try to avoid working with Cathy. They leave the group room and work in the dining hall. Cheryl tells me not to tell Cathy where they have gone. Yet when Cathy does ask me I tell her they have gone to work on the play. Cathy goes to join them and I follow her. ‘I told you not to
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tell her’ Cheryl says to me. Cathy says, ‘It’s always without Cathy’ ...
[and] ... sits down next to me opposite Cheryl and Katie. I ask Cheryl if she
will let Cathy help. She refuses. However, Katie agrees and Cathy joins in
(Fieldnotes).

Katie’s power over Cheryl is also demonstrated here. It is her who agrees that Cathy can
join in. Katie has on other occasions been influential in getting Cheryl to back down.
Cheryl is described by teachers as ‘quite confrontational’ and stubborn. However, Katie is
on occasions able to oppose Cheryl’s stubbornness. However, this opposition is not
available to Cathy. For example, Cheryl mocked Cathy during a focus group about
bullying. This follows a workshop in which Cathy persistently used emotional
manipulation in an attempt to be heard. Cathy’s peers were irritated by her because she
was, as Katie stated, being ‘mardy’. The term mardy is used by children to describe
someone throwing a tantrum to try and get their own way. During the focus group Lionel
draws upon a recent scenario, in which Cathy said she was being bullied. Cathy tells him
he should not talk about that. However, Cheryl continues to discuss this in what seems to
be a deliberate attempt to aggravate Cathy.

Lionel:  If Cathy were being bullied by
Didier:  Adam Gould
Cathy:  You shouldn’t talk about that, this is going to go on
Lionel:  Adam Gould has being bullying Cathy, right and
Cathy:  Shut up
...
Didier:  But Cathy has been bullied a lot
Lionel:  And they were bullying each other
Cathy:  Urrgh
...
Cheryl:  Cathy could be bullying me, yeah, and then I get upset and I can’t
tell anyone, and I tell Florence, and then Adam Gould starts
punching and she won’t tell anyone and she starts getting mardy
...
Cheryl:  Well, Cathy is really...
Cathy:  No, I’m not!
...
Cathy:  It isn’t funny
Cheryl: ... I then would get upset and I can’t tell anyone and then Adam comes along and says are you all right and I say no and then he punches her, like he normally does, and then she starts getting mardy

She does not initially get a rise out of Cathy and then declares, ‘well, Cathy is really [bullying me]’. This comment does stir a reaction in Cathy. The researcher then invites Cathy to have her say, but her peers block her from contributing to the conversation by singing.

Lisa (R): Cathy, what did you want to say?
All: (Singing) All by myself
Didier: (Singing) All by myself
Lisa (R): Cathy, did you want to say something?
Alexandra: Lisa, you know in the assembly that we’re doing, could we have a bit of a role play in the middle of the role play?
Could we start singing that?
All: (Singing - in the background) All by myself...
Cathy: Wasn’t that my idea?
Katie: No! That was my idea.

It seems that Cheryl’s degradation of Cathy is supported by others. Cathy is left excluded from the conversation. Regardless, Cathy does continue to try and get her voice heard. She states that an idea suggested by Alexandra originally came from her. Cathy seems to be seeking recognition for her contribution to the project. Yet, her peers do not address this.

It seems that Cathy’s peers exclude her when she behaves in a way which they refer to as ‘just being mardy’7. However, Cathy’s response in the example used can also be understood as her reaction to not being heard.

The children also used the word ‘mardy’ in a play they wrote about bullying. The victims of bullying were associated as having emotional traits such as being ‘mardy’ or ‘snotty’.

Jaden (B): Why are you playing with her?!
Lucas (B): Do you mean that thing?!
Carlie: I’m not called that I’m called…

7 Mardy is a term used by the children to describe others who throw tantrums to try and get their own way.
Danielle: She’s called Carlie!
Nicole (B): No, she’s a thing, a that, a little mardy girl and snotty girl, so why are you playing with that?
Jamie (B): You’re out of the gang, cos you’re playing with that thing, so go away!

It seems that being mardy is not a valued character trait. In the play the children show how those who are mardy are denounced by their peers. Perhaps then, both Cheryl’s and Katie’s responses can be understood as a form of discipline and an attempt to limit Cathy’s use of emotional manipulation.

Katie and Cheryl perhaps did not perceive Cathy to be suffering, regardless of whether she was or not. This was also reflected by Lionel, who stated that Cathy and Adam ‘were bullying each other’. Cathy’s continued ability to stand up for herself showed her resilience and determination, as demonstrated both in her interactions with Katie and Cheryl. Cathy’s peers seemed to see her in ways that opposed her requests for support. Their perception of Cathy as ‘mardy’ seems to enable Katie and Cheryl to trivialise Cathy’s presentations of distress and discipline her for acting in these ways.

This section has shown that fall-outs play an important role within children’s friendship groups in two ways. Firstly, they are a part of how the girls socially organise their relationships. Secondly, they are used as a way of regulating their friends’ behaviours according to the social norms of the group.

The girls’ interactions described in this section run counter to the school’s core value that children should be ‘respectful, caring and polite’. It also challenges the view that girls are naturally inclined to openly discuss and explore their feelings with other girls.

‘I think the children who manage their behaviour really well [are] usually girls because … they talk things through quite outwardly a lot of the time … It is perfect for them just to kind of enhance what they do already’ (Teacher).

For the three girls mentioned in this section personal feelings are not a platform for ‘caring’ dialogue. Rather, emotional exchanges are used to manage social hierarchies. In addition, emotional exchanges are not necessarily about sharing and listening but defining the feeling rules of the group. For example, Cathy was reprimanded by Katie for using emotion to try and manipulate others. Goodwin (2006) also challenges the assumption that girls seek relational closeness and therefore engage in collaborative interactive
practices. Rather, she argues that girls sanction those who violate the social norms of the group, for example girls use ‘degradation rituals’ in order to reinforce the social positions of those who ‘tag-along’, of which Cathy would be an example.

Drawing on Goodwin it can be argued that conflict plays a significant role in the construction of girls’ friendships. Another teacher reflected upon this too.

‘... if there’s a argument on the football pitch with boys, it’s a very quick handshake and its forgotten about. Whereas, I think with some of the girls ... their arguments tended to go on deeper and longer, and come to the surface every so often ... [and] ... be a lot more prolonged’ (Teacher).

The teacher in this quote perceives conflict between girls to be deeper and more prolonged in comparison to boys. This section has examined why this might be the case. I have shown that conflicts between a group of girls serve to maintain a socio-emotional order specific to their friendship group. Goodwin (2006) suggests that in order to better support girls like Cathy, who are hurt through this conflict, more attention needs to be paid to the construction of peer power relations by looking at girls’ social interactions. She states, ‘we need careful examination of the actual lived moments and practices that make up the life-world of a particular group, so we can investigate how morality is lodged within the actions, and stances that children take up in interaction with their peers’ (Goodwin 2006, pg. 254).

At the start of the section above, I suggested that the SEAL learning outcomes tend to classify different emotions as positive and negative. However, I showed that children’s friendships seem to transcend these categorisations, as emotions within this terrain serve a specific social role. This is different to the social role that SEAL plays, which in Context 1:1. (turn to pg. 18) I suggest maintains longstanding social injustices within education. In Context 1:1 I suggest that SEAL attempts to unify children’s emotions experiences with successful academic learning. In this way, emotions are now conceptualised as means through which academic success can be achieved. I have suggested that this conceptualisation of emotion is amenable to a political context framed by the principles of neo-liberalism.
The interpretation presented in the section above seems to suggest that children’s expression of emotion, whether classified as positive or negative, is intrinsically linked to the way’s that children’s friendship groups are framed by specific ‘emotional habitus’ (Burkitt 1997). For example, within this group of girls being mardy is not at all valued. When Cathy was perceived by Cheryl and Katie as mardy, they intervened in disciplinary ways. While the girls’ fall-outs may be hurtful, they also serve to manage the emotional and social boundaries of the group. The reason why it can be difficult to manage girls’ fall-outs, as the teacher suggests, may be because they serve a social role. It seems that children’s fall-outs are a way for children to negotiate the complex power relations that are an important part of school life. Path a:1. (turn to page 275) also acknowledges the importance of relationships and situations in children’s social interactions. By drawing upon a playful encounter between Justin and Harry during a den-building workshop, I suggest that while it is impossible to make generalisations about children's interactions and their effects, it does seem that, by considering the relational and situational dimensions of children’s encounters, structures and patterns of relating can be examined. This helps us to consider ‘that emotions are not ‘things’ internal to the individual and their biological constitution, but are to do with the social relations and interdependencies between people’ (Burkitt 1997, pg. 52).

In the section above I drew on a friendship group of three girl to examine how emotional conflict serves a social role in that it maintains a social hierarchy between the three girls. However, I have also suggested that Cathy is hurt through this conflict. Cathy’s degradation by Cheryl and Katie resembles bullying. However, it is not perceived as such by adults at the school. In Node a:1 (turn to pg. 291), I examine the intersections between gender and characterisations of bullies and victims. I show how bullying characters all embodied a traditional masculine identity (for example, being loud, swearing, using physical force). Perhaps this characterisation of a bully means that conflicts between girls are more likely to go unnoticed?
Paths: Paths are the journeys that children take through their interactions with others. These may reinforce or transform landmark positions. Vignettes representing paths explore the interplay between the different ways that children endeavor to influence and author social interactions and how their individual efforts may come into tension with those of others.

Path A: The Role of Affect in Children’s Interactions

Path-A draws upon the notion of ‘emotion work’ (Hochschild 2003), to explore children’s social interactions. Hochschild (2003) describes two types of emotion work; ‘surface acting’ is when ‘we try to change how we outwardly appear … [through] … body language’ and ‘deep acting … is a natural result of working on feeling; the actor does not try to seem to be happy or sad but rather expresses spontaneously … a real feeling that has been self-induced.’ (pg. 35). In Path-A, I explore children’s social interactions with their peers through this lens of emotion work. However, I am also interested here in the affective dimensions of experience, I therefore consider the relationship between emotion work and affective experience. I draw upon Wetherell’s (2012) notion of ‘affect performances’, which she suggests ‘come in conventional pairs’ such as accusation and defence, provocation and laughter, intimidation and fear or startle and surprise (pg. 86). In doing so I examine the affective landscapes of the SEAL school. My aim here is to challenge an individualised notion of the relationship between emotion and behaviour, and instead draw attention to the situated nature of children’s affective performances.

Path a:1

“This come over to the Naughty Corner”

This vignette draws upon a moment of role-play between three boys who appropriate their environment to create a ‘naughty corner’. This is used to explore how the boys are affected very differently by the same situation.

Path a:1 will explore how children’s presentations of emotion impress upon other children in multiple ways. I will also examine what happens when these presentations do and do
not impress upon others in the ways that they were expected to. Through focusing on the circulation of emotion in these ways, my aim is to examine how patterns of affective performances unfold between children. To do so I will draw upon a video extract I captured after a few months at the school to examine exclusion and inclusion between boys. This was my third meeting with the children who were participating in the den-building workshops. The group were eager to introduce the project and share their creations with the school community through an assembly. The majority of the group were scripting an assembly in another room. The remaining children (those who had not wanted to be part of the assembly) were adding to the den in preparation for it to be displayed in the school and making props for the assembly team to use in the presentation. I had given one of the children, a boy named Justin, the video camera. This footage was recorded when I was not in the room – as I had been asked by the assembly team to watch the first part of their assembly. After leaving the school I watched the footage. Video 4 is an edited version of what I saw.

I am interested in Harry’s interjections throughout this clip and how Justin responds to them. Harry is the focus because he seems to want to direct the actions of Justin, sometimes Justin responds to his directions and at other times he does not. Path-A:1 examines the movements between Harry and Justin in this encounter. I will look at what precedes Harry’s interjections and also the different ways that Justin opts to respond to them. By examining the children’s interactions in these ways I will gain insight into the
ways that each of them is attempting to steer the encounter. Throughout this exploration I will pay close attention to the significance of Harry’s presentation of his emotions. I will look at how Harry’s presentation of emotion influences the different paths the two boys take through the interactions captured in the video footage. I will explore their oscillations between togetherness and separation as they create these paths. Through doing so, I will recognise the fluidity of processes of exclusion and inclusion in social interactions between boys.

The following extract from my videonotes show how Justin’s possession of the camera allows him the role of cameraman. This object connects Justin and Harry and shapes the ways that they interact at the start of the extract.

> Early on in the video Harry steps into the camera to speak, ‘they are actually plant-pots’, and then away again. His movements actively mark when he is in the film and when he isn’t. The choices made by Justin about what to frame and what not, suggest that he is responding to the signals that Harry is using to demonstrate when he chooses to be filmed. (Videonotes: August 2011)

Harry then invites Justin to engage with him in an imagined place – the ‘Naughty Corner’. Through the act of videography the two boys together enact this imagined place within the corner of the room with the help of a chair and a mirror as props. Justin contributes a verbal account of why Harry is in the Naughty Corner and in doing so conveys its social function. At the same time, Harry inhabits a space in the corner of the room; he sits on a chair and faces the mirror. His actions communicate the socio-physical qualities of a Naughty Corner.

> …Harry verbally directs the movements of Justin, asking him to ‘come over to me in the Naughty Corner’. Justin agrees to this direction by walking towards Harry while constructing a narrative explaining why Harry is in the Naughty Corner. Harry is sat on swivel chair in the corner of the room facing away from Justin and towards a mirror hung on a door into a small stockroom. He is wearing a black plant-pot hat on his head. (Videonotes: August 2011).

The two boys playful co-construction of the Naughty Corner soon subsides. Justin continues to engage in the imagined place of the Naughty Corner, while Harry doesn’t.
Once close to Harry, Justin moves the camera towards the back of Harry’s head, up and over his head capturing an inverted image of Harry’s face. Moments later Justin knocks the hat from his head. (Videonotes: August 2011)

After filming Harry close-up, Justin hits the plastic plant-pot hat from his head. Justin is taking on a character representative of a disciplinary figure, who has sent Harry to the Naughty Corner. I perceive Justin to assert this role later on, as he directs both Harry and Fred ‘go to the Naughty Corner and no hat’.

Harry asks Justin to ‘pass’, in a low-pitched tone of voice. I feel this verbal gesture communicates his experience of Justin’s action as improper. I feel it represents Justin’s actions as moving beyond a boundary... (Videonotes: August 2011)

However, in this instance Harry does not play along. He no longer presents himself as being playful, but instead as slightly annoyed in response to Justin’s decision to knock his hat from his head. His presentation of emotion, as I noted in my videonotes, also works to communicate a judgement regarding Justin’s actions, to which Justin does not engage.

Justin does not respond to Harry’s request, and he instead continues his engagement in the imagined place of the Naughty Corner. Harry is sat facing the mirror... He looks into the mirror as he says ‘Cheryl’s being rude right now’ (Videonotes: August 2011).

Harry then tries to redirect Justin’s focus for the film from the Naughty Corner to Cheryl’s actions, who he describes as ‘being rude’. Again, Harry’s manner communicates his annoyance, first with Justin and then with Cheryl. Moments later he directs Justin to ‘go shove [the camera] in her face like you did with me’. In this statement Harry again communicates his negative view of Justin’s actions and at the same time of Cheryl’s actions by suggesting that she deserves to be party to this kind of intrusion. He is also directing the camera, and therefore Justin, away from him, reinforcing that their filming in the Naughty Corner is over.

During the encounter described through the videonotes above Harry explicitly asks Justin to engage with him on his terms on two occasions. First, he invites Justin to come over to the Naughty Corner and, second, he asks Justin to pass his hat back. On the first occasion Justin responds by entering into the imaginary place of the Naughty Corner that Harry has
initiated. However, on the second occasion, when Harry’s tone of voice suggests a negative judgement over Justin’s actions, he ignores the request. On these two occasions Harry’s demeanor is very different. At first he presents himself as cheerful and playful, and warmly encourages Justin to interact with him. Justin’s response is to add to the imagined scenario by taking the role of the disciplinary figure reprimanding an inferior for misbehaving. Then, after only a short time in the Naughty Corner, Harry becomes annoyed by Justin’s rough way of playing. While, he communicates his annoyance in a quiet manner it is still visible to me as an onlooker. Justin reflects his disinterest in Harry’s annoyance by ignoring Harry’s request to pass his hat back.

Justin’s active disinterest in a request made by Harry is repeated later in the footage. Again when Harry presents a negative perception of Justin’s actions. The video transcription below captures Justin throwing fabric across the room.

*Justin throws bits of materials across the room*

Harry: I’m lucky to have this helmet on. Justin don’t.

Fred: It’s dangerous

*Harry leaves the room* (He comes to find me to tell me about Justin)

Justin: Harry’s a bit of a crybaby.

Fred: No he isn’t… He’s not even crying

This extract reflects both Fred and Harry’s perception that Justin’s actions are dangerous. Unable to stop Justin from throwing the material across the room, Harry calls me back to the room. It seems at this point Harry and Justin are perceiving the events which are unfolding in the room from very different perspectives. Harry seems to be getting increasingly annoyed and presents this in a careful manner, for example, in the extract above he communicates his annoyance in the form of a joke - ‘I’m lucky to have this helmet on’. Justin seems confused by Harry’s response, and makes sense of his reaction by naming him as a ‘cry-baby’. Fred states that this is an inaccurate way to interpret Harry’s response, ‘he’s not even crying’.

A shift from togetherness to separation between Harry and Justin is marked within these video extracts by changes in the emotions which circulate between Harry and Justin. Harry at times interjects to direct the path that the encounter takes, for example, inviting Justin to play with him, ending the period of play, encouraging him instead to annoy Cheryl, stopping Justin from throwing materials around the room. Harry seems to move between encouraging and limiting Justin’s responses. It is also interesting to note how
much influence Harry tries to have over Justin’s actions. This perhaps suggests that he takes on a regulatory role in this encounter with Justin. Justin ignores explicit requests from Harry which carry a negative judgement. It seems that Justin does not recognise how his actions may have stirred particular emotional responses from Harry. Rather, Justin is just playing; at one point in the footage he says to Cheryl, ‘I’m only messing around’, after she had told him sternly, ‘Don’t! You’re supposed to be my boyfriend’.

These explorations are useful in recognising that presentations of emotion may not necessarily impress upon another in the way that one might imagine they would. It is important to take into account how such impressions shape reactions. For Justin his reaction is to ignore Harry, whether or not he has read Harry’s presentation of emotion in the way that Harry intended. Yet he responds later to Cheryl’s request for him to stop by explaining the nature of his actions and clarifying that they are not meant to offend. Though the two requests are similar they come from different actors to whom Justin has a different relationship; his reactions also reflect the different roles he takes in these relationships.

In the section above I argued that children’s presentations of emotion impress upon others in multiple ways, or perhaps do not impress at all. I have shown, through focusing on the circulation of emotion, that a combination of forces shape how the emotional exchanges between children unfold. These include the contrasting perspectives of different actors during the exchanges, the different expectations of how exchanges should play out, and the different roles that actors take in relationships with others. Therefore it is impossible to predetermine how socio-emotional exchanges will unfold. Continuing the exploration of how movements between exclusion and inclusion are an integral part of the organisation of social interactions, District a:1. (turn to pg. 208) reflects how Justin’s inclusion and exclusion is dependent upon the people he is with and the situations they are. District a:1 compares and contrasts two encounters. The first is set in the playground and the second in the music room where the children participated in den-building research workshops. While the encounters develop differently, both show that Justin’s emotional expression is an important part of how he manages his relationships.
The fluidity of socio-emotional exchanges runs counter to a behaviour management approach which encourages emotional exchanges between children to follow certain principles. Through the SEAL curriculum children are expected to learn and mimic particular patterns of interacting with their peers. However, the section above argued that social interactions cannot be stripped back to simplistic formulas of relating. It also shows that children’s social interactions do have an unfolding structure and patterning which can only be understood within a wider context. Engaging with the contextual dimensions of dynamic encounters can enable our understanding of how emotion is central to children’s socio-spatial practices. Within these contexts children also develop ‘public identities’ (Jenkins 2000) (i.e. ways that they are commonly perceived by others). In Node a:2. (turn to pg. 300) I suggest that Justin’s identity as ‘dangerous’ leads to his regular exclusion from activities within the school and games with peers. Therefore acts of exclusion carry a particular weight for Justin.
Paths: Paths are the journeys that children take through their interactions with others. These may reinforce or transform landmark positions. Vignettes representing paths explore the interplay between the different ways that children endeavor to influence and author social interactions and how their individual efforts may come into tension with those of others.

Path A: The Role of Affect in Children’s Interactions

Path-A draws upon the notion of ‘emotion work’ (Hochschild 2003), to explore children’s social interactions. Hochschild (2003) describes two types of emotion work; ‘surface acting’ is when ‘we try to change how we outwardly appear … [through] … body language’ and ‘deep acting … is a natural result of working on feeling; the actor does not try to seem to be happy or sad but rather expresses spontaneously … a real feeling that has been self-induced.’ (pg. 35). In Path-A, I explore children’s social interactions with their peers through this lens of emotion work. However, I am also interested here in the affective dimensions of experience, I therefore consider the relationship between emotion work and affective experience. I draw upon Wetherell’s (2012) notion of ‘affect performances’, which she suggests ‘come in conventional pairs’ such as accusation and defence, provocation and laughter, intimidation and fear or startle and surprise (pg. 86). In doing so I examine the affective landscapes of the SEAL school. My aim here is to challenge an individualised notion of the relationship between emotion and behaviour, and instead draw attention to the situated nature of children’s affective performances.

“If I don’t like somebody I don’t tell them… I’m nice to them and I ignore that feature”

This vignette is framed around a moment when Alexandra, Fred and Justin use playful mocking to distinguish each others’ subject-positions. This runs in contrast to Alexandra’s conversation with me where she described how she was nice to people.
The SEAL curriculum puts a particular emphasis on children’s ‘emotion work’ (Hochschild 2003), the self-control of emotions. Indeed, the objectives of teaching children emotional skills is to encourage them to ‘manage strong feelings such as frustration, anger and anxiety’ and ‘be able to promote calm and optimistic states that promote the achievement of goals’ (DfES 2005a, pg. 7). In this section I draw upon adults’ and children’s reflections on SEAL from interviews and focus groups to reflect their understandings of the role of SEAL within education. This leads me to argue that emotional responses are categorised as proper and improper, thus detaching emotion from the wider social, cultural, political and economical contexts in which it is manifested. My aim here is to consider children’s emotional exchanges as embedded within situated relationships. When viewed out of context these exchanges could be deemed to be right or wrong, when in fact they are neither. To do so I draw upon an extract from a focus group where children playfully mock one another. However, I argue that emotional exchanges are often judged out of context and can lead to individuals being positioned as at fault and potentially stigmatised by peers. To explore this idea I engage with a range of extracts from focus groups where Justin’s peers explain why they find him difficult to relate to.

Emotional education aims to teach children how to make ‘positive’ choices about how they respond to their emotions and therefore reduce conflict within their interactions with peers. In the following extract, a teacher describes a dispute between two children as an opportunity to encourage the children to reflect upon their own actions and how they influence the responses of others.

‘In a one-to-one or one-to-two group [I will ask] ‘what did you say to him, that’s probably why he might have reacted that way’ … You’ve got to work on sort of the strategies between them… get them to think about what they did that might have provoked that person, because they’ll just see what that person did to them they won’t even contemplate until you remind them, ‘well what did you do that might have ... provoked them or upset them’ or ‘why do you think why he might have reacted in that way’. ’ (Teacher)

Through encouraging these kinds of insights the aspiration is for children to be able to self-regulate their responses during similar incidents in the future. For the children, part of the process of managing feelings involves both in-the-moment self-regulation and outside-the-moment conversations with others.
Lionel: Like your brain has loads of feelings in your head and … you have to think about lots of things and if you tell people then you can make them right, but if you don’t tell people you can’t make them right and you start worrying about things…

While emotional education encourages emotions to now enter into the classroom and be viewed as an important aspect of learning, the view of emotion and the relationship between emotion and learning that frames such pedagogy is worth exploring.

The SEAL curriculum categorises emotions into positive and negative. The curriculum draws upon the perspective of Goleman who states that ‘students who are anxious, angry or depressed don’t learn’ and states that ‘emotions overwhelm concentration’ (Goleman 1995, pg. 78). This view supports an historically constructed opposition between emotion and intelligence, where emotions are associated with irrationality and intelligence with rationality (Boler 1999). Goleman popularised the term ‘emotional intelligence’ which, while aiming to acknowledge this opposition, has encouraged the rationalisation of the ‘unpredictable’ emotional dimensions of the self. Gillies (2011) states that Goleman argues that ‘aggression, violence, impulsivity and school disengagement result from an inability to recognise and address emotion’ (pg. 187). Children are therefore encouraged to engage with and name their feelings and act upon certain feelings in particular ways.

‘At registration times in the morning and in the afternoons the children rate themselves in terms of how they’re feeling... You can spot patterns and then you can investigate that, and you can probe a little, and talk to them gently, and maybe coax out of them what the issues are and take some action to try and resolve it or help them to resolve it themselves’ (Headteacher).

The perceived benefits of SEAL approaches such as this, is that they foster children’s ‘happiness’.

Lisa (R): What do you think might be particularly important to the children about SEAL?

Head: I think that, I think it encourages them to be happy, to deal with their emotions ... and I think that’s the most important thing for children, for them to feel happy and if they don’t feel happy, that’s when you start getting, you know, problems in terms of disengagement or possible behaviour problems, or children
The consideration of children’s happiness within formal education is a welcome shift from a more traditional focus that prioritised academic success. It is important, however, to examine the SEAL rhetoric that making children happy will turn them into ‘model’ learners, who, for example, behave in the ‘right’ ways and appear engaged in lessons. Gillies (2011) argues that this association results in the evaluation of emotion (and thus happiness) in terms of ‘appropriateness’ (i.e. as demonstrative of the ‘model’ learner). The ‘inappropriate’ expression of emotion is associated with individual emotional needs. While these needs are attributed to social causes, such as the child’s homelife, the way a child is expected by adults to respond to such inner needs is through talking about them and learning strategies and techniques to keep their emotions under control, such as walking away.

_Mrs Williams asks if everything is going well at playtime ... She asks if there have been any disagreements. He says that there haven’t really. She asks him what he does if there is a disagreement. Justin tells her that he walks away and decides to leave it. ‘That’s brilliant!’ Mrs Williams says that she thinks he can be a peer mediator next year, because he is saying all the right things – as a peer mediator would. It is good to see you doing the right things, she tells him (Fieldnotes)._}

A focus upon children’s abilities to control their expression of ‘inappropriate’ emotion separates felt experience and emotional exchanges from a ‘social and political context’ (Gillies, 2011, pg. 201). Children seem to express emotions in their interactions in order to characterise their social relationships. The remainder of this section examines how children’s emotional exchanges are embedded within power relations in which social positions and identities are produced and re-produced.

The following extract shows how Alexandra, Fred and Justin use playful mocking to set apart their own social positions. This runs parallel to Alexandra’s conversation with the researcher where she has been asked how she is nice to people. The children are discussing a written list of ‘promises’ that they made to one another during a research workshop.

_Lisa (R): Were any of these your promises?_  
_Alexandra: Mine was the first, I would be nice to everyone I meet._
Lisa (R): And how are you nice to people, what do you do to be nice?
Alexandra: (Speaking to Fred) You stop doing that
Fred: You have to me nice to me as well
Alexandra: Why?
Fred: ‘to everybody you meet’
Alexandra: You’re invisible, I haven’t met you
Fred: That means strangers as well. Hi stranger!
Alexandra: Like, I’m like nice, like
Fred: Like!
Alexandra: I’m like smiling
*Justin giggles*
Alexandra: I smile. I say ‘hello’
Justin: And you’re horrible!
Alexandra: If I don’t like something about somebody I don’t tell them
and I’m nice to them and I ignore that feature that they have and stuff like that
Justin: And what you do is you go and tell a teacher and you get
rid of it (clicks his fingers across his face as he says ‘get rid of it’)
Alexandra: I’ll get rid of you in (clicks fingers) in a minute if you don’t stop doing that!
Justin: I’ll kick your beehive if you don’t shut your mouth!

Fred taunts Alexandra by suggesting that her promise of being nice must also apply to him too, even though he is annoying her. Alexandra jokingly says that to her, he is ‘invisible’. Justin begins to taunt Alexandra too, again by joking that in some situations she does not adhere to her promise, instead she is ‘horrible’. Alexandra tells Justin that she will ‘get rid’ of him if he doesn’t stop. Justin retorts, ‘I’ll kick your beehive’. I felt that Alexandra and Justin were joking by their tone of voice and body language. This encounter, while playful, can also be understood as being about recognition. Fred’s and Justin’s exchanges with Alexandra are like playful battles of wit. Outside of this encounter Alexandra is socially positioned as the student who, by her own words, ‘gets chosen for everything’. However, she seems to have a more fragile position here. The adult-led emotional practices she has learnt are irrelevant within this encounter, in which
the children make carefully controlled exchanges of emotion, using mockery and jibes to shape how the encounter develops.

As explored in Methods C:2.1, emotions can be considered to be relational and situated. This is reflected in Alexandra’s, Fred’s and Justin’s socio-emotional interactions with one another. For example, Justin’s closing comment, ‘if you don’t shut your mouth’, heard out of context and judged according to the values of SEAL may be deemed inappropriate and anti-social. However, within this context it can be understood as carefully attuned to the encounter, in which each child is seeking recognition by sustaining, contesting or redefining their own and others’ social positions. The extract reveals the children’s capacities to manage emotions in their interactions. However, the choices they make about how to manage and express emotion sometimes conflict with the practices that the school promotes. This has implications for the ways that children are socially positioned within the school and the ways they are characterised. For example, both children and adults are expected to express their emotion in ways that align with what is viewed as ‘appropriate’ at school. Children spotted doing the ‘right’ things will receive formal recognition from adults.

‘[The praise pod allows] members of staff to spot children doing the right things, showing emotional intelligence, demonstrating the qualities and virtues which we are wanting the children to display, showing the core values and [the children will be] be celebrated for it - reinforcing [what they have done] in a positive way’ (Headteacher).

As suggested earlier in this section, the responsibility to avoid the expression of emotion in ‘inappropriate’ ways, such as aggressive behaviour, is primarily viewed as an issue of self-regulation. Within the school children are also invited to explore the relationship between their feelings and their home and school experiences. In this way, emotion is seen as an expression of individual needs and therefore a means to explore what these may be and act upon them.

‘If anyone is upset or depressed or worried about something from home or school, we know it’s going to impact on their learning... why ask a child to perform in a Maths test or anything else, when at home there could be something really significant going on ... we can’t switch on and off easily, we carry stuff around’ (Teacher).
This identification of needs frames a meeting between Justin and the Headteacher to discuss Justin’s recent ‘outbursts’ with his peers.

*Mr Davidson is speaking with a soft tone to his voice... He says to Justin, ‘this is the second time something like this has happened this week. This is unusual for you this year. I thought you were doing well and learning to control your anger’, like a grown-up’. Justin says that ‘it is hard sometimes’... Mr Davidson asks Justin why this is happening. He asks him if there is anything going on at home. Justin explains that his brother has been winding him up (Fieldnotes).*

In this conversation anger is described as something which exists within Justin, which has its own force that Justin must learn to control - ‘I thought you were... learning to control your anger’. Mr Davidson tries to identify a cause for Justin’s feelings of anger and implies that his behaviour communicates some distress beyond school. This concern reflects an appreciation of how contexts beyond school can affect a child’s behaviour. At the same time, the focus of intervention is upon Justin’s self-regulation of his emotional expression.

Other children have communicated their dislike for Justin because they see him as unable to manage his emotion in ways that are appropriate in a mainstream classroom. They suggest he should be in the integrated resource.

*Harry:  Hardly any people in the class like Justin*

*Lisa (R): Oh really?*

*Didier:  He attacks people for no reason*

*Cheryl:  He should be in the IR*

*Lisa (R): Do you think?*

*Harry:  Because he has got angry problems*

Justin’s changeability seems to be a point of intrigue to his peers, who on occasions seem to push at him until they get a reaction. However, their stirrings do not always seem to be intentional acts. Rather, they seem to be generated by an understandable reluctance, framed by feelings of fear, to accommodate for Justin. Rather, it is easier to make an excuse as to why he cannot participate.
In this case, Harry explains how he told Justin that he could not join the game because there were ‘too many people playing’. For him, this was a legitimate reason to deny Justin’s participation. Justin’s response is to chase Harry. This story is shared as an example of how Justin ‘attacks people for no reason’. The encounters between Justin and the Headteacher and Justin and Harry are examples of how identities are constructed, through the repetition of events that are reasoned in particular ways. Such repetition leads to a fear of Justin; as one teacher states ‘you just don’t know what he will do’. It appears that he has become a fearful object (as a result of his perceived unpredictability).

Ahmed explores how fearfulness can ‘stick’ to objects and suggests that the association of a feeling to an individual is an ‘effect’ of an interaction (2004). In this sense fearfulness does not reside in an individual, rather the naming of the individual as fearsome is an effect of how interactions are read and reasoned by others. In the case of Justin, the identification of him as an irrationally angry individual, influences how his emotionality is conceptualised (as a problem resulting from Justin's lack of self-control over his emotions) and how he is socially positioned by his peers (as different from them and in need of specialist support). As explored in the focus group with Justin, Fred and Alexandra, Justin attempts to redefine his social position by contesting Alexandra’s position. Justin’s attempts to re-position himself are frequent but often undermined by his peers because of their own feelings of fear towards him (as when Harry tells him he cannot join his game).

The section above draws upon my understanding of emotion as relational and situated. I draw upon a definition of emotion outlined in Methods C:2.1. (turn to pg. 180), where I consider emotions as produced through our relational encounters with others. Emotions also enable use to make geographical connections that move beyond the boundaries of physical space and linear time. I also argue that the researcher’s emotions are integral to the organisation of the research materials and analytical interpretations of these. As we engage with data, I suggest that our emotions connect us to our personal histories, relational emplacement and imagined futures.
In the section above I have shown how Justin attempts to redefine how he is positioned by others. Perhaps this understanding can be used to represent Justin’s expression of anger as not only just about him ‘trying to get his own way’, but also as a reaction to his experience of being repeatedly excluded by his peers. In District a:1. (turn to pg. 208) I consider some of the ways that Justin was excluded by his peers from contributing to the den-building workshops. His ideas and creations were often undermined by his peers and often overlooked or destroyed. Through understanding Justin’s experience of exclusion, his expression of anger can be understood in a social context. Perhaps, anger is one of the few mechanism Justin can use to get his peers to hear him.

The section above has shown how the SEAL curriculum emphasises children’s self-control of emotions in certain ways. The findings presented suggest that a focus upon emotional control can stigmatise particular children and overlook the role of emotions in how children organise their social worlds. I argued that children’s informal emotional exchanges are embedded within power relations in which social positions and identities are shaped and re-shaped. Children are able to carefully attune their emotional expression with their peers. However, the choices they make about how to express themselves can conflict with the practices the school promotes. I build upon this in Landmarks a:2. (turn to pg. 264) by exploring the importance of both conflict and collaboration in children’s friendship groups.
Nodes: Nodes are the intersections between children’s actions and ascribed emotional identities. The vignettes selected explore how such identities influence how children are perceived by their peers. They also explore the disparity between how children try to influence how others view them and their already defined identities.

Node A: Intersections between Children’s Actions and their Lived Emotional Identities

Node A explores the relationships between children’s actions and their peers’ perceptions of ‘who they are’ emotionally. Jenkins (2000) defines such processes of social identification as the way in which ‘individually, we identify ourselves, but we also identify others and are identified by them in turn’ (pg. 8). In the examples presented in this section I examine how emotional identities stick to particular bodies. For example, a girl might be identified by adults as ‘caring’. However, these labels then enable or constrain what a child can do within the school settings in particular ways. In addition I want to consider the ways that children perform emotional identities. In particular, and counter to Corsaro’s (2003) argument that children have their own distinct cultural worlds, I want to suggest that children’s perceptions of the identity values that circulate within ‘adulthood’ also play a role in the way that children perform particular identities within their social interactions.

“Bullies pick on people to look tougher”

Here I explore children’s accounts of the power relationship between bullies and those who are being bullied. I also explore how these two figures are given distinct gendered emotional identities in children’s drawings and plays about bullying.
Strength, or personal power, is portrayed as an emotional resource in children’s conversations about the relationship between the bully and the bullied. This example will explore the relationship between a group of children’s perceptions of power in this relationship and their reflections upon the identity characteristics of each party. I will explore how children’s understanding of this relationship shapes the way they judge the use of personal power in specific cases; for example personal power is encouraged in victims of bullying. In doing so, I will suggest that children are making distinctions between types of gendered emotional identities and appropriate actions; depending upon whether a child is a bully (enacting power) or is bullied (needing power) particular emotional identities are assumed. To explore this I will draw upon a range of data from children’s films and plays about bullying and focus groups with children.

The extract below from a focus group with three boys, shows their view that a victim should ‘stand-up’ to a bully.

Lisa (R): And when you stand up what does that mean, what do you do?
Harry: You stand up to them, I don’t mean you stand up to them like that...
Justin: “Naughty boy, stop bullying, naughty boy”.
Fred: ...[but instead it means] we’re going to make you stop bullying (...)

The act of ‘standing-up’ is described as an assertion of power - ‘we’re going to make you stop bullying’. In doing so the victim is acknowledging, alongside others, their capacity to make the bullying stop. Justin reprimands the bully - ‘naughty boy, stop bullying, naughty boy’ - and Harry and Fred concentrate on the role of the victim in making the bullying stop. The role of the victim is also reflected in the following extract from a video interview led by Alexandra, one of the of the SEAL squad participants.

Alexandra: So how have you ever tried to stop this; being bullied? If that makes sense.
Sarah: Well, I have tried to stop it a few times but no-one really listens to me so it doesn’t really work.
Alexandra: Thanks for that interview. Have you got anything else you want to say about bullying?

Sarah’s response suggests that she perceives that to stop bullying you need to tell someone. For Sarah, who in response to Alexandra’s questioning positions herself as the one who has to take responsibility to make the bullying stop - ‘I have tried to stop it a few
times’, the bullying continues and she feels that her requests for help have not been heard - ‘no one really listens to me’.

I will now return to the conversation between the three boys to better understand Sarah’s position. The extract that I will draw upon is from a discussion between the boys in response to a video clip, see video 5, which was captured during a den-building workshop and shows Fred describing a drawing he has made.
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Video 5: Fred describes his drawing of a bully, victim and bully buster (this video can be viewed through the electronic version of this thesis on the disk provided).

In the following extract the boys both acknowledge and contest the ways that Fred’s depiction of the bully, the victim and the bully buster can be interpreted.

Lisa (R): On this drawing we’ve got the bully...
Justin: Yeah, you’ve got the bully in the orange top, and then you’ve got the little Year 3 or Year 4 kid who’s getting bullied. (…)
Justin: And then you’ve got the big, big, big, BIG, bully buster. (…)
Lisa (R): Is the bully normally a bit bigger than the person they are bullying?
Fred: No.
Justin: It can be it depends.
Fred: Usually the bully like to pick on small people.
Justin: Yes, all the time pick on small people. Small people don’t have a lot of strength, they don’t have the strength.

Harry: I’m small and I’m strong.

Justin: Yeah but you’re a Year 5, Year 3s don’t.

Fred: They like to pick on small people because they think they would be an easier target but they are wrong.

Although Fred has depicted the bully, victim and bully buster as different sizes, he also states that it is not always the case that the bully is bigger than the victim. He does state, however, that ‘usually the bully likes to pick on small people’. Justin expands on this by asserting that ‘small people don’t have a lot of strength’. Harry contests this assumption stating that ‘I’m small and I’m strong’. Justin then relates strength to age rather than size. Fred adds to this and says that it is wrong to think that small people are an ‘easier target’. While Justin is referring to strength as a physical attribute, Fred seems to refer to strength in a different way - as not being an easy target. Perhaps then, for Fred, strength is more of a metaphorical concept, which is not related to physical power, but rather to being able to stand up for yourself.

Fred: When you stand up to bullying you have to be like, not like standing up from sitting but you have to be like, “we’re going to stop you from bullying” (...)

Lisa (R): What do you do to stop them then?

Harry: Tell a teacher.

Fred: Tell an adult or a teacher.

In this case strength is associated with confession; confiding with an adult or a teacher to challenge the bully’s acts of strength. Harry suggests that the bully’s actions of picking on people are associated with looking ‘tougher’.

Harry: Bullies pick on people so they look tougher.

The bully is perceived as someone who aspires to present themselves as tough; a characteristic associated, by the bully, with status elevation - ‘they think they’ll get cool friends’ by picking upon children who they think are an ‘easy target’, or less likely to show strength. This is reflected further in an extract from a script for a play about bullying written by the SEAL squad.

*Rose pushes Nicola into a display board*
*Nicola sobs on the floor*

Ella: Why did you do that to my best friend?
Nicola (B): (Shouts) Yeah, you idiot!
Jack: Who are you calling an idiot?
Nicola: You!!!!!!!
Rose: He doesn’t mean like that, you bum heads!
Elizabeth (B): Yeah, you bum heads!
Rose (B): Really Elizabeth… really. Ahem, anyway, we rule this school so…
Bullies: MOVE!!!!!!!

Rose, one of the bullies in the play, states ‘we rule this school’. This suggests that bullies are understood as having social power. However for Fred the bully is also portrayed as someone whose aspirations will not be realised in the ways that they hope. The bully is stripped of their power and, as Fred suggests, of any popularity that may have accompanied it.

Fred: [Bullies] think they’ll get cool friends but it will just make them unpopular.

Returning now to Sarah’s experiences of being bullied, even though she has spoken up about her bullying for her the situation has not changed. She continues to manage acts of bullying and experiences little choice to do otherwise. For example, and this example is reflected upon in Methods C:2.3., she asked me if I thought it was silly to like the cartoon ‘Scooby-Doo’. She explains to me that she really likes the cartoon ‘Scooby-Doo’ and collects lots of books, figurines and other merchandise relating to the television programme. However, some girls in her class laughed at her for her interest in ‘Scooby-Doo’. They tell her she is ‘babyish’. She questioned this position, and told me she thought it was OK for her to like ‘Scooby-Doo’. We had a long chat about how good we both thought ‘Scooby-Doo’ was. This account reflects how Sarah’s values are brought into question by the challenges posed by her peers. This event resonates with Packer and Goiciechea (2000) argument that ‘our activity produces a social context that defines who we are. But that context also confronts us as something alien, so we are divided from ourselves and need to discover ourselves’ (pg. 234). Packer and Goicoechea (2000) suggest that relationships of recognition can ‘split the person’ (pg. 233). Sarah is able to articulate the divisiveness she is experiencing as her values are ridiculed by the girls she describes as her bullies. Her account engages with the role that shame plays in the incongruence she experiences that makes her question her own likes and dislikes when
they are repeatedly criticised by others. However, this is quickly glossed over as we together discuss the reasons why her interests are valuable. While I listened to Sarah’s story, I chose not to act upon it. This is an example of how Sarah’s accounts of bullying, whilst known, are not acted upon. She does not have a powerful adult ally and instead withstands the bullies through her own well-developed practices.

Perhaps Sarah’s story reveals the complexities of ‘appropriate action’. Sarah has acted in a way which she has been told is appropriate for someone who believes they are being bullied, as she has shared this with members of staff and peers at the school. However, the anticipated outcome, that she will be helped and the bullying will stop, has not been realised. This assumed outcome is also reflected in the SEAL squad’s play about bullying.

*Nicola and Ella go to see their teacher, Mr Alex*
Nicola: Mr Alex, um, uh, um, uh, oh
Ella: I will tell the story… we’re getting bullied… um…
*Nicola and Ella cry*
Mr Alex: It’s all right, go and get them, don’t worry about a thing
because every little thing is going to be all right
*Rose, Jack and Elizabeth sing ‘don’t worry about a thing’ by Bob Marley*
Ella: CUT!!!!!
Rose: Sorry, bye!
*Nicola grabs Cathy, Jack and Florence in turn by their wrists and marches across the stage pulling them behind her to Mr Alex*
Ella: Here they are teacher.
Mr Alex: Blah, blah, blah…
*Children yawn*
Rose: I’m glad we’re friends now!

What is interesting about this play is the lack of attention given to how the teacher deals with the situation. The teacher’s intervention is written as ‘blah, blah, blah’ implying that what is said by the teacher is perhaps boring or of little significance to them. However, the act of involving a teacher in this play solves the problem and the bullies and the girls who were getting bullied become friends. In Landmark a:1 I suggested that the act of telling an adult was perhaps more important that what the adult actually does. The act of ‘telling’ or threatening to tell is used as a means of getting one’s voice heard by peers. From a member of staff’s perspective, the way that they are told something is also important.
'Well often children and parents will come to you and say so-and-so is bullying me and sometimes they are, but when you investigate it often, it could be a one off incident. It could be a falling out and it could be someone who has come off the worst who feels like they are the victim and they probably are in that instance, but we talk a lot about, you know, the fact that bullying is about targeting a specific person or a specific group and that it happens over time, there is a pattern that keeps developing' (Headteacher).

This extract from an interview with the headteacher suggests that perceptions of bullying might differ from adult to child. This could suggest that the ways that Sarah speaks about her experience of bullying, means that it is not perceived as bullying within the definition given by the headteacher above. Within this context, Sarah has learnt personal strategies relevant to her own situation to manage the upset that she sometimes feels. For Sarah then personal power is not realised through her confessions of being bullied, but in her capacity to look beyond the taunts of her peers and find ways to seek value from others for her own interests and actions (as in the example of her conversation with me).

It seems that the children portray a bully as having masculine emotional identities. The bully is tough, he aspires to be cool and does not care about the affect he has on others. He is only interested in his own social position and popularity. At the start of fieldwork the Year 5 classroom teacher suggested that I should ‘look out for’ three boys described as bullies. While this implies an association between boys and bullying, which could perhaps explain why Sarah’s experiences of being bullied by girls has gone unnoticed, a social class division is also reflected in a line from one of the SEAL squads plays about bullying.

```
Jaden (B): Why are you playing with her?!
Lucas (B): Do you mean that thing?!
Carlie (V): I’m not called that I’m called…
Danielle: She’s called Carlie!
Nicole: No, she’s a thing, a that, a little mardy girl and snotty girl, so why are you playing with that?
Jamie: You’re out of the gang, cos you’re playing with that thing, so go away
...
Jaden: We don’t want to be friends with the new girl she is kind of geek
```
Here the girl being bullied by two boys is referred to as snotty and a geek. These are both traits traditionally associated with the middle classes. I earlier suggested that the Year 5 teacher associated boys with bullying traits. However, in a play written by three girls about bullying, two girls feature as the bullies.

Rose (B): Hey guys look what I found behind a dumpster (plays a drum)

Elizabeth (B): Yeah, but can you stop, it’s hurting my ears (puts fingers in ears)

Jack (B): Yeah, same, it right hurts

Ella and Nicola: Hey come on

*Ella and Nicola skip*

Rose: Oh my god, you’re no fun. Wait, I have an idea. Let’s go and annoy those little girls.

Elizabeth: (Hesitating) Yeah, let’s do that!

Jack: (Excited) Hey what you doing?

*Rose nudges Jack*

Jack: I mean, what are you ugly rats doing?

Nicola: Oh, we’re ... skipping

Ella: Do you want to join in, it’s fun.

Rose: Hey, I’ve got an idea, why don’t you skip into that wall over there? I’d like to see that.

We can see here that the girls take on the masculine emotional identity described by Fred, Harry and Justin earlier in this section. Rose has found an old drum from behind a dumpster. Featuring a dumpster in the play seems significant. Rose is rooting through scrap and rubbish. There is an association here between the bully and dirt and perhaps poverty. In contrast Ella greets the ‘bullies’ quietly by asking them ‘do you want to join in, it’s fun’. This character embodies a naivety and gentleness, which can be likened with the kinds of traits that victims of bullying need to overcome in order to ‘stand up’ to bullies. This contrasts with Rose’s introduction, who loudly bangs on the old drum she has just found. Here I have shown that children are making distinctions between types of emotional identities and appropriate actions; depending upon whether a child is a bully (enacting power) or is bullied (needing power) particular emotional identities are assumed.
The section above has explored children’s perceptions of the power relationships between bullies and those who are being bullied. I explored how children define a ‘bully’ and a ‘victim’ and see these two characters as having opposing character traits. This suggests what Wetherell (2012) describes as an ‘affective pairing’, where one child is intimidating and the other fearful. In this pairing the bully is perceived to be powerful. The children’s descriptions reflect their sense that the victim has a responsibility to make themselves more powerful than the bully by building allies (typically by telling a teacher). These accounts of bullying were initiated in a research workshop where children created the ‘Bullying Den’. As part of Methods B:2.4. I describe the process through which children made the den and what the final den looked like. The Bullying Den, interestingly, was designed as a space for children to get advice on what to do if they were being bullied. The den itself is a reflection of the individualisation of responsibility (Kelly 2010) for bullying.

The children’s reflections in the section above on bullying reveal a shared view that it is important to ‘stand-up’ to bullies. This is done by ‘telling’ an adult about what is going on. In contrast, Sarah’s case reveals that this does not necessarily resolve the situation. As Sarah was not a regular participant in this research it was difficult to examine in depth why this was the case. However, I have found that the act of ‘telling’ plays a range of different roles. It might be the case that teachers become astute to the different ways that children ‘tell’ on their peers, thus provoking different responses from the teacher. Landmark a:1. looks at one act of ‘telling’, where Katie tells me about how her peers have ignored her during a research meeting. I suggest that Katie did not expect me to act on this information, but used the act of telling to change the encounter between her and her peers.

The section above has explored the intersections between gender and characterisations of bullies and victims. I have shown that the male Y5 teacher and the boys who took part in the research all depicted the bully as a boy. However, the group of girls who wrote the play about bullying for a school assembly, depicted the bullies as both boys and girls. However, these characters all embodied a traditional masculine identity (for example, being loud, swearing, using physical force). I suggest that Sarah’s experiences of bullying, where the acts of bullying are carried out by girls and often hidden from the gaze of adults, have gone relatively unnoticed. In Landmarks a:2. I show how in the school adults refer to girls as being ‘natural caregivers’. I wonder if there is a link between the ways that girls are perceived by adults within the school and the attention placed upon accounts of bullying between boys (or from boys to girls) rather than between girls themselves.
Nodes: Nodes are the intersections between children’s actions and ascribed emotional identities. The vignettes selected explore how such identities influence how children are perceived by their peers. They also explore the disparity between how children try to influence how others view them and their already defined identities.

Node A: Intersections between Children’s Actions and their Lived Emotional Identities

Node A explores the relationships between children’s actions and their peers’ perceptions of ‘who they are’ emotionally. Jenkins (2008) defines such processes of social identification as the way in which ‘individually, we identify ourselves, but we also identify others and are identified by them in turn’ (pg. 8). In the examples presented in this section I examine how emotional identities stick to particular bodies. For example, a girl might be identified by adults as ‘caring’. However, these labels then enable or constrain what a child can do within the school settings in particular ways. In addition I want to consider the ways that children perform emotional identities. In particular, and counter to Corsaro’s (2003) argument that children have their own distinct cultural worlds, I want to suggest that children’s perceptions of the identity values that circulate within ‘adulthood’ also play a role in the way that children perform particular identities within their social interactions.

“Don’t. It’s dangerous!”

This vignette draws upon an encounter involving Justin where Justin’s actions are described as ‘dangerous’ by one of his peers. Rather than seeing Justin’s expression of anger as a reflection of his lack of social skills I suggest that it is a serious form of communication.

‘Over time we learn to interpret and name particular bodily experiences as emotions, and the situations and places in which it is appropriate to express
these and where we are expected to suppress them. Much of this is learnt in childhood but the learning processes are continuous. Thus activists will continue to develop their sense of themselves and acquire socialised means of reacting emotionally to the environments in which they find themselves’ (Brown and Pickerill 2009, pg. 30).

I draw upon this quote from a paper examining the ‘spaces of activism’ at he start of this section because I want to make parallels between the expression of anger in schools and injustice. In this paper the authors examine how ‘creating space for emotional reflexivity within activist spaces can contribute to making our individual and collective engagements in activism and resistance more sustainable over time’ (pg. 25). They are interested in the role of emotion in ‘opening up’ spaces of activism. Reger (2004) suggests that personal emotions can be redefined through organisational process. Through doing so he argues that personal emotions can be transformed into ‘a collectively defined sense of injustice’ (pg. 209). Jasper (1998) associates a collective identity with an emotional response, ‘a positive affect towards other group members’ (pg. 415). Brown and Pickerill argue that a common identity is not a prerequisite for collective action, and therefore examine the complexity of identity in relation to emotions within their paper. However, in this section my main aim is to examine how Justin’s emotional experiences, particularly his feelings of anger, are marked as distinct from the emotional experiences of others therefore restricting the opportunity for a collective examination of the social injustices I believe these emotions represent. I will draw upon fieldnotes from a one-to-one between Justin and the SEAL coordinator. In addition, I will draw on extracts from focus groups where peers share their views about Justin. I will suggest that Justin’s emotional responses are pathologised in this setting and therefore seen by some adults and children as ‘disordered’. I want to suggest that Justin’s responses can be understood in more positive ways when they are situated within a broader social context. I view Justin’s anger as a serious form of communication. Lyman (2004) suggests that ‘when anger is taken seriously as a form of communication… a spirited but ultimately constructive public dialogue about the justice of the dominant political order is possible’ (pg. 133).

Justin’s inclusion is a concern for the SEAL coordinator and his classroom teacher at the school. Strategies have been used to find ways to keep Justin occupied during classes (i.e. using technological resources such as a Nintendo DS or small toys that he can play with during group discussions) or support him through therapeutic interventions (i.e. one-to-ones where he can talk about his own experiences). At the same time, Justin is often actively excluded from activities by his peers. this was something I witnessed personally
during the research workshops, where Justin’s contribution to the dens were often discounted by his peers. On one occasion this led to Justin expressing his frustrations towards Didier, who had told Justin that he could not help him with a job he wanted to do alone, by shouting and throwing an object across the room. I was told by Justin’s teacher that this was probably just another incident when Justin couldn’t get his own way. This struck me as an important interpretation. While the teacher’s response made me feel calmer about the situation, it also worked to label Justin’s emotional experience as insignificant. It might or might not have been, but this was only something Justin could have known. This incident also seemed significant given the ways that Didier and Justin are categorised in opposition to one another (see Node b:2 for an examination of how Didier’s subject-position as the mature boy is juxtaposed against Justin’s subject-position as untrustworthy). I began to examine Justin’s peers’ reflections on his expression of anger. Justin’s anger seemed to be perceived by his peers as demonstrative of his lack of social skills and a problem that he needs to overcome by personally taking responsibility for his anger (as will be explored later in this section). This sense that Justin should take responsibility for his anger is also reflected in a one-to-one session he had with the SEAL coordinator, Mrs Williams.

Mrs Williams asks Justin if everything is going well at playtime, he says again that it is fine. He says that he has been playing with his best friends, Fred, Troy and John, amongst others. She asks, ‘have there been any disagreements?’ He says that there haven’t really. She asks him ‘what do you do if there is a disagreement?’ He tells her, ‘we walk away and decide to leave it’. ‘That’s brilliant’ Mrs Williams responds. Justin seems nervous. Mrs Williams says ... that it is good to see him doing the ‘right’ things (Fieldnotes).

The extract above focuses on Justin’s management of disagreements in the playground. As examined in District a:2 this is a space where Justin can have more emotional freedom. I have shown that this is welcomed amongst some groups of children and not others. Brown and Pickerill (2009) describe spaces as ‘sites of negotiation and contestation through which individuals (and groups) understand and frame their emotions’ (pg. 28). While their concern is spaces of activism, the way they conceptualise spaces can extend to the spaces of schooling. They describe spaces as ‘emotionally saturated’ and suggest that ‘certain settings are more prone to produce emotions than others: as a result of particular configurations of social scripts, the performance of the actors present, and the ‘staging’ of that space’ (Brown and Pickerill 2009, pg. 28). The
extract from a video recording captured by Cheryl is reflective of how Justin’s peers enable and constrain his participation in activities and as a result influence the emotionality of the space. The way that his peers intervene is based upon their understanding of his emotional identity, as an ‘unpredictable’ and ‘angry’ boy. Their interventions seem to be in response to the fear that they experience at particular moments. District b:2 examines how these feelings of fear work to support Justin’s exclusion from classroom activities.

*Justin throws bits of materials across the room*

Harry: (Jokingly) I’m lucky to have this helmet on (Harry is making a hat to wear during the school assembly about the project).

*Justin continues to throw bits of material across the room*

Harry: Justin don’t

Fred: It’s dangerous

*Harry leaves the room (Harry comes to find me to tell me about what Justin is doing)*

Justin: Harry’s a bit of a crybaby.

Justin’s peers here interpret his expression of emotion as ‘dangerous’. This works to sustain a ‘public identity’ informed by a shared understanding of anger and how anger works. Edge a:1 explores children’s understandings of anger as unpredictable and difficult to manage. Jenkins (2000) defines social identification as an ‘internal-external dialectic of self-image and public-image’ (pg. 8). He describes this as a process through which ‘individually, we identify ourselves, but we also identify others and are identified by them in turn’ (Jenkins, 2000, pg. 8). The extract above reflects Jenkins’ notion of social identification and demonstrates a tension between Justin’s ‘self-image’ – how he wants to be seen – and his ‘public-image’ – how others perceive him. In the extract Justin’s actions are described as dangerous – his public-image. Harry’s decision to get a teacher supports Fred’s view that Justin’s actions were dangerous. Justin counters this perception by implying that his actions were acceptable – his self-image – and instead suggests that Harry is a crybaby for telling an adult. In doing it could be argued that Justin is attempting to downplay the significance of his actions in order to avoid reprimand. Fred then challenges Justin’s claim that Harry is a crybaby.

Fred: No he isn’t…He’s not even crying

Justin: Is this Cathy’s?

Fred: Yes
Justin: Oh that’s Cathy’s, that’s Cathy’s, watch
Cheryl: It’s recording
*Cheryl points the camera at Justin*
*Justin hits Cathy’s work with a wooden drumstick*

After this altercation Justin destroy’s Cathy’s work (an addition to the den that I remember her being particularly proud of). For me, this encounter can be reflects the affective coupling (Wetherell 2012) of superiority and inferiority. Wouters (1992) argues that feelings of superiority or inferiority are increasingly withheld and reflect a moral backdrop of social equality. Wouters (1992) suggests that ‘one’s individual style of emotion management has gained importance in the struggle for status and power, as a criterion in the process of ranking’ (pg. 230). This doctoral study has shown that emotion management has become an integral part of schooling and the ways that children are ranked during their time at school (see Context 1.3 for a description of SEAL techniques used at the school). Wouters (1992) argues that at the same time the ideals of social inequality limit the expression of feelings of superiority or inferiority, and such feelings ‘are more easily met with moral indignation’ (pg. 231). This argument can be extended to the school where an increased focus upon equality and inclusion in schools makes it difficult to talk about how children negotiate status and recognition within their interactions. In the extract below, we can see how different responses to different children have to be carefully managed as they disrupt the norms of fairness and equity that operate within the school.

Headteacher: I think with children that have got particular difficulties behaviour wise, so they kind of sit slightly outside the whole school behaviour policy, and so you know you catch them doing good things and reward that, with instant reward if you like. But then other children don’t always understand the logic or the fairness of that, so there is kind of bit of work to be done in terms of communicating to children appropriately...

SEAL coordinator: And it’s not equitable always is it, cos it can’t be because of Colin next door he has a star chart and the kids know he has to have a star chart for certain things but erm you can see sometimes when he shouts out, because they don’t fully understand his special needs, they think hang on a minute if I were doing that you’d be giving me a right bollocking but he is allowed...

Within this context, children’s struggles for social recognition, such as Justin’s anger outbursts, tend to go unnoticed. This reflects Wouter’s (1992) view that it is increasingly
difficult to talk about status and it’s importance in giving value and meaning to our lives. Building from this, Scheff and Retzinger (2001) suggest that shame leads to violence only when it is unacknowledged, either through repression or disguise. They state that ‘violence occurs when the path towards negotiation is blocked by inadequate bonds and hidden cross-currents of emotion – that is, unacknowledged alienation/shame’ (pg, xix).

If we consider that ‘angry speech contains a claim that an injustice has been committed’ (Lyman 2004, pg. 133), then perhaps Justin’s anger can be understood as one of the few means he has to resist the experiences of shame and alienation he encounters at the school (as reflected in the incident during the den-building workshop). Lyman (2004) argues that anger is often viewed as a psychological disorder and therefore its place, as a means of communication, is not taken seriously. Rather anger has become a shameful emotion. Scheff and Retzinger (2001) argue that ‘anger is repressed because of shame… all anger – not just excessive anger – is forbidden in modern societies, because people have been socialized to be ashamed of it’ (Scheff and Retzinger 2001, pg. 18). Within the context of the SEAL school anger is seen as a particularly problematic emotion, as it is seen to disrupt the social harmony that the school aspires towards, as reflected in the Year 5 classroom teacher’s comments below.

I think we are just looking for this caring school and this compassionate school and one where every child is happy to learn (Year 5 teacher).

This pathologisation of anger is also reflected in the children’s views about Justin. For example, when Harry described Justin as not being able to control his anger, Lionel suggest that he should not be in their class and should instead be in what is called the integrated resource (IR), a class for children with behavioural difficulties or special learning needs.

Cheryl: [Justin] should be in the IR
Researcher: Do you think so?
Harry: Because he has got angry problems…
Lionel: He should be in the IR… Why do they put someone in the school when they need to be in the IR?

The children’s comments imply a view that the expression of anger is only allowed within the Integrated Resource Unit (IR), which is a facility at the school for children diagnosed with severe ‘special educational needs’ or ‘behavioural difficulties’. The segregation experiences by these children is reflected in a boy’s comment during a school council meeting. A boy from the IR who is attending the meeting says that he thinks the boundary of their playground, a 3m high fence with a bolted shut gate, should be extended. To
support his argument he states that children might be able to ‘escape’ over the fence at the moment. In this statement, he communicates his understanding that the IR children’s separation from the rest of the school is important. Other children also reflect that their separation is important to them too. For example, when the Headteacher asks a boy what he thinks about having an IR at their school, he says ‘well, it doesn’t really affect us … [but] it’s good because if they were in our lessons they would affect us’. Throughout my time at the school I notice that Justin spent an increasing amount of his playtimes with children in mainstream classes who were also diagnosed with ‘special education needs’. This is examined in more depth in District a:2, where I reflect on a play encounter between Justin and a group of boys diagnosed with ‘special educational needs’.

Justin’s public identity is constructed through applying narratives about anger to make sense of Justin’s feelings and behaviours. Ahmed (2004) suggests that emotional capital is assigned to some emotional figurations and not others. The affective practices of Justin do not provide him with emotional capital in the context of the SEAL school. He is not given social positions such as peer-mediator or school-council-member. Even though he is encouraged to work towards this by the SEAL coordinator.

*Mrs Williams tells Justin during their one-to-one that she thinks he can be a peer mediator next year. She tells him ‘you are saying all the right things – as a peer mediator would’... Mrs Williams tells him ‘other people have said so too’... She finishes by saying that it seems like everything is all being really positive for him at the moment (Fieldnotes).*

This reflects Zembylas’ (2007) view that ‘emotional capital … is systematically transformed into social and cultural capital – such as stronger relations in the classroom and empowered feelings in the school community’ (pg. 453 – 454). This push for Justin to do the ‘right’ things, which demands that he manages his emotions in particular ways, suggests that without such self-regulation he would be doing the ‘wrong’ things. It seems that when children experience Justin as ‘unregulated’ they are concerned about this fuelling a ‘wrong’ and potentially ‘dangerous’ reaction. The encounter between Harry, Fred and Justin reflects this. At one moment, Harry is participating playfully in Justin’s throwing of materials around the room, ‘I’m lucky to have this helmet on’, and the next he seeks adult assistance because it has been suggested by Fred that Justin’s actions are dangerous.

I suggested that boys are socialised to be ashamed of anger and therefore the social roots of anger and aggression can become hidden. An increased focus upon equality and
inclusion in schools makes it difficult to talk about how anger is entangled within struggles of status and recognition. For Justin, his expression of anger is viewed as a psychological disturbance rather than an important means for him to communicate his experiences of shame and alienation in his interactions with his peers. His characterisation as an ‘unpredictable’ and ‘angry’ boy also results in his peers suggesting he should be spatially excluded from the mainstream classroom and placed within the Integrated Resource. In order to adequately respond to the social injustices which children experience on a daily basis at school, I have suggested that anger needs to be understood as a shame response and taken seriously as a means of communicating experiences of alienation.

The section above has referred to the playground twice as a site in which Justin experiences more emotional agency. However, I have shown how teachers, from a distance, try to enter into this space. An example of this was a one-to-one meeting between the SEAL coordinator and Justin, which spent some time discussing the ways that Justin deals with ‘disagreements’ in the playground. In addition, I stated that Justin (who I was told by teachers resists his label of autistic) was accepted into friendship groups of children with ‘special educational needs’ and not other groups. In District a:1. (turn to pg. 208) I look at a playground encounter between Justin and a group of boys, many of which have been diagnosed with ‘special educational needs’. This encounter reveals how Justin is afforded an agency within this group that he doesn’t have when he tries to participate in playground games with children outside of this categorisation. Therefore, while Justin’s belonging to this friendship group reproduces a certain subject-position of ‘different’, it also offers Justin an opportunity for inclusion and autonomy.

In the section above I have described some hesitancy from a few children about Justin being in their class. It seems that the spatial separation of children whose emotions manifest in ways that disrupt the norms of schooling, influences how the children make sense of themselves in relation to Justin. In District b:2. (turn to pg. 223) some of these children also articulate the challenges they face in building relationships with Justin. District b:2 reflects upon how children learn to be fearful of anger, and the ways these feelings legitimise Justin’s spatial exclusion from the classroom.
I suggested above that Justin’s public identity is influenced by the ways that anger is conceptualised and perceived within the SEAL school. Edge a:1, (turn to pg. 232) analyses children’s perspectives on anger. I explore how children describe anger and understand what they should ‘do’ with their feelings of anger and how anger can influence how they or another person might behave. I will identify the types of behavioural responses children associate with anger and how feeling rules work to classify these responses as right or wrong within this particular school.

Earlier in the section above I reflected upon a hostile encounter between Justin and Didier. During my time at the school I was told by the SEAL coordinator that Justin was very jealous of Didier. I wondered why this was the case. In working with the data I have noticed how social interactions between Justin and Didier (and often involving adults) seem to position them in opposition to one another. For example, in Node a:3, (turn to pg. 309) I show how Didier’s subject-position as the mature boy, is juxtaposed against Justin’s subject-position as untrustworthy. This exploration is situated within a wider discussion about the relationship between gender and emotion.
Nodes: Nodes are the intersections between children’s actions and ascribed emotional identities. The vignettes selected explore how such identities influence how children are perceived by their peers. They also explore the disparity between how children try to influence how others view them and their already defined identities.

Node A: Intersections between Children’s Actions and their Lived Emotional Identities

Node A explores the relationships between children’s actions and their peers’ perceptions of ‘who they are’ emotionally. Jenkins (2008) defines such processes of social identification as the way in which ‘individually, we identify ourselves, but we also identify others and are identified by them in turn’ (pg. 8). In the examples presented in this section I examine how emotional identities stick to particular bodies. For example, a girl might be identified by adults as ‘caring’. However, these labels then enable or constrain what a child can do within the school settings in particular ways. In addition I want to consider the ways that children perform emotional identities. In particular, and counter to Corsaro’s (2003) argument that children have their own distinct cultural worlds, I want to suggest that children’s perceptions of the identity values that circulate within ‘adulthood’ also play a role in the way that children perform particular identities within their social interactions.

“Do you want to go to bed with me, so we can have two children and raise them to have big boobies?”

This section explores how children categorise the emotional dispositions of others according to their understanding of how adults’ value their emotions. The girls represented here participate in the ‘adult world’ by portraying themselves as sexy whereas the boy embodies an emotionally maturity.

Children draw on their perceptions of the emotional traits of others in the ways they characterise others. For example, Didier invited me to snub a girl on the TV talent-show
'X-Factor' who he described as ‘arrogant’. However, emotional associations are not unique to children. People of all ages make judgements about other people’s emotional states. This section draws on fieldnotes and extracts from staff interviews and children’s focus groups to examine the ways that gender and emotional identities intersect in the SEAL school setting. My aim in this section is to examine the relationship between gender and emotion. Commonly certain emotional traits are associated with being male or female. Therefore, I attend to situations when children’s emotional identities deviate from those commonly prescribed to boys and girls. I suggest that children’s emotionalised gender identities have implications for how children view and relate to themselves and others.

At the school, children are described by adults through their emotional characteristics, such as ‘caring’, ‘mature’ or ‘needy’. Children’s emotional exchanges with adults, I suggest, can reinforce these characteristics.

‘Cathy is quite flamboyant and out there and likes her needs to be met all the time, but when you have to talk to her about issues she cries really readily. And I know I had to talk to her the other week about shouting out all the time and she just went, you know, ‘I’ve had a really hard time being bullied’. She hasn’t got a lot of resilience about negative comments towards her. You know, [I shared some] mild negative comments and she immediately dragged up the last three years of playground issues’ (SEAL coordinator).

Mayall (1998) suggests that ‘childhood is a relational concept’ (pg. 139). She states that ‘because of the authority and control adults exercise over all aspects of children’s lives, adult models not only importantly affect children’s experiences, knowledge and identity, they are also critical in constructing the personhood of children’ (pg. 139). Mayall (1998) argues that children thus acquire an understanding of how adults value their emotions and their bodies. This, in turn, effects how children view themselves. This is particularly noticeable in children’s presentations of gender. Girls present distinct types of femininity within their friendship groups. For some girls, their femininity is expressed through an emerging sexual identity.

Carla:  ... you want to go down and up and up and down
Kathryn: Like Justin frickin’
Carla:  Kathryn, you want to do that with every boy in this school
Kathryn: I do!
Girls sometimes referred to themselves as being ‘sexy’. For example, one girl sang to others, ‘I’m very sexy, yeah, yeah, yeah’. Another girl likened being in a good mood to feeling ‘like I’m sexy, like a sexy bitch’. In one of the focus groups two girls taunted Didier about a scenario he shared when a girl approached him at ice-skating. They pretended to be the girl in the story.

Cathy: Are you all right? Do you want me to have babies?
Katie: Do you want to go to bed with me, so we can have two beautiful children and raise them to have big boobies?

The girls’ conversations about sex and sexuality take place more frequently during the time when they are participating in relationship education lessons. They also started using ‘adult words’ for genitalia, such as penis and vagina. In a focus group with Didier, Kathryn and Carla about the Making New Friends den-building workshop, they explained to the researcher the different ways that girls, boys and adults talk.

Katie: Almost all the girls like pretend to talk like a baby... We don’t find it talking like a baby...
Cathy: I think it’s sexy
Katie: We find it talking like, it’s like a funny voice, we like doing it...
Lisa (R): And what do boys think about these voices?
Cathy: Boys, I don’t even know
Didier: Don’t even go there, it’s so annoying
Katie: We don’t like boys do we at times?
Lisa (R): What about talking like a grown-up?
Didier: It’s miles better
Cathy: Like this, oh my God, I can’t believe I’m like so pregnant
Didier: That’s like a baby
Katie: I like talking like both really
...
Lisa (R): So how do boys talk?
Didier: Boys talk like grown-ups

In this conversation, the children commented upon the differences they perceive between boys and girls. Didier suggested that boys are more mature than girls. He argued that this is demonstrated through the choices boys make regarding what they say and how they say
it. However, Carla said they enjoyed using ‘funny’ voices in their conversations. When Kathryn mimicked the voice of an adult, she used a posh accent. The topic of conversation she chose was pregnancy. This perhaps reflects her association of sexuality with adults. Perhaps then her conversations about sex are about becoming adult and thus using the concepts and language of adulthood.

Mayall (1998) suggests that ‘the social worlds of childhood are sharply differentiated from those of adults’ (pg. 139). However, she also claims that ‘children both expect and desire to participate in the activities they see adults engaging in at home’ (1998, pg. 143) and this could be argued to extend into schools. This is evident in children’s delight at being nominated for roles such as ‘peer-mediator’ at the school. They agreed to take on this role because they ‘wanted to help people ... [and their] ... school’. Perhaps then, the ways girls use language typically assigned to the ‘adult’ domain, reflects their interest in being a part of the adult world. This is also reflected in a conversation between Cheryl and myself.

Cheryl asks me if I know what vagina means. I say that I do. I say that I was in the same sex education lesson as her... She asks me if I know what penis means. Again I say yes. She asks me if I know what nuggets are. I say that I don’t know. She points to her privates and says, but on a boys (Fieldnotes).

In contrast, some of the boys tend to participate in the adult world by demonstrating their maturity. Didier’s presentations of maturity were particularly recognised and valued by adults and enables his inclusion in their world. For example, Didier’s depiction of children’s fall-outs in the playground were trusted by adults, whereas other boys’ accounts were more likely to be disputed. Didier’s teacher also described him as ‘the most mature boy in the class’.

Adults seem to associate maturity with resilience. One teacher stated that boys ‘learn to be resilient on the football pitch’. It seems that boys are perceived to be more emotionally resilient than girls. Emotional resilience is a sign of boy’s masculinity amongst peers. For example, on the occasions when Didier fell over on the tarmac playground during football he always held back his tears. Rather, he would get up and carry on playing. This type of reaction is common amongst the ‘cool’ boys.

Didier demonstrates his emotional resilience by repressing his tears. Understanding resilience is one of the SEAL outcomes - children ‘think about the importance of resilience in overcoming obstacles in order to reach a goal’ (DfES, 2005a, pg. 1). Within
the SEAL guidelines resilience is described as the ability to put ‘suffering behind [you] and take positive steps to build a better future’ (DfES, 2005b, pg. 37). In the extract from a focus group below, Didier describes his understanding of resilience and how this differs from perseverance.

*Didier: Well like determined you need to, like, try and do your best. If you can’t do, like, a maths sum, just keep, keep trying, and try and try again.*

*Harry: Yeah, cos if you give up then you’re just … not going to get any better really*

*Didier: Resilient means if you’re … walking and then something comes in your way*

*Harry: and it hits you on the head*

*Didier: You’ve got to be resilient and go somewhere else and persevere just means keep, keep, keep trying…*

It is interesting to note that Didier was described by his teacher as the ‘most mature boy in the class’ in front of the rest of the class. This is during a week-long trip to an outdoor pursuits centre with the children. On the first day, the Year 5 teacher asks his class if anyone will volunteer to share a room with Justin. Parents of other boys did not want them to share a room with Justin. Therefore, Justin was put in his own room. This was upsetting for Justin. Justin’s room houses the Nintendo DS and other games, which I assume are offered not only to support Justin to step back from intense emotions he may experience during the residential but also to encourage other children to come forward and share Justin’s room with him. Didier offers to share the room with Justin, and for this he is applauded for his maturity. The fact that maturity was mentioned, implies that Didier is not sharing a room with Justin because he wants to but because it is the ‘right’ thing to do. This reinforces an ongoing identity binary between Didier and Justin, whereby Didier is positioned as mature and trustworthy and Justin as the opposite. In tension with this masculine notion of emotional maturity as getting on with what is thrown your way, SEAL also aims to challenge the repression of emotion strongly associated with being a man and encourages boys to realise it is fine to cry.

‘I think [SEAL] really helps a lot of the boys who internalise their feelings, get frustrated but don’t know why, and now they understand that, ‘hey, we all feel like that’ … [and] … boys can see that its fine to cry’ (SEAL coordinator).
This feminisation of the curriculum has been criticised by some because ‘talking about feelings and being seen to be empathetic and caring tend to be seen as feminine traits, with the consequence that boys may actively reject them rather than risk potential ridicule from peers and criticism at home’ (Craig 2007, pg.11). The personal rejection of SEAL by boys does not seem to be the case for some, for example Didier is an advocate of SEAL and SEAL lessons. I would argue that this is because, as Boler (1999) suggests, emotional education reinforces a masculine conceptualisation of emotion. Walkerdine (1988) has also examined the ways in which education has been constituted as rational and therefore masculine. I have explored this further in Context 1:2 by relating Boler’s (1999) pathological and rational paradigmatic conceptualisations of emotion to the SEAL curriculum. This is reflected in David’s experiences at a SEAL school. While crying appears to be welcomed by adults, David who does cry openly does not mix with other boys during playtimes. Instead he spends his time with groups of girls. On one occasion he was described as ‘gay’ by the boys. Cheryl, described by teachers as ‘assertive’ in character, stepped in to defend him.

David is accused of being ‘gay’ by the boys. Lionel says that he is gay because he talks about women’s privates. Cheryl tells them that if he was gay he would be talking about men’s privates (Fieldnotes).

It also would appear that David’s tears are seen as a point of concern by adults, rather than perhaps increased emotional sensitivity. At the same time, the SEAL coordinator’s statement ‘boys can see it’s fine to cry’ sits in tension with her concern over David’s tears, as she also felt that David was not emotionally ready to take on roles of responsibility such as peer-mediator.

‘I didn’t choose him because he’s not ready, emotionally he’s not ready to come and do this, he wouldn’t have managed all week either, he’ll be ready next year’ (SEAL coordinator).

For David, his emotional responses seems to inform perceptions that he is ‘not ready’ for ‘grown-up’ roles. In addition he is actively excluded, and at the same time resists inclusion, from boys’ groups. Teachers do acknowledge that it is wrong to expect children to behave in uniform ways.

‘... we shouldn’t expect children to all behave in the same way because emotionally we have got children a year apart in age almost from September
to August, we’ve got boys and girls and the expectation for them all to fit into this box and behave in a certain way is wrong’ (SEAL coordinator).

However, there still exist emotionalised stereotypes which are interconnected with the gender roles that children have available to them within the school setting.

This section has suggested that children categorise the emotional dispositions of others. Children’s categorisations relate to how children perceive male and female bodies to be valued in the adult domain and influence how the children themselves present gendered emotional identities. For both boys and girls this involves appropriating their perceptions of adult masculinity and femininity. Some of the girls appropriated sexual language in conversation with adults and peers, whereas boys repressed and controlled their emotion in order to appear mature.

Children’s presentations of gender are also important to how they are socially positioned at school. David did not control his emotions as readily as other boys, who challenged his masculinity by suggesting he was gay. Boys who express ‘feminine’ emotions, such as David, seem to occupy a position outside of the boys’ domain. In David’s case, he did not name any of the boys in his class as his friends. However, mature boys, such as Didier, who control their emotions appear to be well-respected by other boys. Girls who appropriate sexual language, also seem to have a certain degree of authority over other girls. Kathryn, in particular, was a very popular girl to be friends with and was also one of the first to have a boyfriend.

Children present their gender in different ways, many of which have not been explored in this section. However, children’s categorisations of emotional dispositions as either masculine or feminine are important to how they relate to and view their peers. At the same time, children’s perceptions of being a male or female adult influence how they present themselves emotionally.
While I have suggested that identity binaries are reinforced through interactions between adults and children, they also play an important role in peer relationships and friendships. As suggested above, children’s subject-positions could be understood as reference points used by adults (as in the example between Didier and Justin) and by children. In Landmark a:2 (turn to pg. 264) I examine how in a group of girls, each girl seems to have a ‘place’ within their friendship groups. This ‘place’, while it may fluctuate at times, is produced and reproduced as the girls interact with each other. The girls’ positions within the group form stable landmarks within the friendship group.

Earlier in the section above I suggested that SEAL draws predominantly on a masculine conceptualisation of emotion. However, at the same time a rhetoric accompanies SEAL which suggests that this curriculum enables children (and particularly boys) to open up about how they are feeling. In doing so, SEAL is argued as a vehicle for promoting a shift in thinking about emotions, where feelings no longer have to be hidden but can be expressed and embraced. I have suggested that this rhetoric is not realised in practice. This, I argue, is because the SEAL curriculum in centred upon managing emotion (as I explored through the example of resilience). Therefore boys like David, who are open to crying in public, are excluded from school activities because they are not deemed to be emotionally resilient. Links can be made between David’s story and Context 1:2. (turn to pg. 29). I suggest that while a child-centred rhetoric frames the SEAL curriculum, it can also be viewed from two paradigmatic positions – the pathological and the rational (Boler 1999). Firstly the pathological paradigm views individuals at risk from emotional vulnerability. Secondly the rational paradigm claims that these risks can be prevented.
Reflection: **Collating my thoughts**

1. **Looking Back**

   and

2. **Thinking Ahead**

After completing a final draft of this thesis to be read by my supervisor, I spent around six-months settling into a new job. This allowed some distance from the doctoral study. Upon returning to the thesis I have found that this distance has been helpful for thinking about the cross-cutting themes, key messages and implications of the study. I expect that you as the reader will have drawn your own conclusions from engaging with this thesis, which may align with or move away from my own. In this closing section I aim to reflect on my own views about the study. I will start by providing an overview of why I felt this research was important, and in addition to this why I chose to represent the research in the way that I did by drawing on the understanding of ‘validity’ developed over the course of this study. I will outline the aims behind the research study before returning to my research questions. The following paragraphs will then illustrate how my interpretations of fieldwork have responded to my research questions. I will end the section by reflecting on the implications of this doctoral study. These implications raise particular questions regarding classroom, institutional and professional cultures of schooling and show how a reframing of emotions can offer new starting points for thinking about cultural transformation. I will also consider the new questions that have been generated from this study and the potential for future research.

This thesis was designed to facilitate multiple interpretations, to metaphorically convey research as a lived experience. Youdell and Armstrong (2011) suggest that the researcher’s retelling of research is never unmediated, instead we are ‘discursively, psychically and affectively implicated’ (pg. 145) in our representations of fieldwork. It is this perspective that frames my consideration of validity in research. Given my view that research is produced through the researcher’s relational emplacement in the field, I have endeavoured to engage reflexively in this process within my writing. This is reflected in this thesis through the integration of extracts from my research journal, which explored my experiences both within and beyond the field. Differing from my field notes
this journal engaged with the emotional dimensions of fieldwork. Throughout the research process this was a useful resource for exploring how my understandings of the field were being shaped both through my experiences in the field and the values and beliefs that I brought to the study. It is this integrated reflexivity that aligns with my understanding of validity.

Drawing upon the notion of crystallisation developed by Richardson (1989), I have suggested that multiple and shifting identities are constituted through the act of research, both for the researcher and the research participants. I have developed methods that have sought to capture the different dimensions of children’s lives to reflect my position that the self is dynamic and that different selves unfold and are constituted within different contexts. While I have attempted to capture a sense of these unfolding selves, I do not seek to present the ‘whole’ picture. In line with Rose (1997), I recognise that the interpretations presented within this are both partial and momentary. It is my intention to offer glimpses into the unfolding interpretations of children’s school lives developed through the intersubjective relationships between me and them. This thesis demonstrates the dynamic nature of interpretation and each section captures a moment in time. Therefore, I have not attempted to remove inconsistencies and contradictions, in order to prioritise a more open representation of the research process.

I understand identities as intersubjectively constructed (Cunliffe 2008) and for me this was an important dimension of the research process. Cho and Trent (2009) suggest that transformational perspectives on validity prioritise change both for the researcher and the participants. From this perspective, reflexively plays an important role in accessing changing, unfolding and intersubjective identities. This is reflected in the central role that emotional reflexivity played in my interpretation of field data. Reflecting upon and through my felt responses to the data offered further insights into my relational emplacement within the field. In this way reflexive practice supports the examination of ‘meanings that are taken for granted and … create[s] ‘analytic practices’ in which meanings are both deconstructed and reconstructed in a way that makes initial connotations more fruitful’ (Cho and Trent 2009, pg. 324). I have suggested that personal insights offer opportunities for further engagement with the children’s experiences of school life. Drawing upon a perspective that emotions are constituted relationally (Bondi 2005), I see emotional reflexivity as an epistemologically productive way of analysing my relational encounters within the field.
Emotions have played a central role within this thesis, not only as the focus of the study but as a productive aspect of representing the field, and therefore the structure of the thesis was developed with the intent of provoking felt responses in the reader. While I will not know whether this was the case, I wondered if you might have become frustrated because you found yourself revisiting one section over and over again. Perhaps you felt excited at the prospect of building your own narrative. You may have become bored by the non-linear structure. Whilst I couldn’t pre-empt your emotional responses to reading this thesis, my intention was to reflect the significance of emotions in the research process. Pillow (2003) argues that it is important to engage with uncomfortable moments from our research in education. It is these moments that I have attended to in particular through this doctoral study. They were the moments when I felt most affected by encounters that I had seen or heard about. I was emotionally drawn to these moments. In this way, I have welcomed emotions into both the production and reading of this thesis.

As stated in the introduction to this thesis, emotions are an explicit educational focus across many primary schools across the UK. Children’s emotional skills are viewed as an important cause for concern. Emotions, conceptualised within these educational discourses as an interior state, are positioned as a means to ensuring children’s academic success and future well-being. This new ‘emotional pedagogy’ (Ecclestone 2004) seems ‘not to invite emotion into education, but to corral and contain it, to subdue and correct it within the rationality which it might otherwise exceed’ (Kenway and Youdell 2011, pg. 132). Gillies (2011) has shown how understandings of emotion in education categorise particular emotions as right or wrong. This, she suggests, works to pathologise the emotionalities of children (Gillies 2011). In response, Kenway and Youdall (2011) call for a move towards a ‘socio-cultural-spatial analysis of emotion ... [that] ... allows us to engage with emotion in new ways’ (pg. 132). It is within the emotional geographies of schooling that this research has become situated. Like Kenway and Youdell (2011) I have found few educational studies that make links between space and place and emotionality, and particularly from a children and childhood perspective. This is even though this area of study provides opportune ground for rethinking emotion in education.

This doctoral study has intended to show how a socio-spatial analysis of emotion enables alternative ways of thinking about emotion to enter into educational research. In doing so I am seeking to ‘understand emotion – experientially and conceptually – in terms of its socio-spatial mediation and articulation rather than as entirely interiorised subjective mental states’ (Bondi et al 2005, pg. 3 original italics). From this perspective emotions are viewed as ‘located’ in both bodies and places and dynamically constructed though the
‘relationality’ between people and places and spaces (Bondi et al 2005). A particular intention of this study has been to examine the ways that emotions produce and are produced by the socio-spatial landscapes of schooling. For example, how affectivities and emotions become located in particular spaces and places (i.e. ‘I think you need to go to your calm space’) or children’s bodies (i.e. ‘he’s got anger management problems’). In addition, the ways that affective and emotional rituals between children and adults play out within different spaces and places of the school. This positioning of the research connects with Youdell and Armstrong’s (2011) description of the ‘choreography of schooling’.

‘By foregrounding bodies as collectivities in movement that is meaningful and productive, the choreographic emphasises the multiplicity of bodies implicated and constituted in the event. Thinking in terms of the choreographies of the event suggests bodies moving collectively and tacitly - these bodies ‘know’ the moves and act their place in the choreography of the event but these are not the self-conscious or self-reflective bodies of actors’ (pg. 146).

However, I also examine how children’s movements within and through the spaces and places of school sustain, contest and change the choreography of these rituals. This socio-spatial analysis of emotion developed over the course of the study. I did not begin the fieldwork with a clear definition of emotion. For me, it was important to develop this through the research process, in response to field data and my experiences within the field. I therefore entered the field with research questions that would enable adults and children at the school to speak about emotion in their own terms, through an emphasis upon the SEAL curriculum. Whilst I was curious about SEAL, and particularly given the criticisms outlined earlier in this section, my overarching aim was to examine how emotions work within schools. More specifically, I wanted to explore this by engaging with children’s perceptions within the SEAL school, where emotion was a specific focus. Therefore the final research questions that framed this study were as follows:

- **What are children’s perceptions of their role in a SEAL school?**
- **How does their perception of that role affect how they view themselves and others?**
- **How do children understand the purpose of SEAL?**

I didn’t aim to garner definitive conclusions in response to these questions as part of the process of conducting this research. Rather these questions offered a way into thinking about emotion in relation to the personal, social and spatial dimensions of children’s experiences. I have not tried to answer these questions in turn, but rather I used them as a
way to provide a focus for beginning the research. As the research developed I became troubled by the word ‘perception’, which is often associated with reflection or consciousness. However, my understanding of perception became more to do with a way of knowing, that can be both conscious and unconscious. I have therefore sought to examine how children move between intellectualised and embodied ways of knowing about emotion. By this I mean how they move between emotion as ‘understood’ and emotion as ‘lived’. My interest in the relationships between intellectualised and embodied ways of knowing about emotion is reflected in the way that this doctoral study has sought to examine the intersections between space and place, conceptualisations of emotion, social relationships and identities. As explored in Methods A:1.2, ethnography attends to locally constructed meanings within different cultural contexts. An attention to culture, reflected in the term ethnos, has been of primary significance within this ethnographic study which has sought to understand the cultures of emotion with the school context as they are socially and spatially constructed. This examination of emotion raises important questions about the culture of schooling. The rationale framing the new ‘emotion skills’ agenda is centred upon the individualisation of learning. Therefore an individualistic school culture is prioritised through this curriculum. This study has shown how an engagement with the socio-spatial dimensions of emotion offers an opportunity to engage with the social inequities that this kind of school culture seems to reproduce. I have shown that power relations are entangled in children’s expression of emotion. Therefore, the focus on the construction of emotion can allow us to see how the social and cultural injustices of education are implicated in children’s emotionally textured school lives. These insights offer an opportunity for transforming the cultures of schooling, of which emotion has always played a crucial role. The ways of seeing emotion offered within this doctoral thesis allow us to consider how we can change the cultures of education from the inside out. These ideas are examined further in the following review of the key messages generated from this research.

1) Key messages

a) Living discourse and subjectivities

Central to this has been an interest in children’s subject-positions within a SEAL school; asking questions such as how does Justin become known as the ‘angry’ boy or Didier the ‘mature’ boy. An important aspect of this, I have found, is the way that discourses of emotion circulate and shape the ways that emotions are conceptualised within the school
setting and become part of the school’s culture(s). Youdell and Armstrong (2011) argue that ‘subject-hood is always situated in and constrained by relationships of power’ (pg. 145). Power here is conceptualised as productive and lived through discourse (Foucault 1990, 1991). Zembylas and Fendler (2007) suggest that ‘a social control of emotions in education is reflected in the combination of psychological and cultural feminist discourses ... [which] ... perpetuate an assumed divide between the rational and the emotional, and reinforce the existing power hierarchies and the status quo of stereotypes about the role of emotion in education’ (pg. 319). I have looked at the ways that children draw upon these discourses to inform their own understandings of emotion. I have also shown that children’s socio-emotional practices can deviate from these understandings thus suggesting another way of knowing about emotion. Coole (2007) argues that ‘there are many ways in which power operates on a corporeal level’ (pg. 413). She suggests that ‘visceral and stylistic aspects of embodiment help sustain inequalities through practices that often seem too trivial or mundane to identify as modes of power’ (pg. 413). Coole’s exploration of how inequalities are embodied in social practice, reflects the ways that subject-positions between children are produced and reproduced through their social-emotional practices. Returning now to Youdell and Armstrong’s (2011) notion of the choreography of schooling, we can suggest that children’s ‘bodies ‘know’ the moves and act their place in the choreography of the event but these are not the self-conscious or self-reflective bodies of actors’ (pg. 146). These other ways of knowing about emotion I have suggested are shaped through children’s relational emplacement within the school. I have also identified moments when children’s affectivities disrupt the norms of schooling and how adults and peers respond to these disruptions.

b) Disrupting the choreographies of schooling

These moments of disruption are often short-lived as a child or adult intervenes in a way that brings things back to the usual cultural order. I have shown how Cheryl and Katie do this within their friendship group, when Cathy has stepped outside of her ‘place’ within the group. In addition, I have examined how the headteacher might try to work with Justin to encourage him to manage his anger in particular ways. I suggested that Justin’s expression of anger disrupts the ethos of a ‘caring and compassionate’ school that for staff at the school the SEAL curriculum is centred around. Social spaces are produced through a sense of who belongs and who doesn’t (Sibley 1995). Places are ascribed meanings that signify when we are ‘out of place’ (Cresswell 1996). Drawing on Cresswell’s work, Kitchen (2010) argues that ‘spaces are social texts that convey to
disabled people that they are ‘out of place’ (pg. 345). In this way, spaces of schooling can be considered as ‘social texts’ which work to characterise children in particular ways. I have shown how this happens through the ways in which particular spaces within the school are imbued with meaning by the children, such as the classroom, playground, library or headteachers office. I explored how spaces and the events that take place within them become associated with the performance of particular socio-emotional practices. The feeling rules (Hochschild 2003) that frame children’s interactions within particular spaces are learnt through children’s embodied practices and how these are reinforced by adults and peers.

Extending Hochschild’s (2003) concept of feeling rules, Burkitt (1997) extends the notion of emotions as culturally constructed. He argues that this way of thinking about emotion cannot explain why emotions are ‘performed in specific contexts quite spontaneously’ (pg. 49). He also suggests that ‘social power relations involving class, gender and race, are intimately connected to social precepts and regulations, which play such a central role in the shaping of emotions’ (pg. 49). For Burkitt (1997) then the concept of ‘emotional habitus’ becomes an important means of understanding why emotional experiences deviate beyond feeling rules. He argues for a move away from the idea that ‘the expression [of emotion] is an outer register of an inner process’ and instead that ‘if emotions are expressive of anything it is the relations and interdependencies of which they are an integral part’ (pg. 40). This suggests that emotional repertoires are learned through our relational emplacement within a range of settings and situations. Therefore, the emotional dispositions that children may bring into school, could conflict with those that adults at the school expect children to develop. Gillies (2011) argues that children develop a range of emotional skills through their experiences beyond school, which within a school context may not be viewed as skills at all. Following a similar argument, Burman (2008) suggests that children from different backgrounds develop different skills, some of which are recognised within the schooling system and others which are not.

c) (Re)presenting ‘negative’ emotion

Within this study, I have aimed to give value to the moments when children’s socio-emotional practices disrupt the norms of the school’s culture(s). It has been my intention to demonstrate the significance of these moments by situating them within a broader social context. For example, I have shown how Justin’s ‘anger outbursts’ could be seen
through a lens of social injustice. His anger seems to be a relational response to his continued exclusion by his peers. However, it was important for me to represent this experience in a way which did not position blame upon Justin’s peers. Rather, I have also attempted to understand why Justin’s peers would want to exclude Justin from their activities. To do so, I drew upon Ahmed’s (2004) notion of affective economies, whereby she examines how emotional identities stick to certain bodies and not to others. Through drawing on the children’s accounts of their relationship with Justin, it seems that they have learnt to be fearful of him. I related this embodied feeling of fear to the ways that children conceptually understand anger. Lupton (2002) argues that ‘discourses of anger, in particular, represent this emotion as socially destructive and chaotic, requiring a high degree of self-management to keep in check’ (pg. 277). When represented in this way anger is positioned in opposition to emotions considered to be socially productive, such as kindness and empathy. In this way, anger is seen as an obstacle towards cultivating a happy atmosphere within the school. As a result, anger is perceived negatively by some of the children at the school and this seems to then shape whether or not they accept Justin within their friendship groups. However, in particular contexts Justin’s disruption of the socio-emotional norms of the school also gains him recognition from some of his peers. For example, Troy’s approach to building a relationship with Justin is through the sharing of stories that were intended to sound impressive to Justin, such as throwing an apple ‘so far’ that it hit somebody on the head.

d) Changing identities through social interactions

Whilst I have shown that adults’ interactions with children work to categorise them in particular ways, it is also clear that these identities are reworked culturally in multiple ways through the children’s interactions within one another. Howard (2000) states that identities can be understood as ‘relational, defined by their difference from something, processual, and multiple’ (pg. 386). On this basis, it could be argued that identities can change according to the different relationships that children have at a school. In addition and drawing on Ruddick (1996), Howard (2000) suggests that ‘space is not simply a passive arena for predetermined social behaviours but rather an active medium for the construction of objective and subjective identities’ (pg. 382-383). This is reflected in the ways that Justin’s identity is formed through his interactions with and within particular spaces. For example, Justin and Cheryl’s relationship is only performed in spaces which sit outside of formal learning spaces, such as the dining hall or playground. I have shown how through their relationship they co-construct a identity that situates them outside of
the academic identity they are expected to embrace at school. Within the spaces they create with each other it becomes possible for them to speak about things that are typically silenced, such as conversations exploring love or sex. While it seems that different spaces within the school enable or constrain children’s identities in particular ways, I would argue that the ‘betweenness’ of these identities is also important. By this I mean that, for example, Justin’s unacceptable identity as ‘angry’ in a learning context affords him the acceptable identity of ‘antagonist’ in other situations. This suggests that within the SEAL school context Justin’s differing emerging identities across multiple spaces within the school are co-constitutive and interdependent.

e) Learning to perform emotion

Building on this, I have also examined how children ‘perform’ (Goffman 1990) emotion work as part of their social interactions and are reflective of the school’s culture(s). Scheff and Retzinger (2001) argue that feelings of shame and pride are of integral significance to the ways that people present themselves to others. Within the SEAL school, I have shown how the conjuring of feelings of shame and pride work to encourage children to perform particular socio-emotional practices. These practices are deemed by adults as important to children’s academic success during school and career success beyond school. These assumed relationships between socio-emotional practices and future success can be aligned with neo-liberal agendas (Ecclestone and Hayes 2009), where risk and responsibility are increasingly individualised (Kelly 2010). Against this backdrop then educational strategies that work on children’s feelings of shame and pride can be understood as mechanisms of neo-liberal power. Children’s emotional responses to behaving in ‘right’ and ‘wrong’ ways at school works to make their bodies susceptible to regulation and control. Indeed, Foucault (1988) has also shown how the governance of the body not only regulates but also produces emotional feelings in relation to others. However, I have shown that children learn to speak of their emotions in particular ways as they navigate the SEAL school. For example, Justin’s encounter with the headteacher after he was accused of being in a playground fight with other boys reflects Justin’s awareness of the kind of emotion talk that such encounters entail. I suggest that he is careful about what is both said and not said during this encounter, in order to avoid being positioned as responsible for his actions and therefore open to blame. Children’s careful expression of emotion is also reflected in observations from schools using similar emotional curricula. For example, Williams (2013) described how a boy entered his class for registration looking particularly grumpy and frustrated yet selected a smiley face icon
to stick on a ‘how are you feeling today’ board in the classroom. These accounts could suggest that the language of emotion used in schools distances children from their lived emotional experiences.

It seems that children are learning ‘right’ ways to speak about emotions. In addition, by drawing on the example of a school council meeting I have shown how children who perform emotion in the ‘right’ ways are the ones whose voices will be heard. This performing of emotion involves both the regulation of both the body and speech.

However, the ways that children learn to use their bodies and emotion talk suggests that children do realise that an emotional curriculum is not value-neutral. For example, I have shown how children are making decisions about what to say and what not to say to adults. Contrary then to the aims of SEAL, which seems to assume that children will passively take on adult models of emotion, this research suggests that children negotiate and transform the curriculum they are getting. Mirroring a sociology of childhood perspective (Corsaro 1997; James and Prout 1990; James et al 1998; Jenks 1996; Thorne 1993), this research reflects that children are active participants in their own socialisation. In the SEAL school, teachers also felt that children did not utilise the socio-emotional practices they were taught in SEAL lessons in other aspects of their lives. The participating staff members all felt that the these models needed to be revisited and reinforced in order to become embedded in children’s practices. However, a sociology of childhood perspective would argue that the passive accommodation of these emotional models is implausible.

f) Emotions and social injustice

It is suggested that the ways emotions are conceptualised in schools reinforce longstanding cultural power hierarchies of gender, class and race (Boler 1999). Therefore the positive and negative categorisation of emotion in schools can be understood as socio-historical and political constructs. This research has suggested that as a result children’s emotional dispositions become sites through which social injustices are reproduced. In alignment with this, Gillies’ (2011) research about the role of SEAL in Behaviour Support Units explores the pathologisation of the emotional dispositions of boys placed in these units. She argues that ‘the therapeutic model underpinning SEAL activities in schools risks individualising and thereby misinterpreting socially and culturally embedded difference, pathologising particular pupils in the process’ (pg. 185). Ecclestone (2011) also suggests that emotional curricula are targeted at ‘those deemed to be educationally and socially disadvantaged’ (pg. 91). She argues that the rise of emotional pedagogy is
‘the latest manifestation of a long-running tendency in education and social policy to psychologise intractable social and political problems as individual traits that can be remedied through diagnosis and subsequent intervention’ (pg. 93). In this way then issues of social injustice become hidden ‘through a focus on personal control and emotional stability’ (Gillies 2011, pg. 186).

This doctoral study has shown that, for some children (and particularly boys), a perceived lack of emotional control not only influences the education they receive, it also influences the relationships they are able to build with their peers. For example, I have shown that some children perceive Justin’s anger outbursts and David’s tears in negative ways, thus excluding them from their peer group. Likewise, other children will not see these expressions of emotion as a problem, and will welcome these children as a friend.

However, I have shown that these social practices of inclusion and exclusion carry a different significance for Justin than it does for David. David enjoys and seems satisfied to socialise predominantly with Emma and Rachel. In contrast, Justin seems to want a more centralised role within the class. Therefore, he repeatedly attempts to join in activities with children who often find ways to facilitate his repeated exclusion. These two accounts demonstrate that it is important to examine the ways that models of emotion work to socially position children within a school context and whether these positions limit their educational opportunities. At the same time, it is important to recognise that what matters to children in regards to their subject-positions will be different and it is all too easy to position them as either positive or negative. Horton (2010) in his reflection on the importance for a group of children of the release of a pop-song by the group S Club 7, states that the children ‘overwhelmingly did not, typically, describe what S Club 7 meant ... instead, they emphasised the multifarious ways in which this phenomenon mattered to them’ (pg. 391). He argues that what ‘matters’ to children is integral to understanding the role of emotion in their everyday lives. This can also be extended to Justin’s expression of anger. When we understand that social inclusion by peers is of distinct important to Justin, then his anger in response to his continued exclusion can be understood as the means through which he communicates this.

**g) Conflicting discourses of inclusion and equality**

At the SEAL school in which this doctoral study was situated, there were clear efforts to develop strategies and techniques to support the needs of different children who found themselves in difficult situations whether within the school context or beyond. Work that
examines emotion as socio-culturally constructed (Barbalet 2001; Burkitt 1997; Flam and King 2005; Hochschild 2003; Kemper 1990), considers emotions as structured within specific cultural contexts. From this perspective, emotional responses valued in one context might not be valued in another. Therefore, a SEAL school can be understood as producing a specific emotional terrain. From an emotional geographies perspective (Holt et al 2012), this will vary across different SEAL schools as policies and practices are applied and transformed within an existing emotional landscape. I have described how Justin’s inclusion in the classroom was an important consideration for his classroom teacher, who worked with the SEAL coordinator to explore, for example, ways of maintaining Justin’s engagement during lessons. Therefore, while Justin’s peers sometimes struggled to accept his differences, these were accepted by his teacher within the classroom context.

I have also shown how these accommodations for Justin also gave rise to conflicts for his teacher. For example, I described his hesitancy to punish Justin when he ‘misbehaved’ in his lesson, because of his awareness of Justin’s differences. However, at the same time the teacher felt it was also important to maintain an equal punitive system where every child is expected to adhere to the same guidelines of good behaviour. This moment is important because it reflects the conflicting discourses of present schooling. The conflict the teacher is addressing here is related to notions of difference (supporting children’s individual learning needs) and fairness (ensuring every child receives the same education). Principles of fairness also enter into children’s negotiations with adults at the school. For example, I showed how Justin drew on the notion of fairness in a conversation he joined that I was having with David. David was upset because he was not invited to the SEAL squad end of project picnic. Justin explained that if I invited David then, in order to be fair to the other children in the class, I would have to invite them as well. This is an example of how the language of fairness is used as a negotiation tool within the school context. However, whilst this language serves a social role, such as in this example when it was used to legitimise why David could not come on the picnic with the SEAL squad, it also conflicts with the teacher’s desire to adapt a variety of practices to reflect children’s differences.

h) Gender and the pathologisation of emotion

Justin and David’s experiences at the SEAL school both speak to the ways that gender plays a part in how children’s emotional dispositions are pathologised. I have argued that
the SEAL coordinator considers it important to ‘feminise’ the curriculum, by encouraging boys to talk about their feelings and empathise with others. Justin is encouraged to speak about his emotions, in order to begin to understand the relationships between his feelings and his behaviour. The aim embedded within the emotional cultures at work within school is for children to recognise how they are feeling and act on these in acceptable ways, such as ‘walking away’. The development of these personal strategies for Justin by the SEAL coordinator seem to be centred upon finding ways for Justin to manage his anger. Perhaps then, it could be argued that a feminised emotionality is a solution to Justin’s masculinised emotionality. In contrast, David’s tears are also problematised. His sensitivity, one of the teachers explained, was the reason why he could not build friendships with boys. David supposedly ‘needed’ to be friends with girls in order to regulate his own emotional vulnerabilities. David also receives individual ‘emotional support’ within the school. This is for very different reasons to Justin. While Justin has to become more feminine, David has to become more masculine. For both of these boys, while this analysis positions them along a social constructed binary of masculine and feminine, it seems that the focus of the emotional work they are expected to do is self-regulation. This aligns with Gillies’ (2011) argument that emotional curricula themselves harbour a masculine view of emotion, which still positions emotion in opposition to reason. In this way emotion, which is potentially unwieldy, should be mastered. Boler (1999) argues that an emphasis on self-regulation reflects a history of moral education, where “‘good temper’, self-control, and self-policing [are identified] as the keys to harmony and efficiency’ (pg. 34). However, she also suggests a distinction between the role of self-control for boys and girls - ‘preventing boys from expressing anger is discursively framed as being for the boys’ own interest; for girls, emotional control is especially for the benefit of others’ (pg. 34). This reflects Burman’s (2008) argument that historically women have been positioned as responsible for society’s ills in their role as mothers.

The association between girls’ self-control of emotion and a care for others is reflected in the ways in which SEAL is applied in practice. I have shown how girls are considered to be better suited to SEAL than boys, as it is assumed that it builds upon the things that they already do, such as sharing how they are feeling and listening to how others are feeling. In relation to this, the ‘therapeutic’ interventions offered to children are most commonly directed towards boys (as we have seen with Justin and David). In contrast to the assumption that girls are natural caregivers, I have examined how conflict is integral to the maintenance of a friendship group of three girls, Cheryl, Katie and Cathy.
However, while this conflict is necessary for maintaining a particular social hierarchy amongst the girls, it also seems that Cathy suffers more than the other girls as a result of conflict. In Goodwin’s (2006) work she describes how certain members of girls’ group are regularly degraded by other members of the group. She argues that this reproduces particular social hierarchies, for example between children with different social backgrounds. However, in this case Cathy seemed to suffer because she was ‘mardy’ (a term used to describe someone who sulks when they don’t get their own way). This term is commonly used in Sheffield and reflects a ‘feeling rule’ (Hochschild 2003) related to local culture. Therefore, I have suggested that a socio-emotional morality enters into children’s friendships and shapes the disciplinary tactics they utilise within their interactions. While being a member of this group has caused Cathy to suffer, it also seems to serve a social role beyond the group itself. Her association with this group provides her with social status thus reflecting how social recognition is integral to social organisation (Honneth 2012). While the way that Cathy was treated by the girls in this group was never recognised by either children or adults as bullying (which is interesting in itself), it begins to reflect some of the complexities of children’s bullying practices or experiences. I have suggested that the way bullying is both defined and dealt with at the school is perhaps overly simplistic. One person is named the bully and the other the victim. However, Cathy’s story reflects both the gains and loses of her experiences of being degraded by other girls within her friendship group. While I do not want to underestimate the difficulties that Cathy faces as a result of this, this story seems to reflect her active participation in the situation. The story also shows how culturally specific feeling rules are embedded in the girls’ social practices. I have raised two issues in relation to the stories from this group of girls. The first is that an assumption that girls are natural caregivers could mean that bullying between girls is more likely to go unnoticed. This was also reflected in Sarah’s experience of being bullied by a girl. In this case Sarah’s disclosure of her experiences of bullying during my time at the school did not lead to any adult-led interventions. Secondly, the ways that right and wrong are assigned to particular individuals who are implicated in acts of bullying misses the social complexity of bullying, in terms of the roles that children take on and the ways that these reflect wider socio-cultural contexts.

2) Implications
The implications of this research are related to the methodological approaches I have adopted to both conduct and represent the study as well as my interpretations of the field data. These are outlined in the following two sections.

a) Methodological implications

Beginning with methodological implications, I have built upon calls for the researcher’s emotions to be acknowledged in academic research (Coffey 1999, Moser 2008, Punch 2012, Widdowfield 2000). This doctoral study has responded to these calls through the development of an analytical framework within which emotional reflexivity is prioritised. In doing so, I have intended to show that emotions not only play an integral role in shaping our interpretations of the field but that they can also be productive in gaining further insights into children’s socio-emotional practices within a school context. I have also reflected upon how working with emotional responses in this way reveals the partiality and shifting nature of interpretation. In this way, interpretations can be both multiple and dynamic, captured within a particular moment of space and time. This conceptualisation of ‘knowledge’ as fluid has influenced the decisions I have made in terms of representing this doctoral study. I have not only attempted to portray an honest account of the process of doing this research, whilst also recognised that any retelling of research is always mediated, but I have also resisted framing my interpretations of fieldwork as a set of discrete findings. In choosing to reveal the ‘connections’ that I have made between moments from fieldwork, I wanted to begin to convey the way that I have made sense of my relationally emplaced experiences within the school. By offering you the reader different navigational choices through the thesis, my intention was to provoke your own meaning making. In this way, as a reader, you are re-living and re-interpreting the research study. I believe that the ways that I have given value to the role that emotions play in research, has far-reaching implications for educational research more widely. Whilst it is recognised that emotionality is often missing in accounts of research, how we include emotion and affect is still under debate. Katz (2000) has suggested that studies on emotion ‘almost always end up analysing how people talk about their emotions’ (pg. 4). He argues however that emotions are not talk, ‘they are ways of expressing something going on that talk cannot grasp’ (pg. 4). This begs the question of how to represent research on emotion when language is the predominant mode of conveying research within academia. For Thrift (2008) one solution is to bring the performing arts into social sciences in order to experiment with alternative modes of retelling research. Within the current constraints guiding the format of a doctoral thesis, I have experimented with ways...
of integrating emotionality within an academic text. Thrift (2008) claims that experimentation is an important part of engaging with the ‘non-representational’. For me experimentation also gives value to the unfinished. Experimentation leads to further experimentation. Therefore, as I build on this research I will continue to experiment with different modes of representing that which is difficult to put into words.

While I have experimented with ways of retelling emotion, I have also experimented with ways of engaging with emotion. As reflected by Katz (2000), there are a range of challenges brought about by trying to engage with emotion through words alone. This is of particular significance when we move beyond an understanding of emotion as part of an internal world of the individual. While I do consider emotions as felt within our bodies, I also conceptualise emotions as located within the socio-spatial world. In this way emotions produce and are produced by ‘emotional economies’ (Ahmed 2004), which ‘locate and produce subjects in relation’ (Kenway and Youdell 2011, pg. 133). ‘This social conception of emotion suggests that emotions flow between people, they animate social, cultural, political and economic collectivities and travel across time, place and space’ (Kenway and Youdell 2011, pg. 133). While I have suggested that a definition of emotion developed over the course of the research (and is only really becoming clearer in this final stages of writing the thesis), from the outset I knew that I was interested in the relationship between emotion and emplacement. For me, this meant developing research methods that allowed children to examine their emotions in relation to different spaces and places within the school context (both material and immaterial). The research methods developed for and through fieldwork, sought to facilitate children’s exploration of these intersections. In providing scope for children to participate in the development of research methods, we found that visual and material modes of representation (as well as conversation) provided opportunities for the children to reveal aspects of their experience that could not have been captured through words alone. Unexpectedly, performance was an essential aspect to how many of the young participants chose to engage with these methods. For example, a group of girls created a series of dramatic plays in response to creating dens about bullying, which they captured through film. In another example, a group of boys used improvised role-play during one of the research workshops as they played with the notion of the ‘naughty corner’. These are examples of planned and spontaneous responses during or after the research workshops, which produced a range of data to convey socio-emotional practices. Indeed, the making of the dens was also performativity, and fieldnotes written after these workshops also proved particularly useful. The impromptu role that performance has played within this study suggests that
this could be a useful tool for engaging with emotion in future work. An interesting dimension of using performance in research on emotion is how this mode of communication is also used by children to stir emotional responses in the audience members. An example of this is in the children’s films, where many references were made to me and my emotional responses as a viewer, for example ‘we hope you enjoyed that Lisa’. It seems that the mode of performance lends itself to research on emotion, perhaps because this genre allows children to enact emotion within space and with their bodies.

b) Implications of ‘findings’

As I have shown, there is little research in education that makes links between space and place and emotionality from children’s perspectives. I have argued that research in this area is particularly important given the rise of emotional pedagogy. I have shown that much of the work influencing educational policy and practice is focused on adult-orientated perspectives of child development. This work increasingly locates children’s emotion as a key site for ensuring their well-being both during childhood and into adulthood. While emotional pedagogy has been challenged by critical education theorists, through this research I wanted to bring additional ways of thinking about emotion into educational research. Central to this has been an examination of the ‘emotional economies’ (Ahmed 2004) of schooling. A socio-spatial analysis of emotion has enabled a deeper understanding of how emotions work within a school context. I believe that the ways of thinking about emotion examined in this thesis have valuable implications for developments in emotional pedagogy. In some circumstances I have made links back to the SEAL curriculum, in others the focus has been on children’s socio-spatial interactions. In all cases my intention has been to both destabilise and move beyond the perspective of ‘rational emotionality’ (Gillies 2011) prominent in mainstream schools in the UK.

This doctoral study has engaged with children’s intellectual and embodied ways of knowing about emotion. I have suggested that emotional pedagogy works on both these levels as it prescribes a way of thinking about emotion and a way of acting upon emotion. Children’s emotions are also a site through which these rules are enforced, through the fostering of pride or shame. The focus of SEAL is to promote particular socio-emotional behaviours through these methods. An important implication of this doctoral study is that it moves us beyond the positioning of emotions as either right or wrong. Rather I have suggested that children’s emotional repertoires are learned through their relational
emplacement across different spaces and places. This helps to explain why some children’s emotional repertoires differ to those valued within a school context, and how these children come to find themselves feeling ‘out of place’ (Cresswell 1996). In moving away from categorising emotions as positive or negative, it is possible to then see how these categorisations work to pathologise particular children. This thesis has offered alternative ways of seeing anger and sadness in order to challenge these pathologisations. For me, this raises the important question of how we can destabilise these binaries further so that we give value to the different emotional skills that children bring to school.

Importantly this returns me to what I believe has been at the centre of this research - social justice in education. Borrowing from Honneth’s (2012) theory of recognition, he argues that ‘the ‘I’ seeks the ‘We’ of shared group experience, because ... we are dependent on forms of social recognition imbued with direct encouragement and affirmation’ (pg. 214). Honneth’s encouragement and affirmation is very different to the kind that is encouraged in a SEAL school. For him, the SEAL school would represent an ‘ideological form of recognition’ whereby ‘to recognise someone is to encourage them, by means of repeated and ritual invitations and demands (Aufforderungen), to adopt precisely that self-conception that conforms to the established system of behavioural expectations’ (pg. 76). For Honneth social recognition is about non-conformity; the value and respect of an individual’s autonomy within social groups. Interestingly, social justice appears also to be at the centre of SEAL policy and practice. For example, the word empowerment was used repeatedly in SEAL policy and by schools leaders at the SEAL school. However, I have shown in this research that the ‘empowered’ are often those who perform emotion in the ‘right’ ways. A promise of ‘empowerment’ is also used as leverage to encourage particular kinds of emotion work. This misuse of language makes it difficult to see that an ideology is at work. For Honneth (2012) resistance can indicate ideological forms of recognition, and I presented examples of children’s resistance within this thesis. A critical question then is how can policy-makers and practitioners recognise and destabilise this ideology. I don’t think this is a question of making emotional pedagogy better, rather I believe this requires further research that unsettles the ways that emotions are conceptualised in education. It is through a continued commitment to retelling emotions in new ways that further opportunities for children to creatively explore and value their lived experiences with others could open-up in school settings.
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Appendix A:

Project Description for Schools
Edlucating Emotions
Invitation to take part

1) I would like to invite your school to take part in the research project, Educating Emotions. This project aims to explore and make recommendations to further develop social and emotional aspects of learning (SEAL) activities across England.

Your school has been nominated for this project by Sheffield’s Engagement for Learning Consultant.

Below, I have outlined how your school would be involved. I appreciate you taking the time to read this information. If you have any further questions or wish to nominate your school to take part please contact Lisa Procter on 07595424357 or email: l.h.procter@sheffield.ac.uk

2) What?
This creative research project will involve observing SEAL activities across the school, interviews with school staff and workshops with children.

The majority of the research will be conducted through these workshops. As researchers, the children will take part in enjoyable and engaging place-making activities, such as mapping and den-building. These activities will help the children to symbolise and represent their experiences and reflections of SEAL activities.
3) Why?
The emotional development of children is an important aspect of their educational experience. The SEAL resource is now a widespread framework to support schools to integrate emotional development into many aspects of school life. DCSF intends to embed the SEAL guidelines across the majority of schools in England in the near future.

SEAL activities are most commonly evaluated through quantitative methods, such as numbers of exclusions or incidents of bad behaviour.

To complement this information, this research aims to gather information about student’s responses and personal perceptions of SEAL activities and the impact upon how they understand their own and other people’s emotions.

4) Who?
Through this research project the researcher will speak with school staff including the SEAL coordinator, teaching staff, support assistants and lunchtime supervisors.

The workshops will be with 6 students from Year 5 who can find it difficult to manage their emotions and stay calm at school. The children will be selected with support from the class teacher.

5) What are the benefits of taking part?
As part of this research a summary report for the school will be produced. This will indicate the key findings from the research, which will be of potential use in further developing your SEAL programme.

The children who take part in the research workshops will develop valuable skills such as critical thinking, reflection, group work, speaking and listening. These skills are likely to improve their learning ability at school.

6) What will this project cost the school?
This project is free of charge to schools.

7) What will the school commit to?
The children will take part in around 15 workshops, each 2 hours in length, from September 2010 until April 2011. These will take place at the school during school time.

School staff will be interviewed as and when necessary over the 8 months. SEAL activities will be observed at least once a month. It is likely 2 or 3 observations will take place in the first month, September 2010, in order to build a relationship with the class and choose children who would like to take part in the workshops.
Appendix B:

Information sheets and consent forms
Educating Emotions
Information sheet for Students

1) **What?**
   I would like to invite you to take part in some research with me. I want to know all about SEAL activities at your school.

   You will take part in workshops with some of your classmates and me. We will make dens, films and tell stories to share what we think about SEAL activities.

2) **Why?**
   It is important that activities at school are right for children. By thinking about SEAL activities together, we can find out if it should be different. Then your school and other schools may change or improve SEAL in the future.

3) **When?**
   You will take part in about 15 workshops from November until May.

4) **What will I get out of it?**
   You will have a good time, get to know other people better and learn lots of new things.

5) **Will you show the research to other people?**
   The results of the research will be shared with other people at presentations, in books, magazines or on the Internet. We will not tell other people you took part.

   Photographs and film will be taken during the project. We may also need to use some of the photographs or film at presentations, in books, magazines or on the Internet. We will ask your permission before using any photographs or film.

6) **Can I drop out?**
   If you don’t want to take part in the workshops anymore, that’s OK. Just talk to Lisa.
Please read this carefully

1) I have listened to Lisa’s presentation and understand what this project is about. YES NO

2) I understand that Lisa will tell other people what I say during this project but will not tell them who I am. YES NO

3) I want to take part in this project. YES NO

During this project Lisa may take photographs or film

1) If you do not want Lisa to take photos of you to show to other people draw a circle around No. If you do not mind draw a circle around Yes. YES NO

2) If you do not want Lisa to take film of you to show to other people draw a circle around No. If you do not mind draw a circle around Yes. YES NO

If you decide you don’t want to be part of this project anymore, or don’t want to be photographed or filmed anymore, that is OK. Just let Lisa know.

Your name Date Researcher
Project: Educating Emotions
Date: X
Organisation: X

**Educating Emotions**
**Information sheet for Parents/Guardians**

1) **What?**
   Your child has been selected to take part in the research project, Educating Emotions. The project will explore SEAL activities at X school.

   Your child will take part in workshops with some of their classmates and the project researcher. Together, they will make maps and dens and tell stories to share what they think about SEAL activities.

2) **Why?**
   It is important that activities at school are right for children. By thinking about SEAL activities with children, we can find out if they should be different. This research aims to help X school and other schools change or improve SEAL in the future.

3) **When?**
   Your child will take part in about 15 workshops during school time from September until April.

4) **What will my child get out of it?**
   Your child will take part in fun workshops, get to know other people better and learn lots of new skills, such as critical thinking, reflection, group work, speaking and listening.
5) **Will you share the research with others?**

The results of the research will be shared with other people at presentations, in books, magazines or on the Internet. Other people will not be told that your child or their school took part.

Photographs and film will be taken during the project. We may also need to use some of the photographs or film at presentations, in books, magazines or on the Internet. We will ask your child’s permission before using any photographs or film.

6) **Can my child drop out?**

If you are unhappy with the workshops in any way or don’t want your child to take part in the workshops anymore, that’s OK. Just get in touch with the project researcher.

**Project Researcher:** Lisa Procter  
**Tel:** 07595424357

If you do not feel that your complaint was handled effectively you have the right to contact the Project Supervisor.  
**Project Supervisor:** Dr Terry Lamb  
**Contact:** 0114 222 8118
Educating Emotions
Consent form for Parents/Guardians

Are you happy for your child to take part?
Before this project can start, we need your consent for your child to take part. Please fill in the form below and return to your child’s teacher as soon as you can. Thank you.

Please Circle

I have read and understand the information sheet. YES NO

I understand that I can withdraw my child from this research project at any time without giving any reason. YES NO

I am happy for the project researcher to read and listen to my child’s responses. YES NO

I am happy for my child to take part in this project. YES NO

During this project the researcher will take photographs or film.

I agree to my child being photographed during the research project YES NO

I agree to my child being filmed during the research project YES NO

I give permission for images of my child to be used in publications/presentations YES NO

I give permission for images of my child to be used on the internet YES NO

________________________  __________________  __________________
Your name               Date                  Signature

________________________  __________________  __________________
Researcher name          Date                  Signature
Educating Emotions
Information Sheet for School Representative

1) Your school has been selected to take part in the research project, Educating Emotions. This project aims to explore and make recommendations to further develop social and emotional aspects of learning (SEAL) activities across England.

Below, I have outlined how your school would be involved. I appreciate you taking the time to read this information. If you have any further questions please contact Lisa Procter on 07565324668 or email: l.h.procter@sheffield.ac.uk

2) What?
This creative research project will involve observing SEAL activities across the school and particularly focusing on one Y5 class, interviews with school staff and workshops with children from Y5 (please see attached research schedule for more detail).

The majority of the research will be conducted through these workshops. As researchers, the children will take part in enjoyable and engaging place-making activities, such as mapping and den-building. These activities will help the children to symbolise and represent their experiences and reflections of SEAL activities.

3) Why?
The emotional development of children is an important aspect of their educational experience. The SEAL resource is now a widespread framework to support schools to integrate emotional development into many aspects of school life. DCSF intends to embed the SEAL guidelines across the majority of schools in England in the near future.
SEAL activities are most commonly evaluated through quantitative methods, such as numbers of exclusions or incidents of bad behaviour.

To complement this information, this research aims to gather information about student’s experiences and personal perceptions of SEAL activities and their impact upon how students see themselves and others.

4) **Who?**
Through this research project the researcher will observe SEAL activities and speak with school staff including the SEAL coordinator, teaching staff, support assistants and lunchtime supervisors.

The workshops will be with 6/8 children from Year 5. The children will sign-up to take part in the workshops. In the case of more than eight children signing-up the group will be selected with support from their class teacher.

Permission will be sought from individuals by the researcher to have access to the responses they provide through interviews and workshops.

5) **What are the benefits of taking part?**
As part of this research a summary report for the school will be produced. This will indicate the key findings from the research, which will be of potential use in further developing your SEAL programme.

6) **Will you share the research with others?**
The results of the research will be shared with other people at presentations, in books, magazines or on the Internet. The names of individuals or the school taking part in the research will not be disclosed.

Photographs and film will be taken during the project and may also be used at presentations, in books, magazines or on the Internet. Permission will be sought from individuals before using any photographs or film.

7) **Can those who take part withdraw from the research?**
Anyone can withdraw from the research at anytime without a reason. If anyone is unhappy with the research they should contact the project researcher.

**Project Researcher:** Lisa Procter  
**Tel:** 07595424357

If you do not feel that your complaint was handled effectively you have the right to contact the Project Supervisor.  
**Project Supervisor:** Dr Terry Lamb  
**Contact:** 0114 222 8118
Educating Emotions
Consent form for School

Are you happy to take part?
I would like to invite your school to take part in this research project. Before you decide, please read the information sheet provided.

Please Circle

I have read and understand the information sheet.  

YES  NO

I understand that the school’s participation is voluntary and that I am free to withdraw on behalf of the school at any time without giving any reason.

YES  NO

I understand that permission will be sought from individuals by the researcher to have access to the responses they provide through interviews and workshops.

YES  NO

I give permission for the research team to observe activities related to the school’s SEAL programme.

YES  NO

Your name               Date               Signature

Researcher name         Date               Signature
Project: Educating Emotions
Date: X
FAO: X
Organisation: X

Educating Emotions
Information Sheet for School Staff

1) Your school has been selected to take part in the research project, Educating Emotions. This project aims to explore and make recommendations to further develop social and emotional aspects of learning (SEAL) activities across England.

Below, I have outlined how your school would be involved. I appreciate you taking the time to read this information. If you have any further questions please contact Lisa Procter on 07595424357 or email: l.h.procter@sheffield.ac.uk

2) What?
This creative research project will involve observing SEAL activities across the school, interviews with school staff and workshops with children [please see attached research schedule for more detail].

The majority of the research will be conducted through these workshops. As researchers, the children will take part in enjoyable and engaging place-making activities, such as mapping and den-building. These activities will help the children to symbolise and represent their experiences and reflections of SEAL activities.
3) **Why?**

The emotional development of children is an important aspect of their educational experience. The SEAL resource is now a widespread framework to support schools to integrate emotional development into many aspects of school life. DCSF intends to embed the SEAL guidelines across the majority of schools in England in the near future.

SEAL activities are most commonly evaluated through quantitative methods, such as numbers of exclusions or incidents of bad behaviour.

To complement this information, this research aims to gather information about student’s responses and personal perceptions of SEAL activities and the impact upon how they understand their own and other people’s emotions.

4) **Who?**

Through this research project the researcher will speak with school staff including the SEAL coordinator, teaching staff, support assistants and lunchtime supervisors.

The workshops will be with 6 students from Year 5 selected with support from their class teacher.

5) **What are the benefits of taking part?**

As part of this research a summary report for the school will be produced. This will indicate the key findings from the research, which will be of potential use in further developing your SEAL programme.

6) **Will you share the research with others?**

The results of the research will be shared with other people at presentations, in books, magazines or on the Internet. The names of individuals or the school taking part in the research will not be disclosed.

Photographs and film will be taken during the project and may also be used at presentations, in books, magazines or on the Internet. Permission will be sought from individuals before using any photographs or film.

7) **Can those who take part withdraw from the research?**

Anyone can withdraw from the research at anytime without a reason. If anyone is unhappy with the research they should contact the project researcher.

**Project Researcher:** Lisa Procter, **Tel:** 07595424357

If you do not feel that your complaint was handled effectively you have the right to contact the Project Supervisor.

**Project Supervisor:** Dr Terry Lamb, **Contact:** 0114 222 8118
Educating Emotions
Consent form for School Staff

Are you happy to take part?
I would like to invite you take part in this research project. Before you decide, please read the information sheet provided.

Please Circle

I have read and understand the information sheet. YES NO

I understand that I can withdraw from this project at any time without giving any reason. YES NO

I am happy for the project researcher to read and listen to my responses. YES NO

I am happy to take part in this project. YES NO

Can I film and photograph you? Please read the following carefully:

I agree to being photographed during the above research project YES NO

I agree to being filmed during the above research project YES NO

I give permission for the images of me to be used in publications/presentations YES NO

I give permission for the images of me to be used on the internet YES NO

Your name ______________________ Date ________________ Signature ________________

Researcher name ______________________ Date ________________ Signature ________________
Appendix C:

Teacher interview schedule
Project: Educating Emotions

Educating Emotions
Interview Questions for Teachers

Why is your school a SEAL school?

What is important to you in relation to SEAL?

How does SEAL address emotional aspects of learning? What else informs how you approach emotional aspects of learning? How does this link with children’s behaviour?

What challenges do you face as a teacher implementing SEAL?

What would you do if you could? What are the constraints to this?

How does the school evaluate how successful it is at SEAL?

What is your role, as a teacher, in terms of being part of a SEAL school? What is the role of the children in your class? Do other children have other roles? Who else plays an important role in SEAL?

Do you and the other teachers receive any training? What is this like? How does this inform your teaching practice – if at all?

What do you think children learn while being part of a SEAL school? How do they learn this? (Further prompts – peer mediation, sparkle and shine, singing SEAL)

Have a look at these scenarios (show feeling thermometer sheets). What do you think may be going on for the child in these two scenarios? How do they differ? What would the school do in these two situations? How else are children’s emotions noted and checked?
Educating Emotions
Interview Questions for SEAL coordinator

Why is your school a SEAL school?

What is important to you in relation to SEAL?

How does SEAL address emotional aspects of learning? What else informs how you approach emotional aspects of learning? How does this link with children’s behaviour?

What challenges does the school face in implementing SEAL?

What would you do if you could? What are the constraints to this?

How does the school evaluate how successful it is at SEAL?

What is your role in terms of being part of a SEAL school? What is the children’s role? Does this change depending upon which year group they are in? Who else plays an important role in SEAL?

Do you receive any training? What is this like? How does this inform your practice – if at all? Do you receive other support in the implementation of SEAL?

What do you think the children learn while being part of a SEAL school? How do they learn this? Do they learn different things depending upon which class they are in? (Further prompts – meditation, peer mediation, sparkle and shine, singing SEAL)

Have a look at these scales? What do you think may be going on for the child in these two scenarios? How do they differ? What would the school do in these two situations? How else are children’s emotions noted and checked?
Appendix C: Interview schedule (school leaders and teachers)

Project: Educating Emotions
Date:
Organisation:

Educating Emotions
Interview Questions

Why is your school a SEAL school?

What is important to you about SEAL? What do you think is important to staff? And to children?

What would you say are the overarching aims/objectives of SEAL, for your school?

How does SEAL address emotional aspects of learning? What else informs how you approach emotional aspects of learning? How does this link with children’s behaviour?

What challenges does the school face in implementing SEAL? What would you do if you could? What are the constraints to this?

How does the school evaluate how successful it is at SEAL?

What is your role in terms of being part of a SEAL school? What is the children’s role? Does this change depending upon which year group they are in? Who else plays an important role in SEAL?

Do you receive support/training in the implementation of SEAL? What is this like? How does this inform how SEAL is embedded?

What do you think the children learn while being part of a SEAL school? How do they learn this? (Further prompts – meditation, peer mediation, sparkle and shine, singing) Do they learn different things depending upon which class they are in?

What kinds of responses do children have to SEAL?

Have a look at these scales? What do you think may be going on for the child in these two scenarios? How do they differ? What would the school do in these two situations?

What other techniques or tools are used to note and check on children’s emotions?
Appendix D:

Example video transcription
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verbal communication / On-screen text</th>
<th>Notes – my responses / interests</th>
<th>Notes - setting, body position, movements, facial expression, music</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Text: Katy’s and Alexandra’s Sparkle and Shine Bullying Clip!</td>
<td>Text: sparkle and shine is… a great assembly done by the headteacher</td>
<td>Music requested ‘Firework’ by Katy Perry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text: 1st interview</td>
<td></td>
<td>Changing colours on background of slide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katie: Hello my name is Katie Price, this is a film about TK and Beyonce Knowles. We are going to be learning about, er, Sparkle and Shine, so I hope you enjoy it Lisa.</td>
<td>Interesting to note that Katie sees this a film for me – suggests that she has engaged with the idea that I learning from them. It is also worth noting her use of the word ‘enjoy’ – she is hoping that in some way I show an approval for the video through my enjoyment of it. Katie also present herself for camera, smartening her appearance as she speaks.</td>
<td>Plain blue background</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Newspaper transition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katie: Here’s TK.</td>
<td>T seems ‘ready’ and a little nervous. Beyonce seems to be trying to demonstrate a smart, civilised appearance as a newsreader would.</td>
<td>Set in library, close up shot, glances away from camera, looks back to camera, pushes away hair from left eye, smiles as introduces peers, pushes hair away from right eye, looks down, looks back to camera.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T: Hello.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katie: And here is Beyonce.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Camera swings round to T. He sits down on a wicker chair. His hands are holding the ends of the armrests. He is leant forward. The camera turns to Beyonce, she is sat on a chair, again holding the armrests in her hands. She is smiling, she waves as she says hey.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beyonce: Hey.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katie: T what do you think about Sparkle and shine?</td>
<td>Again, the focus is on being ‘better’. Need to find</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
T: I think it is a really good idea, it helps children to be better in school and it helps them so they can get mentioned by the teacher to the parents.

Katie: Beyonce, do you agree with T.

Beyonce: I do I think it really encourages the kids to believe in themselves.

Katie: OK.

ENDS.

Text: 2nd interview with Katy and J

Katy: Hi, my name is Katy. J: Hello Katy.

Katy presents herself as if she is on TV.

J: What do you like about the Sparkle and Shine assemblies?

Katy: Well, I think they are really good because kids get to be praised about good things. You feel really good once you’ve got praised. And also it encourages children to be good so they can get in the Sparkle and Shine book.

Katy loves praise!! Her gesture shows how important it is to her, as does her enthusiasm for rewards and sanctions in out den-building workshop.

Set in computer space outside ICT suite. Katy waves. She is sat on a stool in front of the computers. She is smiling. She holds her hands together on her lap. Her tone of voice is soft. She waves again when the interviewer says hello.

Beyonce is sat upright in her chair. Beyonce finishes what she has said by moving her hair away from her eyes and trying to prevent herself from laughing. Camera moves back to T, who is now sat back in his chair.

Beyonce later asked me to edit this from the video, as she was encouraged by Katie to say this. It seems like an encouragement to use adult language, which Beyonce felt uncomfortable with – a reminder that the children want to say the right thing.
J: Thank you, have you ever been in the Sparkle and Shine assemblies?

Katy: Sadly no, but hopefully one day I will, I hope.

J: What do you think could improve the assemblies?

Katy: Well, I think if like the children that got, that win it got like a little hat, not to keep but just for the things so they can sit in like a little sparkly and shiny hat that says something like ‘I’ve been in the Sparkle and Shine Book’ or a little jacket or something, it would be really good.

J: Thank you, bye

Katy: Bye

J: Hello, I’m J

Katy: Hello, so I am interviewing you about Sparkle and Shine, so J what do you think about Sparkle and Shine?

J: I think it’s good because you get two gifts of the Sparkle and Shine gift box. And you get praised infront of your school and your parents

Katy: So J, can you remember our six core values in our Sparkle and Shine?

These are mantras to learn, there significance is that they should be learnt not what they mean? The language is difficult and the statements more

J looks away from the camera as she says ‘little hat’. From her actions, you can tell it is a hat with a brim. Katy gets quite animated as she is talking about this. She mimes where the sign on the hat would go and wearing a jacket with her hands. At the end she leans forward on her stool placing her hands on the side of the stool. She is smiling, seemingly pleased with her idea.

J is sat in the same seat as Katy was. J is sat forward on her stool propped up by her hands which on the front of her stool. She sits up as Katy starts to introduce the interview. J looks away from the camera as she is thinking.

J starts to laugh at being asked this question. Later, as she starts to say them fluidly, it is clear she is reading from a sign beside Katy. J rocks forward and backwards as she reads them. She repeats the
J: We are determined and we persevere and we are resilient.

Katy: Good

BREAK

J: Yes, we work together cooperatively, we are respectful caring and polite, we are always ready to learn, we respect difference and diversity, we have a voice and we listen to others and

BREAK

Katy: Well, I think that is all we can do for now, so bye.

J: Bye

Text: Bullying interviews

Alexandra: Hi Lisa, today I am going to be interviewing J

J: Hi

Alexandra: Hi J, so, do you know what bullying is?

J: Yeah, it is when somebody’s getting hurt inside for years by other people and it’s being going on for ages and ages but they haven’t done anything

Again, seeing the film as something for me. J presents herself to the camera

J plays with her hair as she speaks. When she says no she tilts her head back at the left.
about it.

Alexandra: Cool, so have you ever being bullied?
J: No

Alexandra: Do you know what cyber-bullying is?
J: Yeah it is when somebody's got a nasty message on their phone or somebody on msn or facebook and people keep sending it to them.

Alexandra: have you ever being cyber-bullied?
J: No

Alexandra: Do you know anyone who has been bullied?
J: Yes

Alexandra: And how long have they being bullied?
J: Two years

Alexandra: Oh, that is quite a long time. What have they done to try and stop it?
J: Well they have noted everything that has happened down in a book and then if it carries on any longer, or if it gets worse, they are going to show it to Mr Arbon-Davis.

Alexandra: Cool, so have you got any ideas how victim in bullying, that they should do something about it – coincides with stuff form den-building about the victim ‘standing up’ to bullies.

Again, time is significant factor.

I am struck by how the children need evidence to support their claim. It's like going to see a lawyer – you have to be able to prove your argument / position. The judge is the head teacher. Although J also has her own tactics that she feel she would be able to use, which are to ignore it.

J's expression changes as she says yes, she half smiles.

Olivia is in the background.

When Alexandra acknowledges the time period, J smiles.

When J speaks about the bully getting annoyed she scrunches up her face a little while smiling.

Alexandra turns the camera back to her as she says hope you like that Lisa.
they can stop it?

J: Well if they just ignore what they do then the bully might just get all annoyed by it and stuff so

Alexandra: Cool, thanks for the interview. Hope you like that Lisa, bye.

Katy: Hi Lionel

Lionel: Hi

Katy: Today we are going to be interviewing you about bullying, so Lionel have you ever been bullied?

Lionel: No

Katy: Do you know any ways you can be bullied like online?

Lionel: You can be bullied in school, you can be bullied on internet, on your phone, anywhere.

Katy: Good, erm, do you think bullying is a good or a bad thing?

Lionel: Err, bad

Katy: Ok, so I think that is all we’ve got time for so, bye

Lionel: Bye

Set in dining hall. Lionel is sat on the dining table. Lionel sits very still.

Lionel looks away as he says, err. When Lionel says bad he half smiles.
Alexandra: Hi S
S: Hi Alexandra
Alexandra: Hi Lisa and today we are going to be interviewing S about bullying.

Alexandra: So, do you know what bullying means?
Bullying is … well bullying is generally where someone calls someone a name or something like that or picks at them but, they don’t just do it once they do it like everyday and it goes on for quiet a while

Alexandra: It keeps missing the camera
Alexandra: so, sorry that’s Jonathan

Alexandra: So have you ever been bullied?
S: Yes, I have been bullied

Alexandra: What was it like?
S: It was really bad, because erm, it’s just it’s something that goes on for ever, well it seems like it goes on forever, and it is just awful.

Alexandra: OK, thanks, do you know what cyber bullying is?
S: Cyber bullying is when you get bullied like over

Sat in computer corridor. Computers are in the background. S is sat very still.

S looks to the ground.
S laughs after she ‘bullying is’. She looks away from the camera, and then returns her glaze to Alexandra and laughs again. Rarely looks at the camera, her eyes move from left to right and then down.

There is an interruption from Jonathan – don’t know what, but this makes S smile – she is now looking towards Alexandra and the camera.

S looks upwards a lot as she talks about being bullied, and occasionally glances back at the camera. **Her pitch is low.**

Alexandra: Again, she refers to the ongoing nature of bullying.

S looks upwards a lot as she talks about being bullied, and occasionally glances back at the camera. **Her pitch is low.**

Alexandra: So, sorry that’s Jonathan

I feel really moved by S’s openness. It is clear she has found it awful.

Alexandra: It is almost like Alexandra is managing S’s disclosure for her. Changing topic as she thinks that something may be too much, or feels uncomfortable. She keeps a direct tone throughout

Her pitch increases as she talks about cyber bullying. She rocks backwards and forwards, looking up and left.
Alexandra: Have you ever been cyber bullied?
S: No, I haven’t been cyber bullied

Alexandra: You’re very lucky, so how have you ever tried to stop this been bullied, if that makes sense
S: well I have tried to stop it a few times but no-one really listens to me that much so it doesn’t really work

Alexandra: Thanks for that interview; have you got anything else you want to say about bullying?
S: No

Alexandra: OK thanks bye, hope you like that Lisa, see ya.

Text: Thanks for watching, videos by Katy + Alexandra, special effects by Katy + Alexandra, All by Katy + Alexandra, End
Appendix E:

Interim reports for schools
Educating Emotions

Interim research report
January 2011
Facts and figures

**Funders:** Economic and Social Sciences Research Council (ESRC)

**Timescale:** Summer 2010 until Summer 2012

**Fieldwork:** September 2010 until May 2011

**Summary of fieldwork activity so far:**

- 3 workshops with research participants
- 4 in-class activities with Year 5 children
- 2 meetings with research participants
- 2 focus groups with research participants
- 1 school assembly with research participants
- 3 interviews with school staff
- Ongoing observation and participation in school life
- Documentary research
Project Aims

Overview of the aims of the research
- To understand the ‘Social and Emotional Aspects of Learning’ curriculum (SEAL) from the perspectives of children
- To explore how children’s perspectives relate to adult perspectives
- To support the development of educational approaches which encompass emotions through sharing children’s perspectives with the school, local authority and beyond (conferences, publications, etc)
- To initiate further research in this area

Emerging Questions
- What are children’s perceptions of their role in SEAL?
- How does their perception of that role affect how they view themselves and others?
- How do children understand the purpose of SEAL?

Methodology, Methods, Participants
The research involves a review of academic and practice-related literature, a policy analysis of emotion-based education initiatives and a concentrated ethnographic study in one primary school for a period of eight months. This study will include participant observations of students’ engagement in a wide range of school-based activities, in-class research workshops with students, a range of interviews with school staff and participatory research with a core group of nine students (aged 9 -10). The core group will create dens, short films and presentations as part of the research process. They will have opportunities to share these creations with the wider school community and local authority.
The School

The research is being conducted in a junior school situated in a village on the outskirts of Sheffield. This school is described as a Wave 1 SEAL school. It was one of the first wave of primary schools in Sheffield to apply the Social and Emotional Aspects of Learning (SEAL) initiative – ‘an explicit, structured, whole-curriculum framework and resource for teaching social, emotional and behavioural skills to all pupils’ (DfES, 2005, pg. 5)1. It is now part of the ‘Global SEAL’ project, to further develop SEAL through bringing a stronger global perspective. Students are of largely White British heritage and come from a range of social and academic backgrounds. Interconnected with SEAL is an inclusive approach to supporting students with special education needs both through teaching and learning opportunities in the main school and an Integrated Resource Unit. The school provides opportunities for children to have a voice through a school council and SEAL focus group, both of which include children from each year group.

Methods used in relation to SEAL

- Methods used by children for self-reflection
  - Feelings Thermometer – All children score how they are feeling during registration in the morning and after lunch. They score themselves between 1 and 10.
  - Class-based discussions

- Methods used by children in relation to peers
  - Peer-nominations for awards/certificates/recognition
  - Observations, interventions and reporting of peers

- Methods used by staff in relation to children
  - Feelings thermometer – The children’s ratings are analysed by the SEAL coordinator and children who give persistent low scores will be monitored by staff.
  - Nominations for awards/certificates/recognition – some of these nominations are based on children demonstrating the school’s ‘core values’2.
  - One-to-one sessions between SEAL coordinator and child
  - Meetings between lunchtime supervisors and SEAL coordinator
  - Staff observations, interventions and reporting of students
  - Communication between school staff, i.e. Every Child Matters meetings and morning briefings
  - Communication between parents and school staff, i.e. phone calls, meetings, coffee mornings

---

2 The school’s core values: We are respectful, caring and polite; we are always ready to learn; we are determined, we persevere and we are resilient; we respect difference and diversity; we work together cooperatively; we have a voice and we listen to others.
Emerging findings

Children’s perceptions of their role in SEAL

- **Self-governance** – The children perceive their feelings to control their movements and actions, such as their arms when they hit somebody or their voice when they are getting wound up. They feel that they need to control their feelings in order to prevent these occurrences. In particular, they highlight being calm as a means of control.

- **Self-reporter** – Many of the children think that it is important to disclose any feelings of worry or anxiety they may have. The children perceive these feelings to be barriers to academic success and therefore need to get ‘them off your chest’. If not, they fear that their feelings will be heightened and inhibit them from participating in school life and potentially subject to bullying. The primary person they say they would approach if they had any worries is the SEAL coordinator.

- **Peer-reporter** – The children take an active role in reporting their peers, particularly for what they classify as ‘bad’ conduct or being ‘naughty’, such as ‘bullying’ or copying a peer’s work. The children’s motivations for doing so vary and include: to themselves receive recognition; to sustain a sense of fairness; to discipline and control their peers in social situations (this particularly relates to those children who use reporting as a threat to peers); and to manage their relationships with their peers.

- **Helper** – Rewarding peers with certificates for helping to mediate a difficult situation is something the children like to do. They also perceive a duty of care to peers – particularly those younger than or ‘different’ to them – in terms of being kind and looking out for them. A message of care for adults is also strong across the school, and children are particularly courteous towards them – such as holding a door open for them or helping them with heavy boxes.

- **Observed** – Children’s behaviour is monitored throughout the school day by staff. Children accept the consequences for their actions, such as being sent out during class or receiving a red or yellow card if they do something wrong at playtime. However, some children believe that some of the rules are unnecessary, such as playing on the climbing equipment at lunchtime, and others do not understand why their behaviour should warrant such consequences.

- **Learner** – The children have gained an understanding of the function of emotion and it’s impact upon both their behaviour and attitude. They perceive that their feelings, which they understand as something conscious and related to thinking, come before their experience – that their feelings frame their experiences. They suggest that they should learn to control and change their feelings in order to feel happier and achieve academic success.
Children’s perceptions of themselves and others

- **The adults’ significance** – The children give significance to how they are viewed by others, and particularly adults. They are aware of how nominations for awards impacts upon parent and teacher perceptions of them. They aspire for adults to speak about their ‘good’ qualities. Those children, who do not feel they will receive such recognition, are quick to ridicule such award systems and boastfully reject them as systems to which they want to participate.

- **Respecting difference** – The children are aware of how others can be different to them and described a number of examples relating to physical and mental disabilities, deformity, race and religion. They felt that these differences should not influence their perceptions of them and stated it is important to respect difference to avoid other people becoming sad. One child said, ‘if they are nice, they’re nice’ and that this is what matters most.

- **Stereotypes and classifications** – Some of the children tend to stereotype particular groups of people in accord to cultural influences beyond their school environment. However, their peers will challenge these assumptions based upon their understanding of ‘respecting difference’. The children also tend to classify others’ behaviours according to the socio-emotional traits they perceive them to have, (‘she’s a bit arrogant’), or their immediate sense of what the other person may be feeling, (‘she’s upset’). The children also commonly qualify their behaviours or thoughts through describing their feelings.

- **Social hierarchies in school** – The children’s perceptions of their peers are influenced by social hierarchies, which are part of both the school culture and the class culture. For example, age is of particular significance and there is a sense that children develop the capacity for responsibility, as they get older. There are also distinct class hierarchies that pervade, such as fast runners have a high status among the boys.

- **Interrelationships** – The girls, in particular, have strong standards about what are right and wrong ways to be with and talk to their peers. They can be sensitive to comments or actions, which they perceive to be hurtful. Their perceptions of situations, in which they think others have been purposefully malicious, can differ from the views of those involved (particularly to boys). In these situations they commonly ask for adult intervention. In situations where an adult has intervened or been invited to intervene, both parties feel it is important to retell events according to how they perceived them before allowing the adult to make a judgement of the situation. Commonly if they are themselves at fault, they will also notify the adult of a peer’s wrongdoing or participation in the situation.

- **Positivity** – The children tend to use the feeling thermometer scale to define how positive they are feeling. They assess how they are feeling in terms of school-based incidents, which they perceive as ‘good’ or ‘bad’. Their feeling rating tends to be decided by weighing up the number of good incidents against the number of bad ones.

**Alexandra:** At Sparkle and Shine assemblies to make us … all excited we always sing a song in it and maybe it’s at the beginning or the end.

**Cher:** I’m just very happy to be in SEAL school because sometimes you have some problems … [and] … sometimes it can sort out them problems … sometimes it’s really good because you get praised and you get certificate.

**Fred:** cos we’re not hiding things and we can talk about it, it will be sorted out, and that’s making us happy, so like Didier said … he is happy to be in SEAL school.

**Didier:** Like your brain has a load of feelings in your head …

**Lionel:** …Your anger has a lot of feelings as well, because like if you lash out at someone you sometimes regret it and it’s not very good

**Fred:** It’s like something you don’t mean to do but a bit like your feelings controlling you
Children’s understandings of the purpose of SEAL

- **Academic success** – Predominantly children relate the application of SEAL as beneficial to their achievement of academic success. They perceive some emotions to be a barrier to learning and feel that these need to be controlled in order to produce ‘good work’. They understand that awards and recognition at school is based, in part, upon the quality of work they produce. Therefore, control of their emotions is interlinked with receiving awards and recognition, which value academic success. The children are also aware of the impact that others can have upon their own success at school and in some instances they resist partnering with particular children.

- **Correct conduct** – The children are aware of expectations of conduct both within the classroom and playground. These are described in value-based terms, such as ‘good playing’ or ‘good cooperating’. The children primarily associate such expectations with gaining awards and recognition from staff/adults. However, some children are more aware of fundamental concepts, such as being ‘nice’ to others, described by one child as ‘treating others as you would expected to be treated yourself’. Some of the children do not expect that they will receive the SEAL related awards, as they find it difficult to consistently conduct themselves in the ways that the school expects for a full week.

- **A happy school** – The children associate many of the aspects of school rituals, and in particular award celebrations or assemblies, with being encouraged to be ‘happier’. For example, they understand a moment during one of the whole-school award ceremonies when the head teacher shakes a magic wand to sprinkle them with ‘magic dust’, as a technique to change their mood and make them feel ‘fresh’. They see their school as a happy place as a result of the application of the SEAL initiative. They feel that it supports them to ‘sort out their problems’ and ‘worries’, and bullying in particular. They understand that their school has fewer ‘arguments’ and incidents of ‘nastiness’ in comparison to schools that do not have SEAL.

Fred: cos we’re not hiding things and we can talk about it, it will be sorted out, and that’s making us happy, so like Didier said … he is happy to be in a SEAL school.

Cher: I’m just very happy to be in SEAL school because sometimes you have some problems … [and] … sometimes it can sort out them problems … sometimes its really good because you get praised and you get certificates
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Facts and figures

Funders: Economic and Social Sciences Research Council (ESRC)

Timescale: Summer 2010 until Summer 2012

Fieldwork: September 2010 until May 2011

Summary of fieldwork activity so far:

- 4 in-class activities with Year 5 children
- 13 research workshops/meetings with ‘SEAL squad’ participants
- 7 focus groups with ‘SEAL squad’ participants
- 3 school assemblies with ‘SEAL squad’ participants
- Creation of 6 films with research participants
- Film review workshop with ‘SEAL squad’ participants
- 10 scrapbook workshops with research participants
- 9 interviews with research participants
- 3 interviews with school staff
- 1 focus group with school staff
- Observation and participation in school life over an 8 month period
- Documentary research
- 2 interviews with Local Authority representatives
Project Aims

Overview of the aims of the research
- To understand SEAL from the perspectives of children
- To explore how children’s perspectives relate to adult perspectives
- To support the development of educational approaches which encompass emotions through sharing children’s perspectives with the school, local authority and beyond (conferences, publications, etc)
- To initiate further research in this area

Emerging Questions
- What are children’s perceptions of their role in a SEAL school?
- How does their perception of that role affect how they view themselves and others?
- How do children understand the purpose of SEAL?

Methodology, Methods, Participants
The research project involves a review of academic and practice-related literature, a policy analysis of emotion-based education initiatives and a concentrated ethnographic study in one primary school for a period of eight months. The study focuses upon Year 5 students. The study includes participant observations of students’ participation in a wide range of school-based activities, interviews and focus groups with school staff and students, creative research workshops with students, and participatory research with a core group, self-named the ‘SEAL Squad’, of nine students (aged 9 -10). The SEAL squad create dens, short films and presentations as part of the research process. They have opportunities to share their creations with the wider school community. Additional students from Year 5 participate in the research through in-class workshops and, for those who want to be more involved, a lunchtime film and scrapbook club.

Fig A: ‘Making New Friends’ den
The School

The research is being conducted in a junior school situated in a village on the outskirts of Sheffield. This school is described as a Wave 1 SEAL school. It was one of the first wave of primary schools in Sheffield to apply the Social and Emotional Aspects of Learning (SEAL) initiative – ‘an explicit, structured, whole-curriculum framework and resource for teaching social, emotional and behavioural skills to all pupils’ (DfES, 2005, pg. 5).1 It is now part of the ‘Global SEAL’ project, to further develop SEAL through bringing a stronger global perspective. Students are of largely White British heritage and come from a range of social and academic backgrounds. Interconnected with SEAL is an inclusive approach to supporting students with special education needs both through teaching and learning opportunities in the main school and an Integrated Resource Unit. The SEAL agenda, to support social and emotional development, is described as underlying many of the school’s activities. The school provides opportunities for children to have a voice through a school council and SEAL focus group, both of which include children from each year group. In 2011 the school also established a ‘peer-mediation’ scheme, which aims to enable children to support their peers to overcome disagreements. The school will also launch its ‘praise pod’ in 2011 to support its current reward-based activities, such as weekly awards assemblies, certificate nominations and in-class reward systems. In addition to individual or paired support for children with special educational needs, the school also offers one-to-one sessions for children who may be having a difficult time to talk to an adult about how they are feeling. Every morning and afternoon, during registration, the children share with their teacher and class a number to represent how they are feeling on a scale of one-to-ten. A member of staff tracks these numbers and, if it seems appropriate, will offer the children with low scores a one-to-one session. Lunchtime supervisors also keep records of children’s playground conduct, and these are shared with teaching staff in the school. These help the school to relate playground incidents with children’s classroom behaviour. The school’s weekly timetable also includes a SEAL lesson and assembly. In addition to these in-school initiatives, the school offers a residential to an outdoor activity centre in Year 5, to support the children’s development of a range of social and emotional competencies, such as collaborative working and communication skills. The school has received recognition for its commitment to children’s social and emotional development by Ofsted and invitations to share their approaches to SEAL at local and national conferences.

---

Emerging findings

How do children perceive their role in a SEAL school?

- **Peer-mediation** – The children see the role of the mediator as a ‘helper’ and ‘problem solver’ for children who have had an ‘argument’. In this role, the mediators judge when and when not their peers may need their help. They also expect children to approach them to ask for help with a playground dispute. The children see the process of peer-mediation as a kind of talking therapy, whereby problems can be overcome through talking. The mediators withhold their responsibility to maintain confidentiality by not talking about what happens during mediations. They keep a record of the sessions by filling in a ‘sheet’ after each mediation, which is then filed in a ‘special book’. This sheet details the names of disputants, the class they are in and a short summary of the problem. The mediators can also share their experiences with the SEAL coordinator, Mrs Williams, who they describe as their ‘boss’. In some cases they understand that she may have to act on the information they share. The peer-mediators also state that they have a responsibility to tell Mrs Williams if a child discloses ‘something really serious’, such as ‘under age sex’, ‘suicide’, and ‘being followed home’. The children were ‘picked’ by the SEAL coordinator and then ‘asked if [they] wanted to do it’. They took on the role because they ‘wanted to help people’ and ‘the school’.

- **Friendship** – The children feel that one of their roles in a SEAL school is to be a good friend. The children, through their plays, portray friendship in two ways. Firstly, as being something that naturally occurs and secondly, as something that can be constructed. In their plays they show how, with the help of a teacher, friendships can begin once bullying is resolved. In these representations children with a high social status – the ‘cool group’ – bully those perceived to have a lower status. For example, a bully in one of the plays declares ‘we rule this school’. The plays also describe some of the character traits that a person being bullied can be perceived to have, such as being ‘mardy’ or ‘snotty’ or a ‘kind of geek’. In these plays the bullies show some resistance to initiating a friendship with the person they are bullying, feeling that this may change the status of their group.

- **Noticing** – The children, particularly the girls, feel that they should look out for others and ‘notice’ whether or not they are being bullied. Katie felt that if someone was being bullied they may be too frightened to tell anybody about it, and therefore others have a responsibility to pick up on any signs of them being bullied. In the group one of the girls, Alexandra, would often look out for her friends and make an effort to cheer them up if they were feeling low.

- **Telling** – It is viewed important by the children to disclose incidents of bullying to either their parents/carers or a member of staff at the school. They feel that once an adult knows what is going on the situation can be ‘dealt with’. However, the act of a child ‘telling’ an adult is a complicated one. It seems that in telling children are going against their peers, against the social order that they co-create. The children also described situations where the ‘bully’ lied about what was going on, making it difficult for the adult to know who was telling the truth. Therefore, they feel it is important to provide ‘proof’ if you are being bullied. Toni described how her friend kept a diary noting each incident of bullying; another felt it important to keep any nasty messages you receive over email or online.

- **Learning** – Anti-bullying week is seen as a chance to learn more about bullying and how to stop it from happening. The children described this as an opportunity to ‘talk about [their] problems’ and ‘make things to stop people from bullying’, such as ‘posters’ and ‘poems’.

- **Authorship** – It seems important for the children to assert authorship over their own creations, ideas and skills. The children will often remind their peers of what they have
created throughout the research process. On occasions the children have disputed who was the author of an idea. In other cases, some of the children try to alert their peers to their own skills – the things they tell others ‘I can’ do well. Justin, whose skills and ideas appear to sometimes go unseen by his peers, also asserts that he has the same, if not better, skills than others. It appears that the children’s ability to evidence their skills and ideas in a way that they receive recognition from others may be related to their social status. In some cases the children appear to be competing for this recognition with their peers. At times, the children may adopt a dominant role, or sometimes a subversive role (such as children being ‘rude’ during peer-mediations – see below), as another way of gaining authorship during their interactions with their peers, often shaping the interactions between others at the same time.

How does children’s participation in these roles affect how they view themselves and others?

• **Maturity/respect** – The mediator’s perception of their role as a ‘helper’ affects how they view their peers. It is clear they expect their peers to treat the mediations in a mature way, which also shows respect for their role as a mediator. However, the mediations can sometimes result in a challenging dynamic between them and their peers. The children feel that peer-mediation is ‘easier said than done’. On occasions they feel that children, particularly those in Year 3 and Year 6, do not take the process seriously and are sometimes ‘rude’. However, the expectations of the mediators to be met with respect may require a lot from the younger children who may not value the sessions in the same way. This expectation also challenges the social hierarchies in the school whereby the Year 6 students, traditionally, have more authority than those younger than them.

• **Stereotypes** – The children view bullies and the individuals getting bullied according to clear stereotypes. The ‘bully’ is often drawn as much larger than the person who ‘is getting bullied’. They describe the bully as ‘a naughty boy’ who may ‘punch’ or ‘tease’ others, and who is able to recruit others to take part in the bullying as well. The children also discussed the notion of ‘long-distance bullying’, where the bully uses sign language to bully. This avoids the bully’s actions from being easy to notice and allows the bully to tease others at a distance. The person getting bullied is inferred to as weaker than the bully, and can often feel ‘sad’ and too ‘scared’ to tell anyone about what is going on. The children emphasise the responsibility of the person getting bullied to initiate the process of stopping the ‘cycle’; they must ‘stand up’ to the bully. They can do this by telling an adult, who then becomes a powerful ally who can help to end the bullying by speaking with the bully and the person getting bullied. The children describe a ‘bully-buster’, who is bigger than the bully and ‘flies’ into the scene to stop the bullying. The peer-mediators likened themselves to bully busters.

• **Getting chosen** – For some of the children the act of being chosen for special roles, such as peer-mediation or school council, holds a great deal of importance. Alexandra stated on a number of occasions, and with pride, that ‘Miss Williams picks me for everything’. Whereas another girl could not make sense of why she was ‘never chosen’.

• **Causality** – If someone is being bullied the children think that they are likely to be able to see that something is wrong because of how they are behaving. The indicators of a child being bullied might include: ‘pretend[ing] to be poorly’; ‘mak[ing] up a reason to not go to school’; behaving differently; ‘they might not eat’; ‘they might not go to the toilet’; ‘they might not talk very much’. The children feel that children who get bullied may also be at risk when they get older, for example they may ‘take drugs’, commit ‘suicide’, or become an ‘alcoholic’. In these examples, the children seem to be linking these actions and behaviours with underlying emotional distress as a result of difficult experiences they are having or have had.

• **Re-presentation** – The children tend to re-present emotional experiences of bullying and friendship into distinct categories. For example, the children define ‘nasty’ actions, ranging from sending a hurtful text message to physical hurting someone, as bullying. In contrast being ‘nice’ and ‘kind’ is what constitutes friendship. However, Alexandra’s description of
how she is nice to others seems to describe a different kind of relating, ‘if I don’t like something about somebody I don’t tell them and I’m nice to them and I ignore that feature that they have’. This is an example of how the children’s re-presentation of emotional experience miss some of the nuances present in their relationships with others. The emotional experiences of those being bullied and those who are not also fall into contrasting categories. For example, the ‘Bullying Den’ has two areas differing in atmosphere. The blues side represents the sadness of being bullied and the yellow side, with streamers and glitter stars, represents the happy feeling once the bullying has stopped.

**How do children understand the purpose of SEAL?**

- **To learn** – It seems that the children are taking on board the understandings and advice that are shared with them through SEAL related activities. They have shared some of the things they have learnt, such as staying safe on the Internet or telling someone if you are being bullied. The children included these messages in the Bullying Den by creating a ‘solutions box’ full of cards stating what you should and should not do if you are being bullied. This approach seems to reflect the way the children learn about bullying through, for example, anti-bullying week.

- **To talk** – The children see talking as a tool for resolution. For example, they describe peer-mediation as an opportunity for children to talk about their problems until they have been resolved. Other opportunities are in place for the children to talk about any worries they may have, such as one-to-ones with Mrs Williams. The children also feel it is important, if someone is being bullied, for them to talk about it with an adult. SEAL encourages the children to talk about their worries and concerns with adults and with their peers.

- **To help** – The children value kindness to others. They are motivated to take on helping roles that foster kindness at their school, such as becoming a peer-mediator. They see their school as a kind and friendly place and see SEAL as helping them to contribute to developing these qualities.

---

**Fig B: Solutions to Bullying**
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Executive Summary

Introduction

This report presents findings from a two-year research project exploring children’s experiences of emotional education. Emotional education refers to the teaching and learning approaches that aim to develop children’s ‘emotional skills’. Such approaches are given increasing consideration in primary schools in the UK and are supported by a range of educational policies most prominently SEAL (Social and Emotional Aspects of Learning) – ‘an explicit, structured, whole-curriculum framework and resource for teaching social, emotional and behavioural skills to all pupils’ (DfES, 2005, pg. 5).

The research involved a review of academic and practice-related literature, a policy analysis of emotion-based education initiatives and a concentrated ethnographic study in a junior school for a period of eight months.

The ethnographic study was carried out in a junior school in Sheffield. This school is described as a Wave 1 SEAL school. It was one of the first wave of primary schools in Sheffield to apply the Social and Emotional Aspects of Learning (SEAL) initiative.

This report is intended to extend debate regarding emotional education. It reflects upon the application of SEAL in education from a sociological perspective and is framed around a series of questions. This report explores what contribution the recognition and exploration of emotion can make to social justice in education. It is hoped that it will offer an opportunity for practitioners to reflect upon their practice by thinking about the social role of emotions at school.

Methods

The study included participant observations of students’ participation in a wide range of school-based activities, interviews with local authority representatives, interviews and focus groups with school staff and students, creative research workshops with students, and participatory research with a core group, self-named the ‘SEAL Squad’, of nine students (aged 9 -10).

Summary of findings and implications

The findings show the importance of valuing how children feel and the different ways they express emotion at school. They highlight the significance of the school context in shaping how children feel and how they express emotion. Emotion is an important part of how children learn to relate to others and build their relationships at school. The findings presented in this report are framed around four questions:
Who are the empowered?

1. **SEAL** is associated with children’s empowerment through fostering children’s voice. This report explores the varied role of emotion as children seek empowerment through their interactions with peers. In addition, this section of the report highlights the complexities of supporting children’s voice and involving children in decision-making processes. The findings are broadly summarised as follows:

- Children seek empowerment through their in-the-moment expression of emotion. Emotion is often used to influence the direction of an interaction or gain recognition from peers.
- Some children express emotions in ways which reinforce the school’s values about what and how emotion should be expressed. Other children express emotion in ways which negate these ‘feeling rules’ in order to be recognised by peers. The children who express emotion in ways which reinforce the feeling rules tend to be selected for positions of responsibility such as a school council member or peer mediator.
- Interactions between adults and children convey messages to other children about what types of emotional bodies are valued at the school. For example, children’s excitement is suppressed and calmness is encouraged.
- Involving children in decision making processes unintentionally reinforces the distinct social positions of adults and children at the school. When children’s views challenge adult ways of doing things, they are less likely to be heard.
- Children are active in sustaining their own social positions. They think that children are vulnerable and need to be kept safe from harm by adults. The children who accept their social position and support adult-orientated perspectives tend to get their voices heard.

**Implications:** These findings show that the ways children conduct themselves emotionally is integral to the way they are socially positioned at school. It is important to recognise the different ways that children choose to express themselves and their views. Perhaps formal meetings are not the best way to involve some children in decision making processes. There is scope to explore how other approaches may provide opportunities for the children who do not easily ‘fit’ the school system, to have a voice.

2. **Is emotional self-control a ‘good’ thing?**

The SEAL curriculum emphasises children’s self-control of emotions in certain ways. This report suggests that this emphasis can overlook the role of emotions in social organisation. Children’s emotional exchanges are embedded within power relations in which their social positions and...
identities are shaped and re-shaped. This is evident in the following key findings.

• A focus upon children’s appropriate and inappropriate emotional expression can separate what children feel and how they express emotion from a social context. As children exchange emotion, whether they are being caring or mocking, they are differentiating themselves from others. Children’s emotional exchanges involve sustaining, contesting or redefining their own and others’ social positions at school.

• Children demonstrate a well-developed capacity to manage their emotions in their interactions. However, the choices they make about how to manage and express emotion sometimes conflict with the practices that the school promotes.

• Children’s identities are constructed through the ways that their emotions are rationalised by adults and peers. Once a child is attached to a particular identity, this frames how they are viewed by others and the relationships they build.

• Children’s expressions of anger seem to be associated with their experiences of injustice and struggles for power.

**Implications:** This report shows that children’s feelings and emotional responses are embedded within social hierarchies. Perhaps then, felt experience can be understood as a way of knowing about the social world. Such a view could extend emotional education from a focus upon emotional control to the exploration of emotions as part of wider power relations. For example, such an approach might ask children to explore the relationship between feelings of disgust and acts of discrimination or feelings of love and allegiance with others. Exploring emotion as a political force in this way connects emotional education with citizenship education and engages children with the everyday challenges to social justice.

3. **Are both ‘positive’ and ‘negative’ emotions important in children’s social relations?**

The SEAL learning outcomes tend to classify different emotions as positive and negative. The curriculum encourages children expression of positive emotion. However, this report shows that children’s expression of emotion, whether classified as positive or negative, is intrinsically linked to how they form their social relations. It is therefore difficult to limit children’s expression of negative emotions as they serve a social role. This is reflected in the following key findings.

• Children’s emotional exchanges with their peers reflect the roles they take in their relationships. Adults’ exchanges with children also reflect the roles they take, for example, as authority figure.

• Girls’ ‘fall-outs’ are used to sustain social norms in girl’s friendship groups. For example, being ‘mardy’ is not considered an acceptable way of presenting emotion. Girls who are ‘mardy’ are often disciplined by their peers through ‘degradation rituals’.

• The ways that girls present their emotion seems to influence their status within girls groups. For example, ‘mardy’ girls are included in these groups but their participation is carefully regulated by other members. In the
example used in this section, the ‘mardy’ girl showed resilience and determination by using strategies to keep her place in the girl group, even when the way she was treated by other group members seemed upsetting for her.

• In girls’ close relationships personal feelings are not a platform for ‘caring’ dialogue and sharing and listening. Girls’ relationships are fraught with fall-outs. An important aspect of these fall-outs appears to be establishing ‘feeling rules’, i.e. ways of managing and expressing emotion. Fall-outs can be understood as a strategy used by children to regulate the conduct of their friends and maintain social hierarchies within friendship groups.

Implications: These findings show that children’s expression of negative emotions serves a social role. It seems that children’s fall-outs are a way of negotiating the complexities of school life. However, children can get hurt through fall-outs, especially if they are repeated. In order to limit hurtful encounters between children, it is important to understand the role of fall-outs within a school context. Such an approach encourages the appraisal of social structures as well as the actions of individual children.

4. Are categorisations of children’s emotional dispositions enabling?

This section of the report suggests that children categorise the emotional dispositions of others according to their understanding of how adults’ value their emotions. The findings below show how children draw upon these categorisations as they present an emotional identity.

• Children acquire an understanding of how emotions and bodies are valued by adults. This is evident in children’s presentation of gender. Girls associate having a sexual identity with adulthood. Girls’ portrayal of themselves as ‘sexy’ and use of sexual language is perhaps a reflection of their interest in being part of the adult world.

• The girls’ increased appropriation of a ‘sexy’ identity coincided with their participation in sex and relationship education (SRE).

• Some children participate in the adult world by demonstrating their maturity. For one of the boys who participated in the research, maturity seems to be associated with emotional resilience. The control of emotions and being resilient is seen to be an indicator of masculinity by the boys. Boys who do more openly express their emotion are excluded from boys’ friendship groups.

Implications: These findings show that children’s presentations of their emotional identities are related to their perception of how male and female bodies are valued in the adult domain. The boys and girls who expressed their emotions through their bodies in ways that contested notions of ‘proper’ gender were excluded by peers. Perhaps within sex and relationship education there is scope for exploring emotions, gender and identity in order to engage with the gender norms that influence children’s judgements and dismissal of others.
1. Introduction

This report presents findings from a two-year research project exploring children’s experiences of emotional education. Emotional education refers to the teaching and learning approaches that aim to develop children’s ‘emotional skills’. Such approaches are given increasing consideration in primary schools in the UK. These skills are seen as a remedy for the mental health problems perceived to be facing contemporary society, and are supported by a range of educational policies most prominently SEAL (Social and Emotional Aspects of Learning) – ‘an explicit, structured, whole-curriculum framework and resource for teaching social, emotional and behavioural skills to all pupils’ (DfES, 2005, pg. 5).

These practices are associated with a democratic vision of education. From this perspective they foster children’s voice, as children are encouraged to express their feelings and relinquish adult control, as children learn to self-manage their feelings and actions (DfES 2005).

From a counter perspective emotional education is defined as a form of governance, within which children’s self-management is aligned with pre-determined values (Boler 1999) that support a particular type of emotionality (Gillies 2011).

This report suggests that emotional education cannot be simply classified as a pedagogy that either fosters or limits children’s emotional expression. Instead, this report aims to explore how both agency and control are an integral part of children’s relationships at school. The report will focus specifically upon the role of emotion in children’s relationships at a SEAL school.

This report is intended to extend practice within schools with an interest in emotional education. It reflects upon the application of SEAL in education from a sociological perspective and asks thought-provoking questions in order to engage with the title question - ‘what contribution the recognition and exploration of emotion can make to social justice in education’. It is hoped that it will offer an opportunity for school leaders and teachers to reflect upon their practice by thinking about the social role of emotions at school.
The research was carried out in a junior school in Sheffield. This school is described as a Wave 1 SEAL school. It was one of the first wave of primary schools in Sheffield to apply the Social and Emotional Aspects of Learning (SEAL) initiative. Interconnected with SEAL is an inclusive approach to supporting students with special education needs through teaching and learning opportunities both in the main school and in an Integrated Resource Unit. The school has received recognition by Ofsted for its commitment to children’s social and emotional development as well as invitations to share their approaches to SEAL at local and national conferences. The SEAL agenda is described by staff as the foundation for many of the school’s embedded approaches to emotional education.

The school integrates a range of practices and activities under the umbrella of emotional education throughout the school day, including registration, playtimes, class-based lessons and assemblies, and extends them into the home, through set homework or training for parents and carers. These practices and activities include:

- The school’s ‘core values’. These guide how teachers allocate rewards to children. These core values are: we are respectful, caring and polite; we are always ready to learn; we are determined, we persevere and we are resilient; we respect difference and diversity; we work together cooperatively; we have a voice and we listen to others.

- A range of reward opportunities for those students who have ‘achieved’ the school’s core values, such as a ‘praise pod’, weekly awards assemblies, peer-led SEAL certificate nominations and in-class reward systems.

- Records of children’s playground conduct written by lunchtime supervisors and shared with teaching staff. These help teachers to relate playground incidents with children’s classroom behaviour.

- The feeling barometer. Every morning and afternoon, during registration, the children share with their teacher and class a number to represent how they are feeling on a scale of one-to-ten. A member of staff tracks these numbers and, if it seems appropriate, will offer the children with low scores a one-to-one session.

- One-to-one sessions for children who may be having a difficult time, to talk to an adult about how they are feeling.

- A weekly SEAL lesson and SEAL assembly. In these activities children are encouraged to, for example, develop more expansive vocabularies of emotion, learn techniques to control emotions, identify emotional expression through body clues or describe the positive and negative...
feelings in relation to events. In addition, SEAL homework is set for children to complete with the support of their parents and carers.

- The school council. Children from each year group and the integrated resource nominate themselves for the position of school councillor and are then selected by teaching staff to represent their class and communicate issues they or their peers may have.

- A ‘peer-mediation’ scheme. Through this scheme a group of Year 5 and 6 children (ages 9 - 11) participate in conflict resolution training to enable them to support their peers to overcome disagreements during playtime.

- School staff receive training in emotional education approaches, such as conflict resolution. Training events are also provided for parents.
What contribution can the recognition and exploration of emotion make to social justice in education?

3. Research design

Methodology, Methods, Participants

The research involved a review of academic and practice-related literature, a policy analysis of emotion-based education initiatives and a concentrated ethnographic study in a junior school for a period of eight months. The study focused upon Year 5 students. The study included participant observations of students’ participation in a wide range of school-based activities, interviews with local authority representatives, interviews and focus groups with school staff and students, creative research workshops with students, and participatory research with a core group, self-named the ‘SEAL Squad’, of nine students (aged 9-10). The SEAL squad created dens, short films and presentations as part of the research process. They had opportunities to share their creations with the wider school community. Additional students from Year 5 participated in the research through in-class workshops and, for those who wanted to be more involved, a lunchtime film and scrapbook club.

Summary of Fieldwork Activity

- 4 in-class activities with Year 5 children
- 13 research workshops/meetings with ‘SEAL squad’
- 7 focus groups with ‘SEAL squad’
- 3 school assemblies with ‘SEAL squad’
- Creation of 6 films with ‘SEAL squad’ and Year 5 children
- Film review workshop with ‘SEAL squad’
- 10 scrapbook workshops with ‘SEAL squad’ and Year 5 children
- 9 Interviews with Year 5 children
- 3 interviews with school staff
- 2 focus groups with school staff
- 2 interviews with Local Authority representatives
- Observation and participation in school life over an 8 month period
- Documentary research
4. Research Findings

4.1. Who are the empowered?

‘A lot of [emotional education is about] encouraging children to be empowered, to have the language to resolve conflict and difficulties, and express how they are feeling about a certain issue and ... to feel good about themselves.’ (Headteacher)

The association of empowerment with emotional education encourages the questions ‘how is empowerment understood?’ and within this understanding ‘who are the empowered?’ Empowerment at the school is often associated by staff with ‘having a voice’. The expression of ‘voice’ is also seen to encompass the expression of emotion.

‘I think that [this school] quite rightly has been recognised as a SEAL school ... it’s an environment where the children are allowed to express themselves and their feelings and [are] encouraged to do so at every opportunity from circle time to school council and it’s great really, that they get a chance to air their views.’ (Teacher)

Hochschild (2003) suggests that the management and expression of emotion is tied to ‘feeling rules’, which are constructed in interactions with others and shape ideas about what an individual should be feeling in a particular situation and in which ways they should communicate their emotion to others. At school, when children express emotion with adults and peers they are together constructing feeling rules.

Feeling rules can be understood as context-specific and are of particular times and places (Barbalet 2001). Given this, a universal set of feeling rules by which people should conform does not exist, but instead feeling rules are representative of particular social, cultural, historical, political and economic forces present within specific contexts. Therefore, it is important to remember that the feeling rules present in the school, some of which are defined in the emotional curriculum and reworked by the school to form a set of ‘Core Values’, are influenced by such wider forces.

Feeling rules change in different situations and with different people, for example the feeling rules that bound an informal encounter such as a group of friends playing ‘tig’ in the playground are different from those within a more formal encounter such as a School Council meeting.
Feeling rules can be reinforced by children as they seek to direct their encounters. For example, during a hands-on and playful activity in a classroom setting, two boys, Justin and Harry, were role-playing in a corner of the room. During the role-play Justin knocks a hat from Harry’s head. Harry, frustrated, asks Justin twice to ‘pass’ his hat back to him. Harry’s request ends the role-play and communicates to Justin a feeling rule. Harry suggests that Justin’s actions were inappropriate because they stirred his frustration.

Children can also negate feeling rules in order to instead be recognised by their peers. For one of the girls, recognition is sought by shouting in order to get others to listen. Whereas one of the boys discredited his peer’s achievements to gain recognition for himself.

The methods that children use to direct their interactions or seek recognition can be quite different. However, leadership and recognition do not occur when children deviate from their typical method. For example, the girl who shouts is not heard by her peers when she does not shout.

In interactions children often focus on the immediate effects of expressing emotion, particularly to gain recognition. In their interactions they are less concerned by how emotion ‘should’ be expressed. Some children frequently negate the feeling rules and instead express emotions in ways that might help them be recognised.

The children that behave according to and reinforce feeling rules, tend to be more likely to be selected for positions of responsibility at the school, such as school council member or peer-mediator. In addition, within their interactions with adults, it seems that children’s ‘voices’ are more likely to be heard when they conform to these perceived ‘right’ ways of managing and expressing emotion, as will be explored in the following example of a School Council meeting.

At the first School Council meeting of the school year, eight children from mainstream classes and one boy from the integrated resource came together to share and discuss their views with two members of school staff about what should change in the school. The children came prepared with ideas based on their own and their peers’ reflections. The adults also invited the children on a tour of the school to communicate what they liked and what could be improved. Ryan, from the integrated resource, was particularly excited by this opportunity and eager to share his views. On one occasion during the tour he taps Mr Davidson, the headteacher, on the shoulder repeatedly to get his attention.

*Mr Davidson says to him, ‘don’t keep doing that to me, it could get annoying’. Mrs Williams asks him, ‘what do you do if you want to speak’. Ryan raises his hand to demonstrate what he should do. She says to him ‘you wouldn’t like it if he tapped you’. ‘I would’, Ryan replies.* (Fieldnotes)

Ryan continued to express his excitement through his gestures and the way he moved his body. He later jumped with his hand in the air and was told by Mrs Williams, ‘you don’t need to jump, we’ll always come to you’. These interactions with Ryan, while they do not diffuse Ryan’s physical expression of his excitement and eagerness, communicated to his peers what types of emotional bodies are expected within these ‘grown-up’ meetings. The other children followed these feeling rules throughout the walk around.
While particular types of emotional engagements are expected from the children by the adults, it also appears that there are certain conventions that bind how adults engage with the children. During the tour, the adults used a range of ways to communicate they had heard the children’s views, such as verbally communicating their support for a child’s perspective.

George, from Year 5, says that books should be put back when they are used by children in the library. Hayley suggests that they ‘move the table so people get used to putting books back’. Mrs Williams responds, ‘don’t give them the excuse to dump it’. Mr Davidson, the headteacher, states ‘I like things tidy’. (Fieldnotes)

However, when the children’s views came into tension with adult-orientated rationales, the children were offered an alternative perspective to challenge their view.

Ryan suggests that at dinnertime ‘you should be able to sit with friends’. (The children are allocated seats by the lunchtime supervisors). Mrs Williams asks him, ‘isn’t it nice to sit with new people though?’ Ryan doesn’t agree, he says he always ends up sitting with girls and cites the Christmas meal as an example. He explains that this is the reason why he has packed lunch. (Fieldnotes)

In this case Ryan did not change his view but presents a compelling argument for why the lunchtime protocol should be reviewed. Rather than discounting his view, Mrs Williams suggested that they may change things for the Christmas meal as she told Ryan, ‘we’ll have to think about how we do the Christmas meal then’. In acknowledging one aspect of Ryan’s complaint, Mrs Williams also limited further discussion about changing the seating system already used at lunchtime, which is adopted by lunchtime supervisors as a way of minimising conflict.

These examples reflect some of the challenges of involving children in decision-making. Children are encouraged to make decisions about the school’s operations but their perspectives and those of adults can sometimes differ. Both positions draw upon legitimate rationales, yet adult-orientated perspectives tend to be the ones that are taken up. For example, one of the children on the tour suggested that all children should know the code for the door of the ICT suite so they can get in there to use a computer when the room is not in use. Mrs Williams said she was not sure about that idea and suggested that maybe ‘they will need to talk about that one’. Therefore these kinds of decision-making practices unintentionally work to reinforce the distinct social positions of adults and children at the school.

Children are also active in sustaining their social position, this is not a one-way (top-down) process. For example, in a conversation about the school’s new security gates the children share how they feel they need to be kept safe from harm.

George from Year 5 says that ‘robbers can’t get into the school’... a younger girl adds to this saying that the gates mean that ‘the teenagers can’t get in’... ‘they used to make the Y3 children upset, calling them names and the dinnerladies didn’t used to say anything, and they were much bigger then us. With the gates it’s easier for us to be more safe’. (Fieldnotes)
Within these ‘grown-up’ meetings the children and adults together sustained a culturally constructed view of children as in need of protection through adult supervision. Those children who concurred with this view of themselves tended to have their voices heard, whereas those who challenged this, such as the child who suggested that all children should have access to the ICT suite, tended to be encouraged to take on an alternative position or told that will be discussed in the future. This also happened within the classroom context when children share their perspectives in SEAL lessons.

In a SEAL lesson the children are discussing techniques to help them calm down, so that their ‘minds are more open to good ideas’ and to ‘good thinking’. Their teacher, Mr Collins, tells them... ‘You’ve got to help yourself to win the game of learning’. The children then start sharing their techniques to calm down. Didier says that he ‘counts to ten’. Rebecca says ‘take a deep breath’. Maram suggests to ‘walk away’. Alexandra says ‘scream in a pillow’. Someone shouts out, ‘what’s she mean?’ The teacher explains that it is like when you want to scream to let out all your anguish... Justin adds ‘sometimes I play on my Xbox’. The teacher reminds the children that they are thinking about when they are at school. (Fieldnotes)

While Justin’s view is not directly challenged, and instead the teacher addresses the whole class, there is a sense here that gaming is not an appropriate suggestion. Beyond the classroom setting, teachers and parents share a concern regarding children’s gaming not only because of the game content but also because online gaming puts children at risk of being ‘cyber-bullied’. The teacher’s response to Justin’s contribution to the discussion implies that gaming is not a valued way of managing emotion.

Earlier in this section it was suggested that children’s voices were heard when they were expressed in a conventional manner, which involves the child managing their emotions in particular ways (for example, children’s excitement and eagerness were expected to be suppressed during the tour as part of the School council meeting and calmness and patience were encouraged). These conventions, or feeling rules, are associated with how children are socially positioned at school, which is bound up with cultural constructions of children more widely. The children who are supported to express their own views, are those who both accept their position and the constraints that this imposes and support adult-orientated perspectives. These children are able to control their emotions in ways that align with the school’s explicit feeling rules. Working upon their own emotions in these ways is described by Hochschild as ‘emotional labour’ (2003). The next section will explore children’s emotional labour at school in more detail.
4.2. Is emotional self-control a ‘good’ thing?

The SEAL curriculum puts a particular emphasis on children’s emotional labour, the self-control of emotions. Indeed, the objectives of teaching children emotional skills is to encourage them to ‘manage strong feelings such as frustration, anger and anxiety’ and ‘be able to promote calm and optimistic states that promote the achievement of goals’ (DfES 2005, pg. 7).

Emotional education aims to teach children how to make ‘positive’ choices about how they respond to their emotions and therefore reduce conflict within their interactions with peers. In the following extract, a teacher describes a dispute between two children as an opportunity to encourage the children to reflect upon their own actions and how they influence the responses of others.

‘In a one-to-one or one-to-two group [I will ask] ‘what did you say to him, that’s probably why he might have reacted that way’ ... You’ve got to work on sort of the strategies between them... get them to think about what they did that might have provoked that person, because they’ll just see what that person did to them they won’t even contemplate until you remind them, ‘well what did you do that might have ... provoked them or upset them’ or ‘why do you think why he might have reacted in that way’.’ (Teacher)

Through encouraging these kinds of insights the aspiration is for children to be able to self-regulate their responses during similar incidents in the future. For the children, part of the process of managing feelings involves both in-the-moment self-regulation and out-the-moment conversations with others.

‘Like your brain has loads of feelings in your head and ... you have to think about lots of things and if you tell people then you can make them right, but if you don’t tell people you can’t make them right and you start worrying about things....’ (Boy - Year 5)

While emotional education encourages emotions to now enter into the classroom and be viewed as an important aspect of learning, the view of emotion and the relationship between emotion and learning that frames such pedagogy is worth exploring.

The SEAL curriculum categorises emotions into positive and negative. The curriculum draws upon the perspective of Goleman who states that ‘students who are anxious, angry or depressed don’t learn’ and states that ‘emotions overwhelm concentration’ (Goleman 1995, pg. 78). This view supports an historically constructed opposition between emotion and intelligence, where emotions are associated with irrationality and intelligence with rationality. Goleman popularised the term ‘emotional intelligence’ which, while aiming to
acknowledge this opposition, has encouraged the rationalisation of the ‘unpredictable’ emotional dimensions of the self. Gillies states that Goleman argues that ‘aggression, violence, impulsivity and school disengagement result from an inability to recognise and address emotion’ (2011, pg. 187). Children are therefore encouraged to engage with and name their feelings and act upon certain feelings in particular ways.

‘At registration times in the morning and in the afternoons the children rate themselves in terms of how they’re feeling... You can spot patterns and then you can investigate that, and you can probe a little, and talk to them gently, and maybe coax out of them what the issues are and take some action to try and resolve it or help them to resolve it themselves.’ (Headteacher)

The perceived benefits of SEAL approaches such as this, is that they foster children’s ‘happiness’.

Lisa (R):  What do you think might be particularly important to the children about SEAL?

Head:  I think that, I think it encourages them to be happy, to deal with their emotions ... and I think that’s the most important thing for children, for them to feel happy and if they don’t feel happy, that’s when you start getting, you know, problems in terms of disengagement or possible behaviour problems, or children withdrawing into themselves or not feeling engaged with their learning...

The consideration of children’s happiness within formal education is a welcome shift from a more traditional focus that prioritised academic success. It is important, however, to examine the SEAL rhetoric that making children happy will turn them into ‘model’ learners, who, for example, behave in the ‘right’ ways and appear engaged in lessons. Gillies (2011) argues that this association results in the evaluation of emotion (and thus happiness) in terms of ‘appropriateness’ (i.e. as demonstrative of the ‘model’ learner). The ‘inappropriate’ expression of emotion is associated with individual emotional needs. While these needs are attributed to social causes, such as the child’s homelife, the way a child is expected by adults to respond to such inner needs is through talking about them and learning strategies and techniques to keep their emotions under control, such as walking away.

Mrs Williams asks if everything is going well at playtime ... She asks if there have been any disagreements. He says that there haven’t really. She asks him what he does if there is a disagreement. Justin tells her that he walks away and decides to leave it. ‘That’s brilliant!’ Mrs Williams says that she thinks he can be a peer mediator next year, because he is saying all the right things – as a peer mediator would. It is good to see you doing the right things, she tells him (Fieldnotes).

A focus upon children’s abilities to control their expression of ‘inappropriate’ emotion separates felt experience and emotional exchanges from a ‘social and political context’ (Gillies, 2011, pg. 201). For example, children express emotions in their interactions in order to characterise their social relationships. The remainder of this section examines how children’s emotional exchanges
are embedded within power relations in which social positions and identities are shaped and re-shaped.

The following extract shows how Alexandra, Fred and Justin use playful mocking to set apart their own social positions. This runs parallel to Alexandra’s conversation with the researcher where she has been asked how she is nice to people. The children are discussing a written list of ‘promises’ that they made to one another during a research workshop.

Lisa (R): Were any of these your promises?
Alexandra: Mine was the first, I would be nice to everyone I meet.
Lisa (R): And how are you nice to people, what do you do to be nice?
Alexandra: (Speaking to Fred) You stop doing that
Fred: You have to me nice to me as well
Alexandra: Why?
Fred: ‘to everybody you meet’
Alexandra: You’re invisible, I haven’t met you
Fred: That means strangers as well. Hi stranger!
Alexandra: Like, I’m like nice, like
Fred: Like!
Alexandra: I’m like smiling
*Justin giggles*
Alexandra: I smile. I say ‘hello’
Justin: And you’re horrible!
Alexandra: If I don’t like something about somebody I don’t tell them and I’m nice to them and I ignore that feature that they have and stuff like that
Justin: And what you do is you go and tell a teacher and you get rid of it (clicks his fingers across his face as he says ‘get rid of it!’)
Alexandra: I’ll get rid of you in (clicks fingers) in a minute if you don’t stop doing that!
Justin: I’ll kick your beehive if you don’t shut your mouth!

Fred taunts Alexandra by suggesting that her promise of being nice must also apply to him too, even though he is annoying her. Alexandra jokingly says that to her, he is ‘invisible’. Justin begins to taunt Alexandra too, again by joking that in some situations she does not adhere to her promise, instead she is ‘horrible’. Alexandra tells Justin that she will ‘get rid’ of him if he doesn’t stop. Justin retorts, ‘I’ll kick your beehive’. This encounter can be understood as a struggle for recognition. Fred’s and Justin’s exchanges with Alexandra are like playful battles of wit. Outside of this encounter Alexandra is socially positioned as the student who, by her own words, ‘gets chosen for everything’. However, she seems to have a more fragile position here. The adult-led emotional practices she has learnt are irrelevant within this encounter, in which the children make carefully controlled exchanges of emotion, using mockery and jibes to shape how the encounter develops.

Emotions are integral to the social interaction. Personal feelings guide Alexandra’s, Fred’s and Justin’s reactions to one another. Justin’s closing comment, ‘if you don’t shut your mouth’, heard out of context and judged according to the values of SEAL may be deemed inappropriate and anti-social. However, within this context it can be understood as carefully attuned...
to the encounter, in which each child is seeking recognition by sustaining, contesting or redefining their own and others’ social positions.

This extract reveals the children’s capacities to manage emotions in their interactions. However, the choices they make about how to manage and express emotion sometimes conflict with the practices that the school promotes. This has implications for the ways that children are socially positioned within the school and the ways they are characterised. For example, both children and adults are expected to express their emotion in ways that align with what is viewed as ‘appropriate’ at school. Children spotted doing the ‘right’ things will receive formal recognition from adults.

‘[The praise pod allows] members of staff to spot children doing the right things, showing emotional intelligence, demonstrating the qualities and virtues which we are wanting the children to display, showing the core values and [the children will be] be celebrated for it - reinforcing [what they have done] in a positive way’ (Headteacher).

As suggested earlier in this section, the responsibility to avoid the expression of emotion in ‘inappropriate’ ways, such as aggressive behaviour, is primarily viewed as an issue of self-management. Within the school children are also invited to explore the relationship between their feelings and their home and school experiences. In this way, emotion is seen as an expression of individual needs and therefore a means to explore what these may be and act upon them.

‘If anyone is upset or depressed or worried about something from home or school, we know it’s going to impact on their learning... why ask a child to perform in a Maths test or anything else, when at home there could be something really significant going on ... we can’t switch on and off easily, we carry stuff around’ (Teacher).

This identification of needs frames a meeting between Justin and the Headteacher to discuss Justin’s recent ‘outbursts’ with his peers.

Mr Davidson is speaking with a soft tone to his voice... He says to Justin, ‘this is the second time something like this has happened this week. This is unusual for you this year. I thought you were doing well and learning to control your anger’, like a grown-up’. Justin says that ‘it is hard sometimes’... Mr Davidson asks Justin why this is happening. He asks him if there is anything going on at home. Justin explains that his brother has been winding him up (Fieldnotes).

In this conversation anger is described as something which exists within Justin, which has its own force that Justin must learn to control - ‘I thought you were ... learning to control your anger’. Mr Davidson tries to identify a cause for Justin’s feelings of anger and implies that his behaviour communicates some distress beyond school. This concern reflects an appreciation of how contexts beyond school can affect a child’s behaviour. However, the focus of intervention is upon Justin’s self-management of his emotional expression.

Other children have communicated their dislike for Justin because they see him as unable to manage his emotion in ways that are appropriate in a mainstream classroom. They suggest he should be in the integrated resource.
Harry:  Hardly any people in the class like Justin
Lisa (R):  Oh really?
Didier:  He attacks people for no reason
...  
Cheryl:  He should be in the IR
Lisa (R):  Do you think?
Harry:  Because he has got angry problems

Justin’s changeability seems to be a point of intrigue to his peers, who on occasions seem to push at him until they get a reaction. However, these stirrings do not always seem to be intentional acts. Rather, they seem to be generated by an understandable reluctance, framed by feelings of fear, to accommodate for Justin. Rather, it is easier to make an excuse as to why he cannot participate.

Harry:  He gets angry just when you just say there is too many people playing the game, because I said that and he chased after me.

In this case, Harry explains how he told Justin that he could not join the game because there were ‘too many people playing’. For him, this was a legitimate reason to deny Justin’s participation. Justin’s response is to chase Harry. This story is shared as an example of how Justin ‘attacks people for no reason’. The encounters between Justin and the Headteacher and Justin and Harry are examples of how identities are constructed, through the repetition of events that are reasoned in particular ways. Such repetition leads to a fear of Justin; as one teacher states ‘you just don’t know what he will do’. It appears that he has become a fearful object (as a result of his perceived unpredictability).

Ahmed explores how fearfulness can ‘stick’ to objects and suggests that the association of a feeling to an individual is an ‘effect’ of an interaction (2004). In this sense fearfulness does not reside in an individual, rather the naming of the individual as fearsome is an effect of how interactions are read and reasoned by others. In the case of Justin, the identification of him as an irrationally angry individual, influences how his emotionality is conceptualised (as a problem resulting from Justin’s lack of self-control over his emotions) and how he is socially positioned by his peers (as different from them and in need of specialist support).

As explored in the focus group with Justin, Fred and Alexandra, Justin attempts to redefine his social position by contesting Alexandra’s position. Justin’s attempts to re-position himself are frequent but often undermined by his peers because of their own feelings of fear towards him (as when Harry tells him he cannot join his game).

Perhaps then, Justin’s expression of anger can be understood as not only just about him ‘trying to get his own way’, but also as a reaction to his experience of being repeatedly excluded by his peers. During many of the den-building workshops Justin was often not encouraged to contribute to the den. The contributions he did make were often undermined by his peers and often overlooked or destroyed. Through understanding Justin’s experience of exclusion, his expression of anger can be understood in a social context. Perhaps, anger is one of the few mechanism Justin can use to get his peers to hear him.
This section has shown how the SEAL curriculum emphasises children’s self-control of emotions in certain ways. The findings presented suggest that a focus upon emotional control can stigmatise particular children and overlook the role of emotions in how children organise their social worlds. It has been suggested that children’s informal emotional exchanges are embedded within power relations in which social positions and identities are shaped and re-shaped. Children are able to carefully attune their emotional expression with their peers. However, the choices they make about how to express themselves can conflict with the practices the school promotes. The next section builds upon this by exploring the relevance of both positive and negative in children’s friendship groups.
3. Are both ‘positive’ and ‘negative’ emotions important in children’s social relations?

The SEAL curriculum classifies emotions as positive and negative. The teaching and learning approaches and activities it supports aim to foster children’s positive emotions. Through SEAL, representations of emotion, such as I feel scared or we feel excited, are seen as subjective reports. In the extract below a teacher describes how children’s personal feelings can have negative and positive consequences depending upon how the children themselves respond to them.

“We are allowed to feel scared because situations make you feel scared, but how do you react to your scaredness, are you proactive or do you just retreat into your shell, because it could stop some children doing new things or stopping them from having a really good quality of life, which is what it is about really” (Teacher).

Crossley (1998) states that ‘emotion does not lie outside of the social world ... It is positioned squarely within it’ (pg. 19) and suggests that ‘emotions play a constitutive role in social life’ (pg. 17). Perhaps then, emotions are not only influential in children’s sense of personal fulfilment, as reflected in the teacher’s comment, but also play an intrinsic role in the production of the social world. This section will look beyond ‘negative’ and ‘positive’ views of emotion and will explore the role of emotion in the construction of social relations.

Crossley suggests that ‘emotions ... can be and frequently are judged rational or irrational according to their relationship to their context’ (Pg. 19). Building on from this it is also possible to suggest that people within the same environment can hold contrasting views about other people’s expression of emotion, as reflected in the following example.

During lunchtime a boy, David, hides small icepacks from a lunchbox belonging to his friend, Ellie, around the classroom for her to find. Ellie laughs. David is excited and finds increasingly unusual places to hide them. A lunchtime supervisor, Beryl, asks David ‘not to move from his seat’ (Fieldnotes).

Ellie and Beryl’s different perspectives of the same event are reflected in their emotional exchanges with David. David and Ellie’s emotional exchange communicates something of what their interaction means to each of them. For example, when Ellie laughs David seems to get more excited. Ellie’s laughter conveys her concordance with David’s humour. In contrast, Beryl’s response to David, to ask him not to move from his seat, asserts her status as an
authority figure. Beryl and Ellie’s contrasting emotional responses reflect and sustain their different relationships to David, as authority figure and friend.

The role of emotion in the organisation of social relations, will be explored further by examining the changing dynamics between three girls who regularly socialise with one another - Cheryl, Katie and Cathy. The interactions that take place between these three girls are sometimes antagonistic.

One of the female teachers jokes that Cheryl, Cathy and Katie will get sick of each other before the end of the week-long residential at the outdoor pursuits centre. She tells us that keep on falling out – ‘I said to them that if they can’t work together they would have to be separated ... One of them always seems to be left out’... She tells us that they could all work really well as part of a bigger group during the problem solving activity and describes this as ‘weird’ since they could not get on in a small group (Fieldnotes).

The teacher here has observed that the children ‘keep on falling out’ when they are working in a ‘small group’. However, the girls continue to want to work together even after they have fallen out. The remainder of this section explores how these fall-outs play a significant role in the social organisation of the group.

Goodwin explores how girls’ ‘interactive rituals’ are used to negotiate social order. For example, she examined how girls ‘construct hierarchically organised and differentiated social relations’ through their conversations (Goodwin 2006, pg. 247-248). The construction of social order seems a significant part of these girls fall-outs. This is evident in the following extract from a focus group with Cathy and Katie.

Katie: Hello! This girl’s coming to our school tomorrow, she’s called Cathy and she looks very cool and I want to be her bestest friend in the whole wide world
Cathy: What about me Katie, I’m the other Cathy, are you going to just leave me?
Katie: I’m going to leave Cathy, this other girl, she’s called Cathy Perry
Cathy: So you’re going to leave Cathy for Cathy
Katie: Yes. Cathy (pause) I don’t know what her other names is, but she looks really nice, really pretty, really bubbly, really fantastic, really creative, really...
Cathy: She speaks Spanish
Katie: And she speaks Spanish, oh la contino
Didier: Uno, dos, tres...
Katie: Cuatro, cinco, seis...
Didier: Da da da dum
...
Cathy: Katie are you really going to be horrible and leave?

Cathy asks Katie if she is going to ‘just’ leave her for a new girl who is joining their class with the same name. Using the word ‘just’ implies that leaving would fail to consider the full extent of her actions. Cathy emotionally qualifies the act of ‘leaving’ by describing it as a ‘horrible’ thing to do. Her use of emotive language, which portrays leaving in a negative way, is perhaps used to communicate to Katie that this is a hurtful thing to say and/or do.
In contrast to David’s and Ellie’s interaction, Cathy’s and Katie’s seems to be about something beyond relational closeness. For example, Katie seems to actively avoid defining her relationship to Cathy as one of friendship. In the following extract Cathy is talking about how people sometimes ‘torment’ her and can be ‘mean’. In response Katie shares a very positive account of her school experience, which Cathy suggests she contributes to by stating ‘I’m Katie’s friend’.

Cathy: I feel happy with my friends ... except for some people, they torment me sometimes, but that’s only sometimes and erm, and, I just feel comfortable at the school, I feel really happy at the school sometimes, when you’re not being, when some people are being not mean
Katie: It’s been really nice in the school since I’ve been here, I’ve been liking all my friends here, well, and...
Cathy: I’m Katie’s friend
Katie: And I’ve got lots of friends here, especially Mr Collins, and Lisa, Didier...
Didier: Wooo!
Katie: We’ve got Cheryl, Didier, Fred, Didier, Mr Collins...
Didier: Shall we just put it everybody in the class
Katie: Everybody in the class have been very nice to me since I’ve been a bit of a ...
Cathy: Does that include me?

Goodwin draws upon Garfinkel’s notion of ‘degradation rituals’ to describe the ways in which girls undermine those who break the social norms of a group or try to move above their social position within a group (2006, pg. 223). Perhaps Katie’s active choice not to name Cathy as a ‘friend’ can be understood in this way. Katie also makes a degrading reference to Cathy’s mum, who she describes as ‘really weird’ and implies that Cathy is also weird.

Cathy: My Mum Mrs Grange is a teaching assistant
Katie: She’s called Mrs Grange and she’s related to her cos she’s really weird

In doing so, Katie casts Cathy as having a ‘spoiled identity’ (Goodwin 2006). However, Cathy continues to show her allegiance to Katie. For example, at one point the children are talking about when they put red circular stickers on their heads and pretended to be Hindu. Didier describes this as offensive. Cathy agrees and adds, ‘but I wasn’t doing it, it was Katie, no it was Cheryl, it wasn’t Katie’.

Katie’s insult occurs despite Cathy’s earlier accusation that she was ‘mean’ for suggesting she was going to ‘leave’. Perhaps Katie’s response is a way of maintaining their distinct social positions. Katie’s insults follow Cathy’s attempt to use emotional manipulation to strengthen her allegiance to Katie. This is a resource that Cathy seems to draw upon more widely in order to manage her social interactions, but to little effect.

For example, Cheryl mocked Cathy during a focus group about bullying. This follows a workshop in which Cathy persistently used emotional manipulation in an attempt to be heard. Cathy’s peers were irritated by her because she was, as Katie stated, being ‘mardy’. The term mardy is used by children to describe someone throwing a tantrum to try and get their own way. During the focus
group Lionel draws upon a recent scenario, in which Cathy said she was being bullied. Cathy tells him he should not talk about that. However, Cheryl continues to discuss this in what seems to be a deliberate attempt to aggravate Cathy.

Lionel: If Cathy were being bullied by
Didier: Adam Gould
Cathy: You shouldn’t talk about that, this is going to go on
Lionel: Adam Gould has being bullying Cathy, right and
Cathy: Shut up
...
Didier: But Cathy has been bullied a lot
Lionel: And they were bullying each other
Cathy: Urgh
...
Cheryl: Cathy could be bullying me, yeah, and then I get upset and I can’t tell anyone, and I tell Florence, and then Adam Gould starts punching and she won’t tell anyone and she starts getting mardy
...
Cheryl: Well, Cathy is really...
Cathy: No, I’m not!
...
Cheryl: It isn’t funny
Cheryl: ... I then would get upset and I can’t tell anyone and then Adam comes along and says are you all right and I say no and then he punches her, like he normally does, and then she starts getting mardy

She does not initially get a rise out of Cathy and then declares, ‘well, Cathy is really [bullying me]’. This comment does stir a reaction in Cathy. The researcher then invites Cathy to have her say, but her peers block her from contributing to the conversation by singing.

Lisa (R): Cathy, what did you want to say?
All: (Singing) All by myself
Didier: (Singing) All by myself
Lisa (R): Cathy, did you want to say something?
Alexandra: Lisa, you know in the assembly that we’re doing, could we have a bit of a role play in the middle of the role play? Could we start singing that?
All: (Singing - in the background) All by myself...
Cathy: Wasn’t that my idea?
Katie: No! That was my idea.

It seems that Cheryl’s degradation of Cathy is supported by others. Cathy is left excluded from the conversation. Regardless, Cathy does continue to try and get her voice heard. She states that an idea that Alexandra is suggesting originally came from her. Cathy seems to be seeking recognition for her contribution to the project. Yet, her peers do not address this.

It seems that Cathy’s peers exclude her when she behaves in a way which they refer to as ‘just being mardy’. However, Cathy’s response in the example used can also be understood as her reaction to not being heard.
The children also used the word ‘mardy’ in a play they wrote about bullying. The victims of bullying were associated as having emotional traits such as being ‘mardy’ or ‘snotty’.

Jaden (B): Why are you playing with her?!
Lucas (B): Do you mean that thing?!
Carlie: I’m not called that I’m called…
Danielle: She’s called Carlie!
Nicole (B): No, she’s a thing, a that, a little mardy girl and snotty girl, so why are you playing with that?
Jamie (B): You’re out of the gang, cos you’re playing with that thing, so go away!

It seems that being mardy is not a valued character trait. In the play the children show how those who are mardy are denounced by their peers. Perhaps then, both Cheryl’s and Katie’s responses can be understood as a form of discipline and an attempt to limit Cathy’s use of emotional manipulation.

Katie and Cheryl perhaps did not perceive Cathy to be suffering, regardless of whether she was or not. This was also reflected by Lionel, who stated that Cathy and Adam ‘were bullying each other’. Cathy’s continued ability to stand up for herself showed her resilience and determination, as demonstrated both in her interactions with Katie and Cheryl. Cathy’s peers seemed to see her in ways that opposed her requests for support. Their perception of Cathy as ‘mardy’ seems to enable Katie and Cheryl to trivialise Cathy’s presentations of distress and discipline her for acting in these ways.

This section has shown that fall-outs play an important role within children’s friendship groups in two ways. Firstly, they are a part of how the girls socially organise their relationships. Secondly, they are used as a way of regulating their friends’ behaviours according to the social norms of the group.

The girls’ interactions described in this section run counter to the school’s core value that children should be ‘respectful, caring and polite’. It also challenges the view that girls are naturally inclined to openly discuss and explore their feelings with other girls.

‘I think the children who manage their behaviour really well [are] usually girls because … they talk things through quite outwardly a lot of the time … it is perfect for them just to kind of enhance what they do already’ (Teacher).

For the three girls mentioned in this section personal feelings are not a platform for ‘caring’ dialogue. Rather, emotional exchanges are used to manage social hierarchies. In addition, emotional exchanges are not necessarily about sharing and listening but defining the feeling rules of the group. For example, Cathy was reprimanded by Katie for using emotion to try and manipulate others.

Conflict appears to play a significant role in the construction of girls’ friendships. Another teacher reflected upon this too. In contrast to boys’ fall-outs, he felt that the girls’ conflicts seemed to have more depth and be more prolonged.

‘… if there’s a argument on the football pitch with boys, it’s a very quick handshake and it’s forgotten about. Whereas, I think with some of the girls … their arguments tended to go on deeper and
longer, and come to the surface every so often ... [and] ... be a lot more prolonged’ (Teacher).

The SEAL learning outcomes tend to classify different emotions as positive and negative. The curriculum encourages children’s expression of positive emotion. However, this report shows that children’s expression of emotion, whether classified as positive or negative, is intrinsically linked to the production of children’s worlds. While the girls’ fall-outs may be hurtful, they also serve to manage the emotional and social boundaries of the group. The reason why it can be difficult to manage girls’ fall-outs, as the teacher suggests, may be because they serve a social role. It seems that children’s fall-outs are a way for children to negotiate the complex power relations that are an important part of school life.
4. Are categorisations of children’s emotional dispositions enabling?

The previous section suggested that children regulate their peers’ emotional expression through their interactions and ‘degradation rituals’ (Goodwin 2006, pg. 223). This section explores how children categorise the emotional dispositions of others according to their understanding of how adults’ value their emotions.

Children construct characterisations of others which have an emotional quality. For example, one boy invited me to snub a girl on a reality TV show who he described as ‘arrogant’. However, emotional associations are not unique to children. People of all ages make judgements about other peoples’ emotional states. At the school, children are described by adults through their emotional characteristics, such as ‘caring’, ‘mature’ or ‘needy’. Children’s emotional exchanges with adults can reinforce these characteristics.

‘Cathy is quite flamboyant and out there and likes her needs to be met all the time, but when you have to talk to her about issues she cries really readily. And I know I had to talk to her the other week about shouting out all the time and she just went, you know, ‘I’ve had a really hard time being bullied’. She hasn’t got a lot of resilience about negative comments towards her. You know, [I shared some] mild negative comments and she immediately dragged up the last three years of playground issues’ (Teacher).

Mayall suggests that ‘childhood is a relational concept’ (1998, pg. 139). She states that ‘because of the authority and control adults exercise over all aspects of children’s lives, adult models not only importantly affect children’s experiences, knowledge and identity, they are also critical in constructing the personhood of children’ (pg. 139). Mayall suggests that children thus acquire an understanding of how adults value their emotions and their bodies. This, in turn, affects how children view themselves.

This is particularly noticeable in children’s presentations of gender. Girls present distinct types of femininity with their peers. For some girls, their femininity is expressed through an emerging sexual identity.

Carla: … you want to go down and up and up and down
Kathryn: Like Justin frickin’
Carla: Kathryn, you want to do that with every boy in this school
Kathryn: I do!
Girls sometimes referred to themselves as being 'sexy'. For example, one girl sang to others, 'I'm very sexy, yeah, yeah, yeah'. Another girl likened being in a good mood to feeling 'like I'm sexy, like a sexy bitch'. In one of the focus groups two girls taunted the only boy about a scenario he shared when a girl approached him at ice-skating. They pretended to be the girl in the story.

Kathryn: Are you all right? Do you want me to have babies?
Carla: Do you want to go to bed with me, so we can have two beautiful children and raise them to have big boobies?

The girls’ conversations with boys about sex and sexuality take place more frequently during the time when they are participating in relationship education lessons. They also started using frequently the ‘adult words’ for genitalia. In a focus group with Didier, Kathryn and Carla about a den-building workshop, they explained to the researcher the different ways that girls, boys and adults talk.

Carla: Almost all the girls like pretend to talk like a baby... We don’t find it talking like a baby...
Kathryn: I think it’s sexy
Carla: We find it talking like, it’s like a funny voice, we like doing it

... Lisa (R): And what do boys think about these voices?
Kathryn: Boys, I don’t even know
Didier: Don’t even go there, it’s so annoying
Kathryn: We don’t like boys do we at times?
Lisa (R): What about talking like a grown-up?
Didier: It’s miles better
Kathryn: Like this, oh my God, I can’t believe I’m like so pregnant
Didier: That’s like a baby
Carla: I like talking like both really
...
Lisa (R): So how do boys talk?
Didier: Boys talk like grown-ups

In this conversation, the children commented upon the differences they perceive between boys and girls. Didier suggested that boys are more mature than girls. He argued that this is demonstrated through the choices boys make regarding what they say and how they say it. However, Carla said they enjoyed using ‘funny’ voices in their conversations.

When Kathryn mimicked the voice of an adult, she used a posh accent. The topic of conversation she chose was pregnancy. This perhaps reflects her association of sexuality with adults. Perhaps then her conversations about sex are about becoming adult and thus using the concepts and language of adulthood.

Mayall suggest that ‘the social worlds of childhood are sharply differentiated from those of adults’ (1998, pg. 139). However, she also claims that ‘children both expect and desire to participate in the activities they see adults engaging in at home’ and that this extends into schools (1998, pg. 143). This is evident in children’s delight at being nominated for roles such as ‘peer-mediator’ at the school. They agreed to take on this role because they
'wanted to help people ... [and their] ... school'. Perhaps then, the ways girls use language typically assigned to the ‘adult’ domain, reflects their interest in being a part of the adult world. This is also reflected in a conversation between Connie and the field researcher.

Connie asks me if I know what vagina means. I say that I do. I say that I was in the same sex education lesson as her... She asks me if I know what penis means. Again I say yes. She asks me if I know what nuggets are. I say that I don’t know. She points to her privates and says, but on a boys (Fieldnotes).

In contrast, some of the boys tend to participate in the adult world by demonstrating their maturity. Didier’s presentations of maturity were particularly recognised and valued by adults and enables his inclusion in their world. For example, Didier’s depiction of children’s fall-outs in the playground were trusted by adults, whereas other boys’ accounts were more likely to be disputed. Didier’s teacher also described him as ‘the most mature boy in the class’.

Adults seem to associate maturity with resilience. One teacher stated that boys ‘learn to be resilient on the football pitch’. It seems that boys are perceived to be more emotionally resilient than girls. Emotional resilience is a sign of boys masculinity amongst peers. For example, on the occasions when Didier fell over on the tarmac playground during football he always held back his tears. Rather, he would get up and carry on playing. This type of reaction is common amongst the ‘cool’ boys.

Didier demonstrates his emotional resilience by repressing his tears. Understanding resilience is one of the SEAL outcomes - children ‘think about the importance of resilience in overcoming obstacles in order to reach a goal’ (DfES, 2005a, pg. 1). Within the SEAL guidelines resilience is described as the ability to put ‘suffering behind [you] and take positive steps to build a better future’ (DfES, 2005b, pg. 37).

In tension with developing children’s resilience, SEAL also aims to challenge the repression of emotion strongly associated with being a man and encourages boys to realise it is fine to cry.

‘I think [SEAL] really helps a lot of the boys who internalise their feelings, get frustrated but don’t know why, and now they understand that, ‘hey, we all feel like that’ ... [and] ... boys can see that its fine to cry’ (Teacher).

However, one of the boys who does cry openly does not mix with other boys during playtimes. Instead he spends his time with groups of girls. On one occasion he was described as ‘gay’ by the boys. Cheryl stepped in to defend him.

David is accused of being ‘gay’ by the boys. Lionel says that he is gay because he talks about women’s privates. Cheryl tells them that if he was gay he would be talking about men’s privates (Fieldnotes).

A member of staff felt that David was not emotionally ready to take on roles of responsibility such as peer-mediator.
‘I didn’t choose him because he’s not ready, emotionally he’s not ready to come and do this, he wouldn’t have managed all week either, he’ll be ready next year’ (Teacher).

For David, his lack of emotional resilience leads to his exclusion from grown-up roles and boys’ groups. Teachers do also acknowledge that it is wrong to expect children to behave in uniform ways.

‘... we shouldn’t expect children to all behave in the same way because emotionally we have got children a year a part in age almost from September to August, we’ve got boys and girls and the expectation for them all to fit into this box and behave in a certain way is wrong’ (Teacher).

However, there still exist emotional stereotypes which guide what it means to be a ‘proper’ male or female.

This section has suggested that children categorise the emotional dispositions of others. Children’s categorisations relate to how children perceive male and female bodies to be valued in the adult domain and influence how the children themselves present gendered emotional identities. For both boys and girls this involves appropriating their perceptions of adult masculinity and femininity. Some of the girls appropriated sexual language in conversation with adults and peers. Whereas boys repressed and controlled their emotion in order to appear mature.

Children’s presentations of gender are also important to how they are socially positioned at school. David did not control his emotions as readily as other boys, who challenged his masculinity by suggesting he was gay. Boys who express ‘feminine’ emotions, such as David, seem to occupy a position outside of the boys’ domain and does not have any friends who are boys. However, mature boys, such as Didier, who control their emotions are well-respected by other boys. Girls who appropriate sexual language, also seem to have a certain degree of authority over other the girls. Kathryn, in particular, was a very popular girl to be friends with and was also one of the first to have a boyfriend.

Children present their gender in different ways, and many of which have not been explored in this section. However, children’s categorisations of emotional dispositions as either masculine or feminine are important to how they relate to and view their peers. At the same time, children’s perceptions of being a male or female adult influence how they present themselves emotionally.
5. Implications and further questions

The school involved in this study has shown a commitment to allowing emotions into education. Much of their practice is valued by many of the children at the school, who feel they are listened to and that how they feel is taken into consideration. Children are aware of how difficult periods in their life can affect their attainment and the school staff show a genuine concern and regard for the well-being of children. While children’s attainment is still a priority, a great focus is put upon children’s enjoyment of education and children’s rights to feel valued and be heard.

This report is intended to extend debate regarding emotional education. It reflects upon the application of SEAL in education from a sociological perspective and is framed around a series of questions. It is hoped that this report will offer an opportunity for practitioners to reflect upon their practice by thinking about the social role of emotions at school.

The research findings have shown that school life influences how children feel and the ways they express emotion. Emotion is important to how children build relationships and identities at school. This section explores the implications of these findings in response to the report title, ‘What contribution can the recognition and exploration of emotion make to social justice in education?’ These implications have given rise to further questions which are intended as starting points for reflective discussions amongst practitioners.

1. Who are the empowered?

SEAL is associated with children’s empowerment through supporting children’s voice. This report explored the varied role of emotion as children seek empowerment through their interactions with peers. In addition, the report highlighted the complexities of supporting children’s voice and involving children in decision-making processes. The ways that children express their emotion has a significant effect upon the roles they have at school. Children who have positions of responsibility, such as school council member, are encouraged to conduct themselves in a calm manner during adult-style meetings. Within these meetings, those children who are calm tend to have their views heard. However, these children also seem to have some sense of what adults think they should say and have learnt to say the ‘right’ things.

These findings show that the ways children conduct themselves emotionally is integral to the way they are socially positioned at school. It is important to recognise the different ways that children choose to express themselves and their views. Perhaps formal meetings are not the best way to involve
some children in decision making processes. There is scope to explore how other approaches may provide opportunities for the children who do not easily ‘fit’ the school system, to have a voice.

**Further questions:** How can all children have a voice and be heard at school? What kinds of opportunities can schools provide to support children’s different perspectives to inform decision-making?

2. **Is emotional self-control a ‘good’ thing?**

The SEAL curriculum emphasises children’s self-control of emotions in certain ways. This report suggests that this emphasis can overlook the role of emotions in social organisation. Children’s emotional exchanges are embedded within power relations in which their social positions and identities are shaped and re-shaped. This report has shown that children’s feelings and emotional responses vary depending upon their own experiences. For example, some children may develop a sensitivity towards being excluded because this happens to them on a regular basis. In these cases it is difficult for the children to contain their anger and frustration. Their communication of anger is perhaps one of the few resources they have left in order to be heard. Emotions are therefore stirred within social contexts.

This suggests that children’s feelings and emotional responses are embedded within social hierarchies. Perhaps then, felt experience can be understood as a way of knowing about the social world. Such a view could extend emotional education from a focus upon emotional control to the exploration of emotions as part of wider power relations. For example, such an approach might ask children to explore the relationship between feelings of disgust and acts of discrimination or feelings of love and allegiance with others. Exploring emotion as a political force in this way connects emotional education with citizenship education as it engages children with the everyday challenges to social justice.

**Further questions:** How can emotional education engage children with the political dimensions of emotion? What support would teacher’s need to further develop their practice within this area?

3. **Are both ‘positive’ and ‘negative’ emotions important in children’s social relations?**

The SEAL learning outcomes tend to classify different emotions as positive and negative. The curriculum encourages children expression of positive emotion. However, this report shows that children’s expression of emotion, whether classified as positive or negative, is intrinsically linked to the production of social relations. It is therefore difficult to limit children’s expression of negative emotions as they serve a social role. For example, girls’ fall-outs play a significant role in managing friendship groups. Fall-outs enable girls to develop the feeling rules that guide the interactions between group members. While fall-outs can appear substantial and sustained, the girls tend to continue their friendships. These findings contrast a commonly held perception that girls are naturally inclined to openly discuss and explore their feelings in caring ways. Rather it seems that girls actively influence the ways that emotions circulate between themselves and others in order to provoke fall-outs.

What contribution can the recognition and exploration of emotion make to social justice in education?
These findings show that negative emotions serve a social role. It seems that children’s fall-outs are a way of negotiating the complex power relations that are an important part of school life. However, children can get hurt through fall-outs, especially if they are repeated. In order to limit hurtful encounters between children, it is important to understand the role of fall-outs within a school context. Such an approach encourages the appraisal of social structures as well as the actions of individual children.

**Further questions:** How does the social environment at school influence children’s disputes and bullying practices? What procedures can be established to enable school leaders and teachers to reflect upon and respond to this question in order to develop bullying prevention and intervention programmes?

4. Are categorisations of children’s emotional dispositions enabling?

The report suggested that children categorise the emotional dispositions of others. Children’s categorisations relate to how children perceive male and female bodies to be valued in the adult domain. They influence how the children themselves present gendered emotional identities. Girls’ appropriated a sexual identity through which they defined themselves as ‘sexy’. Other girls took on a ‘girly’ identify. Boys managed their expression of emotion in order to present a masculine identity. The boys and girls who expressed their emotions through their bodies in ways that contested notions of ‘proper’ gender were excluded by peers. Interestingly, the girls’ increased appropriation of a ‘sexy’ identity coincided with their participation in sex and relationship education.

This suggests that there is scope within emotional education, and in particular sex and relationship education, to explore emotions, gender and identity in order to critique the gender norms that influence children’s judgements and dismissal of others.

**Further questions:** How can emotional education encourage children to explore and question the gender norms that lead to social inequalities at school? What support would teacher’s need to further consider such forms of social inequality and respond to them in their practice?
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Appendix G:

The Invisible Boy: A story about anger and exclusion in a primary school
The Invisible Boy
A short story about anger and exclusion in a primary school

Lisa Procter
School of Education, The University of Sheffield
All drawings and models created by the young research participants from the project ‘Educating Emotions’

This story, designed for children and adults, explores children’s expression of anger and their exclusion at school. Relationships between children at school are influenced by how they express themselves emotionally. Some emotions are valued and others are not. Anger can be seen as a particularly shameful emotion to both feel and express, especially for boys. ‘Angry’ boys can be feared by other children and excluded from both classroom and playground activities. In this way ‘angry’ boys become invisible. This story is unfinished. It offers a starting point for adults and children to explore new ways of thinking about and responding to anger in schools.

Other children don’t let Toby join in their games. They tell him he cannot play again and again and again...

...Toby doesn’t understand why they are scared of him. He feels embarrassed. He wishes he was more like other children.

Toby is a school boy with an unusual power...

...Toby can turn invisible.

...And then, as if by magic, Toby disappears.

On special days, one girl can still see Toby. She sits close to him. She does not say anything. Toby knows she cares for him very, VERY, MUCH. He cares for her too.

...Toby turns Invisible.

...Toby can play games on the computer, or spin very, VERY fast on swivel chairs without anyone ever knowing!

One day he sees an incredible rainbow. He walks across the playground. And then...

...as he stands underneath the rainbow, something very, VERY, WONDERFUL happens...

What happens next?

Help us catch children or adults who:
1. Are not proud of their achievements
2. Do not ask or answer seriously
3. Get provoked easily
4. Stop and think before they act.

If you catch someone doing any of these things please tell

• Tell yourself to STOP!
• Give your thinking brain time
• Tell yourself you can handle this!
• Say to yourself ‘be calm … be calm … be calm’
• Walk away
• Count backwar ds from 10, 20, 100
• Tell someone else how you feel
• Breathe deeply – in and out five times
• Tense and relax your muscles
• Take some exercise
• Go into a deserted place and shout
• Feel your pulse
• Picture yourself dealing with the situation calmly and strongly

...but he still feels angry inside.

Toby still feels embarrassed. He still wishes he was more like other children...

You may think this is an incredible thing to be able to do, but Toby can only turn invisible when he gets very, VERY, VERY angry.

After a while, Toby becomes visible again.

Children are now scared of him.

Sometimes Toby does like having an incredible power. Sometimes it is fun to be invisible. He can do lots of things that other children can’t do...

...but he still feels angry inside.

What happens next?