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ABSTRACT

SANDERS, ALANE K., Ph.D., March 2010, Communication Studies

Schools as Emotional Arenas: Enhancing Education by Dismantling Dualisms in High School Life (374 pp.)

Director of Dissertation: B. Scott Titsworth

In this dissertation, I position schools as social and emotional arenas, embedded within powerful societal and educational discourses about emotion, relationships, and learning. Based on in-depth interviews and participant observation at New Haven High School, I present a qualitative study of students' and teachers' emotional experiences related to learning and being at school. Guided by a reflexive methodology, key reflective sensibilities emerged as meaningful when analyzing discourses: social constructionism, organizational socialization, and feminist-poststructuralism. Specifically, theoretical frameworks for the major themes were crafted using structuration, narrative, dialectical, boundary-management, emotion socialization, instructional, learning, and critical theories.

Results coalesce around four key themes which include analysis of (1) how emotion shapes teaching and learning; (2) how discursive and material structures and practices shape emotion rules and experience in schooling; (3) the ways in which peers groups, close friendships, and romantic relationships evoke, mediate, and socialize emotion; and (4) the influence of home life on students' emotional socialization and well-being at school. The impact of dualistic thinking on school life is discussed within each of these themes. Specifically, the consequences of viewing emotion as separate from reason, and public spheres as separate from private spheres are examined.
This project attempts to disrupt dispassionate views of schools that ignore the emotional realities of teaching and learning, and, conversely, explore ways in which emotion both enables and constrains students' abilities to learn and thrive at school. In so doing, I draw attention to taken-for-granted ideologies and practices shaping emotional experience, and interrogate the ramifications of dominant societal and educational discourses about emotion. Of particular importance are the ways in which these discourses pervade student life and guide students' and teachers' decisions about how to manage their emotions at school. I enter into perennial discussions of the role of emotion in the public sphere to argue that emotion should not be viewed as antithetical to reason, but should be considered a form of reasoning. Moreover, I seek to dislocate clear boundaries between students' public and private lives calling instead for recognition of the dynamic interplay between public and private spheres that becomes evident though the medium of emotion. Ultimately, I contend that we sacrifice deep connection with and understanding of students in educational organizations by striving to create emotionally neutral domains for learning detached from the broader landscape of students' lives. I call for new emotional scripts that could enlarge possible subject positions for stakeholders, and enhance learning in the classroom. Contributions to theoretical and practical knowledge, limitations of the study, and suggestions for future research are also discussed.
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Since the impetus of schooling, emotions have been primarily viewed as impediments to learning that should be controlled to enable high order cognitive processing (Boler, 1997). Students’ experiences of emotion have typically been viewed and disciplined as ‘private’ matters, not appropriate for display in a public school setting (Bendelow & Mayall, 2000). Oatley and Jenkins (1996) captured the sentiment well by stating, "there is a suspicion in Western culture that there is something wrong with emotion" (p. 38). In recent years, however, a growing number of scholars have begun to question this view of emotion, and sought to examine the role of emotions in learning (see Boler, 1999; Efklides & Volet, 2005; Linnenbrink, 2006; Mayring, 2003; Schutz & Lanhart, 2002; Smith-Sanders & Harter, 2007; Zemblyas, 2005). These scholars have aided in our understanding of the complexity of students’ and teachers’ emotional experiences, the dynamic interplay between emotion and cognition, the ways in which emotions can both enhance and impede learning, and the promise and problems of school programs focused on teaching social and emotional literacy. The study of emotions holds much promise for the improvement of pedagogical design and practice in hopes of creating healthy, productive school environments (see Boler, 1999; Park, 2004; Schutz, Hong, Cross, & Osbon, 2006; Zemblyas, 2005, 2006).

Defining Emotion

Emotions have often been overlooked for study due to the sheer difficulty in even defining these very real, yet illusive experiences. Different disciplines and scholars further muddy the understanding of emotion by using the same terms yet implying different meanings. Feeling, emotion, affect, and mood are terms that have contradictory
definitions across literature on these issues (see Linnenbrink, 2006). For this study I use the word emotion to encompass and be virtually synonymous with feeling and affect (terms which have sometimes been separated out to connote a specific physiological experience or a feeling toward an activity or person, respectively). I understand emotions as consisting of three elements or components: the physiological, the cognitive, and the linguistic. Emotions are embodied in some way; that is, felt through bodily sensations such as an increased heart rate or muscle tension, etcetera (see Lupton, 1998). Emotions are shaped by our thoughts and perceptions about the world, and the things and people in it. Finally, emotions are situated within a discursively created and negotiated set of interpretations and attributions. My goal in this study is not to debate the competing definition of emotions, but to work to understand how whatever it is we call emotion is interwoven with students’ abilities to thrive in educational environments.

Schools as Emotional Arenas

Fineman (2000) described schools as “emotional arenas to capture the intense activity of emotion in organizational life” (p. 1). Organizations are populated by people who are fueled by a wide range of emotions—including anxiety, frustration, excitement, and passion—which impact the ways in which roles are performed and tasks are accomplished in the organization. Schools, too, should be under the purview of organizational scholars as they are complex systems which share similar issues with yet are very different from what we consider ‘adult’ organizations (Fineman, 2000). Schutz and Lanehart (2002) argued that:

Researchers interested in teaching, learning, and motivational transactions within the classroom context can no longer ignore emotional issues. Emotions are
intimately involved in virtually every aspect of the teaching and learning process and, therefore, an understanding of the nature of emotions within the school context is essential (p. 67).

Thus far, emotional aspects of teaching and learning have primarily been studied in isolation from the broader school environment (for exceptions see Boler, 1999; Carlyle & Woods, 2002; Zemblyas, 2005) which distorts key processes of organizing that influence emotional experience at both micro and macro levels. Examining the role of emotions in schooling from an organizational perspective allows us to more deeply interrogate how organizations are discursively structured and managed (Giddens, 1984), and the important role emotions have not just in individual lives, but also in organizational functioning (Mumby & Putnam, 1992).

In this study, I seek to position schools as emotional arenas, embedded within powerful societal and educational discourses about emotion, in which students and teachers attempt to create a meaningful learning environment. More specifically, I examine emotion as a form of reasoning, and seek to unpack how emotions are discursively triggered and managed (i.e., how emotions are evoked through teachers talk to students, students talk to teachers/each other, etc.; and how students and teachers choose to handle emotional experiences through expression, masking, or channeling). Discourses about emotion will be examined to better understand why particular practices and experiences ‘matter’ and seem to trigger emotion (e.g., grading, labeling, test taking, having to talk in front of others). I hope to capture the broader ‘ecology’ of students’ emotional lives by learning about their emotional experiences in the classroom, in the hallway, after school, with peers, parents, administrators etc. and how these experiences

3
intersect and impact students’ attempts or desire to learn. The crux of this study is to understand the complexity of students’ and teachers' emotional experiences as embedded in discourse and how these experiences impact their abilities to thrive at school. This project is intended to deeply illuminate the experiences of students, but takes an interactional perspective in so doing to understand the co-construction of their school experiences with teachers, administrators, peers, and parents.

A Reflexive Methodology

A reflexive methodology serves as the meta-theoretical framework for this study of the connections between emotion, communication, and education. A reflexive approach to social scientific research assumes deep reflection on and interpretation of social acts and their discursive, political, ideological, and cultural contexts (Alvesson & Skoldberg, 2000). A hallmark of a reflexive methodology is the fact that it encourages researchers to avoid committing to a particular theory or theories at the start of the project. Instead, consistency is maintained at the meta-theoretical level through the inspiration of ongoing reflection on key themes (i.e., critical theory, organizational socialization theory, feminist-poststructuralism, etc.), and interpretive reflexivity achieved through moving between these themes and empirical work. This approach does not presume that the researcher is unread or uninfluenced by particular theories, but encourages the researcher to reflect upon her intellectual tendencies and be deeply reflexive about her ideas about what will be most important in the field, allowing the most significant issues to emerge from the reflexive process rather than be imposed prematurely. In chapter one, potentially important literature related to emotion, communication, and education is previewed. Moreover, my theoretical sensibilities are
discussed to make the reflexive research process more transparent and reflective. Chapter two details my methodological choices and the unique design of the study. The results are discussed in chapters three through six by interweaving participants’ voices with key disciplinary knowledge. Finally, I close with discussion of the theoretical and practical implications of the key findings, limitations, and suggestions for future research.
CHAPTER ONE - REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Emotion, as it is used in this study, is positioned as both an individual and social phenomena. Societal influences on the experience and expression of emotion, and the relationships between emotion and learning will be considered. Finally, the influence of emotion on students’ abilities to thrive at school is discussed. Importantly, in this chapter I also highlight my theoretical sensibilities and discuss key issues related to the impetus of this project including the historical treatment of emotions and knowledge, my current attempt to position schools as emotional arenas, and a feminist-postructuralist understanding of discourse and emotion. I argue for a dismantling of the emotion versus reason binary, and reconstruction of emotion as a form of reasoning. I draw upon my theoretical sensibilities to make this discursive shift, and position this study in relation to previous explications of the interrelationships between emotion, education, and communication. However, my approach to the collection and analysis of discourse will not be encamped in a particular way of seeing. My goal is to be deeply reflexive about these sensibilities allowing the possibility of a variety of interpretations to emerge. Part of that reflexivity is owning my ideas of what may be important for understanding this context and participants experiences.

Discourses of Emotion: Reconsidering Rationality

Historically, emotion has been conceptualized as an individual, biological experience. Modernist scholarship did much to inhibit “scholarly research” on emotions because emotions were seen as irrational and scholarship was devoted to “rational thought” (Lupton, 1998). Thought and the production of objective knowledge were positioned as a virtually disembodied endeavors (see Dewey, 1916; James, 1989). Dewey
(1916) argued that most understandings of knowledge and “rational reasoning” involve apprehending knowledge as something external to the body and intellectually apprehended separate from one’s senses. The body, because it was thought to be vulnerable to passions and sensations, was seen as posing a threat to the mind by impeding proper judgment and intellectual activity (Lupton, 1998; Zigler, 1994). The dualism places rational reasoning and knowing as opposite from sensory experiences gathered through organs of our bodies beyond our mind (Dewey, 1916). This dualist thinking works in tandem with another powerful dualism that permeates society; public/private, as emotions are positioned as individual, private matters unsuitable for the public sphere. Hence, the notion of emotion as a knowledge producing resource has been underrepresented in scholarly research. Scholarly and lay audiences alike often fail to recognize that meanings ascribed to emotions, such as what they are called and how they are interpreted, arise out of a broader cultural and social processes (Kovecses, 2000; Lupton, 1998). Emotionality, therefore, cannot be understood solely as an individual trait or biological given; rather it is a social and embodied experience in which physical sensations are triggered or granted meaning in and through discourse.

Feminist, postmodern, and critical theorists have since challenged modernist conceptions of emotion and theorized emotional experience as “an essential and insightful conduit to knowledge” (Lupton, 1998, p. 3). In fact, some scholars have argued that knowledge production and scientific notions of truth can never be emotionless as emotions underpin human existence and social life (see Game & Metcalfe, 1996); notions of scientific truth have historically been, and continue to be, influenced by cultural and political values undermining the validity of their claim to ‘neutral,’ universal truth(s)
(Harding, 1998). Critical scholars have begun asking questions related to how and why emotions have been ‘systematically discounted,’ and, importantly, how the role of emotion can be more creatively employed in educational practices (see Boler, 1997, 1999; Zembylas & Boler, 2002).

Communication scholars are uniquely positioned to examine ways in which emotional experiences and expressions are socially stimulated and interpreted through interaction and talk. Importantly, emotions should always be understood as existing within a social, cultural, and political context (Boler, 1999; Lupton, 1998; Parrott and Harre, 1996). These broader forces shape the nature of peoples’ emotional experiences and cannot be overlooked in understanding why and how emotions are evoked, interpreted, inhibited, or expressed in various ways. Though I strive to avoid entrenched theoretical commitments, I adopt a social constructionist approach focused on the intermingling of discourse and the embodied experience of emotion. This perspective is core to my perspective on the world. As such, I own it here as a key influencing factor on the design and enactment of this study. I argue that emotional experiences are certainly physiological in nature, but ultimately are expressed and imbued with meaning through discourse. Lupton (1994) defined discourse as “a pattern of words, figures of speech, concepts, values, and symbols that is organized around a particular object or issue and that can be located in wider historical, political, and social processes and practices,” (p. 61). Additionally, Lupton (1994) highlights the ways in which discourses are textual, intertextual, and contextual. That is, discourses are expressed in texts, draw upon other texts to realize meaning, and are always situated in particular settings fueled by historical, political, and cultural processes. From this perspective, the role/experience of emotion in
one’s life is understood as created, in part, and mediated by discourse. The role of language is not simply to label embodied emotion sensations; rather it is to make sense of emotion in a way that gives rise to ideological meaning systems about the nature of reality, social relations, and bodily experiences that in turn influence and shape the way emotion is experienced and interpreted in the future. Weedon (1987/1997) eloquently stated that “How we live our lives as conscious thinking subjects, and how we give meaning to the material social relations under which we live and which structure our everyday lives, depends on the range and social power of existing discourses, our access to them and the political strength of the interests which they represent” (p. 26). This project seeks to render visible the political forces that influence discourses of emotion/rationality and education, to better understand how and why students and teachers are either complicit with or challenge existing discourses, and to examine how various subject positions are created, eliminated, or privileged in current discourses.

According to Weedon (1987/1997), “Feminist poststructuralism…is a mode of knowledge production which uses poststructuralist theories of language, subjectivity, social processes and institutions to understand existing power relations and to identify areas and strategies for change” (p. 40). A feminist poststructuralist perspective holds promise for illuminating how and why emotion is understood as irrational and/or a hindrance to learning (more specifically, the gendered ways emotions come to be understood as private and then devalued as irrational); the consequences of this conceptualization; and possibilities for altering our understanding of emotion. Weedon (1987/1997) argues that some of the most powerful discourses in our society have firm roots in educational institutions. Yet, educational institutions as well as other firmly
established institutions are themselves sites of contest and constant challenge (Weedon, 1987/1997). Hence, not only does this project hold great potential to enlarge and inform students’ educational experiences, it stands to alter how generations of individuals are socialized to think about emotion and broaden the range of scripts available to story their lives. Weedon (1987/1997) states that “Language is the place where actual and possible forms of social and political consequences are defined and contested. Yet, it is also the place where our sense of ourselves, our subjectivity, is constructed” (p. 21). In short, who we are and our understanding of our relation to the world has emerged and been defined in and through language, and it is through the same that we can also shift and create new possibilities.

Enlarging Reason by Dismantling Dualisms

Dualisms are part of a powerful legacy in Western thought and continue to permeate our language and culture (Boler, 1997; Dewey, 1916; Mumby, 2000). The binary oppositions established through dualistic philosophies and language “are not a coincidence: binaries are not neutral, equivalent pairs but represent hierarchical relations in which one term is valued more than the other” (Boler, 1997, p. 2; see also, Cirksena & Cuklanz, 1992). In the case of reason/emotion, reason (as it has traditionally been understood) has been revered as the desired, powerful, rational ideal, while emotion has been positioned as “deviant” or the subordinate “other” (Barbalet, 1998; Boler, 1997; Hyde, 1984). Strongly influenced by early philosophers like Plato and Descartes, Western philosophy has largely been dominated by the view that emotion is antithetical to reason (Barbalet, 1998; Hyde, 1984). Some philosophers like Hume (1740/1911) shifted the view of emotion from opposing reason to emotion just being different than reason. He
viewed emotion as offering direction to reason, refocusing people afresh of their purposes; yet even this helpmate role to reason was not adopted by most philosophers. In 1916, Dewey argued that theories of knowledge in education positioned emotion and intellect as completely separate entities. Dewey (1916) stated, “The emotions are conceived to be purely private and personal, having nothing to do with the work of pure intelligence in apprehending facts and truth” (p. 335). He argued that the only exception may be in the case of intellectual curiosity where intellect and emotion meet. However, intellect was seen as pure and emotions as “disturbing heats” resulting in the mind pushing toward the outward truth and the emotions pushing inward to the private and personal. The positioning of reason and emotion in this dualistic fashion has influenced relations of power, served political purposes, and shaped the activities and qualities that are most valued in society. This, in turn, also influenced the subject positions and material opportunities for groups of people, for example, often limiting women to the private sphere and securely positioning men in the public (see Boler, 1999; Lupton, 1998; Weedon, 1987/1997; Wood, 1994).

History offers disturbing and revealing examples of the many forces that coalesced to create possibilities for some people and limit those of others based on ideas of emotion as irrational. A certain irony exists, for example, that supposedly neutral, rational, scientific reason was used to argue that women by their very nature are emotional and therefore unstable, positioning them as only suitable for duties in the private sphere (i.e., caregiving for children, husbands, and household) conveniently freeing men to participate in and control the public sphere that in turn establishes “medical” knowledge, laws, and rules for organizing through men’s “rational” being (see
Lupton, 1998; Wood, 1994). Binaries of reason/emotion and public/private work in tandem to honor some experiences, while minimizing the value of others. Turner (1987/1995) and Lupton (1998) elaborate by illustrating how biomedicine colluded with patriarchal power to keep women subordinated through the diagnosis of ‘hysteria.’ Through the Victorian period and throughout the 19th century women who sought medical care for anything from a headache to something more serious were almost always diagnosed with hysteria, which was constructed as a medical condition only suffered by women because of their hormones and a disordered uterus, making them unstable and unfit for public life. These ideas of women’s anatomical inferiority and innate suitability for private life carried over and intersected with other discourses (e.g., about education, professionalism, governmental participation) thereby limiting the possibilities for women to participate in public spheres (see Boler, 1999; Turner, 1987/1995; Wood, 1994).

These examples offer us insight into the ways in which and reasons (e.g., cultural, political, economic) why discourse has given birth to the emotion/rationality dualism, and we come to see how culturally arbitrary and politically powerful this dualism has been. This creation has served a number of people well, primarily men, and while some women have resisted the subject position of a caregiving, emotional wife, many have not. “Subjectivity” as defined by Weedon (1987/1997) “is used to refer to the conscious and unconscious thoughts and emotions of the individual, her sense of herself and her ways of understanding her relation to the world” (p. 32). Women’s collusion with the ‘emotional’ subjectivity, conscious or unconscious, allowed it to gain momentum. As Foucault (1981) explains, power’s “success is proportional to its ability to hide its own mechanisms” (p.
The more taken-for-granted and engrained these conceptualizations are in our language, social structure, and popular culture, the least likely we are recognize or challenge them.

Because this dualism and related perception of emotion as irrational (and separate from reason) and reason as rational is so deeply entrenched in our society, attempts to elevate emotion from its relegated “irrational” status proves difficult (Boler, 1997). However, dismantling the dualism of reason verses emotion challenges us to not view these two entities in competition with each other, but, rather, in concert with each other. Reason/rationality in the dualism has come to represent a neutral, logical, scientifically driven or technical form of knowledge and being, while emotion has come to represent a dangerous passion or force that inhibits one’s ability to function and make good decisions. Rooney (1993) argues that reflecting on and realizing how the seemingly universal or taken-for-granted dichotomies and distinctions of philosophy have been created allows us to re-work these conceptions for ones that are enabling rather than constraining. In my desire to not replicate dualistic conceptualizations, I position emotion as a knowledge producing resource. In doing so, I shed binary thinking that promotes one as either being rational or emotional, for a perspective that views emotion as a form of reasoning. In doing so, we come to view the existence of multiple rationalities, not just an instrumental or technical rationality as the only viable form.

Dewey (1916), too, argued for a dismantling of the dualism between emotion and reason, recognizing the unique ways our senses allow us to apprehend and respond to the world, and their role in influencing and providing valuable information to the mind. He argued that educational possibilities of connection and continuity are eliminated by the
separation. In an effort to honor our sensory experiences as knowledge producing, Dewey stated: “A person is reasonable in the degree in which he is habitually open to seeing an event which immediately strikes his senses not as an isolated thing, but in its experience with common mankind” (p. 343). Dewey sought to position our senses as deeply intertwined with thought, reasoning, and ultimately connections to knowledge and others. Dewey sought to overcome dualistic thinking in educational practices that dichotomize such domains as the individual and society and the mind and the body. By privileging the mind and demonizing the body as a hindrance to learning, traditional rationalist thought failed to examine the body as a source of creativity, energy, experience, and valuable uniqueness. Other scholars, too, have challenged the notion that “rationality” in its historically limited sense (i.e., as technical, instrumental, scientific) captures all of the resources we draw up to accomplish life (see Boler, 1999; Dougherty & Drumheller, 2006; Gagliardi, 1996; Harter, Leeman, Norander, Young, & Rawlins (2008); Mumby & Putnam, 1992; Strati, 1996). For example, Harter et al. (2008) provide an understanding of imagination as a form of reasoning; an understanding that engages new possibilities for understanding the power of imagination and/or imagination coupled with technical-scientific perspectives for organizing.

Mumby & Putnam (1992), too, argue for an alternative characterization of organizational life as bounded emotionality rather than bounded rationality asserting that emotions have an important role to play in organizational relationships and functioning. Related, the purpose of my project is to extend theory and practice in relation to how we understand emotion and its role in our lives. Of course, it is important to recognize, as is true with any mode of reasoning, that emotion can both enable and constrain actors.
Previous perspectives have mostly focused on emotion only as a constraint, however, instead of a potentially beneficial source of knowledge.

Once we come to realize that the binary of reason/rationality verses emotion, among many others, is culturally determined and arbitrary (Boler, 1997; Mumby, 2000), we can begin to contest and (re)construct our understanding of emotion and its role in society. We can begin to ask "how can we ‘refashion’ cultural values to affirm emotions and define them as sources of knowledge?" We can explore what it would mean for educational institutions specifically and society generally if emotion were understood as a knowledge producing resource for organizing and living. Like any form of reasoning, emotion can be beneficial at times and unbeneﬁcial at others; yet without the setting the stage to ask questions about the situated and embodied experience of emotion as a knowledge producing resource we fall short of examining the enabling power of emotion. As Foucault (1981) articulates, “Discourse transmits and produces power; it reinforces it but it also undermines and exposes it, renders it fragile and makes it possible to thwart it” (p. 101). Thus, it is through discourse that a given set of circumstances and subject positions come to fruition, and it is also through discourse that they can be contested and changed (Weedon, 1987/1997). As understood from a poststructuralist lens, a subjectivity is “precarious, contradictory and in process, constantly being reconstituted in discourse each time we think or speak” (Weedon, 1987/1997, p. 32). Our subjectivity is never truly fixed, once and for all. Importantly, language has power only as individuals become bearers of it; taking upon themselves meanings and subject positions and perpetuating or contesting a certain range of available possibilities for both. Individuals are agents
existing within a culturally and historically specific context and ever emerging set of possibilities and practices.

Writing about my understandings of the historical treatment of emotions in schooling and knowledge production, and articulating my feminist-poststructuralist sensibilities is a reflective practice intended not to "write my way into findings or a theoretical framework" but to own my personal tendencies and lens' for viewing the world. Next, emotions will be discussed in the context of schooling through the review of key research.

Emotion, Organizing, and Education

Emotions as Individual or Social

Emotions have long aided in human survival by serving multiple functions. Historically, emotions and their expression are credited with bonding mates and promoting group security, warning predators (both animal and human) of anger and impending danger if approached, and preventing accidents of various kinds (Anderson & Guerrero, 1998). As emotions serve both individual and social purposes, the nature of emotions themselves can be categorized as being primarily individual or social in nature. Individual emotions have been conceptualized as emotions that are focused on individual goals (yet, I would argue, still embedded in social expectations). Social emotions, however, are always understood as existing as a result of being in the presence of others, and, on some level, caring about their impressions of you. Kemper (2000) states, “a very large class of human emotions results from real, anticipated, imagined, or recollected outcomes of social relations” (p 46). In an educational context, individual emotions are typically related to not meeting a personal goal the student had set for him/herself (Goetz,
Zirngibl, Pekrun, & Hall, 2003). For instance, feeling disappointed by not earning a certain grade on a test, or not completing a homework assignment he/she planned to complete early. Social emotions, such as shame or embarrassment may arise when a student performs poorly on an exam compared to her/his peers. It is the social expectations and perceptions that trigger the emotional response. Schutz, Hong, Cross, and Osbon (2006) argue that virtually all emotions that occur in an educational setting involve a person-environment transaction in which interactions, comments, and encounters are appraised, comparing the situation to contextual knowledge and resources available to cope, to determine the emotional response. Emotions are seen as lying at the interface between the individual and society, between the biological and the social, and for this reason are crucial to the maintenance of relationships and society (see Denzin, 1984; Finkelstein, 1980).

People are inevitably socialized to express or view emotions in a particular manner. Socialization sources are pervasive and sometimes competing ranging from parents and peers to community organizations and school systems to popular culture. Through these sources of socialization, people learn rules of emotional display, control, and modification (Anderson & Guerrero, 1998). These phenomena point to the role of communication, and specifically, most often interpersonal communication in producing and managing emotion. Anderson and Guerrero (1998) argue that most emotions are elicited in social interaction. Certainly, emotions can exist outside of interpersonal communication, elicited by events or physiological forces, but these occurrences are rare. Our conception of needs, expectations, goals, and desires are developed socially within a particular environment and our experiences are appraised against these variables.
Interpretations of the experience and the desire to share our emotional experiences through communicative expression are framed within the social context. Importantly, social emotions tend to spawn other emotions influencing one’s behavior towards others and the outcomes of those emotionally fueled interactions.

Meyer & Turner (2002) articulated the relationship between emotion and classroom contexts: “Emotions are intertwined in teachers’ instructional responses and students’ beliefs and actions, constituting an integral part of the interpersonal processes that create classroom contexts” (p. 107). Classrooms can usefully be viewed as social settings in which interactions have important implications for learning and success. From an instructional perspective, the quality of the learning environment is largely shaped by the types of interactions that are made possible within it and the quality of communication reciprocated between teachers and students, students and peers (Anderson & Guerrero, 1998).

**The Relationships between Emotion and Learning**

According to Pekrun, Goetz, Titz, and Perry (2002) many researchers examining the classroom context have not been inclined, until recently, to examine emotions in education (for exceptions see Weiner, 1985; Zeidner, 1998). This may be due to a systematic disciplining of emotion out of school; a place where cognitive processing was to be at its highest, and emotions were thought to impede students abilities (Boler, 1997; Dewey, 1916). However, competing theories of emotion have emerged to challenge this myth of ‘scientific, instrumental rationality, many of which argue that emotion and the traditional notion of rationality (which is used in many of the studies detailed here) have a close relationship with one another. One view positions emotions as a guide to rational
behavior; another views rationality as fueling emotional behavior; a third view conceptualizes emotionality and rationality as deeply intertwined (see Dougherty & Drumheller, 2006). This last view of emotion is how I approach the relationship between emotionality and rationality (as traditionally conceptualized); however, I would take this view a step further to position emotion as a rationality/form of reason. I do believe that emotion and the traditional notion of an instrumental rationality are deeply intertwined and work in concert with one another, but I believe the language with which we talk about this relationship positions emotion as separate from reason in and of itself. In an effort to transcend dualisms that limit our understanding of and experiences in the world, I position emotion as a rationality. The task of making this discursive shift is cumbersome as most studies, even those that value emotion, tend to discuss emotion as different than reason or rationality. Hence, if I refer to emotion and reason/rationality in a contradictory way, understand that I am working within the language used by the authors to maintain coherence, but work to shift this language.

A close look at the emotional terrain of academic learning illustrates that emotion cannot be ignored much longer. Pekrun, Goetz, Titz, and Perry (2002) examined the prevalence and impact of academic emotions—those linked directly to learning in the classroom, instruction, and student achievement—in educational settings. These emotions (e.g., anxiety, pride, enjoyment of learning), they found, are deeply intertwined with students’ motivation to learn, the types of learning strategies they employ, their desire/ability to self-regulate their learning, the mental resources they tap into to learn, and their academic achievement. Interestingly, anxiety was noted as the most frequently experienced emotion, often in relation to taking exams, being in classes, and completing
homework. However, negative emotions (i.e., shame, anger, embarrassment) were not mentioned more often than positive emotions such as hope, pride, relief, or enjoyment. Hence, students reported experiencing rich and diverse emotions over the course of their educational experiences; emotions that both enabled and constrained their ability to learn. There are nuances in the way students drew upon emotions to enable learning. Negative emotional experiences, such as being angry over failing a test can be used as a reason to disconnect from learning or as a catalyst for motivation. Students noted boredom as a impeding their learning either because the material was dull and disconnected from their lives or because the material was too complex to follow so the student disconnected from the instructor and class. Students sometimes experienced the same emotions for different reasons, or reacted to an emotional experience differently than a peer though they felt the same emotion, they may have interpreted it differently. This complexity emerged when students were asked to talk about experiences during which time many students meta-communicated about experiences giving insight into how practices and past experience influenced current emotions and learning.

Because the presence of emotion in educational settings and its influence on learning has garnered increased attention in recent years (see Boler, 1999; Mayring, 2003; Schutz & Lanehart, 2002), scholars have begun re-envisioning their theories of teaching and learning to account for the pervasive role of emotion. Seifert (2004) argued for a restructuring of key educational theories—motivation theory, attribution theory, achievement goal orientations theory, and self-efficacy theory—to account for the important role emotions plays in educational outcomes. Seifert draws our attention to ways in which emotions underlie each of these theories giving rise to motivations and
behaviors. Affective experiences such as humiliation, shame, or boredom are emotions that play central roles in the patterns of behavior students enact.

Instructional communication scholars have built an impressive body of research on teacher immediacy behaviors (see for example Anderson 1979; Chesebro & McCroskey, 2001; Christophel & Gorham, 1995; Gorham & Zakari, 1990; Johnson & Miller, 2002; Kearney, Plax, Smith, & Sorenson, 1988; Kelley & Gorham, 1988; McCroskey, Sallinen, Fayer, Richmond, & Barraclough, 1996; Richard, Gorham, & McCroskey, 1987; Rocca and McCroskey, 1999; Rodriguez, Plax, & Kearney, 1996; Sanders & Wiseman, 1990; Titsworth, 2001) making it one of the most investigated constructs related to learning. Immediacy is expressed through communication that indicates a closeness, warmness or willingness to communicate (Mehrabian, 1981). Scholars have reported extensively on the affective arousal functions of immediacy behaviors. For example, a teacher smiling at a student may arouse comfort or happiness; a teacher expressing praise toward a student may evoke pride. In essence, immediacy behaviors influence students, affectively changing their emotional valence in the classroom and influencing student motivation. While affect can be generally understood as emotion, scholars have not fully articulated the emotional nature of immediacy in the communication literature in a direct way, opting instead for the cherished language of affect, arousal, closeness, and feeling. Elaborating on this notable literature using the language of emotion more explicitly could further deepen our understandings of the interconnections between emotion and learning. Moreover, immediacy research has a quantitative bias, poising qualitative scholars to make important contributions to understanding its relationship to student and teacher experience and student learning.
Other scholars have demonstrated how emotions are essential for rationality (e.g. Taylor, 2001). Taylor calls for the inclusion of “multiple ways of knowing” in education/learning and encouragement of emotional literacy to tap into multiple intelligences (and the unconscious). He argues that feelings should be explored in concert with decision-making to contextualize student behavior. Others, too, have pointed to the ways emotional experiences have been overlooked in educational research as an important contextual factor to understand patterns of students’ behavior (see Linnenbrink & Pintrich, 2002; Turner, Husman, & Schallert, 2002).

Classrooms can be understood as having ‘emotion cultures’ or cultures that impact the emotional experiences and expressions of students. Emotion cultures are defined as the “patterns of meanings embodied in symbols, by which people communicate, perpetuate, and develop their knowledge about and attitudes toward emotions” (Gordon, 1989a, p. 115). The types and amounts of emotional expression as well as the types of emotional experiences that are triggered and managed contribute to the ‘tone’ of that culture (e.g., supportive, putative, etc.). The creation of a supportive emotional culture can overcome such potentially damaging practices as student labeling (see Zembylas & Isenbarger, 2002), reduce students’ engagement in risky behaviors, and increase their achievement and desire to learn (Black, 2006). Emotion ideologies become evident in the patterns and practices of students and teachers. Importantly, there is a reciprocal relationship between the student and educational discourses of emotion. The student both shapes and is shaped by these discourses (Zembalyas, 2005). The emotional roles a student may choose to perform inevitably limit or create opportunities for emotional experience/expression in the future. Emotion is undeniably a part of every
educational setting yet systematic studies of emotion and its role in students’ and teachers’ lives have rarely been conducted (Boler, 1999), which may be explained by the discursive positioning of emotion in opposition to rationality throughout most of history.

For many students, the very culture of the school, including the structuring of the classroom and instruction, creates a mismatch with their preferred learning style, which may exacerbate negative emotions (Nichols & Jones, 2003). Nichols and Jones found that while many teachers espouse approaches to teaching and learning that promote contextually fitting, emotionally positive, supportive, creative learning environments, they often fail to foster such environments in their own classrooms. They further argued that state mandated, high-stakes accountability mechanisms are one culprit as these mandates encourage efficient, teacher-directed mastery of information absent genuine learning. But do these mandates change the way teachers organize their classrooms? Nichols and Jones would argue not necessarily; these mandates have just further entrenched the practices of teachers who already taught in a teacher-directed, information driven way.

In addition to the need for a person-culture fit in creating a learning environment, the person-task fit must be considered as well. An appropriate match between a student’s abilities and the challenge of a task (i.e., tasks should be challenging, but not seemingly impossible for the students to complete) tends to generate positive emotions, thereby enhancing learning (Glaser-Zikuda & Mayring, 2003). Not all students ‘fit’ comfortably, so to speak, in their schools. Not surprisingly, Glaser-Zikuda and Mayring (2003) found that students who were classified as ‘low achievers’ by their school standards reported experiencing more negative emotions and a larger variety of negative emotions than ‘high
achieving’ students. High achieving students indicated experiencing primarily positive emotions related to learning, and the negative emotions they experienced were mostly related to anxiety over performance on an assignment or test. Interestingly, high achievers were more likely to use that anxiety to improve their performance, or meta-communicated about its role in learning. However, low achievers tended to be debilitated by the anxiety and tended to experience anxiety about virtually every school related performance.

Taken together, these studies illuminate the undeniable and complex presence of emotion in learning. The question, then, becomes why do we not see more varieties of emotion expressed or hear more about emotion as a positive influence on cognitive processing?

*Emotion Scripts and Regulation*

Education has long been positioned as serving the purpose of socializing children and adolescents into appropriate roles as citizens (see Bendelow & Mayall, 2000; Elias, 1994). Schools emerged in the United States largely for the purposes of schooling the young on key religious texts and virtues, and later became geared toward the advancement of an industrial society (Prothero, 2007). As capitalist values continue to permeate our nation, schools socialize students to become productive workers (Boler, 1999). Hence, students receive early occupational training (see Gecas, 1981; Jablin, 1985a; Jablin, 2001; Meyer & Driskill, 1997), which usually involves early training in emotional regulation, or the control of one's emotions to fit appropriate social orders (Boler, 1997; Boler, 1999). As students are trained to become contributing members of a productive capitalist society, efficiency and conformity become key goals in schools’
structures and social orders. In the midst of encouraging knowledge mastery and learning, through both implicit and explicit rules of organizing, students risk becoming positioned as objects of a system with their unique realities and desires rendered invisible or unimportant (Bendelow & Mayall, 2000).

As previously discussed, organizations tend to view emotional expression as irrational and use organizational rules and resources to regulate emotional expression and reinforce the rational paradigm (Mumby & Putnam, 1992; Putnam & Mumby, 1993). Waldron (1994) explicates three themes in the literature on emotion work in organizations: regulation of emotion displays, process of emotional interpretation including rules for emotion display, and how emotional communication defines work roles. Everyday interaction rituals (Goffman, 1967) serve to regulate emotion rules. Oftentimes, interactions become routinized in organizations perpetuating rituals that may promote the private management of emotions. Organizational structures create ‘feeling rules’ which impact the ways in which people are permitted to reveal or conceal experienced emotions (Fineman, 1996). ‘Feeling rules’ also govern organizations where the specific intent is not to commodify emotion, but to control it in other ways. Hochschild (1990) argues that feeling rules serve almost as “zoning regulations” controlling what types and how much of a given emotion should be displayed within the organization. The performance of emotion is based upon the enactment of culturally created and agreed upon scripts (Waldron, 1994). Dougherty and Drumheller (2006) found that organizational members actually “rationalized” their emotion by using what has been considered “rational,” logical talk to describe emotions, or by denying or
reframing the experiences altogether in an effort to behave according to the dominant scripts of the organization.

Through regulative rules or practices students, too, are encouraged to hide or display emotions in particular ways (see Bendelow & Mayall, 2000; Boler, 1999). Because certain ideals of behavior are so privileged and taken-for-granted in Western society, students and teachers alike often fall into patterns of self-governance aligning their emotional expressions with societal norms, which many would consider the ideal for organizational life (for critique, see Boler, 1999). Boler (1999) argues that this “pastoral power—teaching students and teachers to self-police—manifests through a combination of religious, scientific, and rational discourses” (p. 31). The subject position of a 'good student' arises out of educational philosophies deeply embedded in and influenced by religious values of moral obedience; capitalistic values of utility, efficiency, and skill; and scientific/medical values of emotional neutrality and control. These values are evidenced in the rules and disciplinary mechanisms in place for ‘deviants’; constant forms of measurement (e.g., testing, grades, competitions); and the mental-hygiene movement and its later counterparts—“rational” emotional literacy programs. These values and their subsequent influence on organizing schools both philosophically and materially, leads many students to enact, some unquestioningly, behaviors aligned with the subjectivity of a 'good student' and discipline themselves internally to do so. The private management of negative emotions that may arise from this performance may be detrimental to students’ well-being. The impact of psychological stress on mental and physical health has become a central concern in contemporary society (see Cohen, 2000), and one that deserves attention in the context of student life.
Dougherty and Krone (2002) note that the notion of ‘emotional intelligence,’ a concept popularized by Goleman (1995), may be used by organizations to rationalize and reify the control of emotions. An emotionally intelligent person is pleasant to be around, evokes the appropriate emotions at appropriate times, and demonstrates an awareness of others' emotional needs. Emotional intelligence manifests itself in communicative behavior making its discursive structuring a key part of organizational life (Dougherty & Krone, 2002). With increased attention paid to understanding emotion, and emotion literacy in organizing, school programs have begun to emerge that address the social and emotional components of students’ lives. Social and emotional components of this socialization have recently been positioned as vital to preparing students for their future roles in society, and for achieving academic success and overall health (see Elias, 1994; Elias & Weissburg, 2000), yet some scholars approach these programs with caution (see Boler 1997; 1999).

Emotional literacy has become a buzz word of organizational and psychological scholarship and popular culture, and is now permeating school systems as a literacy that needs to be fostered. These concepts and programs related to addressing students’ complex lives hold promise for giving voice to students and enabling them to develop competencies heretofore unacknowledged as important in formal schooling. However, the underlying philosophies of these programs may serve to further regulate students’ emotional and social lives in the service of those in power, namely administrators and teachers, and further entrench societal ideals of “emotionless rationality.” There lies a tension between praising emotional literacy programs and deeply interrogating their possible negative consequences. Certainly, particular regulations may be argued to serve
us well in avoiding destructive communication (i.e., expressing anger or hatred toward another race or sex) (Lupton, 1998), and enable us to accomplish goals (for example, the ability to focus on and complete a task); however, all emotion rules should be examined to better understand how they serve to empower or impede learning/living. Outgrowths of students’ emotional lives, it is argued, can be seen sometimes in violent behaviors, disruptive acts, or damaged relationships, which is the basis of argument for needing to control emotions in schools (see Bodine & Crawford, 1999). Other scholars have viewed these outgrowths as a call for less restrictive emotional orders so as emotions can be expressed in a healthy manner and avoid negative emotions building to a point of people being forced to succumb to destructive behaviors (Dougherty & Drumheller, 2006).

Boler (1999) illuminates how emotional conduct is regulated by gendered rules of emotion and how the politics of emotion (i.e., how emotions are socially controlled and positioned) influence whether emotion is valued or positioned as embarrassing/hindering in educational settings. Particularly, women, she argues, are hurt by the politics of emotion because they are thought of as emotional beings incapable of controlling their behavior or engaging in logical reasoning or high level conceptualization. Thus men, who are thought to be less emotional, are positioned as having the capacity to be the most effective citizens, decision makers, producers, and leaders (see also Lupton, 1998). The ongoing discursive positioning of women as emotionally well-suited for private life as caretakers, etcetera, limits women's identities, and social and economic value (Wood, 1994). Boler’s purpose is for emotion to be recognized in discourse and praxis to make clearer the ways in which emotion has been used as a tool to exclude women from power.
in society and, most importantly, to open the door to unrealized possibilities that could be explored if emotion was seen as a useful and powerful resource.

The social order of schools is interesting as adults tend to hold power over students and enforce the maintenance of certain social and emotional orders (Bendelow & Mayall, 2000). Schools, thus, attempt to organize students’ intellectual, bodily, and emotional lives (Fineman, 2000). Students’ voices and experiences should be rendered intelligible in school systems rather than invisible so that their emotional lifeworlds can be understood, not just controlled. Emotions lie at the intersection of a number of dualisms prevalent in western society such as the public and private, biological and social, mind and body (Bendelow and Mayall, 2000). It is important to examine the ways in which emotions can transcend these dualisms and be positioned as offering important information about the ways in which humans negotiate and span boundaries between what have been established as dualistic properties. Boler (1999) argues for an analysis of how “emotion rules can be challenged and how emotions can be ‘reclaimed’ as part of our cognitive and ethical inquiry,” (p. xiv). The outcome of this analysis provides hope for improving the lives of students, and people in general, especially those whose emotions have been pathologized; who have been made to feel inferior or to think that powerful emotions are a sign of their flawed character. Furthermore, the hope is that through education students would learn that negative emotions are not merely a private problem, but are more logically, “a sign that something is wrong with the outside world,” (p. xiv). Some scholars advocate for a pedagogy driven by discomfort through which students may come to interrogate taken for granted assumptions about emotions as impediments to learning or to question by whom and how their emotional lives are
regulated (see Boler, 1999; Boler & Zembylas, 2003; hooks, b., 2003; Zembalyas & Boler, 2002).

*The Emotional Landscape of Students' Lives*

Goetz, Zirngibl, Pekrun, and Hall (2003) capture the complexity of students' emotional experiences related to school: “Academic emotions are embedded in a system including aspects of the scholastic, parental, and peer-related environment as well as personal appraisals of oneself, one’s learning, and achievement outcomes” (p. 21). In short, emotional experiences are deeply interconnected with every other aspect of students’ lives. Adolescents are faced with many consequential decisions to make related to risky behaviors such as drinking alcohol, having sex, smoking cigarettes, using drugs, and skipping school (Caffray & Schneider, 2000), and relationships such as reacting to emotional dilemmas between peers and friends (see Saarni, 2000). These decisions are deeply emotional and situated within a mesh of dilemmas and competing identities.

Emotional experience is bidirectional when it comes to difficult decisions (i.e., emotion fuels the decision and emotions emerge as a result of the decision). Adolescents differ in the way they rationalize experiences; some believe that the negative emotions such as guilt, outweigh the positive emotions such as feeling socially accepted or the emotional sensation stimulated by the substance or behavior and vice versa (Caffray & Schneider, 2000). Moreover, the tensions related to making decisions about these issues hover in the midst of an educational environment as students attempt or not to learn. Hardy (2007) recognizes that students do not arrive at school as emotionally neutral, blank slates. They bring with them the weight of a series of other forces that are material (e.g., substandard
housing, lack of food or clothing), relational, and symbolic in nature. For schools to be effective, they must recognize this fact in the design and enactment of learning.

Taken together, these bodies of work related to emotion, communication, and education represent both historical and emergent views about emotion and its role in our lives. Based on my desire to understand students’ and also teachers' and administrators' emotional experiences as situated within and managed by discourse, and deeply embedded within a social, historical, and cultural context, I pose the following research questions:

*Research Question 1*: How do students, teachers, and administrators co-construct understandings of and experiences with emotion?

*Research Question 2*: How do emotions shape students’ abilities to thrive at school?

*Research Question 3*: What strategies do students, teachers, and administrators use to manage emotions at school (e.g., expression, masking, channeling)?
CHAPTER TWO - METHODOLOGY

Beginning with a discussion of qualitative research, this chapter articulates my ethnographic approach, and describes the insight gathering and analysis methods employed. A reflexive metatheory is discussed as a guiding framework for the study.

Qualitative Research

The goal of qualitative research is to make the world visible in a meaningful way through the use of a variety of interpretive and material practices (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005). Key to this form of inquiry is the study of things in their natural setting, and an attempt to “make sense of, or interpret, phenomena in terms of the meanings people bring with them” (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005, p. 3). Qualitative researchers do not believe that there is an objective reality to be discovered and apprehended; rather, reality lies in its representations which can be more fully seen through a variety of methods (Flick, 2002). For this reason, qualitative researchers design studies using a wide range of interpretive practices that hold the potential for making different parts of the world visible in a variety of ways. Ongoing human action and meaning-making is difficult to capture with many methods let alone one. Hence, diverse methods and perspectives are associated with the openly defined qualitative research including participant observation, ethnography, autoethnography, ethnomethodology, narrative, case studies, critical and feminist approaches among many others (see Denzin & Lincoln, 2005). Qualitative researchers recognize that their interpretations of other people’s lives are always filtered through their unique lens, created through a culmination of language, gender, class, ethnicity, education, and other social and political qualities.
A qualitative approach is well suited to examining the nuances of people’s lives in a social scene particularly the ways in which they construct meaning, the cultural norms that influence their behaviors, their emotions and thoughts, and material experiences (Lindlof, 1995; Strauss & Corbin, 1998). Schools are particularly complex settings where a variety people and discourses meet, requiring the negotiation of meanings and social orders (Woods, 1996). Although, in recent years, the National Research Council (NRC) has created increased challenges and hurdles to qualitative researchers interested in educational contexts. The NRC initiated a scientifically based research (SBR) movement that marginalizes interpretivist-based epistemology in favor of positivist research (e.g., the use of “objective,” replicable, generalizable methods, like causal models and experiments) (Ryan & Hood, 2004). This legislation, linked to the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, devalues qualitative research failing to recognize the important contextual, political, and particular aspects of a school, or how students experience its curriculum (Bloch, 2004; for additional critiques of this movement see Lanther, 2004; Maxwell, 2004). Schools are multi-layered, complex settings in which students are increasingly bounded within a measured, standardized world. Qualitative approaches have the potential to better understand the forces that (re)create that reality, and also provide students other ways of expressing themselves and talking about their lives.

According to Denzin and Lincoln (2005), a “combination of multiple methodological practices, empirical materials, perspectives, and observers in a single study is best understood, then, as a strategy that adds rigor, breadth, complexity, richness, and depth to any inquiry” (p. 5). This conceptualization of rigor then serves as an alternative to the usual standards and language of validation (Flick, 2002). A discussion
of expectations for high quality, reflexive research will be further articulated in the next section. Rather than framing this study around a particular theory; I instead introduce a reflective/reflexive framework to guide my orientation to research.

A Reflexive Methodology

Alvesson and Skoldberg (2000) argued that qualitative researchers ought to spend more time and energy on “interpretation and reflection—in relation not only to the object of study but also to the researchers themselves and their political, ideological, metatheoretical, and linguistic context” (p. 241). Without this type of reflection, high quality interpretation is unlikely. The authors proposed that researchers often become so entrenched in a particular way of seeing whether it be through the lens of a certain theory or through ongoing allegiance to a set of methods or interpretive practices that they preclude multiple or alternative interpretations and explanations for social phenomena. Reflection, however, is a challenging process; one that encourages the researcher to investigate the multiple influences on her as a person/researcher (e.g., positionality in the world in relation to gender, race, age, class; theoretical influences such as critical theory, or language; intellectual training, experiences, etc.), and make conscious the often unconscious reasons behind our approaches to collecting data, interpretation, and forms of representation. As noted by Steedman (1991), the collection of data does not “scoop up” meaning that is lying around in some social site. Observing or seeing does not automatically give meaning to nature; rather, meaning is “produced in acts of interpretation” (p. 246). Moreover, interpretation is far from a neutral, value-free enterprise. Particular interpretive possibilities are brought about through paradigms, perspectives, and political interests; inevitably favoring certain interpretations while
suppressing others. Using a reflexive methodology calls for a break from a rigid, clearly defined reference point; a willingness to loosen in regard to theoretical consistency, widening one’s focus; and a distancing of ourselves enough from our common theories and practices to learn more about what they are not positioned to say.

Alvesson and Skoldberg (2000) advocated for a consistency at the metatheoretical level rather than the theoretical level. This level is more holistic than many of our theories that deal with specific conditions in the social sciences (e.g., the gendered and political nature of knowledge, etc.), and thus shapes the theories we choose to employ. A reflexive metatheory is intended to frame and inspire ongoing reflection (reflection focused on the researcher herself and the societal and theoretical influences on her research)—making reflexive interpretation possible. Most researchers tend to focus on one theme or dimension of reflection (e.g., seeing everything through a critical lens). A reflexive metatheory would initiate movement between a variety of philosophical ideas and empirically based elements. As stated by the authors, “the interplay between philosophical ideas and empirical work marks high-quality social research” (p. 7). It is suggested that a reflexive methodology actually involves no particular theory. Rather, a reflexive methodology is a framework that attempts to keep researchers from locking into a particular philosophical position. Alvesson and Skoldberg (2000) stated that it is a framework for “drawing attention to and mediating between various core dimensions of reflection, for initiating acts of reflection and maintaining movement between reflective themes (i.e., personal, critical, feminist, etc.). The framework gives multi-level reflective activities a certain structure and systematization. Reflection occurs when one mode of thought is confronted by another” (p. 247). A mode of reflection could be feminist
poststructuralism, critical theory, socialization theory, or any other theoretical mode of seeing/interpreting. The goal is not to necessarily mix these reflective themes together, but to move between them to create layers of possible interpretations.

Giddens (1976) wrote about the “double hermeneutic” which speaks to the interpretation of interpreting subjects. All qualitative researchers engage in this level of interpretation. A reflexive approach, however, would involve the open play of reflection across other themes adding additional interpretive possibilities. For example, then, critical themes/theories would represent a triple hermeneutic, and if a feminist poststucturalist lens was also employed, a quadruple hermeneutic. Many authors focus on being reflective on a broader, more general level, while emphasizing one reflective theme/method/level of interpretation; while, reflexive researchers engage in reflection as a mode of inquiry across multiple themes (e.g., the hermeneutic, the critical, the postmodernist, etc.) (Alvesson & Skoldberg, 2000). Each approach is valued in its own right, but one particular theme in and of itself offers far fewer interpretive possibilities than reflecting back and forth across multiple approaches. Reflective reductionism is a term the authors use to describe the limitations of an approach that privileges one way of understanding and eliminates others. This encourages researchers to always see what it is they are looking for rather than see what may be most important in the social scene and lives of participants in the study.

Engaging in reflexive research requires a breath and depth of understanding across a variety of disciplines and ways of understanding. This can be daunting, but it creates research opportunities ripe for immense creativity as new connections may be made between previously unconnected phenomena (see Koestler, 1964). It is naïve (and
undesirable) to think that researchers enter the field as blank slates, unread or influenced by particular themes. A more realistic view to engaging in this type of research is to encourage the researcher to read across a variety of fields on issues that may be related to her subject of interest. This knowledge allows the researcher to situate herself within what is already known and also make decisions about what methods may be employed while in the field. The challenge, however, is to avoid becoming entrenched in preconceived notions of what an experience should be like, or what will be most important, and sharpen one’s senses to the multiplicity of possibilities. As argued by Lindlof and Taylor (2002) “a priori theory can sensitize to what could be important, but it should not override or overshadow the meanings that the researcher discovers in the scenes being studied” (p. 215). The researcher should allow reversals of preconceived and emergent interpretations and perspectives, and entertain different positions.

Ultimately, one or more perspectives or approaches to understanding the particular social experiences and people may emerge as most rich, nuanced, or needed to enhance understanding and knowledge. Once various versions/levels of interpretations have been developed, it is perfectly fine to highlight one or two as more salient than the others. This, however, should be determined by the interpretive process, not the researcher's predetermined dispositions (Alvesson & Skoldberg, 2000).

The subject of interest for this study is the interrelationship between communication, emotion, and education. As such, I have read and reviewed research related to this issue across multiple fields and perspectives. As evidenced by my preview of potentially important literature in the preceding chapter, I am influenced by the currents of critical and feminist poststructuralist work more broadly, and organizational,
interpersonal, and instructional communication more specifically. We inevitably have
preconceptions and a body of knowledge with which we approach research; however, it is
our responsibility to then be reflexive enough about these influences to allow other
interpretative possibilities to emerge. For example, I may find that the students and the
school system position emotion as a knowledge producing resource in non-oppressive
ways delimiting the worth of an critical-emancipatory approach; perhaps momentarily
shedding my critical-intellectual luggage allows me to see positive aspects about the
ways emotion is employed that would not have been likely to emerge had I focused
primarily on the negative, oppressive structuring of schooling. Perhaps by focusing too
wholeheartedly on a feminist analysis of the gendered positioning of emotion in
education, I would be inclined to see only issues related to gender and lose sight of the
varied experiences of emotion across a variety of other qualities. Finally, by focusing
entirely on the discursive and linguistic construction of students’ identities and
experiences in schooling, I may compromise a nuanced understanding of the material and
the embodied. Every mode of interpretation has inherent strengths and weaknesses that
should be recognized (for a review of these, see Alvesson & Skoldberg, 2000). In short,
at this point, a formal guiding theory will not be articulated for this study. The goal of a
reflective/reflexive methodology is to broaden the range of possible interpretations
available in any particular study, thus broadening the knowledge that can be generated
through the study. Though I would be remiss not to mention that at my core I believe in a
socially constructed world which underpins my view of all school experiences. This is a
metatheoretical sensibility that I will never fully shed. In an effort to employ methods
that allow me to gain insight into people’s experiences and meaning-making while still
leaving open a variety of interpretive possibilities; an ethnographic approach combined with creative interviewing methods has been adopted for this study.

Do, Say, and Make Methods

Sanders and William (2002) distinguish between “do,” “say,” and “make” methods. Do methods are related to observation methods common to ethnography. These methods often yield important information related to participants’ actions, but additional methods are often needed to gain insight into emotions or motivations that influenced the behaviors. Say methods are those that draw upon verbal communication and typically take the form of traditional interviews and focus group interviews. These methods are rich sources of information to tap into the inner worlds of participants, but are limited to what people can articulate in words. While make methods are intended to “elicit creative expression” in participants, and engage them in exercises that are likely to activate memories and feelings and enable participants to better articulate their ideas (p. 145). Make methods are focused on what participants literally “make” through creative expression with ambiguous visual stimuli. Each of these types of methods will be discussed in further detail below as they relate to this study.

Do Methods

Ethnography

Ethnography, a form of inquiry often used by qualitative researchers, provides a holistic approach to understanding meaning-making within a particular culture. Ethnography emerged out of the field of anthropology and has since been adopted by a variety of fields and developed into multiple genres (for a historical treatment of ethnography from past to present, see Tedlock, 2000). Ethnographic traditions are
grounded in first-hand experience and investigation of a particular culture or social site (Atkinson, Coffey, Delamont, Lofland, & Lofland, 2001). This first-hand experience is yielded most typically through participant observation, though other methods are commonly used as well. Generally, ethnographers attempt to understand a specific social setting, including aspects of its culture, belief and social systems, behaviors, motivations, and material existence, in a meaningful way (see Hammersley, 1992; Lindlof & Taylor, 2002). Ethnographic approaches combine “research design, fieldwork, and various methods of inquiry to produce historically, politically, and personally situated accounts, descriptions, interpretations, and representations of human lives” (Tedlock, 2000, p. 455). The value of ethnography lies in its ability to capture the multiple dimensions and nuances of a culture. For communication scholars, this approach allows for the observation of naturally occurring talk, situated within the socio-cultural milieu, and the potential to observe participants’ perspectives as revealed and negotiated through interaction (see Carbaugh & Hastings, 1992; Folger & Bush, 1994; Vidich & Lyman, 2000).

**Truth and rigor.** Issues of truth and authority currently fuel discussions of ethnography (see Angrosino, 2005; Tedlock, 2000). Traditional assumptions of ethnographic research positioned ‘the truth’ as something that could be established through the cross-checking of perspectives and reports between researchers and insiders (Angrosino, 2005). This view, however, is considered somewhat limited by most contemporary ethnographers based on the increasing inclination to recognize the myriad factors (e.g., gender, class, ethnicity, socio-economic status, education, etc.) that prevent consensus and enliven multiple possible interpretations of a social setting. Hence, a
monolithic claim to the Truth should not be sought by any ethnographer (Marcus, 1997). However, the careful explication of potential explanations and truths are honored, without one particular claim being privileged. Moreover, in the process of explicating such truths, member-checking can be a viable means for assessing the plausibility of particular representations. I engaged in "playback conversations" (Tompkins, 1994) with participants to engage in perception checking on numerous occasions throughout my project to deepen my understanding of what I was hearing, observing, and interpreting.

As noted by Hayward (1987), the human observer, whether in everyday life or specific research, is always present and always influential; hence, the “myth of detachment” as a researcher or person is just that—myth (p. 168). No presentation of material is unbiased (During, 1999), which points to the importance of owning that bias so that it can be accounted for and taken into consideration when evaluating information. These realizations allow us space to honor how and why multiple truths can and do exist. It helps us understand why there can be many different interpretations of an event and they all can be true (Rosaldo, 1993).

While multiple interpretations of a social setting are possible through qualitative research, conceptions of rigor should not be abandoned. Popay, Rogers, and Williams (1998) argue that in qualitative endeavors the movement of the researcher from a framing of the data to quotation and analysis, should be clearly described and established through logical methods grounded in bodies of knowledge and participants voices. Researchers should illuminate the subjective meaning, contexts, and actions of those being investigated; describe the researcher's involvement in the social scene; and situate participants' voices within current literature. As such, analyses of discourse collected
through this project should be rigorously compared to and grounded in quotations from participants, and direct observations of participants in action. Moreover, in addition to providing sound evidence to support my interpretation, it should be positioned as one possible interpretation among many of the texts (Lieblich, Tuval-Mashiach, & Ziber, 1998). In an effort to deeply reflect on my position in the social scene, I describe my role in the research process later in this chapter.

Hammersley (1992) proposes that qualitative accounts should be examined for relevance, which asks if and how an account contributes to a field theoretically, methodologically, or through social policy. When examining the account created in and through this project, it should expand scholarly understandings of emotion and its positioning in education, should have executed rigorous yet unique methods to yield insightful information about students’ experiences, and should provide insight into the improvement of pedagogy and, ultimately, students’ emotional journeys through school. In short, the findings should be “useful” (see Mishler, 1990). Finally, the account created through this project should coherently engage with previous research and current findings to create a meaningful picture of the participants’ experiences, and offer some sense of innovation or originality in the presentation of the analysis (Lieblich, Tuval-Mashiach, & Ziber, 1998; Riessman, 1993).

Self as Researcher

Koch and Harrington (1998) encourage reflexivity both in terms of self-critique and self-awareness on the part of the researcher, and promote the acknowledgement of how our experiences have influenced various stages of the research process. When thoughtfully interrogated, researchers can effectively draw upon past experiences and
knowledge to illuminate meaning in their research (Schutz, 1994). My past experiences of conducting research in schools aided in the interpretation of observations, the crafting of interview protocols, the building of rapport with students and teachers, and made me aware of some of the challenges of doing research in a school setting (e.g., rigid schedules, parental permission for student participation, teacher suspicion and mistrust of the researcher).

As Hand (2003) argues, reflexivity should not be engaged in at the start or finish of a project, but should be exercised at every stage of the research process. This should involve not only personal, critical reflection, but also reflection on the broader context in which the research site and participants exist (Hand, 2003; Mauthner & Doucet, 2003). Situational and social worlds/arenas mapping was employed to enhance my understanding of the various influences on and actors in the research scene, and to bring into focus the broader context in which participants exist (see Clarke, 2005). Engaging in mapping enabled me to be more reflexive about my role as the researcher and more reflexive about the research site in particular. This mapping process helped me envision the presentation of results as it encouraged me to think more holistically about students’ experiences and multiple roles in different contexts.

Mapping also helped me on a personal level because it allowed me to see that my schooling experiences were similar to some of the students I would be interviewing as their school and community were comparable to the high school I attended. It also allowed me to see that I was part of a higher socio-economic status than many of the students I encountered in my study. Finally, and perhaps most importantly, I reflected deeply on my upbringing and how it influenced how I encountered my high school
education. I came from a two-parent family in which the value of education was stressed. My parents helped me with homework, attended school events, and encouraged me to earn strong grades. My home life was safe, nurturing, and stable and provided for my social and material needs. While I was a shy high school student, I had a core group of friends who remained consistent throughout my four years. Participating in sports and school clubs enabled me to meet more people and built self-confidence. I had a relatively positive experience in high school, though I experienced tension over the injustices of peers' experiences (e.g., being bullied), and frustration over the lack of tolerance for otherness. These experience defined who I was as a high school student, but also who I am today. Self-awareness and situational awareness are key components of engaging in reflexivity; also important is reflexivity on the level of epistemology.

Epistemological reflexivity calls upon researchers to reflect their assumptions about reality and knowledge, and implicate these assumptions in one's findings (Dowling, 2006). Horsburgh (2003) recognizes that the researcher is deeply involved in the process and product of research making it crucial to be aware of how the choices made defined and limited what could be "found" (Dowling, 2006). Making transparent the political and social constructions of the process infuses honesty and adds a level of validity to ethnographic research (Fontana, 2004). I sought to engage in this reflexivity by articulating my theoretical sensibilities in chapter one.

Finally, reflecting on the embodied experience of completing this study bears mention. Conquergood (1991) argues that ethnography is an embodied practice yet most ethnographies favor "abstracted theory and analysis" (p. 181) over acknowledgment of the body's role in how we come to know. I was keenly aware of my body while in the
field as I was pregnant with my first child. Being pregnant while conducting my research impacted me relationally, physiologically, and intellectually. I began my research before I was noticeably pregnant, and perceived that when it became obvious that I was expecting more people made an effort or found an opportunity to strike up a conversation with me. I was frequently asked questions about my body (i.e., how I was feeling, if I was comfortable), many people told me stories of their own, friends', or family members' pregnancies, and teachers who perhaps viewed me as a young researcher began speaking to me as a friend and positioned themselves as information mavens on pregnancy and child-rearing. Physiologically pregnancy impacted my interactions with participants as I, during my early months of observation, was quite ill. Teachers often took on caring roles to ensure that I was comfortable; they offered home remedies and suggestions for easing sickness, and even brought snacks and drinks to the office area where I conducted interviews. I felt as though my physiological "weakness" of being sick warmed them to me as it was easier to relate to me as a fallible person rather than one who was perfectly polished and poised. Pregnancy also made me more attuned to emotion as a knowledge producing resource. This new stage of my life evoked new ranges of emotions and encouraged me to more deeply reflect on the relationships between parents and children, and emotion as an insightful co-pilot in my life guiding my decision making. I often contemplated the consequential influence parents have on a child's emotional well-being beginning with how a baby is cared for in the womb. This revelation was revisited multiple times spurred by comments from participants. For example, one special education teacher told me "I have a job because people are bad parents" referring to the number of students who are developmentally delayed due to poor prenatal and/or
postnatal care. Ethnographic methods, truth and rigor in research, and my ‘self’ as a researcher have been discussed. Next, the particular ethnographic scene on which this study is based is discussed.

**Ethnographic Scene, Discourse Collection, & Analysis**

An ethnographic approach was selected for this study based on its ability to yield important insights into the practices and patterns of a school culture, and the cultural and social belief and behavior systems that influence students’ emotions, communication styles, and experiences with schooling. The relationships between social and material structures of schooling can also be examined. Ethnography provides a holistic approach, one that has the greatest potential to capture the ways in which various discourses and experiences intersect and influence one another. Contextualizing students’ experiences within their broader schooling experiences is important for opening the possibility of advancing particular claims related to emotion, communication, and education.

**The Ethnographic Scene**

New Haven High School, located in a small city in the North Central United States, served as the field site for this study. New Haven High School houses 9th through 12th grades and has a total enrollment of 1007 students, and employs 62 teachers. The student body is primarily Caucasian (96%), but has Multiracial (2%), Black (1%), Hispanic (<1%), Asian Pacific/Pacific Islander (<1%), and American Indian/Alaskan Native (<1%) ethnicities represented (U.S. Department of Education, 2006). According to the school’s website, the class of 2002 pursued the following goals after graduation: 78 percent pursued an advanced education; 57 percent entered a baccalaureate program; 31 percent enrolled in technical education; and 7 percent entered the military” (NHHS
NHHS had undergone a series of changes prior to my arrival. The principal had been in his position for one year, the assistant principal position was eliminated along with a guidance counselor, school psychologist, and a number of teaching positions from lack of funding. Due to the inability to pass a school levy in the community, a number of other budget cuts had taken effect: the elimination of bus transportation for students to and from school and a pay for play policy requiring students to pay two hundred dollars per sport to participate. There were four new teachers hired who were starting their first year of teaching when I began my observations. The average years of service for New Haven teachers was fifteen years (NHHS Website, 2008).

Discourse Collection

For this study, I began by immersing myself in the scene through observations for one month. After this period, along with observation, I began conducting in-depth
interviews with students, which included the creation and explanation of a collage about
their school experiences and related emotions. Simultaneously, teachers and
administrators were interviewed to understand how students' experiences were co-
constructed with others. In the following sections, I detail the negotiation of access to the
site, and my approach to the *do* methods of participant observation and the use of
fieldnotes. The approach to interviewing will be discussed in the *say* methods section.

*Organizational access.* Ethnographers are faced with the daunting task of
negotiating access to a field site. Access must be granted by key gatekeepers of the
organization and/or group to conduct your research (Lindlof & Taylor, 2002). By
presenting a strong rationale for her research goals, including the practical value of the
knowledge obtained, the potential contribution to the organization itself as well as the
“social good of research,” a researcher enhances her chances of gaining access (Lindlof,
1995, p. 111). Once access is granted, there is no guarantee, however, that organizational
members will cooperate. In the past, I have used the strategy of expressing a desire to
understand an individual’s experience or expertise to broaden participation to a wider
range of stakeholders (see Lindlof & Taylor, 2002).

When negotiating access, I took great care in presenting myself as a competent,
trustworthy, friendly person to ensure that the organizational members felt comfortable
allowing me to spend time with them. Moreover, I ensured that my research proposal
clearly articulated the focus of my project, my respect for and desire to honor the
practices and values of the school while conducting my research, and my qualifications.
To begin negotiating access for the present study, I sent a letter to the high school’s
superintendent detailing my interest in conducting my dissertation research in his school
district. The superintendent was interested in the project proposal, and presented it to the Board of Education who all indicated their willingness to support the project. The superintendent and I communicated via e-mail and telephone to set up a meeting with the Board of Education to further discuss the project and discuss ways to make it a successful and meaningful endeavor for all stakeholders. Lindlof & Taylor (2002) note that this method of seeking acceptance (i.e., flowing from the top down) is the most effective method for ensuring cooperation from key members of the organization (namely the administrators, principal, assistant principal, teachers, and ultimately students).

At the Board of Education meeting, I presented a prepared speech stating the focus of the study, my goals, methods, and qualifications. I presented each member with a written overview of my project, and a copy of my curriculum vitae. I fielded questions from the members about confidentiality and reporting of information once the project was complete. The Board unanimously supported the project under the condition that I undergo a background check and follow reporting procedures of teachers and other staff in regard to student disclosure. I agreed to do so which requires me to share information with a school psychologist or principal if a student discloses instances of abuse, engagement in illegal behavior, or thoughts of suicide. Agreeing to this may have markedly changed the nature of the information students were likely to share with me.

Participant observation. Participant observation refers to a common ethnographic practice in which the researcher immerses herself into the social setting of interest for a period of time. The goal of the participant observer is to “investigate, experience, and represent the social life and social processes” of the actors in the setting (Emerson, Fretz, & Shaw, 2001, p. 352). The participant observer often engages in a delicate dance
between various social actors and goals, assuming a position in an almost liminal space often filled with contradictions and dilemmas (e.g. Adams, 1999). Researchers are quite literally, “bodies in the field” (Conquergood, 1991), carrying with them senses and bias that influence their perceptions. Thus, an ethical and reflective researcher constantly works to recognize how her instincts influence her interpretations, and also remains open to evidence that challenges or weakens existing assumptions (Lindlof & Taylor, 2002). The researcher takes notes throughout her immersion in the field, culminating in a detailed account, sometimes referred to as a “thick description” (see Geertz, 1973) of the ethnographic scene.

Though participant observation is considered a primary method of ethnographic research, the role of the researcher in these observations may take different forms. Gold (1958) proposed four typologies to describe these roles: complete participant, participant-as-observer, observer-as-participant, and complete observer. These typologies were later modified by Adler and Adler (1987) to three conceptualizations known as peripheral-member, active-member, and complete-member. As a peripheral-member, the researcher can develop an insider’s view without engaging in the core practices of the members of the group. As an active-member, the researcher becomes involved in the core activities of the group and might even assume some responsibilities within the site; however, the researcher does not necessarily identify with or obligate herself to the values and goals of the group. The third role that may be assumed is the complete-member in which the researcher studies a setting in which she is already a member or has become accepted as a complete-member during the observation process. At the beginning of my research, I assumed the role of a peripheral member trying blend in and be a "fly on wall."
Throughout my time, however, my role changed to be active member in certain realms; for example, I went to lunches with teachers, helped proctor an exam, and answered questions when students needed directed toward resources and I happened to be present. Jackson (1990) noted that the "ethnographer strives to achieve a precarious, liminal balance between being an insider and an outsider" (p. 14). Striving to achieve this balance made me keenly aware of my surroundings and interactions with others.

I immersed myself in the settings through observation over the course of eight months in the school and at school related functions (i.e., in classes, assemblies, extra-curricular activities, in the cafeteria, the hallways, offices). I began observing from the first day of school in August and continued observing through March though I observed significantly less in the months of February and March. I logged over 400 hours of observation during my study.

Although merely being present in the research site alters its qualities to some degree, the peripheral-member role is the least intrusive in nature. I selected this role based on my desire to reduce disruption in the learning processes of the students or the naturally occurring talk, routines, and practices of the school, but this role evolved into a more active-member role as I became comfortable with some of the teachers and they with me.

Field observations were the first step to understanding students’ experiences at and related to school. Without spending time within the actual school, witnessing students’ talk and action, it would be difficult to understand their meaning-making and understand the social and situational structures in which they exist (Eder & Fingerson, 2002). These are important issues that can greatly inform the design and enactment of
interviews. Being present in the field also allows the researcher to build a rapport with students and increase their trust, before asking them to participate in interviews. Observations continued until a saturation point (i.e., reoccurring themes were evident in the discourse, no new themes were emerging) was perceived (Adler & Adler, 1998).

Fieldnotes. The process of writing fieldnotes is central to ethnography and participant observation (Emerson et al., 2001). Fieldnotes form records of the social action researchers observe while in the field, and thus must be impeccable in quality. During participant observation, the researcher attempts to record descriptions and reflections on the social actors involved (who), what they are doing, where they are doing it, when they are doing it, and how (Lindlof & Taylor, 2002). Fieldnotes are intended to provide a constantly emerging account of lived and observed experiences in the field that will influence the unfolding of the project and be subjected to further analysis in later stages. As noted by Lindlof and Taylor (2002), the researcher must be patient recognizing that her understanding of the scene is developed through the gradual culmination of a variety of details about communicative practices and events.

Fieldnotes can take a variety of forms in both purpose and detail. The most simple version, scratch notes, are brief records that are hastily written down within the social scene. Scratchnotes contain anything that may strike the researcher as potentially important including participants actions, statements, descriptions of conversations, material objects, and/or events (Sanjek, 1990b). I recorded scratchnotes in the hallway or at social events when I did not want to be obvious that I was observing and recording information. These notes were expanded upon at a later time. Headnotes, on the other hand, are typically recorded outside of the social scene, and involve the writing down of
events or any other memories along with reflections on their impressions of the specific incidents as well as the project as a whole (Lindlof & Taylor, 2002). I recorded headnotes at the end of each day to capture overarching reflections and impressions of the scene. Fieldnotes create an unfolding, chronological account of the researcher's involvement in the field, and provides a significant supply of recorded communicative events and contextual descriptions. Fieldnotes preserve descriptions that could be easily lost from memory and provide evidence for the researcher's eventual claims and perceptions. Over the course of my study, I recorded over 700 single-spaced pages of fieldnotes documenting my observations and reflections.

Descriptive fieldnotes are intended to be very “raw” descriptions of the social scene, actors, and actions, stating exactly what was observed with meticulous detail and careful choice of language (Lindlof & Taylor, 2002). The challenge of the ethnographer is to mold, reorder, and expand their fieldnotes into a coherent and meaningful form that can be presented in a more formal text (Emerson et al., 2001). Fieldnotes often contain highly compelling and descriptive accounts that become even more meaningful when combined with theoretical and practical articulations of their significance (Clandinin & Connelly, 1998).

Say Methods

Interviewing

Interviewing is often employed by ethnographers in conjunction with observations. Ethnographic interviews offer the potential to “fill in” meanings behind observed interactions (Warren, 2002), and allow the participants an opportunity to explain their actions from their own perspective. Additionally, in-depth interviews also
offer a temporal range not always possible through observation alone (i.e., participants make connections between past, present, and the future) (Warren, 2002). In-depth interviews are often drawn upon to gather very personal information about a participant’s experiences, views of self, and sense-making about decisions and actions (Johnson, 2002). A variety of topics that are important to youths' lives often are not likely to be observed in daily conversations with peers and teachers, but could be discussed in the privacy of an interview (Eder & Fingerson, 2002). The goal of the interview is to unveil how social actors make meaning in unique ways. The interview situation itself represents a “site of meaning construction that emerges out of the interaction” between the interviewer and interviewee (Heyl, 2001, p. 179). A combination of observation and interviewing should allow the researcher to learn about the communicative norms of the youth being studied (Eder & Fingerson, 2002). Discourse familiar to the youth should be used when conversing with them during the interview (Briggs, 1986).

It is especially important to recognize the perspectives and identities the researcher and interviewee bring to the interview experience. Each speaks to the other from a perspective embedded within situated and historically developed hierarchies of society related to gender, race, class (Campbell, 1998), and particularly acute for this study, age (Graue & Walsh, 1998). Essentially then, these social positions are present in the interaction between interviewer and interviewee. Importantly, Mishler (1986) contends that interviewers must share power with their interviewees to gain insight into the events and experiences of the other.

Historically, Tierney and Dilley (2002) note, teachers have been considered the respondent of choice in education research interviews, and students have been overlooked
as capable participants in research interviews. Eder and Fingerson (2002) assert that children and adolescents should be granted the opportunity to “give voice to their own and others’ interpretations and thoughts rather than solely rely on adult interpretations of their lives” (p. 181). Mayall (1999) goes as far to argue that youth could be considered “a minority group compared to adults who order and control their lives” (p. 182) as they are often seen as subordinate to the more developed “adult.” Children and youth grow up with adults, including parents, relatives, teachers, etcetera, all commanding their behaviors (Caputo, 1995). They are taught “to listen to, respect, and obey adults” (Eder & Fingerson, 2002, p. 182). This social positioning has important implications for power dynamics that are present in the interview, dynamics of which an adult interviewer must be especially cognizant. The interviewer runs the risk of being viewed as teacher-like or yet another adult to obey and listen to. Hence, the interviewer must avoid behaviors or the creation of moments that remind the interviewee of being in a classroom, or being controlled.

Tammivaara & Enright (1986) suggest that power dynamics can be diminished if the interviewer avoids initiating all of the discussion during the interview. Empowering youth to initiate comments or topics allows youth to speak about issues that are most salient to them and validates them as knowledgeable participants, while enriching the authenticity of the data. Focus group interviews are advocated as one way to further diffuse power differentials, as youth outnumber the “adult,” and focus groups place them within a peer culture in which they may feel more comfortable (Simmons, Eder, & Evans, 1992). By using both individual and focus group interviews, the researcher can
understand how students’ responses may change across each and how responses may be mediated by peer influences (see Fingerson, 1999).

When creating the interview protocol, the researcher must remember that youth are used to being part of classrooms in which teachers pose questions with “known-answers” (Tammivaara & Enright, 1986), or questions in which the teacher has a particular correct answer in mind. Then, when students are asked questions in an interview setting they may seek to say what they feel is expected of them or most acceptable rather than what they may genuinely think. According to Larkin (1979) interviews should tap into students own reality rather than the researchers; thus, the students should not feel that they have to shove their experiences and ideas into the researchers pre-determined, structured categories. To encourage students to take the lead in talking about their experiences, they were engaged in a sensitizing collage mapping activity which will be discussed in detail in the make methods section.

In interviews, students were asked to create a collage about their schooling experiences and related emotions using a mapping technique intended to enable participants to reflect upon their schooling experience, recall critical incident/memorable emotional triggers in their educational experience and identity formation as a ‘learner,’ and make connections between ideas in a way that enables them to better articulate their experiences (this component is described in detail below). This collage served as an initial catalyst for our conversation (encouraging participant reflexivity) and illuminated key emotions related to learning and captured part of the trajectory of students’ experiences over time. Graham (1997) employed a somewhat similar method in her study of key turning points and commitment in post-divorce relationships. The use of mapping
provided insightful information on participant interpretations of their experiences and a visually revealing ‘story’ of participants’ experiences. Saarni (2000) encourages us to use the metaphor of the ‘map’ to understand how our emotional experiences “link up with one another in a variety of direct or circuitous ways” (p. 309). These maps allow us to see continuity of and context for our behaviors and beliefs related to emotions. This is important in interpreting why we act and feel the way we do, and highlights that our emotional experiences are deeply intertwined with our relationships. Even very young children recognize that emotional reactions are triggered by the current situation, but exist in the context of history and time (see Harris, 2000).

Follow up questions (which varied among students depending on what they shared through their collage/mapping) and broader questions related to students’ perceptions of their peer/teacher/family/schooling experiences will be posed during and following the explanation of their map/collage. A protocol of interview questions are offered in Appendix A and copies of informed consent forms in Appendix B. These questions provided a guiding framework, but shifted in response to the responses of participants. Demographic information was also collected and analyzed. Students from various grade levels (9th-12th) and backgrounds were observed and invited to be interviewed. After observing in a class I would announce that I was conducting a study to better understand how emotion and communication impact their school experiences, and would like to interview students to gain their perspectives. Then, I distributed a sheet to each student and asked that they record their name, indicate that either they would or would not like to participate, and then provide their contact information if they would like to do an interview. These students were then contacted and came to participate in
their interviews during study halls. Throughout the process, I also randomly requested the names of students in various grades and their student schedules to invite students to participate from grades or a gender that was underrepresented. Teachers and administrators were also interviewed to deepen my understanding of the co-construction of experiences in schooling. I approached teachers during their planning period to ask if they would be interested in participating. Finally, administrators (a term loosely used to described district support faculty and actual administrators in an effort to protect identities) who frequently interacted with students were invited to participate.

I conducted a total of 42 in-depth interviews. The transcripts from these interviews culminated in over 870 single-spaced pages. Twenty-four interviews were conducted with students. Each interview session began with the student creating his/her collage. Students spent on average 50 minutes creating their collage. Not counting the time participants spent creating their collages, interviews lasted, on average, one hour and twenty minutes. Interviews ranged in length from 35 minutes to four hours. Student interviewees were selected from each grade level including 9th \((n=4)\), 10th \((n=4)\), 11th \((n=6)\), and 12th \((n=11)\) grades. Ten males and seventeen females were interviewed. A total of eleven teachers were interviewed with interviews averaging one hour and 40 minutes in length. Interviews ranged from 30 minutes to three and a half hours. Six females and five males participated in interviews from a variety of subject areas. Finally, four administrators were interviewed. These interviews lasted on average one hour and 30 minutes and ranged from 50 minutes to two hours and thirty minutes. The gender of the participants will not be revealed to ensure confidentiality. Teachers and
administrators were not asked to create collages due to time constraints on their schedules.

**Narrative Inquiry**

Due to the student driven nature of the interviews, oftentimes students’ explanations of their collages took narrative form. Given this occurrence, key issues related to narrative understanding are highlighted here. Lieblich, Tuvel-Mashiach, and Zilber (1998) argue that stories construct and transmit important information about individual and cultural meanings: “People are meaning-generating organisms; they construct their identities and self-narratives from building blocks available in their common culture, above and beyond their individual experience” (p. 9). Narrative, then, provides a meaning centered, contextually situated, approach to understanding students’ experiences through the construction of their stories, and also provides information about the ways in which discourses of emotion are created, negotiated, and reproduced or resisted. Because people are storytellers by their very nature (Lieblich et al., 1998), stories provide a way to coherently organize one’s experience and create a sense of continuity across defining emotional experiences that occurred across time and space. Importantly, in and through the telling, modification, and reaffirmation of stories, people have the power to craft their lives (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000). Children learn early on the function and power of narrative as they begin to listen to and tell stories (Engel, 1995). Thus, even the very young are skilled at making sense of their worlds through stories. As argued by Ryan (2008) narrative has the ability to capture the complexity of young people's worlds saying "the often contradictory influences of family, religion, and
social, and cultural, and economic discourses are deeply inscribed in their practices and talk" (p. 217).

A narrative approach to studying emotion and discourse, allows one to also examine key narrative problematics related to living that sometimes remain unexamined or articulated. Harter, Japp, & Beck (2005) articulate the following key problematics as understood through their sensibilities which I believe can serve to illuminate the complexity of students' emotional lives and identities as learners: knowing and being (i.e., through narrating, knowledge of self and others in constituted; narrative is a source of self-discovery and creation, a creator of subjectivity possibilities, points to gaps and silences in stories and the potential for heteroglossia), creativity and constraint (i.e., the struggle between the individual and the group, the role of ‘public mindsets’ in shaping the way things are done in the world, how the personal is political, narratives are contested terrain, the role of counternarratives and deviance), continuity and disruption (i.e., narrative as emplotment, the tension between human desire for coherence and the disruption, the transformative power of metaphors and narratives), the partial and indeterminate (i.e., storytelling is highly contextual, is based on shifting knowledge, and draws upon events, spatial setting, and time).

Narrative inquiry holds the potential to reveal the temporal nature of experience (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000). Harris (2000) noted that a narrative format for understanding emotion can help children and adolescents connect and organize emotional episodes in a way that allows the person to grasp the significance of the present episode, and also past episodes. To fully understand the organization of schools and students experiences within them, one must be able to contextualize those experiences in past
experiences and the longer, historical narrative of schooling and emotion. Narrative also allows us to story actual and possible worlds and identities (Bruner, 1986; Brockmeier & Harre, 1997). Tellers have the capacity to enlarge possible story lines and possibilities for alternative identities (see Freeman, 2001; Riessman, 1993). Narrative holds the potential to enable students to story themselves across the past, present, and into the future. Make methods also encourage the exploration of experience in relation to the world and visioning for the future.

Make Methods

Creativity and Generative Tools

Qualitative researchers have been described as bricoleurs, drawing on available methods, aesthetics, and materials to piece together an interpretation (Becker, 1998; see also Levi-Strauss, 1966). In this study, I asked the participants to become bricoleurs by producing a collage, with given materials, representing their complex lives in relation to schooling and emotion. According to Bohm (1998), all people are creative, although many are not in the habit of exercising that creativity.

In a desire to tap into creativity and imagination in her field, design and market research, Sanders (see Ivey & Sanders, 2006; Sanders, 1992, 1999, 2000; Sanders & William, 2002; Stappers & Sanders, 2003), a researcher originally trained in anthropology and psychology, began experimenting with the development of “generative tools,” which basically involved giving participants materials to create artifacts that expressed “aspects of their life, their worries, and joys, etc.” (Stappers & Sanders, 2003, p. 77). The participants were then invited to share an explanation of their artifact individually or in groups. Traditional methods employed in her field in the early 1980s
and 1990s (e.g., individual and focus group interviews, questionnaires) proved inadequate for fully illuminating the experiences of people including their emotions, needs, desires. Moreover, imagination was not stimulated, leaving researchers at a loss for designing into the future. Sanders (2000) articulates the purpose of using generative tools:

They take advantage of the visual ways we have of sensing, knowing, remembering, and expressing. The tools give access and expression to the emotional side of experience and acknowledge the subjective perspective. They reveal the unique personal histories people have that contribute to the content and quality of their experiences (p. 10).

Essentially, these tools generated the possibility for learning about people’s experiences more deeply. The stimuli provided by generative tools (e.g., images, words, objects) are intended to be ambiguous so that participants have the freedom to make meaning out of them as they feel driven (Bruner, 1990). Through the narrative the participants tell about their artifact, they can “fill in” what is unsaid about the representation based on their experiences and imagination (McCloud, 1994). Sanders and Williams (2002) describe the stimuli given to the participants:

Being ambiguous, these stimuli can be interpreted in different ways, and can activate different memories and feelings in different people. The visual nature liberates people’s creativity from the boundaries of what they can state in words. Together, the ambiguity and the visual nature of these tools allow people much room for creativity, both in expressing their current experiences and ideas and in generating new ideas (p. 147).
Graue and Walsh (1998) argue that most discussions of qualitative research focus on the researcher as the primary instrument of the research (and rightfully so), but often overlook other “instruments” that could be valuable to generating useful information. They argue that the “creative use of instruments is particularly appropriate” (p. 121) when working with young people because it provides opportunities to overcome distance between the researcher and the participants, and assist the participants in describing their experiences. A high quality instrument does not limit the description that interviewee could make, but rather makes it easier for the interviewee to conceptualize the questions/issues and articulate their own narrative.

According to Root-Bernstein and Root-Bernstein (1999), creative thinking is manifest in emotions, intuitions, images, bodily feelings which can be translated into formal communication. Creative acts involve a process referred to as bisociation, which is the bringing together and combining of previously unrelated ideas (Koestler, 1964). Bisociation involves making completely new connections, while the commonly used term association refers to already established connections among ideas (Sanders & Williams, 2002). A deep involvement in a problem or situation over a period of time is necessary for bisociation to occur (Koestler, 1964). Finally, Koestler highlights that dreaming also plays an important role as it often involves bisociation at an unconscious level.

Greene (1995) argues that students should be given more creative experiences and exposure to the arts in an effort to release their imaginations in new ways. She argues that through creative activity, imagination can be tapped into and used to break down the taken-for-granted and imagine new possibilities for understanding the present and crafting the future. Dewey (1934/1980), too, argued that aesthetic experiences have the
potential to heighten imagination, insight, and shape meaningful interaction. Artful experiences can create knowledge not usually generated through traditionally rational forms of experience (Harter et al., 2006). Recognizing that emotions are often illusive experiences in and of themselves, creative techniques can be employed to enhance the possibility of participants articulating their experiences and engaging in meaning-making about them. Other scholars have used elicitation techniques including verbal, written, and visual to spur memories or enable participants to make associations (see Harper, 2005).

_A Generative Approach to Experience and Expression_

Sanders and William (2002) argue that research in their field (market/design) so narrowly defines the role of those they design for, that the customer is not able to contribute creatively to the process. Similarly, we often clearly delimit the role of those we seek to study, even if inadvertently, by the way we construct interview protocols, etc. To fuel people’s creativity, Sanders and William (2002) suggest the following four-step framework: (1) immersion, (2) activation of feelings and memories, (3) dreaming, (4) bisociation and expression. The bisociation and expression step takes place during an actual meeting or interview. During this step, the participant creates an artifact and explains its significance to the researcher.

_Sensitizing and immersion._ The immersion step involves the participant documenting in some form their “thoughts, feelings, and ideas about the experience being investigated” (p. 147), in this case, experiences and emotions related to schooling. This process lasts anywhere from one week to several, and takes place in the comfort of the participants' usual surroundings. Immersion tools are intended to be used prior to the main session to encourage participants to reflect on issues related to those that will be
discussed in the meeting and reflect on their own experiences in relation to those issues. Immersion tools range widely and may include such things as workbooks containing daily questions to be answered by the participant over the week(s) before the meeting; hands-on exercises; diaries in which people are asked to become attuned to taken for granted activities; day-in-the-life exercises in which people outline their typical day and may be asked to speak to specific aspects of it and their related emotions; send a camera home with which participants document aspects of their lives, and add descriptions to the images. These methods are intended to begin activating memories and feelings, preparing the participant for bisociation and expression. In this study, students were simply told generally what the study was about and asked to reflect on the most common emotions they experience at school, what their typical day is like at school, and the things that influence their emotions at school the most (e.g., teachers, tests, friends) prior to coming to the collage making session. Certainly, the sensitizing and immersion processes could have been deepened to further intensify participants' reflection.

**Collaging/Mapping.** The selection of a specific generative technique (used during the actual in-person meeting/interview) depends upon the goals of the researcher, and more than one may be used in any one session. Collaging is a technique well suited to eliciting memories and tapping into emotional experiences and responses (Stappers & Sanders, 2005). Other techniques like modeling, charting, and cognitive mapping are better suited for physically building models of ideas; understanding patterns and processes of a system; or dealing with abstract issues, respectively (Sanders & William, 2002; Sleeswijk Visser et al., 2005). For this study, collaging was used during the generative session due to its potential for enabling participants to connect with and
articulate emotional experiences related to schooling. Moreover, collages prime people for and encourage them to tell stories (Sanders & Williams, 2002). The collage took the form of a large blank posterboard with an arrow running directly through the middle representing time. Originally students were given instructions to place the images farthest to the left that represent their earliest experiences they choose to present, and those towards the right move closer temporally to the present moment. However, this seemed daunting to many participants so I decided to leave the instructions more open, not pressuring them to represent their experiences over time. Happy faces adorned the top of the posterboards (above the arrow) to indicate that positive emotional experiences should be placed at the top, and sad faces adorned the bottom to indicate that negative experiences should be located at the bottom. Moreover, mixed emotional experiences could be placed on the line or in the middle of the board. See Appendix C for an example of the collage canvas. Outside of those instructions, the participants were free to create their collage in any way they saw fit. They were given a version of the instructions that other researchers have found successful for enabling creativity and expression—“Use these components to express how you feel about the experience of xxxxxxx. You can do whatever you want, as long as it makes sense to you” (Sanders, 2000, p. 8). For my study, the participants were given the following instructions on a sheet of paper:

I would like for you to create a collage you can use to talk about your experiences related to school. Focus on experiences that evoke emotions in you (for example, excitement, boredom, frustration, satisfaction, anxiety, etc.). You may talk about things that happen outside of this building, including your home and social life, that impact how you feel at school. You may use as many or as few of the
materials I have given you. Do whatever makes the most sense to you. You may also add words or draw pictures of your own if there are things you wish to express and you do not see them represented.

**Creating and piloting toolkits.** Toolkits, or the collection of stimuli given to the participant to place on the canvas, are tailored to the topic of study; in the case of this study, students’ experiences and emotion related to schooling. A large set of images and words should be brainstormed, and eventually narrowed down through pilot testing and analysis for redundancies. The help of others should be solicited in the brainstorming session to ensure a variety of words and images emerge. The toolkit used for the actual research project should be reduced to no more than 150 words and images combined (Sanders & William, 2002; Sleeswijk Visser et al., 2005). Leaving the images or options too open may leave the participant overwhelmed and debilitated rather than enabled (see Sleeswijk Visser et al., 2005). Of course, participants always have the option of expanding the kit during their active session through the use of blank stickers/sheets, and pens if they do not see a word or image they need to construct their visual representation. To view the toolkit used for this study see Appendix D.

Sleeswijk Visser, Stappers, Van der Lugt, and Sanders (2005) provide the following suggestions for creating the “toolkit” of images and words: they should be open to multiple interpretations; the image content should be diverse (e.g., nature, people, interactions, objects, fantasy, animals) and represent multiple contexts (e.g., work, home, school, vacations, emotions, thoughts); the numbers of positive and negative images and words, and concrete and abstract should be balanced; people in the images should be of different ages, genders, and races; and the style of the images should vary in color and
design (see page 131). Images should be more evocative than obvious. Moreover, words and images that span a range of emotions and experiences broader than those expected of a particular experience should be used (Sanders & William, 2002).

Pilot testing involves inviting people who can represent the future participants (e.g., high school students) to test the quality of the toolkit. The researcher should offer the instructions to the pilot participant and ask them to complete the task. Areas of confusion in instructions should be noted and clarified, and the researcher should pay careful attention to the amount of time each participant spends completing the task to approximate time conditions for the actual study. While the participant is completing the task, you may ask them what they are thinking, if they see redundancies, or weaknesses (e.g., the lack of an image or word to express particular feelings, experiences, or ideas). Asking them while they are completing the task may prolong the process (which should be accounted for in timing), but will allow you to gain insight into how they are encountering the task while it is fresh. Asking immediately after the task is complete will alter the time estimation the least, but may offer different insight into the process as a whole. Toolkit stimuli should be refined based on the feedback received, and then produced. Prior to beginning the study, the toolkit I created was pilot-tested with three high school students who provided feedback on the process. Based on their suggestions I refined the words and images included.

*Generative process.* People who expressed interest in participating in the study were asked to start the process of immersion one week before their generative session/interview. The generative session was an in-person meeting during which the students created their actual collage and explained as well as answered additional
questions and probes related to their experiences with school and emotion. Sanders (2006) articulated the currents of design research indicating growing interests in emotion, and approaches to design that don’t reinforce, but open possibilities. The collaging approach allows the student to be able to talk about what is most important to them about their experiences, and they are not limited by my preconceived notions. Once the session was complete, a digital photo was taken of the student’s collage, and the recording of their explanation of the collage and our unfolding interview was transcribed (see Appendix E to view samples of the student collages created). The interviews were analyzed in conjunction with fieldnotes and organizational artifacts.

**Analysis of Discourse**

A reflexive methodology is most focused on the processes of interpretation and reflection. The analysis was an intellectually challenging process given the multifaceted ways in which the discourses could be interpreted based on the lens of each theory. Reflexive methodology does not have a devoted allegiance to a particular analysis technique beyond rigorous interpretive efforts across reflection themes (i.e., particular theories and perspectives); however, I would argue that in analyzing the discourse according to each reflective theme one is inclined to highlight particularly compelling quotes, incidents, or images, make notes of perceived themes and nuances, and group passages together in some meaningful way. Historically, grounded theory and the constant comparative method have long been associated with the analysis and interpretation of discourses collected through ethnography. Glaser and Strauss (1967) formulated this inductive approach as an anecdote to the dominant deductive approaches of the time. Over the years, the particular elements of this approach were shifted and
altered through other works (see Charmaz, 2000; Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Strauss, 1987; Strauss & Corbin, 1998), and were taken up to different degrees by researchers. Generally, this approach was used to develop theory from the ground, but was premised on rather myopic views of the researcher and their interaction with the data assuming that the process was purely inductive and rather neutral. The reality is that researchers have various sensibilities that enable them to see relationships between ‘unconnected’ phenomena. Most researchers who adopt the principles of grounded theory and the constant comparative method today, approach the categorization and sense-making process as retroductive--both inductive and deductive--recognizing that no amount of technical rigor absent knowledge of existing concepts and ideas will lead to a clearly rendered theoretical analysis.

Alvesson and Skoldberg (2000) recognizing the value of having a coherent plan for beginning to organize and make sense of the discourses, note that the use of practices based on this method (i.e., close reading, coding, categorization, connections) continue to be deeply useful to qualitative researchers. However, they advocate for a less technically driven, inductive approach to using these strategies in favor of more focus on rigorous interpretation. A version of these methods of data analysis were used in conjunction with each reflective theme in the discourses (e.g., feminist-poststructuralism, critical theory, emotion work, instructional communication, organizational socialization theory, narrative, etc.)

The discourses yielded through observation fieldnotes and the transcription of interviews were analyzed using a form of the constant comparative method (see Charmaz, 2000; Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Strauss & Corbin, 1998). All transcripts and
fieldnotes were read multiple times beginning at the start of and continuing throughout
the research process to develop a sense of the discourses as a whole. Through ongoing
comparisons, reoccurring, repetitious, and forceful comments (i.e., strongly worded
examples) were noted and categorized (Owen, 1984). Particular themes that emerged
through this process were identified, organized, and then refined through multiple
iterations of data examination. Open-coding was done as categories were emerging which
means making loose connections between potentially important phenomena. Once
categories were established discourse continued to be analyzed and categories shifted and
changed. As I analyzed, I engaged in the writing of “theoretical memos” to wrestle with
shifting meanings and nuances to the discourse (Charmaz, 2000). Then I moved to axial
coding which drew themes across categories to help connect seemingly separate
categories.

In keeping with a reflexive approach, this coding and analysis was done from the
perspective of each reflective theme, and was retroductive in nature—moving between
the empirical material and the theoretical perspective. Then, reflexivity was exercised to
compare each analytic interpretation of the themes in relation to the others developed.
In addition to analyzing transcripts and fieldnotes using a version of the constant
comparative method, a second analysis was done of the narratives that emerged during
observations and through emotional experience mapping, and the collages themselves. I
sought to also analyze the discourse in a way that positioned people’s stories as units of
discourse, not thematically discrete categories. This provides additional insight into how
people construct meaning about their experiences in a more holistic manner. Specifically,
some of the stories people told in one portion of the interview to explain their
school/emotional experience collage lent themselves to a holistic analysis to capture the connections between emotional catalysts or turning points. A holistic-content reading (Liblich, Tuval-Mashiach, & Zilber, 1998) of this portion of the transcript took into consideration the story as a whole and also focused on key themes that emerged in the interviews. By examining the story as a whole first, subsequent sections of one’s narrative(s), could be examined for particular purposes/themes, yet still be understood in context of and continuity with that participant’s more complete narrative construal. Narrative was a reflective theme that emerged as important as both a theory and a method of analysis. Narrative analysis provided an understanding of students' experiences with school and emotion, and provide a needed framework for understanding how and why students tell their stories the way they do.

In this section, the tenets of my methodological framework and research practices have been discussed. The methodological choices made in designing this study were based on my desire to create circumstances ripe for a rich nuanced portrait to emerge of students’ experiences. The goal was to collect and analyze discourse in a way that leaves open the possibility of a variety of interpretations. The interpretations that are detailed most fully in my results section were determined through the reflexive process. I understand this account as co-constructed through interactions with the participants and previously written texts. While I privilege the voices of participants, I understand my position of power in interpreting and organizing their stories and experiences. As with any account, this represents just one possible interpretation of this scene and the characters within it; many others exist, and I hope they will be explored in the future.
Guided by a reflexive methodology, key reflective sensibilities emerged as significant in analyzing the discourse of this study: social constructionism, organizational socialization, and feminist-poststructuralism. Specifically, theoretical frameworks for the major themes were crafted using structuration, narrative, dialectical, boundary-management, emotion socialization, instructional, learning, and critical theories.

The results presented in these chapters coalesce around four key themes which include analysis of (1) how emotion shapes teaching and learning; (2) how discursive and material structures and practices shape emotion rules and experience in schooling; (3) the ways in which peers groups, close friendships, and romantic relationships evoke, mediate, and socialize emotion; and (4) the influence of home life on students' emotional socialization and well-being at school. The impact of dualistic thinking on school life is discussed within each of these themes. Specifically, the consequences of viewing emotion as separate from reason, and public spheres as separate from private spheres are examined. Importantly, these themes should be viewed as deeply interconnected. A key goal of this project was to illuminate the complexity of students' experiences related to their emotion and schooling. Rather than focusing on a single context of their lives (e.g., experiences in the classroom), I sought to examine the broader landscape that constituted their experiences and identities, and argued that the very nature of emotion calls for us to blur boundaries to understand actual lived moments. Figure 1 below provides a visual representation of the key overarching contexts that organize each chapter.
Chapter three is devoted to the first theme, *Classroom Life: "Peaks and Valleys, Peaks and Valleys,*" which enters into the most obvious site for learning: the classroom. The theme strives to capture the emotional trajectories of students' and teachers' days in the classroom, the messy process of co-creating learning and learning environments, as well as the negotiation of relationships and identity in the classroom. While the first theme examines discourse from a more micro perspective, the next theme, *Structure, Power, and Politics in Schooling,* assumes a decidedly macro focus by tracing historical
influences on the structure and practices of the modern school. This theme, presented in chapter four, is focused on interrogating two pervasive parts of school culture and students' emotional and academic lives: discipline and testing. Chapter five explores the third theme, *Socializing at School: Emotional Support and Sabotage*, which examines the role of friendships, peer group interactions, and romantic relationships on students’ emotional, social, and learning experiences. Chapter six presents the final theme, *There's No Place Like Home*, which discusses the diverse familial influences on students' approaches to education, communication of emotion, and general emotional well-being.

These results are based on over 400 hours of field-work that included participant observation and 42 in-depth interviews with students, teachers, and administrators. Field notes, interview transcripts, and students' collages support and develop my interpretation of each theme. Pseudonyms are used throughout the chapters to protect the identities of the school and participants. I weave between voices of the participants, my theoretical sensibilities, and existing theory to make meaning out of the discourse.
CHAPTER THREE -

CLASSROOM LIFE: "PEAKS AND VALLEYS, PEAKS AND VALLEYS"

The hallways are abuzz with chatter as students make their way to classes. Many with Hollister tee-shirts and shiny New Haven planners in hand. There's a feeling of excitement as students hurry to socialize and get to class on time; there's a sense of orderly chaos as they file down the halls saying 'hi' to one another smiling, laughing, inconspicuously searching for their classrooms, and taking it all in. It's the first day of a new school year. I make my way to the back of the rows of desks and take a seat. It's first period in Ms. Connor's English class. The walls are adorned with motivational posters on acceptance, being yourself, and learning; images from the Great Gatsby, Scarlet Letter, and The Grapes of Wrath; lists of the class rules and Ohio Graduation Test Goals. A few of the students chat amongst themselves, but most of them are very quiet. A few students look at me and seem to 'notice' me and appear to realize I'm not a high school student, but they don't say anything. Ms. Connor welcomes the students and tells them where their assigned seats are. Once everyone is seated she begins to tell them about the class and then asks, "Are you excited?", "Scared?" A few students say, "yeah" but not too eagerly. Ms. Connor answers, "Me too. I've never taught this class before so this will be challenging. We'll be learning together." A few students smile and nod; most sit silent, slumped in their chairs and expressionless. (fieldnotes, 8/27/2007)

There is a striking irony in the emotional lives of high school students. Day in and day out students frequently switched between the emotionally "neutral" student in
classroom, to the emotionally "alive" student in the hallway. This dance between neutrality and emotionality was evident as students traversed between "academic" moments and extracurricular or social activities. Yet, as one learns through interviews, emotions were circulating through students and teachers alike during virtually all of these moments. The eager anticipation of new possibilities; the nervous hope of doing and saying the right thing; the satisfaction of accomplishment; the disappointment of a poor grade; the frustration of a hard task; the hurt of a bad relationship. Emotions are a force in organizational life that often simmer below the surface and sometimes erupt. As argued by Fineman (2000), emotions are the lifeblood of organizational life and relationships. Pulling back the veil, allows one to see that emotion is ever-present in these students' and teachers' lives; but resourcefully managed through complex strategies. This theme examines the (in)visibility of particular emotions and enters into the lived moments of learning to more deeply understand the role of emotion in co-creating learning, the development of classroom climate and culture, the teacher-student relationship, and identity negotiation.

While reading this chapter it is important to remember that the language used in much scholarship, even scholarship that honors the role of emotion in schools, is often dichotomous in nature. This section in particular talks extensively about emotions being either "positive" or "negative" as I intertwine the voices of participants and disciplinary knowledge. Instructional communication, educational, and psychological research on emotion in learning primarily refers to emotions in this way, meaning that positive emotions are those that make us feel productive, good, and capable, while negative emotions are those that make us feel unproductive, bad, or incapable. I work within this
dichotomous language in an effort to make sense of student and teacher experiences in light of previous research, but I caution you to remember that there are significant nuances lost in these dichotomies. While it is primarily true that positive emotions increase the capacity to learn because students feel safe to engage their minds, capable of accepting the challenge of the work, and willing to share their ideas (Frederickson, 2001); it is also true that "pedagogies of discomfort," lessons in which students are encouraged to feel uncomfortable or what have typically been referred to as negative emotions, can be highly transformative learning experiences (Zembalyas & Boler, 2002).

A Teacher's Typical Day: "Do I Have to Go in There?"

Hargreaves (1998a) argues that emotions "lie at the heart of teaching" (p. 835). Teachers often have a deep emotional investment in their work due to the relationships fostered with students, parents, and co-workers, their high investment of personal resources like time and energy, and their passionate pursuit of goals and sometimes moral commitments (see Jeffrey & Woods, 1996; Nias, 1996). Hargreaves (1998a) also contends that "good teachers" are "emotional, passionate beings who connect with their students and fill their work and their classes with pleasure, creativity, challenge and joy" (p. 835). In short, a good teacher fuels her practices with positive emotion. For example, Ms. Matthews stated: "I like my classes to be full of energy and activity, and kind of chaos. That's my teaching style. To do that I have to have to be pretty energetic." This teacher recognizes that her mood and energy deeply impact instructional outcomes. She continues:

I'm never in a bad mood at school. I mean I can really say that even what's going on with me outside, my personal life, I'm very, it's very rare-in fact the kids
sometimes say to me, "Why aren't you ever angry?"...but I feel like as a mentor and as a teacher, my mood's gonna influence the kids' moods. So you know I have to invite them to learn everyday. I have to be positive. I have to exude that or how can I expect that of them?

Striving to exude positive emotion is an admirable goal that would likely enhance students' learning and the quality of relationships within the school (Allen, Long, & Judd, 2008); yet teaching and living in and through positive emotion seems an idealistic goal given the challenges educators face in the course of their day. Most would agree that having a teacher who strives to have a positive attitude toward teaching encourages students to feel comfortable to learn in the classroom (Palmer, 1998). This does not mean, however, that students do not experience negative emotions in classrooms with a positive ethos. Rather, the positive ethos makes it safe to engage with material and try new learning experiences that may be challenging, frustrating, or disconcerting. Feeling negative emotions while learning can, in a generally supportive, positive environment, encourage some of the deepest learning (Kohl, 1994). It should be noted, however, that teachers who demoralize, demean, and exude a negative attitude toward teaching and students do not create learning environments that encourage deep learning from positive or negative emotions (Allen et al., 2008; Kohl, 1994; Palmer, 1998).

To more deeply understand the presence and processes of emotion in school life, one must also view emotional experience not as simply individual but as interactional. Emotions are certainly experienced by individuals, but emotions ultimately arise out of interactions with others. As argued by Carlyle and Woods (2002) "the emotional landscapes of teaching are formed through social transactions, shaped not only by
individuals, but also by sociological, political and institutional forces” (p. XV; see also Blackmore, 1996). To more meaningfully examine teacher emotional experiences at school we turn to a narrative offered by Mr. LeBronski, a seasoned teacher, who expressed care and concern for students' learning and personal development. Mr. LeBronski's response to the prompt "Tell me about a typical day of teaching including how you felt as you progressed through each part of your day" is below:

When I get here in the morning I usually feel pretty fresh when I come in. I have the day at least in theory kind of planned out in my head. I have usually pretty good classes in the mornings and so they kind of roll through. We usually get done what we need to get done so I’m usually feeling pretty good, pretty positive about a lot of things. Very, very few problems occur at least on my schedule in the morning. Lunch time I have a nice break which after teaching four straight classes you get that nice little break. You eat lunch and do whatever.

However I have a tendency to get a little bit lower energy wise and emotional wise in the afternoon because my last two periods – my sixth period class is very small and I think there’s only nine kids in there and I think six of them have IEPs (Individual Education Plans) and they have a tendency to miss school so you’re dealing a lot of time with six kids. Any three could be out at any given time. So it’s a little frustrating in there because you can’t move real fast number one and then you have to move slower because you got kids missing school.

And then last period I usually find myself by the end of that period counting down that period until the bell rings because there are a lot of kids that
are in there that are immature and there’s a segment of that class that I really like and there’s a segment of that class that I really don’t like. I don’t not particularly like them as kids; they’re just very immature and they just drive me to the brink of insanity usually pretty much. Unless you’re on them all the time and keep them busy but I usually find myself counting down the minutes till that final bell rings with that last period.

So my mornings are wonderful. My lunch is usually kind of regroup, but right after that it usually has a tendency to decline by the end of the school day. While learning has traditionally been described in rational language (see Boler, 1999; Schutz & Lanehart, 2002), absent emotion, teachers often define segments of their day in emotional terms. As I passed teachers in the hallway or sat with them at lunch, conversations rarely circulated about the actual subject matter of classes; rather, the conversations were about relationships with students and colleagues, and subsequent emotions. Only one out of the eleven teachers I interviewed indicated experiencing consistently positive emotions personally and demonstrating a consistently positive emotional tone for her classes. Most others described their emotions waverering with one teacher, Mr. Mathias, describing it well saying it's all "peaks and valleys, peaks and valleys." For that reason, he noted that he waivers between excitement to start class some days to dread on others saying: "Sometimes I look at Ms. Connor (another teacher) as I stand by my door and ask 'Do I have to go in there?'" The narrative featured below, from Ms. Johnson, repeatedly identified by students as one of the most beloved, caring teachers, illustrates that even the best teachers experience a wide range of emotions in a typical day.
My first period class are my juniors, and they are very – the dynamic in that classroom is funny. If one student, this certain student, if he is not here, the class goes pretty smooth, and we really get some deep thought process in questions or in work. However, if he’s here, and it depends on what mood he’s in, how the rest of the class goes.

They seem very immature, more so than any other year that I’ve noticed. That really impacts me. That’s also the period that we have our announcements. We do the Pledge sometimes, and I’m very, very stern about the Pledge. I say, “If you’re not gonna do – if you don’t do the Pledge, I don’t care. You’ll stand up and you’ll be respectful.” All that rides on how that period starts out, those first few minutes. Huge amount of absences during the first period; it shows a lot about how important certain households feel about getting places on time. It’s because then – throughout the day, then I’ll see these students. Then they’re here. So that class is – I’m usually not – I usually don’t dread first period. That’s not one of the ones I dread. It’s kinda fun. It depends on how the dynamics are going that day. Sometimes it picks me up, so it works out okay, sometimes.

Second period, I dread; dread with every being in my body. It’s my freshman class. It’s the only freshman class of the day, and it’s absolutely horrid. It’s taken me – this is what, mid-terms are this week? This is the third nine weeks of school, and it’s taken until about last week or the week before, to finally reign in that class and feel like some of them are actually learning. It’s taken an extremely long time. I don’t dread it quite as much, and I don’t have that pit in the bottom of my stomach, but it’s about all I can do to make it through that class
period sometimes. Now, though, hopefully for the rest of the year – knock on wood – it won’t – because I’m about ready to go home after that period.

And then, my third period class, my sophomores; they’re a little bit better, more quiet. Very, overall, quiet. I even had to tell them today, “If you think you’re yelling when you read out loud, then you’re reading loud enough.” It’s funny, the replies that I get from some of them, “I don’t like to yell.” And I said, “That’s too bad because you’re not reading loud enough.” That’s something they have to get, as sophomores; they need to know how to orally speak and read. Right. So they’re okay. It’s just like fighting tooth-and-nail to get responses from them. They’re extremely quiet. And that’s fine because then, my next period, I have planning.

Move on to a study hall; it’s not a big deal. However, my sixth and seventh period; so the only two periods after lunch, and it is funny, they’re both junior classes.

My sixth period class is a very large class, my largest class of the day. The big array of emotions and personalities in that class, and not one – single one overrules. It kind of almost evens the period out. It evens the students out. They actually accomplish quite a bit. I don’t know what it – I haven’t put my finger on it yet, because it is such a diverse class. I bet I have every array of emotions, every array of personalities. It doesn’t matter if somebody is absent or not, it’s still the same. ..which says a lot for diversity, I guess.When it’s all, mostly one way or another, it seems to really pull the class down or up. That’s a good class; real energetic, it’s a real good class. A lot of IEP students in that class, which I
came into the year thinking, “Oh, boy.” But in general, really, really nice class; seem motivated. They work well for me. When I say, “Get busy,” they get busy, so nice surprise. Nice surprise.

My seventh period class, I just used to really rave about. They were my best class. Smallest class, 10 kids in the class, and now, boy they’re really falling off the stick. It’s funny how you start out the year, and how you end up. I used to tell them they were my best class. Now, I find myself saying, “You guys are worse than my freshmen.” And they just stare at me when I say that. I say, “You guys, this is the last period of the day.” Last period of the day; you either hate it, or you look forward to it.

I have a few IEP students in there. There’s only 10 people in the class. However, there’s one person in there that does kinda – it’s like my first period class. It depends on how he reacts that day. We got a new student in there, and it changed. I guess it changed when she came. He reacts to her, and then she does her own thing. Missed out on the first two nine weeks of – she did, the new student – of how I run my classroom and my expectations. I think when they’re there to see that in the beginning, then it’s okay because they know just how far to push you. Maybe it’s when I walk in the room and they see what mood I’m in, she’s missed all of that. Then he reacts; whereas before, I didn’t have that. She came last week of the second nine weeks. So the dynamics of that classroom really did change. I’ll get ‘em reamed back in, but –by the end of seventh period, I’m done.
Hargreaves (2000) argues that emotions are not peripheral to people's lives, but are deeply influential on action and rational reflection on lived experience. He calls teachers *emotional practitioners* who can make things exciting or boring (Hargreaves, 2000, p. 812), and refers to teaching, learning and leading as *emotional practices*. The tone of these practices arouses and impacts feelings in ourselves and others (Denzin, 1984). In this sense, teaching and learning are deeply interactional and deeply emotional endeavors.

**A Student's Typical Day**

To more fully understand the intertwined nature of students' and teachers' lives we turn to two narratives told by students about their *typical* day at school. First we follow the story of Stephanie, a straight 'A' student, who indicated liking school. Then, we read the narrative of Julie, a student who has earned mediocre grades, and is indifferent about coming to school. Interestingly, most students, regardless of academic performance, noted that boredom and anxiety were the two emotions they felt most frequently throughout the day.

*Stephanie's Narrative*

Well first period I go to history and I laugh a lot in that class because all the students are talking and talking about stuff that has nothing to do with what we’re learning but it’s just fun. Other students are talking. So I usually laugh a lot in that period. So it’s pretty good. It kind of wakes me up. And we usually go over our notes and stuff. That class is definitely not boring with all the kids. And then second period I go to choir. Sometimes I just sing. It’s kind of laid back and my choir teacher is also really funny and will tell us some funny stories about her
kids. [Laughter] So that’s good because we’re singing and it’s easy and if we have
time left we can work on our homework or whatever. So that’s pretty laid back
too. We just usually sing and then we can talk and whatever. So that’s pretty fun.
And 3rd period I have English and it’s not that bad. It’s kind of a little boring
because we’re doing Julius Cesar right now so that’s kind of boring. Other than
that it’s not too bad. I mean, it’s not my favorite, but. And then 4th period I have
German which that’s good. It’s kind of boring because there’s not a lot of kids in
that class. We used to have a lot of kids and then we don’t really seem to have
that many anymore so there’s not really a lot of people, so that one’s kind of
boring.

Then I go to lunch and I talk to my friends and stuff and I don’t usually do
a whole lot in there. Then I go to geometry which is not my favorite. It’s kind of
boring. The teacher, he makes some jokes which makes me laugh just like here
and there, but basically that class is just boring. Then I have study hall which I’m
just pretty tired by then and I want to sleep but I usually just do my homework
and sit there. And then I go to biology which is fun because we’re doing a group
project now. So I work with the group on a project, that’s pretty fun. I have most
of my fun classes in the morning.

Boring is kind of the way to describe the afternoon. The morning I’m kind
of tired at first once I get to school then once I get to history and we’re laughing
and stuff then, then I would say that class, the morning classes could be fun. It’s
more fun in the morning. Because then after lunch really just makes me tired
because I sit there and eat and that’s pretty much why I think the afternoon
classes are boring because after lunch I’ve eaten and I’m tired and everything just seems boring.

Differentiating between indifference, boredom, and emotion management is difficult for an outside observer. Many students managed their expressions so as to not be too anything (e.g., excited, bored). It was very hard to tell when students were truly engaged and thinking about the material. This student did process the material being presented, but her expression was no different than the student failing the same course. The most apparent emotion displays were in the form of laughter interspersed throughout the day and these were a type of display that student noted faking less often than others. Physiological distractions like hunger and fatigue were often noted by students as setting in after lunch. The majority of students indicating having less energy and being less engaged in their afternoon classes. Much like the teachers narratives reveal, most students are "done" or feel that their day "declines" in the latter class periods.

Mr. LeBronski, one of the teachers whose narratives you read above, reflected on the deterioration of his day as it related to his interactions with students:

I don’t tend to elaborate on things near as much in the afternoon in terms of things we’re talking about or whatever simply because it’s so much harder with those last two periods to do that. I don’t know whether one causes the other or it’s a reciprocal thing or whatever. But I have a tendency probably to not seem as interested, be more just straightforward, here are the things you need to know. Here’s the facts. Don’t really elaborate. Probably doesn’t seem to be quite as maybe at ease or as calm as I am with my morning classes at that point. I know there’s a change there. I can feel that change every day.
Sometimes and I know I should never do this but sometimes I just assume that because of their age and because 17-years-old or whatever, they’re juniors, because graduation is looming on the horizon for them, sometimes I just assume that they’re gonna do the work. If they want to get through this thing then they’ll do it. And sometimes I probably don’t prompt them as much as I probably should. It just seems to me like in the last couple of years I’ve taught it’s always been those last period or the last two periods or something like that where I get to the point where they either get it or they don’t instead of taking the time I usually do with other classes. You know what I mean? But I’m mad about that. I’m personally disturbed that I sometimes not allow but choose to say that to myself. If they don’t do it it’s their problem. I mean your energy on a daily basis is finite. You’re gonna run out eventually and if you happen to expend it all in the early part of the day and I know you always try to divvy it out evenly it just doesn’t happen that way. Especially when the feedback from the students is we don’t care whether you’re energetic or the way you elaborate on us or not. When I pick up those vibes I can go into this story or relate what we’re talking about somehow some way and I’m getting the vibe from the kids that they could care less whether I do that. It just makes me think, well, why spend the energy?

Students’ and teachers’ resources for managing frustration and challenges deteriorate as the day progresses, which draws attention to the reciprocal emotional influence of each party on the other. Mr. LeBronski is making assumptions about students and adjusting his teaching accordingly; while the students may simultaneously be perceiving that they are reacting to him rather than the other way around.
Kardyn, a student, noted feeling that teachers seemed to believe their days were far more demanding than students:

They get frustrated with us when we’re not concentrating in class or when we’re exhausted and we’re not talking or responding to them. It’s just kind of like, “Well, yeah, you’re teaching all day, but at the same time we have to get all this in all day. You already know all this.” It’s like, “You have to teach a class about one subject. We have learn like all these other subjects.” So, I just feel like they don’t understand sometimes and that they just need to really look at everything that we have on our plate, too. That we’re involved with sports and family and work and trying to find out who we are. So It just kind of bothers me with that.

Viewing each participant's day in full allows one to see how each class is situated within the broader emotional and social context of a person's world. Also recognizing that each person is not a "rational robot" as one teacher put it, allows us to better understand what stands in the way of optimal learning and positive (read: productive) emotional environments.

In addition to students and teachers reacting to one another's emotion and communication styles, something as simple as the weather can threaten students' and teachers' performance in the classroom. Consider the following excerpt from fieldnotes:

It's eighty-nine degrees today, which means the school is hot and sticky. I enter the classroom and am taken aback by the smell of sweat and body odor. The students shift uncomfortably in their desks. Girls are pulling their shorts and wiggling to move the bare skin on the backs of their legs from the sticky seat. One student slides into the desk chair which is attached to the desk; the desk is too
small and pushes into her abdomen. As she breathes her stomach pushes harder against the desk; she cannot move or lean forward to write. Two fans are running full blast, twirling in a hypnotic rhythm. Students are holding their papers on their desks while they try to write. The teacher leads the class through practice questions for an exam on Friday. Students are quiet. The same few answer his prompts. The others look bored and expressionless. "You need these skills! Come on someone read you can do this!" The same student who has read five times reads the problem again. The classroom walls are virtually bare; only a clock in the front of the room draws your attention. It seems to move dauntingly slow today. Even I am wishing the bell will ring soon. After forty minutes the teacher says "Okay, I think we've beaten these to death. Let's go over definitions. Take out your geometry notebook. Do number 13--copy it down and work on it as long as you need. Moments later the bell rings (this is an extended period so some students get out while others stay for an extra 20 minutes). The hallway fills with students and chatter, lockers slamming, some voices rising above the hum. The students look towards the door. The teacher says "Number 13!" I read the problem on the overhead "Midpt of a segment the point halfway between the endpoints of a segment such that if X is the midpoint of AB, then AX =XB. A--------X--------B, If X is the midpoint of AB, Then AX =XB. If AX=XB and A,X, +B are collinear then X is the midpoint of AB." I read it again, but I can't process it with all the noise. The sound of mucus being loudly sucked in with every breath interrupts my thoughts--the student beside me is stuffed up, but does not blow his nose the entire period. I give up on trying to solve the problem and look
around. One student yawns, another walks to the front of the room and sharpens his pencil---grinding, grinding, grinding, others "appear" to be trying to work; their heads remain facing their papers, but their eyes scan their periphery to see what others are doing. The teacher prompts the students to stay focused reminding them of an upcoming test: "If I were you and I didn't want to fail Friday I would do the problems and check your answers with mine, and I say that with all due respect to geometry students either well prepared or not." Some students are working through the problems and going to check answers. I sense that the end of the period is soon. Students are so attuned to the schedule they become more restless in the final minutes of each period. Some begin to whisper, others quietly pack up. The bell rings and the students literally jump out of their seats--the sudden action is a bit alarming. Within the first 15 seconds of the bell ringing all of the students are gone or on their way out the door. Four minutes of "freedom" and then on to their next class. (fieldnotes, 9/5/2007)

The images of educational institutions as well-oiled, rational machines fail to recognize that most schools do not have resources like air conditioning and each class is full of living breathing human beings each experiencing a variety of emotions. One teacher, Mr. Mathias, summed it up by saying "in a class of about 15 students I'm getting at least 15 emotions every single day." And as articulated by Ms. Matthews, "students emotions may fluctuate wildly even within one class period." Sometimes these emotions are visible or sensed, other times they are resourcefully hidden.
The next student's narrative of her typical day displays not only her school day, but also how her morning unfolds before arriving at school. Julie's story reminds us that students arrive at school from very different home lives, and assume different levels of responsibility outside of class. Julie, whose mother has struggled with depression and substance abuse, wakes herself and prepares both her and her mother to begin the day.

‘Kay, so I wake up. Actually, my alarm clock is set at 5:00 in the morning but I wake up at like 7. I wake up and then I turn my mom’s light on like "Mom, wake up," and I put her tea in the microwave ‘cause she has to have her tea every morning like that’s all she ever drinks so my mom’s tea is in the microwave and I go warm up the truck and I just ‘cause she’s, she hates getting up in the morning, so I try to do like everything I can ‘cause it just make it easier for her. I'm like okay, "Mom, let’s go," so we get in the truck and she drives to school where she always, she’s always mad ‘cause there’s all those cars lined up at the school you know. So she’s usually yelling and I’m like just drive. I go to math first period and Reece sits in front of me and we usually always talk and Ms. Crandall is always yelling about how we never listen to her. We never do anything. She doesn’t know why she’s teaching, blah, blah, blah you know. And everybody’s just kinda sitting there like passing it off as another day ‘cause she does it every single day. Then she’ll pick random people to go up on the board and then write down the problems and usually like 5 people don’t even have ‘em right so then she like yells at them. Today she was like all like sarcastic with this one kid and. It was kinda like really rude. I was just like. Like he was standing there and he
did the problem like he didn’t know how to do it, so he just kinda like guessed how to do it you know? And I mean at least he tried, and she’s like, she’s like, “Well this would be right if you were like on Mars.” Like it’s just saying stupid stuff like that. She’s like, “If you would be smart enough to like look in your book,” and stuff like that. I’m like. Yeah, I was just like why are you saying that stuff? I mean he was just sitting there like I thought he was gonna cry. I was like it's worse when you’re like in front of everybody. And getting it you know? And she’s just like, “What is the answer to this?” And like it took her like 15 minutes just to go through this one problem. I was like or you could just like explain how to do it instead of embarrassing him you know. It’s gonna make him hate math more.

But then I go to art class and I like art but I don’t like our art class like it’s just so boring. It’s like we’ve been doing these collages like we drew something. Then we had to do newspaper collage. Then we had to color part of it with crayon and then paint over it, wash it off and then we’re doing another one and I just don’t like that class, and Ms. Reed is just like boring. She’s, she’s like all into like normal art like she just like I don’t know. She just like stands up there and says like "what’s the meaning for this? What’s the meaning for this?" I’m like I don’t care. Like nobody cares. Everybody just sits there and so I’m just like "whatever."

And I go to health class then. There’s this one kid in there that I really, really do not like him and he sits right in front of me, and then my friend, Tom, sits behind me and this kid and Tom always like go at each other, and I’m like
right in the middle of it ‘cause that’s where my desk is so today I was just like shut up and I don’t like this kid. He’s annoying and he just like talks like not to anybody in particular. He just like talks. He’s like "I’m gonna be racing soon, April 4th, blah, blah, blah. I ate a Snickers for breakfast" and I’m like what are you talking about? I'm just like stop talking. He has like this really annoying laugh and everything but I’ve never actually like said anything to him ‘cause he’s never actually done anything to me. It’s just like he’s just so annoying. And we took notes today and that was really boring. And then where do I go after that? Health, oh, I go up to science.

And we don’t ever actually do anything in science like we just like we did this one lab today about like acceleration. And we had to like move in front of this motion sensor and try to get it right on the graph on this calculator, and I just kinda sat there. I was just like I’m not doing this. I never get that class. Like the first day I was in there they were talking about stuff I’d never even heard of [she transferred in from another school]. They’re talking about like PHs or something, I don’t know but there is one kid in my class like the second day I was at school he writes me this note. He’s like, “I really like you. You should call me.” And I’m just like no. And I was just like, “he said are you gonna call me?” I was like, “Maybe.” I felt bad but I was just like this is totally random. I don’t even know you. But he like sits right beside me now and he was, he was doing something today and I laughed at him. He was like, “What are you laughing at?” I just kinda turned away you know.
Then I go to American Studies. That’s a sophomore class and I’m a freshman. I don’t even know why I’m in that class. They just randomly put me in it but I sit by Sam. We always talk and stuff and Mr. Conrad taught us today ‘cause Ms. Merrill’s been teaching us for a while because we’re doing OGT stuff but Mr. Conrad’s so funny ‘cause me and Sam call him Mr. Cons ‘cause he calls me Jules. Then he calls Sam Boms and ‘cause his name’s Sam Bomer, so he’s like Boms. And so we call Mr. Cons and he was teaching us today and I don’t know all me and Sam do is like laugh. Like we got our work done but like we’re just laugh and like he just calls me Al and call him Spaz I don’t know. Like me and Sam don’t hang out anywhere but school but like when we do hang out, it’s like really fun so. And there’s this one girl. I think her name is Avery. She’s like in a gang, I don’t know. But Sam was like, “Are you in a gang,” and she’s like, “No.” He’s like, “Yeah, you are. You told Carla you were.” She’s like, “Don’t even worry about it.” And so I was like, “You’re in a gang?” She’s like, “Shut up.” I was like, “Okay.” And this one kid Branden who wasn’t there yesterday so I was like, “Branden, where were you, you little school-skipper?” just joking around with him. And he’s like oh what’d he say. He’s like “It’s none of your f-ing business.” I was like yikes. I’ve never talked to you before in my life like why are you cussing at me?

Then, I go to lunch. That’s where I sit with all those guys. I mean people like I dated this one kid, Casey Whitaker. Like and I was dating him like before I even came to this school. And so everybody was talking like oh, you’re Casey’s girlfriend you know? And then we like broke up and a lot of people still call, me
Whitaker. They’re like, “Hey, Whitaker.” I’m like ehhh and like my name is Julie. Like I’m separate from him now. It just like I don’t know. They’re like, “We’re not making fun of you. We’re just making fun of him.” I was like, “Then call him Julie.” That would be better. They’re like, “Oh, we never thought about that.” But they still won’t call me my name. Like it’s just playful but I’m just like I just wanna punch ‘em sometimes.

And then afterwards, oh, I go, I go to English class and that is the loudest class ever. We don’t do anything ever like it’s Mr. Sorber like his first name’s Tyler. So everybody’s like, “Hey, Tyler.” They don’t call him Mr. Sorber. I’m just sitting there and I was drawing on Chris’ folder. I was drawing this little cat and Jane had like a Sharpie and her face and stuff like that, and Mr. Sorber comes over. He’s like, “What are you guys doing?” I was like, “Oh, I’m just drawing,” and then Jessica and Chris were drawing like this really inappropriate stuff on Chris's paper and then Chris turned it in. I was like you’re gonna get in so much trouble. They’re just like drawing and laughing. I just I did not look to see what they were up to, but Chris was like gonna be sent down to the office for this but. It’s like okay and then Shelby, every single day she makes a huge scene in that class. Like he moves her assigned seat ‘cause she just moves someplace else and like goes talk to somebody you know? And like he lets certain people go sit wherever they want like he lets me go sit wherever I want ‘cause like we don’t really disrupt class or anything. Like he might have to tell us once like hey, stop talking you know. But like Shelby she’ll just like talk and talk and talk like she won’t stop ever. And so she’s like, “I’m not sitting in my assigned seat. I hate my
assigned seat,” and like she’s just like yelling and cussing. She’s like, “I’m going to the bathroom.” He’s like, “No, you’re not.” She’s like, “Yes, I am,” and she’ll just like walk out and then she’ll come back -and he’s like, “Go down to the office.” She’s like, “No.” And then he’ll like have to call the office, but she never gets in trouble like he just lets it go, and then, “Jess is like I’m not doing this. I’m going to sleep.” And I’m just like, “Shut up like I don’t learn anything in that class because everybody’s like yelling like papers flying like everywhere and people are like yelling and cussing and throwing things and moving desks and jumping and, and I’m just like "what?" and Mr. Sorber just kinda like stands there and he just like looks around and he’s just like yells and everybody kinda like calms down for a couple minutes and then like if he’ll like go work with somebody else real quick and like everybody else will get like really loud and stuff. I’m just like "oh, my gosh," like "what am I gonna do in here?"

It's just like I think people take advantage of him ‘cause he’s a new teacher. And they just like don’t really respect him and like but I don’t know. I do all my work in that class so he just kinda like. Like the people that do most of their work in that class he just kinda like lets ‘em go and just kinda gives ‘em a little more leash and like other people he’s just like "no." He’s like "you’re not allowed to do anything." And like those people in my class have like zeros and then like we have Sandy, Heather, and Colton in there and they’re like they’re from the group home but like they’re really cool so and they just like sit there and like they have these weird names for each other. They just like yell their names across the room. It’s like 'Chicken' and I don’t even know what else. They’re just
like loud and then Randy’s in there, and he’s really good at like public speaking and stuff ‘cause when he gives speeches like everybody just kinda like stops talking and like listens to him. But today he wasn’t he just kinda sat there and like once or twice, he’d like stand up and he’d turned off the projector and stuff like that you know just like stupid stuff like that. And David always claims he’s having an asthma attack like everyday it’s really that bad. He’s just like, “I’ll be right back.” And that’s just crazy. I’m just like I just kinda sit there. I’m just like -Like they always think it’s really funny when Mr. Sorber like spazzes out on them.

He (Mr. Sorber) just kinda sits at his desk and the bell rings and everybody gets up to leave. He goes "no" and everybody sits back down. We just kinda sit there for a minute. And he gives us like three extra papers to do. And then nobody does them. I always do them but then we leave and then it happens all over again the next day. Somebody stole his pencil sharpener like seriously. I was like okay. Glad you had fun stealing his pencil sharpener, and he like was yelling at everybody. Everybody’s like, we’re tryin' to get him fired.

Wow so 7th period. 7th period I have study hall and I don’t do my homework in that class. I just kinda sit there and...like you’re not allowed to sleep so I just kinda like sit there like this and just zone out. But last semester I sat with my friend, Brandon, and like we were like were talking. It’s like really quiet in there. And like we always talked and went through all these like we had pictures and stuff. But I don’t sit by him. I sit by this one girl. Her name’s Tracy, I think. I don’t know but every time I move she’ll look at me and so like
I’ll like go like this (moves hand) or something and she’ll look at me and so I’m like. So I just kinda like sit there like this (leaned back) just like, yeah. And then like I’ll move to do something and she’ll just look at me. I’m like "what am I supposed to do?" So I just sit there, don’t do anything. But study hall’s boring now. I don’t like that class. Should prob’ly do my work in there but I never do. I have a hard time doing it when it’s like all structured like I have to. I do my work when I feel like it.

Julie's story reveals how strongly interactions shape her feelings about school. She mentions subject matter very little as being a source of emotion, but talks frequently about the other people she encounters throughout her day and her assessment of these people. These people are, in essence, characters in her life (Carr, 1986; Frank, 2002a). These characters have a powerful influence on the emotion she experiences in each class period as the dynamics change with each ring of the bell. Some characters evoke annoyance; others comic relief; others (de)motivate learning. Classrooms are sites in which the intertwined nature of students and teachers socio-emotional lives becomes starkly apparent. The classroom is where the “work” of school is accomplished and where students and teachers must embrace or overcome the forces in their lives that are competing for attention.

Classroom Environments: Traversing Between Different Emotional Worlds

Examination of these students’ and teachers’ narratives reveal that each classroom tends to have a unique essence generated through the interplay between the subject matter, the broader socio-political-economic environment, and the communication patterns of students and teachers who are members of the class. This essence can be
understood generally as the "culture" and "climate" of the class. Classroom climate can be defined as a "set of systemic entities...inferred from students' and teachers' perceptions of psychosocial attributes of the classroom social system" (Nunnery, Butler, & Bhaireddy, 1993, p. 3). This could include, for example, perceptions of supportiveness, cohesiveness (e.g. Shapiro, 1993), and cooperative learning (e.g. Ghaith, 2003; Hirschy & Wilson, 2002). Classroom culture can be understood as a "set of beliefs, norms, and practices that constitute the fabric of school [and classroom] life" (p. 752). Taken together, climate and culture capture the perceptions and activities that shape the classroom environment (Titsworth & Smith, 2006).

A key goal of this project is to more deeply understand the role of emotion in communication and learning. As such, the more specific emotional climate and culture of the classrooms will be examined. Gordon (1989a) defined an emotional culture as the “patterns of meanings embodied in symbols, but which people communicate, perpetuate, and develop their knowledge about and attitudes toward emotions” (p. 115). Gordon notes that it is though “language, rituals, art forms, and other publicly available, symbolic vehicles of meaning” that such a culture is expressed and realized (p. 115). Each classroom is unique in its emotional culture because such cultures arise directly out of interactions between those who are members of each class.

Students were keenly aware that in addition to the subject matter covered in each class changing so too would the emotional environment. Students noted preparing themselves to perform in each class according to the cultural rules that governed educational practices and emotions. Taylor noted that in one class she "was scared to breathe" and in another she felt "relaxed and happy." These feelings stemmed from
interactions with both teachers and fellow students. Lushina, a student, commented on one of her classes saying that "there are football players in that class so they just take things over. They're so mean." Another student Maddox said of one of his classes: "there are a lot of people I can connect with in there so that's a fun class." During observations not only did I sense the changing climates and cultures, I also realized that teachers and students share power in constructing the learning environment. I observed in certain classes that students segmented themselves into groups they felt comfortable in often glaring at other students whose comments or behavior annoyed them. Danny, a student, confided that he "hated a group of girls in that class because they are always talking during other people's presentations and then they were so mad that people didn't listen during their presentation like they deserve that respect." During observations I witnessed a particularly supportive climate/culture in which students worked collaboratively and supported one another to meet the class goals. Students shared nervousness about upcoming projects, offered encouraging comments, and shared resources to help one another complete their work.

The role of the teacher in the construction of an emotional culture/climate cannot be underestimated. Power dynamics influence the processes that develop an emotional culture legitimizing certain ways of relating, emotion rules, beliefs, and the regulation of resources such as time (see Zembylas, 2005); and teachers are powerful people in the classroom context. During interviews, students repeatedly described the teachers' emotional tenor as deeply impacting their classroom experience and individual emotions. Consider the following quote from Betty, a student:
I keep thinking of Ms. Tucker when I think of that (teacher emotion impacting her feelings) because my sophomore year was so horrible. Every time I went to her class if I was having like an awesome day for some reason it would like drain me. Like I would be so upset about something she might have like said to me or something. And like I remember my friend had her right before lunch period and she would come to me and like tell me what like how she humiliated her that day or something.

Classrooms have emotional atmospheres that greatly impact individual emotions (Adams, 1989). While this student had a negative emotional outcome as a result of interaction with her teacher, other students experienced the opposite. Melia, another student commented on positive emotional effects from her teacher saying "he wasn't just teaching us. He really liked it and was really into it. So I think that kind of like rubbed off because like if he's excited about it that kind of rubs off and makes us excited about it too." Melia points to emotional contagion or the contagiousness of others emotions (Fineman, 2000). Students and teacher alike recognized that emotions could be caught like colds, and that those who tended to have a great deal of power in classrooms, like teachers, had a powerful impact on the emotions that were cultivated and circulated. Mr. Mathias, a teacher, reflected saying: "Every day I try and come in and be positive, so like in – and I notice that the days that I do make a conscious effort, or maybe I am just happy about the way something’s going, things do go better." Because students often mimic or catch teachers' emotions, exuding positivity can create a better classroom environment that engages students and encourages them to have a positive attitude toward learning. This attitude encourages students to also learn about concepts that may evoke negative, but
productive emotions about historical or current events, etcetera (e.g. the Holocaust, racism).

Ms. Johnson learned through experience, that she can evoke fear or comfort in her students:

I didn’t realize it until about two years ago, how much the teacher’s mood affects the kids. I try not to raise my voice as much as I used to because I was a yeller. I raised three kids, I was a yeller. And I don’t think until that year did I realize that – a couple little freshmen in the front row, I yell – I terrified ‘em. But you know what I realized; they either had that at home all the time – and it devastated me that I got a look on – that that look on their face was actually kind of terror. I thought, “I never wanted to do that,” so I really became more aware of mood then.

Madaline, a student, spoke about teachers who express negative emotion:

Yeah, and it’s not fun. Like I think they need to take a lesson on how to put their emotions aside and be not mean. Cause it is hard whenever they’re in a bad mood, that just puts the whole class in a bad mood, and nobody wants to do anything. It really does affect everything, I think.

Madaline's response raises an important nuance in students' understandings of what emotion is. She calls for teachers to "put their emotions aside and not be mean." Her discourse positions emotions as negative; something not appropriate for an optimal learning environment. This was overwhelmingly the way students and teachers referred to emotion (with a negative connotation) rather than differentiating between negative and positive emotions. Though students and teachers often spoke of the vibe of a class (i.e., climate/culture) as being positive or negative, they used emotion as a negative term
though they referred to teachers being fun or upbeat they did not readily associate these descriptions with the words emotion or emotional. Jarred, a student talked about how the positive learning environment helped him embrace a class enough to accept doing the necessary work:

And then fourth period I have AP U.S. History. That’s one of my harder classes that I’m not too crazy about. But the – I think the vibe in there is kind of – it’s really positive like the teacher, he tries to make things fun and everything, as fun as he can but he does have to get stuff done so we kind of understand that.

Students’ affective learning is related to students "increasing internalization of positive attitudes" toward a course, its content and instructor (Kearney, 1994, p. 81; see also Bloom, 1956). Banfield, Richmond, and McCroskey (2006) note that teacher affect is related to respect and liking of a teacher and typically leads to positive instructional outcomes. Numerous communication strategies may be used to improve affect toward learning and to improve the classroom environment. Among such communication strategies is for teachers and students to engage in immediate behaviors (see Anderson, 1979; Mehrabian, 1981), avoid verbal aggressiveness (Infante, 1995), and for teachers to enhance credibility (McCroskey & Teven, 1999), and demonstrate caring toward students. First, immediacy behaviors are explored.

Nonverbal and Verbal Immediacy: Affective (Dis) Connections

Generally defined, immediacy behaviors refer to the use of communication to enhance physical and psychological closeness between communicators (Mehrabian, 1981). Anderson (1979) notes that highly immediate behaviors foster approachability, increase sensory stimulation, indicate availability for communication, and communicate
warmness and closeness. While immediacy has been studied in a number of contexts, the majority of research has been focused on the effects of teacher immediacy in classroom settings (Johnson & Miller, 2002). Research has identified positive relationships between teacher immediacy and student affective, cognitive, and behavioral learning (Kelley & Gorham, 1988; Sanders & Wiseman, 1990). Rocca and McCroskey (1999) found that highly immediate teachers are likely to be evaluated more positively by their students. Also, immediacy has been related positively to student compliance-gaining on various tasks (Kearney, Plax, Smith, & Sorenson, 1988) as well as student cognitive learning (see for example, Chesebro & McCroskey, 2001; Christophel & Gorham, 1995; Gorham & Zakari, 1990; McCroskey, Sallinen, Fayer, Richmond, & Barraclough, 1996; Richard, Gorham, & McCroskey, 1987; Rodriguez, Plax, & Kearney, 1996; Titsworth, 2001).

Immediacy can be divided into two areas of behavior: nonverbal and verbal. Eye contact, gestures, relaxed body position, directing body position toward students, smiling, vocal expressiveness, movement, and proximity are all nonverbal cues that have been identified as immediate (Anderson, 1979). When teachers are nonverbally immediate students perceive higher learning (Gorham, 1995). Anderson (1979) found that immediacy positively influenced student affect toward teacher communication, the course instructor, the course content, and the course in general. Students were also found to use more immediate behaviors as a result of teacher's use of nonverbal immediacy. Taylor, a student, noted that her teacher engaged in both verbally and nonverbally immediate behaviors that made her feel comfortable in and look forward to class:

Mr. Ferguson shows a lot of emotion with his kids because he cares about everyone. Just in the little things, like if we’re just sitting there he comes over
and, you know, rubs your back a little bit, “Hey, how you doing?” you know, stuff like that. It’s really nice.

Immediate behaviors can be seen as kind, confirming gestures to students, and can also enliven class. Madaline, for example, talked about how the lack of a nonverbally immediate communication style can make the class boring:

And I think some teachers make class fun, and others don’t. Like if they just sit there and like all monotone, “Okay, let’s turn to Page 54,” it’s like, “Oh, my gosh, do we do anything else but take notes?”

Mr. Mathias, a teacher, spoke of using nonverbal immediacy to enliven his teaching:

Sometimes I'll be in front of the class and I'll just be drilling, "We gotta learn, learn, learn." And then I'll stop, and I'm like, "Whoa, getting kinda boring." Then I'll sorta pick up my voice and like really just, "This is how we use inverse operations" (monotone), I'll really like use inflection to like get 'em going. I'll move around in front of the class, and it sorta picks up the energy just a little bit, breaks the monotony, and that's when I get more excited.

In addition to making classes more engaging and students feel more connected with their teachers, more recent studies have evidenced the neutralizing impact teacher nonverbal immediacy can have on students' interpretations of instructor violations of availability to students or demanding course workload (Mottet, Parker, Cunningham, Beebe, & Raffeld, 2006; see also Kearney, Plax, & McPherson, 2006). Nonverbal immediacy has also been proven to impact students’ perceptions of teacher’s misbehavior, moderating its effects, interpersonal attraction, homophily, and verbal aggression (see Plax et al., 1986; Richmond, McCroskey, et al., 1987; Rocca & McCroskey, 1999; Thweatt & McCrosky,
Moreover, students of nonverbally immediate teachers are much more likely to comply with teacher requests and workload demands (Mottet, Parker-Raley, Cunningham, & Beebe, 2005). These requests may involve working on challenging assignments which may evoke positive or negative emotions in students, yet students typically maintain a positive attitude toward the teacher and class if immediacy is used.

Mehrabian (1981) characterizes verbally immediate behaviors as the words and vocal style a person uses to communicate openness and approachability. More specifically, highly immediate communicators use words that include the sender and receiver in the same group (i.e., we, us), communicate approachability, and verbally convey a positive attitude. The use of humor, praise, and self-disclosure are also immediacy behaviors (Gorham, 1988). Research has found that when an individual uses immediate expression in a conversation with another, he/she conveys greater liking for and a greater desire for continued interaction with that person than someone who is non-immediate. In more recent years, the validity of the verbal immediacy construct has been called into question with critics arguing that most immediacy is a result of nonverbal behavior (see Richmond et al., 2006), and that verbal immediacy is more accurately defined as "effective teacher behaviors" (see Robinson & Richmond, 1995, p. 81). Regardless of distinctions in the conceptual definition, verbal immediacy, or verbal effectiveness often creates more positive classroom environments. Logan, a student who hated virtually everything about school had a fond place in his heart for one particular class because the teacher used humor to engage students:

Then there’s seventh period, probably my favorite period of the day, not just because it’s the last one, but Mr. McMann, my teacher, he makes learning fun.
Whatever he does, he does it – we take notes, but when he talks about this stuff, he makes it fun. He does all these funny reenactments and stuff. It was funny, when we were talking about Napoleon – you know how Napoleon put his arms inside his vest like this? He was like, “That’s where he hid his charm meter, so every time he’d talk about some girl, Napoleon,” he said that was his charm meter there, and he’d do click noises and turn his hands. It was so funny. He makes it fun. It’s my favorite class because of that, a good way to end the day.

Humor was, not surprisingly, a key contributor to a positive classroom environment. Approachability of the instructor was another powerful factor in students’ assessments of the learning environment. Students spoke repeatedly of wanting to be able to relate to their instructors. Robert found this connection with his English instructor:

Well, for my English class, the teacher for that, she’s really fun and she’s really relaxed. Like she can really relate to, you know, like our generation and what we’re going through and she likes to have fun but then at the same time, you know, she knows when it’s time to buckle down and do what we need to do.

I observed this particular teacher during my fieldwork, and, importantly, she did not sacrifice the quality of learning for "entertainment" or fun. Rather, because students enjoyed her personality and teaching style, they were willing to do their work without complaint. Other students, however, found their teachers to be less verbally immediate and more offensive. Logan shared his reflection on teachers who focus on failure rather than praise:

It seems like they’re always pushing that towards the kids, saying, “If you don’t do this, you’re gonna fail this, you’re gonna fail that.” It’s really annoying. It
doesn’t seem like there’s any positive – not positive, but just a lot of negative hate, I guess, teachers really not caring it seems like. Like motivation. That’s the word I’m looking for. It’s like, how motivating is that? It just seems like they say, “Well, you’re gonna fail if you don’t do this.” That’s not really motivating anymore. It makes it seem like kids are failing all day long. It doesn’t work.

Joel, another student, similarly grew wary of teachers who always assumed the worst about students or expressed negative sentiments. He recounts an incident in which he was getting notes for a homework assignment from a friend:

And he just looked at me (the teacher) and he goes, "Joel are you doing something constructive or are you just annoying me?"

Teachers who frequently used these sorts of statements with students were usually seen as less immediate, less credible, and ultimately created more negative classroom environments. Some students actually chose not to learn from such teachers because they felt it would compromise their personal integrity (Kohl, 1994). Another culprit contributing to undesirable learning environments was verbal aggressiveness on the part of the teachers and students.

*Verbal Aggressiveness: Breeding Dread and Depersonalization*

Verbal aggressiveness is a personality trait predisposing people to use communication behaviors that attack the self-concept of others (Infante, 1995; Infante & Wigley, 1986). Verbally aggressive messages can take the form of "character attacks, competence attacks, insults, maledictions, teasing, ridicule, profanity, threats, and nonverbal indicators" (Infante, 1987, p. 182). The intent of these messages is to dominate or damage the other persons’ position on a topic and/or self-concept, and often to inflict
psychological pain on others (Infante, 1987; Infante & Wigley, 1986). Verbally aggressive messages are damaging to the targets of these message usually resulting in embarrassment, anger, humiliation, depression or feelings of inadequacy (Infante, 1995). Students most often view these behaviors on the part of teachers as misbehaviors or violations of proper norms (Thweatt, 1999). Tabitha, a student, for example spoke of her discomfort in witnessing verbal aggressiveness from her teacher directed toward a fellow student:

I just dreaded that class every day because she’d always pick on this one boy because he never did anything right. So— She made him cry a couple times, in front of everybody. The guys in that class actually started their own conversation, like didn’t even acknowledge it because they didn’t want to see it happening, so— it's really uncomfortable, especially when the teachers caused it.

In the instructional context, verbal aggressiveness has been proven to have a negative impact on students' perceptions of their teachers and student learning. For example, Martin, Weber, and Burant (1997) found that students perceived instructors who used verbally aggressive messages as less competent, less immediate, and less appropriate than those who were not verbally aggressive. The example above illustrates the violation of general cultural norms of respect; and evokes negative emotion in a student so severe that he displays what is known in the literature as negative emotion, crying, in the classroom which is also typically a violation of societal norms (see Planalp, 1999). As is evident by the other students' reactions, bearing witness to others expressions of negative emotion is usually uncomfortable and hurtful. Other students, too, like Giselle experienced the verbal aggression of a teacher:
I think it’s their personality more I guess and their attitude towards it. If you
don’t understand something, like last year – not saying any names, but last year I
was in class or whatever and I didn’t understand something. It was the easiest
thing. I just – my mind went blank for 0.2 seconds and I couldn’t understand
what he was talking about, and he’s just like, “Are you stupid or something?”
Who says that to a student? I’m like, “You seriously gotta be kidding me,” and I
was like, “Whatever,” so I just shut up. I didn’t say nothing, didn’t answer
nothing the rest of the class and I didn’t ask no questions. Passed the class but
barely because I didn’t ever ask any questions ever again.

After her negative interchange with her teacher, Giselle was not motivated to ask
questions and invest in learning the course content. This outcome has been previously
documented as students' state motivation (Myers & Rocca, 2001) and affective learning
(Myers & Knox, 1999) are lowered by perceived instructor verbal aggression. In short,
Giselle chose not to learn from this teacher.

Verbal aggression has received considerable attention in research covering
numerous areas of study in the communication field (e.g. Booth-Butterfield & Sidelinger,
1997; Infante, Chandler, & Rudd, 1989; Infante & Gorden, 1991; Sabourin, Infante, &
Rudd, 1993; Semic & Canary, 1997). Findings suggest that regardless of the context,
verbal aggression is a highly destructive form of communication behavior.

Martin, Anderson, and Horvath (1996) found that verbally aggressive individuals
tend to think that the use of verbal aggression is justified. However, most bystanders
typically judge such behaviors as inappropriate like Ms. Miller, a teacher, who witnessed
her colleagues’ verbal aggression:
I’ve heard of other teachers yelling at kids, telling ‘em they’re worthless and things that I would never say to a student just because I’d be so afraid of hurting their feelings and the long-term effects. You might not think what you say really affects ‘em but I think telling a student he’s a loser isn’t really a good thing to do, and being unrealistic with the goals you set with them. I heard a teacher yelling at a student and the kid had taken a while to pick out a password for the computer and then he’s like, “That’s it. I’m gonna give you three seconds to pick a password,” and the kid started typing. He’s like, “1, 2, 3. That’s it. You’re outta here,” and then took him out into the hall and literally ripped him so – yelled for like four minutes straight. Just literally laid – and this kid was just bawling, and I’m like – something like that, that was unrealistic. The kid’s not gonna type that fast to be able to get it in the computer. Granted he might’ve been slow before and he’s not – I know the student. He’s not always the best, but at the same time give him five seconds to at least get it done before you – and it wasn’t even three seconds. He was like, “1, 2, 3. That’s it,” and then just ripped him, and I’m not a yelling person so I probably think some teachers are overboard.

Verbal aggression is typically viewed as a negative violation of the norms that shape the student-teacher relationship (Infante, 1995; Martin, Weber, & Burant, 1997). Teachers who are higher in verbal aggressiveness were also found to be less caring than teachers who do not use negative communication behaviors (Teven, 2001; Teven & Gorham, 1999). Rocca and McCroskey (1999) found that instructors who are perceived as verbally aggressive are also perceived as being lower in immediacy and homophily. Verbally aggressive teachers in the present study induced fear in students that caused them to
sacrifice their grades and learning. Consider the interchange between Melia and her teacher below:

Yeah, I’m like scared of my English teacher now. And I -- because like when I went up to ask her about my paper and she’s like was mean to me and basically I almost wanted -- I wanted to cry. I was like oh my gosh. I’m like I was scared enough to go up there anyways and she was just like yelling and being mean. I was like oh my gosh. So I left and she ended up not giving me any points.

Some relational/cultural dynamics in the classroom led students to avoid approaching certain teachers; especially verbally aggressive ones.

One teacher, Ms. Matthews, noted witnessing verbally aggressive teachers, but not as many verbally aggressive students:

I've seen teachers just screaming and yelling at students, belittling students. I haven't witnessed students so much doing that to teachers. Or, when I have they get sent right to the office for insubordination.

Teachers are not often punished for their misbehavior outside of loss of credibility and likeability. The fact that students can easily be punished by teachers and administrators for engaging in such behavior, made it less visible during my study though it was still present. Star recounts the story of a student provoking tears in a teacher:

I heard Knowlton (a teacher) cried before. They made her cry. I forget. Toby Johns told her that – I heard this story today, that’s why it’s so fresh in my mind. He told her that she’s a horrible teacher and she cried. I guess she like sat down in her chair and just sat there for a while and she started crying.
Verbally aggressive behaviors on the part of teachers and students contribute to poor classroom climates, decrease perceptions of openness and fairness in the classroom, and may lead students to believe the teachers do not care about their success or well-being. Each of these assumptions will be examined in more depth in the following sections.

**Democratic Learning Environments: Honoring Pro-Social Communication**

The notion of creating classrooms based on democratic principles is gaining increased attention (see McMillian, 2004; Smith-Sanders & Harter, 2007). Democratic principles are the basis upon which the majority of U.S. government organizations and, importantly, society are established. As individuals move through life, they are challenged to function properly in a democratic society. However, students are not fully equipped with the skills necessary to solve problems, think critically, voice their ideas and respect diversity (Knight, 2001; Kubow & Kinney, 2000). Educational institutions are the logical site to educate individuals on democratic principles aiding in their successful socialization into a democratic society (Dewey, 1916; McMillian, 2004). Unfortunately, little has been done to create classrooms climates in which democratic principles are exercised (Kelly, 2002; Print, Ornstrom, & Nielson, 2002; for exceptions see Chory-Assad, 2002; Smith-Sanders & Harter, 2007).

To achieve classroom democracy, teachers must move away from traditional instructional models. Rather than autocratically transmitting knowledge to students, the teacher must co-create a dialogic learning environment in which "students are given the opportunity to express and respect different attitudes, arguments, and points of view" (Print, Ornstrom, & Nielson, 2002, p. 194). Teachers who employ autocratic teaching styles are characterized as being bossy, criticizing, faultfinding, dominating, and
punishing (Dreikurs & Cassel, 1997). Jennifer and Kardyn, both students, shared reflections on their least favorite teachers and teaching styles both identifying autocratic styles as being frustrating:

The least I’d probably have to say I think it would be like when I was talking about with the whole teachers deal and the misunderstanding and then how people just really don’t listen and it’s just kind of like their way just cause they’re a teacher. It’s just kind of like your mom saying, “I’m your mom. That’s why it’s like that.” It’s like you feel like it’s the same scenario and it shouldn’t be.

Like yeah, they’re your teacher, you need to listen to them, but if you should go to let them know how you feel but without feeling like you’re gonna get grounded.

(Kardyn)

When I don’t get along with my teachers, it’s because they only see one point of view--their side, and don’t see your side. And then they have to have their way or no way, and they don’t listen. (Mallory)

Teachers who are considered more democratic in their style are described as being encouraging, acknowledging of achievement, helpful, open to discussion, invitational, and cooperative. Classroom discussion, service learning, and class debates model democratic approaches to learning (Murphy, 2004), and can help socialize students effectively for the world beyond the classroom (McMillian & Harriger, 2002). Consider the following quotes from student interviews, all identifying democratic teaching and learning styles as their favorite:

Well, with a lot of the like issues that are going on with our school and everything, she’ll – like she’ll tell us that we need to take a stand and everything
if there’s things we don’t believe are right or things that we don’t agree with and
fight for it and everything and she just believes in personal expression basically
and, you know, kind of kids against like faculty or, you know, like the school
system or something like that. And she just – she’s really supportive with all that
stuff. (Maddox)

And then it’s just that like they’re laid back and understanding kind of, you
know? Like Ms. Johnson. She understands and she listens. The classroom is
more laid back. I think it’s easier to learn than if you have to pay attention at all
times and then have an uptight teacher. If I do anything wrong, I’m gonna get in
trouble. (Jennifer)

He would do like free writes, so you could write about anything you wanted to
just kind of express yourself a little bit. Then even if you – and just anything you
want, and he – he doesn’t check it or anything. Just as long as he sees you have
stuff written down, he’ll give you points. And the – he’ll analyze stuff, and he –
he brings out – it – I guess the best part is – is because of all the discussions we
have. And it’s like the whole class is kind of open, and it’s kind of what makes it
really cool. (Leo)

And then as far as the way they teach it – as far as the way they teach it like I like
discussion. Like I – I like discussion just because it’s kind of everybody’s
chipping in a little bit. And everybody’s giving their own opinion.

So, and we would discuss like issues of – today’s issues. We discussed like
different stuff in the Constitution like – like what he’d have us do. He’d have us
like – one of the things he would have us do is he’d have us be Presidential
candidates, and we had to represent a certain political party. And we had to defend what they defend, and that made stuff interesting, and then other times he would make us stand for – he would make us do a project on something. Like we’d have – we’d go against these people like say two. I’d get paired up with somebody. We’d have to argue for abortion, and then somebody else would have to argue against abortion. So that was – that also made the class more interesting. And then you got to bring – at one point we were all like a senate. So we got to try to bring in new policy – policy and somehow involve our state, so that made it interesting especially – especially because then the senate would ask questions on it. And they’d vote on it, and I threatened to it – I – I didn’t threaten. My – my proposal was to impeach one of the other senators, and all the girls, they were being buzz kill. They didn’t want to. All the guys did though. (Leo)

Dialogic and democratic learning environments position students as co-participants in the process rather than objects of a powerful teacher (Brunson & Vogt, 1996). Teachers must make themselves more vulnerable to students by sharing power and responding and sharing information in new ways (Hochheimer & Hochheimer, 1994).

Democracy and fairness in the classroom has been found to positively impact students learning and overall educational experience (Chory-Assad, 2002). Students are challenged to learn at a deeper level, and to gain a better understanding of course material through an open classroom environment. Perceptions of fairness and climates of respect in the classroom also contribute to the decrease in student misbehavior, freeing more time for learning (Hyman, 1997). Democratically based education has been shown to aid students in learning leadership, interpersonal, and life skills. Research indicates that
participation in democratic education can improve individuals' abilities to think critically, problem-solve, as well as learn respect and qualities of good citizenship (Kubow & Kinney, 2000). Furthermore, good discipline should be based on democratic rather than autocratic dimensions, creating a climate in which students and teachers respect each other (Hyman, 1997; Kotzen, 1994). Moreover, democratic education provides a place in which students' experiences are perceived to be fair since each student is treated as equally as possible. There have even been links to democratic education as preventative of school violence, substance abuse, racism, and sexism among other personal problems (Knight, 2001).

With the benefits of equitable and democratic classroom climates outlined, it is evident that fostering democracy in the classroom has numerous benefits. Kelly (2002) addresses the need to build democracy in the classroom. This is especially important with increased diversity and violence in schools. Shechtman (2002) also asserts that teachers and institutions must be better prepared to meet the educational needs of all students. To reach this goal, teachers must be equipped with democratic methods of educating. Therefore, the implications of democratic classrooms are twofold: Students are better able to learn course material in democratic classrooms and students are better prepared to navigate circumstances that arise during everyday life in a democratic society. While there are obvious benefits to fostering democracy in a classroom, creating such classrooms has been largely unsuccessful (Print, Ornstrom, & Nielson, 2002; Wood, 1992). In order for teachers to emphasize democratic processes, procedures, and values, they must alter traditional methods of transmitting information to students. Changing such methods takes time, money, energy, and the willingness to be more vulnerable in the
classroom. Moreover, we must remember that any course format, no matter how seemingly productive, has limitations and may not fit each student.

Communication plays a vital role in the development and maintenance of a democratic learning environment. In 1916, Dewey argued that "a democracy is more than a form of government; it is primarily a mode of associated living, of conjoint communicated experience" (p. 93). Viewing the classroom experience as co-constructed between the teacher and student places communication at the center of learning.

Communication behaviors enacted during classroom time contribute to the types of skills that are developed in students. Edwards and Shepherd (2004) illuminate the link between communication and democracy in education. Challenging the transmission model of education, they argue that a democratic education environment more closely reflects society, and allows for a mutual interplay between teacher and student leading to the co-creation of knowledge. The role of communication in a democratic education is not that of transporter of information; rather, it is the medium by which knowledge is created.

Characteristics of democratic teaching styles are similar to immediate teaching behaviors. As noted by Print, Ornstrom, and Nielson (2002), democratic classrooms create an environment in which students are given the opportunity to express ideas and are not deterred by such autocratic/non-immediate behaviors as being criticized or bossed around by teachers. Democratic teaching styles are invitational and encouraging, reflective of immediate communication behaviors (Anderson, 1979; Hyman, 1997).

Wigley, Pohl, and Watt (1989) found, not surprisingly, that verbal aggression and the pre-disposition to praise are negatively correlated. Verbally praising is considered a democratic and immediate behavior. It was noted earlier that perceptions of fairness are
related to lower levels of verbal aggressiveness on the part of the students (Chory-Assad, 2002). Hence, students who are more verbally aggressive will most likely perceive their classrooms to be less fair and democratic. Verbally aggressive behaviors do not co-exist with democratic or immediate behaviors. Taken together, these communication strategies, immediacy, verbal aggressiveness, and democratic practices deeply contribute to the ultimate learning environment that is constructed between students and teachers. In the next two sections additional contributors to the emotional environment of the class are explored: the role of caring and emotion work in teaching and learning.

**Caring in Teaching**

*Caring* is a term that often surfaces in educational contexts to discuss the teacher-student relationship. Importantly, *caring* can be understood as "an act of communication between persons" (Webb & Blond, 1995, p. 614); one diametrically opposed to verbally aggressive acts of communication, but related to immediacy (Teven & Hanson, 2004). Such a view of caring has been developed in contexts ranging from education, to nursing, to general philosophies of human relationships (see for example, Benner, 1984; Bateson, 1958; Buber, 1957; Noddings, 1984). While definitions of caring abound, one that seems particularly useful in the context of education is a relational understanding of caring. Hollingsworth and colleagues (1993, 1994) describe caring as a form of relational *knowing* that informs the enactment of pedagogy and interaction with students. That is, how does teachers' knowledge of and care for students become lived out in the actual practice of teaching? Code (1991) argues that "the process of knowing other people requires constant learning: How to be with them, respond to them, act toward them" (p. 39). Caring teachers must often spend significant time with students to be able to develop
the relational knowledge necessary to form a caring relationship (Noddings, 1992). While some teachers view modeling and teaching about caring as part of the moral responsibility of their work (see e.g., Noddings, 1984, 1992); others view it as a moral code that should not necessarily be part of formal schooling (for reviews see Zembylas 2003a; Zembylas, 2005). This section examines the role of caring in teaching including the relationship between caring and student motivation, and the emotion work engaged in by teachers to maintain caring relationships with students.

Numerous teachers derive a deep sense of satisfaction from developing caring relationships with their students and view caring to be a core aspect of teaching (Goldstein, 2002; Lortie, 1975; Nias, 1989). Literature on caring and teaching further substantiates that connection between good teachers demonstrating caring toward students (Collinson, Killeavy, & Spencerson, 1999; Heath, 1994; Rogers & Webb, 1991). Ms. Clark was one of multiple teachers who spoke extensively about the importance of communicating to the students that they care about them before trying to teach them subject matter:

I truly believe that kids want to know how much you care before how much you know. I could sit up here and impress 'em with all my knowledge and blah blah blah blah blah blah, but I think it's important for them to know first how much you care about them and so I just – that's where I start. I start with saying yes, I do care about you, your learning, you personally. I take an interest – even – we (her and her husband) go to everything. We go to plays, we go to musicals, we go to sporting events. We are involved. But you know what? Some of these kids in the regular biology classes, they don't do any of those things but like I have kids
bringin' in – "Oh, watch me" or they'll take a video on their camera and "Watch my skateboarding" or they love to bike and so I talk about them goin' down to the skate park down here or "Where were ya last night on your bike?" Kinda in that aspect or a lotta kids now that are juniors work. "Where ya workin'?" and kinda take an interest in what they're doing and I think that has a role in why I – I mean I'm gonna not – I mean I know that I have kids that – in the past that are discipline problems but I can say with all reality I think it's because you gotta show 'em that you care about 'em and you know what? There's teachers out there that it's either black or white and no gray and that's fine. That's the way they are and that's the way they always are and that's fine. At least you know where they stand, but there's a lot of gray in life. Especially with a lot of these kids – a lot of these kids' lives so you gotta be able to deal with "okay, but yeah, don't take advantage of me" so I do, I believe that it's because I hope I know how to treat the kids and they are hopefully respectful in that matter back. So I don't – I'm not tootin' my own horn, but I just – I really, truly believe that you gotta let 'em know how much you care about 'em before you tell 'em how much you know. They don't really care about what you know unless they know that you care about 'em.

Ms. Clark notes that through caring she can earn the trust and respect of her students that may in turn encourage them to learn the content of the course. Other teachers, as well, observed that the teachers who seemed to be most well-liked and respected were those that showed compassion, sympathy, empathy, or simply took interest in the lives of students. Moreover, such teachers typically cultivated a climate of trust in their classrooms (Chory, 2007; Teven & Hanson, 2004). Mr. Cornish, reflects on the issue:
"The teacher that is not a real, real maybe compassionate person. I think they become a lot more businesslike in their class. Where again, the person that is a compassionate person is willing to listen to the feelings of the – of the kids. The kids notice that."

Students notice, too, when teachers do not exemplify caring as is evident in the following reflection from Mr. Turner, a school administrator:

... I know that she [a teacher] cares. It is not a question of that, but it’s a question of how she lets students know, and I wonder what her upbringing was, because there’s a way that you can let people – hey, you can do better than that, or you can just keep paddling them, and she tends to do that, and kids completely miss the fact that she’ll come in at 6:30 in the morning to work with them. She’ll stay there ‘til 4:00 to work with them. They get caught up in the, “Well, she’s negative. She never gives me any positive – she doesn’t,” and she probably doesn’t do enough of that, but it’s not because she doesn’t care. And she’s doing it for the right reason, because she does care, that she wants them to be successful, but there’s a disconnect there, that they don’t understand that she cares because of the way she – she thinks her consistent prodding is letting them know, but they don’t get that.

Caring, compassionate teachers had a certain ethos about them (McCroskey, 1998); teachers lacking this ethos were often deemed dispassionate, uncaring, or, in the words of one student, Jess, "just working for a paycheck." Connecting with others is one of the main ways in which teachers and students do the “business” of schooling through a humanistic, emotional approach. Kahn (1993) defines compassion as “an emotional presence” evoked “by displaying warmth, affection, and kindness” (p. 546). In is through
communicative means that compassion and caring are expressed to others, and instantiated in cultures as something “we do.”

Teachers who viewed the expression and modeling of compassionate relationships as part of their job, often sought to correct students who failed to reciprocate such acts of caring. For example, during a teachers' luncheon at which I was present, one teacher relayed the story of a boy joking around after students were conversing about how a high school girl in the neighboring town was recently in a car accident that left her paralyzed and in a coma:

Jonathan was joking about being a vegetable. I said "you wouldn't want someone talking about you like this". He didn't even care. He just did it again to try to get some laughs (teacher shaking his head in frustration). I told him to go to DMR (detention). I couldn't stand him anymore. The kid has no concept of empathy. He just thinks he's better than everyone else and nothing like that will ever happen to him. (fieldnotes, 2/17/07)

Knowing when and how to express sympathy or empathy toward others is a key tenet of being emotionally intelligent (Goleman, 1995), and key tenet of expressing caring for other human beings (Noddings, 1984). Many teachers felt it was their duty not only to model caring, but to teach students how to reciprocate such acts of communication with other human beings.

Sutton and Wheatley (2003) argue that "writers who urge caring as a basis for management and discipline (e.g., Freiberg, 1999) do not discuss how caring for children can coexist with anger, disgust, and sadness. In short, caring does not look or feel the same across people and situations (i.e., caring is not always 'warm and fuzzy'). This
variety of emotions can lead to an "emotional roller coaster" (Sutton, 2000a) that can make it difficult for teachers to behave consistently" (Sutton & Wheatly, 2003, p. 342). A veteran teacher, Mr. Cornish, recognized that truly caring about students makes teaching a challenging enterprise:

I look at it as teaching’s a roller coaster. I mean if you’re gonna be in it for the long run, teaching is a roller coaster because you – you know what I mean? This year may be a great year. Next year could be the worst year. And you’re counting down the days until you retire.

As argued by Frost, Dutton, Worline, & Wilson (2000), organizations are everyday sites of deep emotional experience that call for members to engage in compassionate acts. Kahn (1998) positions compassion as key to caregiving and views both as embedded in the work interactions of organizational members. Frost et al. (2000) aptly state that "pain and compassion are not separate from "being a professional" and "doing of work" in organizations" (p. 25). It is through such experiences that humanity is represented in the workplace. Most teachers sought to excel at their jobs, often talking about what qualities a person should have to be a good employee and mentor. They were acutely aware that it requires more than knowledge of the subject matter to do their jobs well. Miller (2002) argues that rules for emotional expression are not always spelled out, but are expected by the nature of the role a person assume. For many, that role involved acts of compassion.

One such teacher, Ms. Johnson, said:

I think that we need to be more caring and understanding, but I don't think we need to enable. I'm not saying be their friend; I'm saying we need to be more aware, and maybe more human.
Some scholars fear that caring and compassion in teaching causes dependency issues with students and burnout in teachers (see Zembalyas, 2006; see also Miller, Stiff, & Ellis, 1998). Most of the teachers interviewed for this study recognize that teaching from a philosophy of care and compassion requires a great deal of emotion work, but they were willing to do the work. One teacher, Ms. Sackman said "my own husband doesn't know how or why I do it" when talking about her daily challenges as a special education teacher. She shared stories of changing the adult diapers and soiled pants of students, and searching for patience when students do not understand how to use a broom or complete an activity. She argued that through patience, caring and compassion she could empower rather than enable students. Teachers in all subjects expressed similar desires. To do so, they frequently described engaging in emotion work and managing work feelings (Miller, 2007). While emotional labor and emotion work share similar qualities, a key distinction is that emotion work typically involves authentic emotion that stems from the work itself (e.g., being a teacher and caring about students). Emotional labor on the other hand is typical in professions in which people feel they must manufacture or conjure up particular emotions through surface or deep acting that support the profits of the organization for which they work (Miller, 2007). Teachers spoke extensively about their work feelings. While not all teachers would consider the management and expression of their emotions as emotion work, but rather emotional labor, most viewed the expression of compassion and caring as part of their emotion work and professional identity as a teacher. The notion of teacher's professional identities is discussed further in the next section.
Teachers' Professional Identities

Teachers are usually expected to behave professionally as they assume their public role. Notions of professionalism often include implicit and sometimes explicit rules of how to manage emotion. The notion of professionalism in teaching will be further discussed here as it relates to emotion and teacher identity. To begin this section let us first revisit one of the key contentions of this project: that emotions are not simply individual responses to stimuli, but are most frequently socially stimulated, organized, and managed (Rose, 1990). According to Rose (1990), "social conventions, community scrutiny, legal norms, familial obligations, and religious injunctions" influence how emotions are experienced and managed (p. 1). This understanding points to the powerful influence of discursive practices on emotion, and allows us to examine the ways in which discourse shapes the emotional practices through which identity is constituted (Abu-Lughod & Lutz, 1990; Zembylas, 2005). Drawing upon poststructuralist conceptions of teacher identity and emotion will allow us to more deeply interrogate the role of power relations, culture, and ideology in shaping roles and rules related to emotion.

The appropriateness and impact of various emotion displays by teachers is strongly regulated by culture (Higgins & Moule, 2002; Sutton & Wheatley, 2003). Cultural views of emotion (for example, views of emotion as irrational) regulate how emotion is displayed or hidden and understood (Mesquita & Albert, 2007). The quality and dynamics of human interaction are thus influenced by emotion regulation principles unique to each culture. Prescriptions let members of organizations know what should be expressed and restrictions inform members of what should not be expressed (see Parkinson, 1995; see also Hochschild, 1979). Broader society and school practices often
manifest in the classroom as many emotion rules are taken-for-granted. It is against such rules that behavior is judged. Normative conceptions of relating and experiencing the world arise out of cultural beliefs and practices (Mesquita & Albert, 2007). Emotions in relations are deeply tied to cultural forms of knowledge and practices. Rules and roles guide people through their lives and evaluate patterns of emotion as appropriate or in violation of cultural expectations (Parkinson et al., 2005). For example, Emerson, a student, shared this story about teachers:

...sometimes teachers almost aren’t as professional as they should be. Like, they make comments that like, I don’t think teachers should make. Like, about, like, people - like, people in authority. And like when they say it, like even if I don’t feel that way, it makes me start to feel that way like about the Superintendent, and just like the Board. Like, teachers will just make certain comments. It makes me lose a little bit of respect for the teacher too, really. It’s usually in class, which really surprises me - some of my teachers say things about students and like, they should not be saying, you know. Like, they gossip like kids sometimes.

Emerson and other students held teachers to higher standards than students. Emerson even commented "it's one thing for students, but for people in authority it doesn't seem right."

Such rules create the need for emotion and communication management to perform emotional selves “appropriately”, and to judge the performances of others. It is through such knowledge that we legitimate or reprimand the behavior of others. In previous sections, you read discourse from participants that discussed the appropriateness and desirability of particular teacher behaviors in the classroom. Through a post-
structuralist lens, teacher identity can be understood as constituted in and through power relations and negotiated among social and cultural forces (Cornell, 2000; Holstein & Gubrium, 2000; Zembylas, 2005). Hence, the notion of teacher identity is contingent and malleable, and dependent on students' conceptions of a good teacher. One new teacher said that her biggest fear was that she would "lose her temper and cuss." Another teacher regaled me with tales of his "explosive temper" and "memorable" eruptions that could be "heard down the hall." He then discussed how he had learned to manage his temper through socialization and emotion management techniques such as deep acting. Another new teacher discussed that he feels anxious due to the feeling of "always being watched" by students who were judging his behavior. None of the teachers could recall formal messages they had received or training that communicated how they ought to use/manage emotion to be considered professional. All expressed the sentiment that society had already let them know what was acceptable (calm, emotional control) and unacceptable (crying, extreme anger displays). When I asked an administrator what he expected of the teachers at his school he had this to say:

Well, my expectations are this, I don’t want them in their classroom to lose emotional control, just ‘cause I think that’s modeling something that – it goes back to the guy, that the only way he knew how to handle it was to cuss, yell, come in here. I don’t want them to see that and think that’s the right way to do it, so I would prefer that the teachers have a way of dealing with – if it’s a little issue that they can handle, great, but I don’t want them to feel that they have to have an argument or a disagreement in class. Hey, that’s what we’re here for. The most important thing I want them to do is instruct, so if they’ve got a situation
discipline-wise that that kid has escalated, I don’t want the teacher to escalate with them. Send them down here and you go on with the class.

Don’t let your emotions take it where that one kid now stops you from doing what you’re supposed to do for the other 21 kids in there, so I guess I would like them to be able to keep their emotions in check to that point, that they don’t forget what their mission is each day. Also, understanding that hey, there are times when that doesn’t happen, and maybe they brought something in with them that hey, they had a disagreement with their wife, they haven’t been getting sleep because they’ve got their two year olds up, whatever. I would also, if that’s the situation, for them to be able to say to a kid in this situation – when it’s to the office, not necessarily in the classroom. I just don’t think that’s the place for discussion. Separate them out, even if it’s just having them sit in the hallway, cool down, I would like them to be able to say, “I was wrong. I was on edge, but here’s what happened,” and bring resolution, that hey, I was wrong, you were wrong, but let’s do better with this.

I would hope that all of our staff could do that. I would hope that they would be consistent day to day in setting their expectations about what it is in this class, and I think that’s so important for kids. Now I understand with 58 different teachers, the expectations of one from this end to this end, they’re going to be greatly different, but I think as long as they can be consistent day to day in their classroom, then that lets kids have an understanding of what the expectations are. Now it may be different from this person to this person, but if there’s a consistency with that person, then you don’t put the kids in an unfair spot, so I
think that’s what I would expect for them, to have clear expectations and be consistent day to day, and if something happens that they’re not, to be able to say, “Hey, that was as much my fault as yours,” because I think kids understand that too, and I think there’s nothing more disarming to a kid when they’re all mad and everything to say, “I was wrong.”

Right away, you can just see it. It goes out of them, and they’re more likely to say, “Well, I did this too,” and you go on. Now it’s not always that way. A lot of times the teacher wasn’t wrong. The kid came in, they did something, they knew what they weren’t supposed to do, and for whatever reason, they kept escalating to a point where they were moved. Well, I want the teacher to be able to stay as much as they can emotionally unattached and move that student out of the room so they don’t disrupt and get them to here where we can deal with that.

The administrator's position on managing emotion to maintain a professional identity captures the inherent tension in viewing emotions as knowledge producing resources. The code of professionalism may collide with a person's emotional knowledge that is telling them to react in a particular way to a situation that is frustrating, unjust, or in some cases they may feel, calls for the expression of negative emotion. However, expression of negative emotion, or letting emotion "take it somewhere" that one should not as a teacher violates expectations of professionalism, and may inhibit learning for other students. Not "losing emotional control" positions emotion as something potentially dangerous that should be controlled. The charge to remain "emotionally unattached" expressed the common sentiment that we can bar emotions from our lives and relationships--an impossible task; yet, teachers know what this means. The teacher's job is to "instruct" yet
emotions are a key part of that instruction, I argue, making the discursive positioning of emotions in this narrative and most we encounter aligned with societal discourses of emotion, professionalism, and learning.

The process of teaching and learning is fraught with emotional experience on a variety of levels. The next section examines a general emotion—embarrassment—on students' and teachers' experiences at school. This emotion bears attention as it was frequently recalled as defining key parts of participants' school lives.

*Embarrassment*

Embarrassment is one of the most actively avoided, but frequently felt emotions, especially by adolescents (Gross & Stone, 1964; Harre, 1990). Miller (1996) estimates that about "ninety-eight percent of the time embarrassment occurs in the public" making school a prime location for vulnerability (p. 39). Sattler (1965) identified three conditions under which emotions of embarrassment usually arise in interaction: "(1) the presence of another person, or at least the thought of another person; (2) the person becoming aware that he[she] is the center of attention; and (3) the person feeling that he[she] is being judged" (p. 14). As students and teachers progress through their school day they typically, either consciously or subconsciously, strive for a particular self-presentation (e.g., Cupach, Metts, & Hazelton, 1986). Embarrassment typically results when a person projects an undesirable social image to others and realizes their social *faux pas*. For example, realizing you tucked your shirt into your underwear making it visible to the students you are teaching, a student telling a joke in front of her peers and no one laughs, or offering the wrong answer to an "easy" question. The realization that one should be embarrassed stems from knowledge of particular social norms and standards through
which individuals develop an identity they wish to project. In this section we will examine embarrassment as a socially stimulated and managed emotion, and consider how the organization of classrooms and communication strategies influence experiences of this emotion.

Goffman (1956) helps us situate the interpersonal factors and social evaluations that lead to embarrassment in a broader institutional frame. He notes that broader hierarchies of power may create situations in which people are placed in complex situations that compromise their ability to perform their identity as they wish due to power or status differences. In such situations, showing embarrassment indicates that one is not meeting personal expectations for self-presentation, but leaves the door open for a more successful performance in the future. For example, during observations I sat in on a class in which exams were returned to students and identities had to be managed in the moment:

The teacher circulates the room passing back Friday's exams. Students are chatting back and forth. One boy announces, "I think I bombed" and starts laughing. The top of his test is laid on his desk. It reads: 62%. "Sweet!" he exclaims prompting laughter amongst the other students. Sara says to the girl sitting next to her, "I didn't have any time to study. I probably didn't do that well." The girl replies, "Yeah, me too." They receive their exams: Sara received a 94% and her neighbor a 92%. Both mute their smiles and leave their papers lying face up with the grade showing. Students who received lower than a B generally put their exam face down or in their folder immediately. Rebecca said to her
neighbor, "I didn't like this chapter so I didn't try very hard" upon seeing a 75% at the top of her exam. She continued: "I got an 'A' last time so it doesn't matter."

This scene points to the ways in which students managed others’ perceptions of them and their identity as students. The young man anticipated a potentially embarrassing situation and tried to mediate the damage using humor. Sara and her neighbor attempted to mediate a potential threat to their identities as intelligent students by noting external factors as possibly hindering their performance, but were notably pleased when they received good grades (though tried not to act *too* excited). Rebecca engaged in both preemptive identity management and damage control upon receiving a less than desirable grade noting that she earned an 'A' previously, letting her peer know it is not a problem to earn such a grade again should she desire thus maintaining her identity as a good student.

According to Cupach & Metts (1990) most people have a deep desire to repair their embarrassment and frequently attempt to do so by drawing upon verbal strategies like those used above: excuses, exclamations, justifications, humors, etcetera. These tactics point to the important role communication plays in the management of embarrassment.

Teachers, too, drew upon verbal strategies and organized their classes in ways to avoid embarrassing situations or questions they may not feel comfortable answering. Teachers who were responsible for facilitating lessons on "delicate" topics such as sex offered especially poignant examples of dealing with potential embarrassment. Consider Ms. Groves, a teacher, who talked about managing her own and her students' embarrassment:

Ms. Groves: I think the reproduction topic is probably the hardest. Yeah, it’s one of those things where it’s embarrassing to me, like if I was outside of this room,
you would never hear me talk about those things; my Mom’s like "what--you teach that?"-- ‘cuz I get embarrassed when she says anything –And I’m like “You know you just have to kinda joke around with the kids about it and let them say what they’re gonna say, as long as it’s school appropriate” and just move on from there. ..and if they have questions – and we did, I think it was Compass, when they were here, she brings a box in, which is kinda nice and if the kids have questions they’re embarrassed to ask, they can just throw them in the box. So if it’s a dumb question you don’t really have to answer it, or hopefully nobody’s gonna throw anything stupid out there.

Alane: That’s a good idea.

Ms. Groves: Yeah. Yeah and you don’t have to be embarrassed about it.

Alane: So what are some examples of things that they’ve asked?

Ms. Groves: Um, I’m trying to think; well, anytime we talked about sex, “Well is oral sex real sex?” “What’s that called?” and they’ll just start throwing out names and so you gotta kinda reel them in a little bit from that, it’s always the sex topics – What else do they say? Well we talk about erections and ejaculation, there’s always some comments that come about that too, so I try and be funny about it and when we say “ejaculation” I’m like “e-JA-cu-LA-tion” (says with gusto and smiles) and they’re like “Oh my God,” you know and they think it’s funny, so it kinda keeps it light and makes it easier on me too so I don’t feel so embarrassed and they don’t know that I’m embarrassed too.

Ms. Groves notes that she feels embarrassed talking about these topics (which are often considered "private topics" except for in the classrooms of teachers charged with
educating students on these issues). Hence, she structures the class in a way that invites students to participate without fear of being judged for their questions or ultimately embarrassed. Ms. Groves acknowledges that approaching the course in this way allows her to present a face that shows she is not embarrassed to engage with these questions and topics (even though she is) because sensing her embarrassment might teach students that it is not "normal" to talk about these topics at school. Here the hierarchy of power in the school called upon Ms. Groves to perform a certain identity, knowledgeable, confident teacher, in and through a certain task, discussions of topics that evoke embarrassment in her and therefore threaten to derail her desired self-presentation. The very notion that talking about sex at school could be embarrassing can be understood by how "sex education" is normalized or vilified in circulating discourses (see Wagener, 1998 for a Foucauldian analysis of sex education).

Restructuring situations that may threaten one's identity is not always an option for students. Power also must be considered in understanding how students may be enabled or constrained to enact their identity as they choose. In the classroom, teachers are in a status position that affords them more control over the classroom. However, before falling into the notion of power as something one person has we must return to Foucault (1980) who aptly points out that power is a process rather than a possession. Undoubtedly, material circumstances, historicity and cultural norms influence the flow of power, but ultimately power is in relations between people. It circulates and gains meaning through discourse and social practices. Interactions between teachers and students in which the student does what the teacher asks (e.g., writes a paper) and the teacher provides a resource (e.g., the opportunity to pass a class and earn a diploma) (re)
produce situations in which the teacher is in control. Teachers exercising their power can be productive or oppressive to students' school experiences. Through interviews and observations I learned of the ways in which relations of power shaped students' school days. Students frequently vented to friends about teachers they thought were unfair, complained about teaching methods, and criticized the school schedule. I asked each of these students if they mentioned anything to their teachers or administrators about these issues--only a single student had. Students viewed teachers and administrators primarily as having power as a possession and recurrently succumbed to negative learning experiences and emotions as a result. In the following excerpt, Allison recounts her ongoing experiences of managing her emotions to maintain a desired identity in front of peers in challenging class:

Of course you get called on in this class, and I don’t know much about this place we’re talking about. I guess we read it in our reading before, and I didn’t know much about it. Of course I got called on. He’s like “Why does Cuba have this land where this mountain is?” Or “Why did they keep it that way?” I didn’t know and I got like really sweaty and hot. I was scared, you know. I don’t know and I usually don’t answer. I got really scared. After waiting forever he was like “Okay.” And then something about looking back in the reading. I have big eyes. I know I probably open them wider. I didn’t roll my eyes. I’m like, “Ugh.” I turned back, but I didn’t roll my eyes, I know I didn’t. He was like “Don’t roll your eyes because you know that really gets me mad.” Something like that. So I looked and I read it, and I finally got the answer. I felt like I was going to die. Then my one friend, she’s also in that class. He called on her for a question. It was okay, she
didn’t know. He had her read a sentence, then translate it. She didn’t really say it in the right order, so he made her go to the other room and finish writing it, translating it and getting it to when you read it, it makes sense. Then he had me read it again and I got this one word wrong. I went back and fixed it right away. He was like “That word didn’t belong. That word’s not right.” So I did it again. It was bad so I read a bit more but I know what I’m talking about. He probably didn’t think I did it but I always write out my stuff. But I get tired of Spanish, translating it to English. I’m not good at making stuff sound right. I just write it how it is. If it doesn’t make sense it’s kind of hard for me to make it. I have a difficulty in that class. I felt like I was off to cry then. I was sitting there looking at my paper and I just felt like crying. I told my mom. I’m like “Mom, I can’t take that class. I can’t get called on.” I just couldn’t take it. So she’s kind of thinking about it and called to see if I could drop it. Because all my sisters had him, and Spanish teachers are mean. I want to drop it but I don’t know if I can because my study hall, I’d have to wait until next semester and I don’t know if I can wait that long. So nerve wracking and scary. Next time if I get called on I’ll probably cry if I get yelled at again. I just really don’t think he cares really. He wants us to learn more, but I wish teachers wouldn’t call on people a lot, because you come there to learn. He should talk a little bit then ask questions about it. I know you’re supposed to like talk in Spanish. We usually read. It’s really hard comprehending a few things. I want to drop it, and hopefully I can. But I’ll have to wait until parent teacher conferences. My mom wants me to wait until then. I don’t know if I can wait until November 14th. So now when I go to that class I don’t have fun
anymore. Usually me and my friends are like “Oh, okay.” We don’t talk; we get scared. When I go to class I need to think of the time. “Okay, only a few more minutes. You get to leave.” That’s what I look forward to. I know Spanish, but I just don’t know if I can take it anymore. It’s too nerve wracking for me. I feel bad dropping because I know Spanish really well. I feel really bad, but I wasn’t big on Spanish because of the teacher. I don’t like getting called on. I think it’s good to get called on, but not a whole lot. Not if you have to wait, because if you have to wait it just embarrasses me more. It embarrasses me so much. I get all red. By the end of that class, if I had that skirt on, it got really hot. Like a sweat mark on my chair because I got so hot and nervous and scared. I don’t like that class anymore. I just sit there. I just really want to change it but I don’t know if they’re going to let me go from study hall. Yeah. I just don’t like the teacher because I get really emotional. Like if somebody says something really mean, I just feel like I’m going to cry. Yesterday I felt like I was going to cry...It’s really tough for me to be in that class... It’s like “Oh my God, I didn’t do anything.” I don’t want to be embarrassed by my peers too. I had to hold back my tears. I don’t want people judging me. I’m not a baby; I don’t have to cry at everything. I try to control. They shouldn’t wait. I think teachers, if they have a choice of calling on kids, they should only give them a little bit of time and be like “Okay.” They shouldn’t be rude about the question or answer. If you’re feeling weak, most teachers are nice and they’re happy so I think that’s good. But they should care about your feelings too, you know. Sometimes you can see it in a person that they’re going to cry, or
they’re scared. I probably had a red face because my ears get hot. I thought "Why can’t I be more dark, or tanner?"

Jennifer's quote captures the desperation she feels to avoid embarrassment and being judged by her peers. The embarrassment induced by not knowing the proper answer or translation in front of her teacher and peers leads her to want to cry--which she views as making the situation more severe. The language Jennifer uses to describe crying such as "weak," "try to control," and "I'm not a baby" illuminates the view she has derived of emotion from current discourses that define, discipline, and punish unruly behavior (Foucault 1972; 1980). The physiological manifestations, in this case, also play a role in making her vulnerable to further embarrassment because her emotion becomes visible to others through her reddened face and sweating body. These nonverbal cues are highly recognizable as stemming from negative emotion and very difficult to mask (Leary, 1992).

Summary

Classrooms can be understood as emotional arenas, each with unique social and emotional philosophies and practices that shape the nature of the learning environment. Immediacy is a communication behavior that has important emotional underpinnings and consequences for students' and teachers' relationships and learning. Verbal aggressiveness and immediacy can be understood as contributing to the emotional climate of a classroom and (dis)abling the achievement of democratic classrooms that foster positive emotional atmospheres and may heighten learning. Emotion is infused into how most teachers enacted their identities as caring teachers and managed to maintain professionalism. Finally, students and teachers noted experiencing embarrassment as an
ongoing part of the learning process; an emotion that was primarily debilitating. The next chapter turns attention to macro-forces that shape schools and, subsequently, learning and emotions.
CHAPTER FOUR - STRUCTURE, POWER, AND POLITICS IN SCHOOLING

In pursuit of a deeper understanding of students academic and emotional experiences at school, one must also examine the broader structures that organize schooling. These structures arise out of discursive constructions and understandings about how students will best learn and become productive members of society (Fineman, 2000; Giddens, 1979, 1984). Issues of material organization (e.g., the way the desks are set up in the classroom), curriculum, role-taking, emotional expression, and power and discipline are all negotiated through discourse. The following sections trace historical influences on the structure and practices of the modern school, and turn an eye toward understanding three pervasive parts of school culture and students' emotional and academic lives: discipline, testing, and grading. These sections approach our understanding of the school system and subsequently the experiences of participants in the school from a macro perspective.

The Disciplined Student

Disciplining the young and helping them develop self-discipline has long been a part of formal education (Covaleskie, 1994; Foucault, 1977). While teaching students the subject matter (i.e., reading, writing, arithmetic) is the ultimate goal of most teachers, discipline is recognized as a necessary part of schooling and a key part of preparing youth to participate in society. In the words of Roth (1992) "the task of creating rational, autonomous persons falls initially to pedagogical institutions. Their goal is to produce young bodies and minds that are self-governing; failing that, they try to make their graduates governable" (p. 692). To more deeply examine issues of discipline and power
in schooling we turn to the work of Michel Foucault (1980) who illuminates the ways in which power circulates through institutions:

Take, for example, an educational institution: the disposal of its space, the meticulous regulations which govern its internal life, the different activities which are organized there, the diverse persons who live there or meet one another there, each with his own function, his well-defined character--all these things constitute a block of capacity--communication--power. The activity which ensures apprenticeship and the acquisition of aptitudes or types of behavior is developed there by means of a whole ensemble of regulated communications (lessons, questions and answers, orders, exhortations, coded signs of obedience, differentiation marks of the "value" of each person and of the levels of knowledge) and by means of a whole series of power processes (enclosure, surveillance, reward and punishment, the pyramidal hierarchy). (pp. 218-219).

These regulated communications and power processes structure and control educational experiences; yet, the ways in which communication constitutes the process of schooling, shapes participants' identities, and circulates power is often taken for granted leaving many school practices fairly uncontested. One such practice is the often covert disciplining of emotions in public spheres.

In his seminal work, *Discipline and Punish* (1977), Foucault examines power relationships that exist within various institutions, namely prisons, schools, and mental institutions. While he did not study schools directly, Foucault traces the ways in which practices from prisons and medical establishments came to knowingly and unknowingly influence the organization and practices of schools and vice versa. Foucault (1977) delves
deeply into understanding the nature of power in relation to discipline, and offers a
detailed understanding of two important forms of power: sovereign and disciplinary.
Sovereign power is the form of power that is recognizable in particular individuals; for
example, teachers and principals. Recognizable by others and themselves as agents of
power, these individuals may exercise power publicly upon others who know they are
being acted upon. Sovereign power is typically exercised in response to particular
circumstances; for example, punishment in response to a violation of a public rule. For
example, while observing a class the teacher said to a student who was scooting his chair
around to intentionally make noise "Calm down or you'll spend the entire day in the
[principal’s] office. I'll write it [the detention slip] for three days. I won't waste my time
to write it for one." The student knew he was being acted upon by someone with
sovereign power and stopped the offensive behavior to avoid the threatened punishment.

Disciplinary power, on the other hand, is as diffuse as sovereign power is visible.
Disciplinary power emanates from everyone and everywhere making it far more difficult
to detect and resist than sovereign power. While individuals are distinctly aware of which
parts of their lives are impacted by sovereign power; it is nearly impossible to elude
disciplinary power due to its scattered nature and the lightness with which it works.
Rather than controlling through the direct application of power by an agent, disciplinary
power controls through the disinterested, invisible gaze. This gaze is the gaze of society--
peers, leaders, imagined others, ourselves--driven by conscious and subconscious
knowledge of normalized rules and roles. This type of power is exceptionally effective
because it makes visible the subject while the power remains virtually invisible. The
possibility of subversion is much more difficult because the power itself does not operate
from one locus, identifying no clear target for resistance, and is in constant operation in
relations. Pastoral power, a version of disciplinary power, refers to the ways in which
people learn to discipline and control their own behavior absent a specific sovereign
power (Foucault, 1984). Social relations become governed between individuals (e.g.,
students correcting peers behavior), within the individual (e.g., masking the desire to cry
in a class), and by imagined others (e.g., not copying an essay for fear of being
surveilled). Mr. Mathias described an exercise of pastoral/disciplinary power between
two students as he related the story of a student who had frequent outbursts due to a
medical condition:

There's one student that sits behind him [the student with outbursts] that's really
taken to him, sort of like his mentor--like he checks his work and he like really
helps him out. Like in the middle of class he'll stand up and just start looking out
the window, he'll just tell him, "Hey, you need to sit down." It makes it nice,
cause then I don't have to always be the one yelling at him.

This teacher was relieved that he was not forced to exercise sovereign power over this
student who was unable to control his behaviors according to classroom rules. The
classmate used pastoral power to align the student's behavior. Though certain students are
unable to "self-police" their behaviors adequately, many are quite effective at this feat. A
feat celebrated by educational institutions and broader society due to its efficiency.

Foucault (1980) views disciplinary power as functioning through the body noting that it
"reaches into the very grain of individuals, touches their bodies and inserts itself into their
actions and attitudes, their discourses, learning processes and every lives" (p. 39).
Disciplinary power is deployed through various 'technologies' that work to train and discipline individuals into "normal" productive members of society.

As early as the 18th century, there was a great deal of focus on disciplining the individual body in the military, schools, and hospitals in an effort to create the most 'economic man,' one who was used his body to maximum efficiency to achieve goals. Raising one's hand to speak, asking permission to sharpen a pencil or use the restroom, sitting in one's seat quietly while the teacher is speaking, all represent manifestations of power at work on the body (Corrigan, 1991). A variety of techniques were transferred from institution to institution to manage characteristics of the body. These techniques were based on the premise that bodies were manageable, analyzable, transformable—a concept Foucault (1978) referred to as docility. Docile bodies were achieved through discipline and discipline then shaped these bodies according to normative conceptions of a productive person. Three of the most powerful technologies, or techniques of control, according to Foucault (1977), are hierarchical observation, normalizing judgment, and the examination. As these techniques of control are discussed it is important to remember that for Foucault (1983) the exercise of power "incites, it induces, it seduces, it makes easier or more difficult" (p. 220). Power is not always negative as many assume it to be, nor are individuals always passive subjects. Where there is power, there is also agency and the opportunity to resist (Foucault, 1983). One reason these techniques of control are so effective is that many individuals choose to engage in hegemonic relationships—subjecting themselves to control by others in pursuit of a goal or reward.
Observation

Prisons, especially, proved how effective direct observation or the possibility of being surveilled was in influencing behavior. Schools and other organizations structured their space in ways that allowed observation of behavior and ordering of bodies. The classrooms I visited, with the exception of one, had the desks in clear rows facing the teacher and each student had an assigned seat. Students who required more discipline and surveillance were seated close to and under the direct gaze of the teacher. For example, during one class a boy who continued to talk with the student next to him and ignore the teachers prompts to focus on his work was met with this order from his teacher, Ms. Johnson: "Jimmy you just bought yourself a ticket to a front row seat--right here at my table. Bring your paper and sit up here. Since you can't stay on task on your own I'll be right here to remind you" (fieldnotes, 1/10/08). Students who were "troublemakers" were also separated from each other so that they could be more easily controlled by the teacher to diminish disruptive behavior (e.g., Mr. Schramm reorganized his entire seating chart three times in one semester in an effort to seat a group of boys apart from one another who were, in his words, "out of control" when sitting next to each other or certain other students). Melia, a student, spoke about her reaction to the structure of the school environment:

...some desks are just like so horrible. And all I want to do is like stand up and I just -- I'm so -- moving, moving, move because I don't feel comfortable. Yeah and we just get like four minutes in the hallway and in that time you're trying to get to your locker and to your class. So you don't get to talk to very many people. And they don't realize that you're sitting all day. And you can't talk. They're up
front in front of the classroom talking. So it’s like you don’t understand that.

Like your freshman year you have all classes. It’s like you don’t get to talk. And so like they don’t get it—so when you get yelled at for talking it’s like sorry I just didn’t get to talk for like ever. So it’s like when they cut down our lunches to thirty minutes that’s just like okay now I get thirty minutes out of the day to actually talk but I’m trying to eat too and trying to drive—trying to beat everybody else and try and get a parking place. More stress.

Melia, like many others, had to work to control the impulses of their bodies to move and talk so as to fit the order of the school. She knew she was being watched and that she would be punished for being disruptive to the learning environment.

Within the school itself, students were organized into class sections based on grade or ability in particular subjects allowing for easy categorization. The very structure of the school also exerts disciplinary power by making it easier to observe student and teacher behavior with long corridors, windows in the doors to classrooms, tiered bleachers in the gymnasium, and classrooms without dividing walls leaving students in clear view. The most "unruly" area of the school, the hallway, was controlled through organizational rules about attire and the materials one was permitted to bring to school. For example, there were rules that prohibited backpacks, bags, coats, and hooded sweatshirts from being worn into the school due to the possibility that students could hide illegal substances or materials in them. Banning these things made surveillance and control much easier. Teachers and administrators were assigned "duties" at different times during the day to watch a particular area on school grounds. In between classes, teachers stood in the hallway and watched students between classes to greet them and
ensure they were following school rules. Before and after school, teachers and administrators stood outside the building to watch as students entered and left the school. Lunch, study hall, and detention were also key events that required the gaze of more than one person with "sovereign power."

Importantly, observation is done not just by those with sovereign power, but also by peers, parents, and others. Discourses about how to behave at school penetrate the school from these parties in addition to those recognized as holding sovereign power in this context--verbal and nonverbal behaviors work to discipline the way students walk, talk, participate in class, etcetera. For example, a girl was walking down the hall on the wrong side complicating the flow of students trying to get to classes. A boy said to her "to the right" indicating to walk down the opposite side. She moves over and keeps walking (fieldnotes, 9/13/07). On another occasion a girl was talking loudly to her friend as she walked down the hall. Two other girls turned toward her, looked at her directly, raised their eyebrows and pursed their lips indicating disapproval. The girl noticed and immediately said "oops" and lowered the tone of her voice (fieldnotes, 9/5/07).

Foucault's work can be used to understand students' desire to hide many emotion displays from others. Students repeatedly noted that they did not want others to "see" them expressing emotion; especially negative or what has been historically considered weak emotions like sadness through crying. Multiple teachers said that if a student seemed they were upset they would send them to another area so that others could not as readily view their emotion display. Mr. Mathias said "If I can tell someone is going to cry or is having a bad day I quietly, it's usually the girls, I quietly ask if they would like to go to the bathroom." Ms. Clark, too, noted that she asks students to go with her to the hall or
if they need to go to the bathroom to calm down. While Foucault did not study emotions explicitly, his notion of observation can be applied to observing not just general behavior, but emotion displays as well. To more deeply understand how technologies of control work to exert power over emotional experience and displays we must examine the technology of normalizing judgment.

**Normalizing Judgment**

Another technique of control, normalizing judgment, compliments the notion of observation by providing a standard by which observed and possible behavior could be judged. Disciplinary power, in particular, works to define what is considered "normal" by creating disciplined subjects (i.e., people who conform to particular standards of docility, competence, etc.). Normalizing judgment often functions through comparison; an individual's action are evaluated by referring to a "whole that is at once a field of comparison, a space of differentiation and the principle of a rule to be followed" (Foucault, 1977, p. 182). "Normal", according to Covaleskie (1994), "is nothing more--but also nothing less--than the social forms of life within the dominant discourses that power creates" (p. 81). These normal forms of life then create an ideal by which members of society are judged and then rewarded, or punished if deemed "abnormal." What it meant to be a "normal" student at New Haven High it seemed was to be able to follow the rules of the school, complete one's school work without extensive help from teachers or peers, be respectful of others, possess social skills, dress in a manner socially acceptable in the mainstream at the time, and, particularly relevant to this study, control one's body, emotions, and thoughts in ways that would allow him/her to focus on the school work at hand and be "productive." Normalizing judgment made non-conformity punishable, and
was the impetus in creating a category of people who would be known as deviants or
delinquents (see Boler, 1999; Kohl, 1994). Sovereign and disciplinary power alike
function in relations to push individuals toward the norm, and sanctions were developed
to castigate those who did not align (e.g., detention). These people were especially easy
to identify during my study because they frequently spent time in detention separated
from the normal students, were in special classes with tutors if they did not excel
academically, or were labeled by peers as strange or weird. As argued by Covaleskie
(1994), "...the invisibility and lightness of the operation of this form of power leads the
subjects to confuse the "normal" with the "natural" (p. 82). This confusion has important
implications for understanding emotion in schooling.

Normality and Emotion

While curricula is intended to make clear the subject matter on which students
are educated, it tends to hide some of the most powerful subjects taught; one of which is
emotional control (Boler, 1999). Explicit discussions of emotion are rare in classrooms,
yet most students and teachers know how to manage their emotions in order to be
considered normal in the school setting. This knowledge is acquired through years of
socialization and the exertion of power on emotions. Many may not even realize they
have acquired such knowledge because of the swiftness through which normalizing
judgment and other exercises of disciplinary power act. In terms of being normal
emotionally, many students realized that one must not show too much emotion. In the
words of Jessica, "you can't be 'too' anything or people think you're weird." Another
student, Melia, elaborated on this notion:
I believe there are unsaid rules and kind of like standards because like people that are a little more happy than they should be we’re like 'why are they happy? Well, they can’t be that happy for that that’s stupid or whatever because they’re -- they get to see their boyfriend this weekend?’ It’s just like whatever. Or like people are like so upset. They’re like why are they upset about that? That’s so stupid.’ But like to them that’s not stupid and so yeah I believe there is unsaid standards because it’s like if you do this then you should be like this. I don’t know, like, you can't be too much over the top but you can’t be too like not -- I don’t know how to explain it but...you can never reach the standards that are supposed to be.

Based on the premise that showing too strong of an emotion is wrong or abnormal, students strive to neutralize their emotions. Emotional neutralization is a common practice in schools (see Bendelow & Mayall, 2000), in an effort to appear emotionally competent and in control of one's body. The notion of strong emotions being abnormal or dangerous stems from powerful traditions in Western culture that favor rationality and seek to diminish emotionality especially in public settings (Fineman, 1996, 2000). Ancient Greeks, Aristotle, and Plato viewed rationalism as the ideal and felt emotions were antithetical to rational thought (Dewhurst, 1997). These beliefs were further supported by such writers and thinkers as Descartes, Locke, and Hume and were manifest in modern economic and psychological theories that are common today (see Boler, 1997, 1999). In fact, the marginalization of emotion in the public realm has been so consistent historically that few even question its subordinate position.

Because emotions have been treated historically as private matters that do not belong in the workplace or school (Fineman, 1993, 1996), individuals must find ways to
mask their felt emotions and align their expression with organizational rules so as to
avoid being labeled delinquent. This alignment of expressed emotion with emotion rules
is referred to as emotion work or management (Hochschild, 1979; Waldron, 1994).
Following the rules, it seems, makes one a normal member of the organization.
Hochschild (1983) discusses two ways in which individuals may engage in emotion work
to align their expression with emotions rules: deep acting and surface acting. Deep acting
refers to times in which people may actually use imagery or other strategies to convince
themselves to feel a particular way to match the social order (Hochschild, 1983). Surface
acting is more superficial than deep acting in that it involves putting on the facade that
you feel a particular way to match the social order rather than trying to actually make
yourself feel that way (Hochschild, 1983). For example, smiling when you are secretly
sad because you do not want others to know you are hurting is surface acting. The
impetus to 'act' is based on an understanding of what emotions are normal or acceptable
to display and which are considered abnormal.

Historically, crying has been conceived as a "feminine" or "weak" expression of
emotion (Planalp, 1999); one that should not be displayed in the "rational" public sphere.
Hence, students who seek to conform must manage their emotions to prevent the display
of tears. Betty, for example, engaged in surface acting in an effort to hide her felt
emotions during class: "I remember like wanting to cry and so my eyes are like watering.
And I just kind of pretended like I was yawning or something like I covered it up with
other things." Another student, Giselle, faced with the same experience, engaged in deep
acting: "I try to think of something else and get my mind off of it so that I don't cry in
class." When asked why they try so hard to hide it, neither student could tell me why.
Betty, for instance, said "I don't know why. I guess I never really thought about it."
Giselle responded, "people would think you're weird if everything upset you at school."

Boler (1999) argues that rules for the expression of emotion are deeply
influenced by religious, medical/scientific, and capitalistic discourses. It is through
discourse that most emotions are constructed as "private" or "irrational." In interviews,
students and teachers alike frequently responded to prompts to offer their first thoughts
when they hear the word emotion. Every student except one responded by saying
"crying", "being upset," "girls," or even the word "hide." When prompted to do the same
exercise with the word rational students most common responses were related to justice
(e.g., "someone being fair," "thinking things through") and control (e.g., "being calm,
"able to make good decisions," "keeping emotion out of your thoughts"). While
emotional neutrality is typically most valued in the public sphere, discourse also
sanctions certain emotions as more permitted for particular genders (i.e., women cry, men
express anger) and roles in society (i.e., anger for bill collectors, happiness for flight
attendants) at particular times. However, organizations tend to view emotional expression
as irrational and may use organizational rules and resources to regulate emotional
expression and reinforce the rational paradigm (Mumby & Putnam, 1992; Putnam &
Mumby, 1993).

Dougherty and Krone (2002) note that the notion of "emotional intelligence," a
concept popularized by Goleman (1995), may be used by organizations to rationalize and
reify the control of emotions. Emotional intelligence emerged as a mass marketed
concept when Goleman (1995) published a book, Emotional Intelligence, detailing the
ways in which you can determine one's emotional quotient (EQ) and manage emotions
effectively. An emotionally intelligent person is pleasant to be around, evokes the appropriate emotions at appropriate times, and demonstrates an awareness of others' emotional needs (Goleman, 1995). Though others had written about emotional intelligence (e.g. Salovey & Mayer, 1990) prior to Goleman, it was his book that made conversation about emotion in organizations more mainstream. The book provided organizational managers a 'rational' reason to pay attention to emotion. Many schools, too, became interested in managing emotion more openly and effectively which led some to began instituting programs intended to make students "emotionally literate" (see Boler, 1999). Emotions became a more visible site of control, though they largely remained most influenced by processes that seemed "natural" and were, subsequently, hidden. Interestingly, Melia discussed her natural emotions as "weird": I have so many emotions and I hate it sometimes that I like do that. But sometimes it feels good like just to cry. *(Laughter)* It’s kind of weird but I like it." Rather than embrace her natural experience of emotion as cathartic, she viewed it with disdain and labeled it as abnormal.

Hochschild (1990) argues that feeling rules, established through discourse and action, serve as "zoning regulations" that control what types of and how much of a given emotion should be displayed within the organization. Discourses of "emotional intelligence" play a key role in influencing the decisions individuals make in regard to their emotion management. Violations of complete emotional neutrality must align with "intelligent" and "rational" displays of emotion. Interestingly, a student, Katharine, responded to the question "On a typical day of school what emotion do you think that you feel the most?" by saying "Well, probably a little bit of stress, but for the most part I'm
just kind of normal." Students discourse about emotion continually pointed to neutrality or "emotionally competent" feelings as appropriate or normal.

Negative emotion is perhaps the vilest offender of emotional neutrality or intelligence, and the most heavily controlled through social sanctions. Explicit and implicit norms about the public expression of negative emotion that shape students' and teachers' decision-making about whether to hide or display felt emotions. Schools often strive to achieve a social order of emotional neutrality or 'reasonable' positive emotion displays in the classroom in hopes of maintaining a controllable, efficient atmosphere. Thomas noted that expressing strong negative emotion is a "social taboo or yeah it’s something you don’t do, but it happens." Students socialized into this sort of emotional setting may find themselves engaging in emotion work to put forth the appropriate face and manage their felt emotions in a way that matches cultural expectations. Power plays a vital role in preserving the private management of emotions, especially negative emotions (Fineman, 1996; Matterson et al., 2000; Tracy, 2000). Students and teachers especially noted the inappropriateness of displaying strong negative emotions like anger by yelling because such displays were judged as inappropriate calling for the agent to be disciplined accordingly. Thomas, a student, commented on his teacher's behavior:

I think there were teachers here in my four years that let their emotions of how they felt about a student get out of hand. I think that’s happened on more than one occasion where it was that built up just stress from that one student and then them blowing up on that one student and showing way too much emotion and making it way too personal for that student and for themselves in front of other students.
Students were aware that they were not permitted to display such strong emotions and were quick to judge teachers who violated the emotion norms. Issues of emotion work and emotional labor were further explored earlier in the context of the classroom.

Normalizing judgment is a key technology of control in students and teachers emotional lives. Emotion rules arise out of discursive constructions of what is deemed normal in a particular society or organization. These rules have a complex impact on the ways in which emotions operate in organizations because whether individuals choose to act according to or resist the norm/rules feeds back into the system and has a recursive effect on future interactions (Fiebig & Kramer, 1998). Next, Foucault's third technology of control, the examination, is discussed.

The Examination

It was in 18th century Europe that schools began systematic forms of teaching paired with careful observation of pupils (Foucault, 1977). Likely influenced by monasteries and armies, schools began dividing school time into defined periods and established specific tasks that must be completed at particular times. The goal was to encourage maximum productivity and allow for the recording of performance in relation to the curriculum. Testing became a key part of evaluating student progress and productivity. It also provided a means to individualize learning. Teachers divided students into stages and tracks based on students' exam performance and often seated students in different spaces in the classroom based on their learning capability or stage. Power is manifest in what Foucault refers to as "disciplinary technologies" and the examination became a powerful disciplinary technology as it allowed students to be ordered, identified, controlled, directed. The measurement made possible through the
examination presented information that could be analyzed and averaged. The process of normalization gained traction through the results of examinations. Statistics applied to the results of a test can yield a normal curve allowing students to be judged. It provided a clear means to reward students who were performing at or above average and punish those who performed below average. Hierarchical classification of students made clear who was below average (read: "abnormal"). Students can then be easily tracked in classes that fit their "natural" talent and place in society. The disciplinary power of the examination was one of the most effective means of deploying the process of normalization because it provided a normalizing "gaze" beyond the sovereign power of the teacher and appeared to be a "true" measurement of the way the world is or should be (see also Covaleskie, 1994). "True" measurement is exceedingly important in a democratic society like the United States because schooling practices must match the values espoused by the government and citizens, namely that of equitable opportunity to succeed regardless of background. Next, the practices and politics of examination in a democratic society are more deeply interrogated.

Measuring Students through Meritocracy in a Democracy

During the early 1900s schools became increasingly bureaucratized as educational theories and practices became more heavily influenced by the social sciences (Beane, 1990). There was a desire to systematize practices in schools in an effort to maintain conformity and increase efficiency (see Boler, 1999). Emotions came to be identified as "disruptions" to the social organization and a threat to social efficiency and harmony. Virtues of an industrial society were transferred into school systems; the roles of teachers and students were translated through a "human resources" lens as the directors and "raw
material" respectively for capitalist production (Callahan, 1962; Haraway, 1991). It was recognized that the schools must transform the raw materials (read: students) into productive members of society who could advance the nation state (see Feinberg, 1975). Those in power turned to scientific means to determine which students would be "profitable" investments and which would be "poor" (see Boler, 1999; Feinberg, 1975). The decision to use scientific means to measure students was not the challenge; the challenge was how to assess students in this way yet not violate the rhetorical emphasis on democracy and self-determination being circulated in the broader society (Feinberg, 1975).

Standardized testing emerged as a "neutral" means of measuring students' skills and abilities determining who is likely to meet or exceed the standards established to be successful in society (Bledstein, 1978). The "intelligence scale" was developed in 1908 by Binet and was then adopted by Edward Thorndike who would become a preeminent influence on the testing movement (Boler, 1999). The beauty of testing was that it constructed intelligence as something that was fixed and measurable in a scientific, supposedly unbiased, manner. Testing provided a meritocratic means to identify "good students" and "poor students" and track them accordingly in preparation for society (Spring, 1975). Bledstein (1975) states that "by invoking the highest ideals--talent, merit, achievement--the educational system sanctioned the privileges, indeed, the affluence, of an accredited individual in American society. Theoretically, neither birth nor prejudice nor favoritism restricted those privileges" (p. 127). An effective twist of fate was that students who did not match the standards of intelligence, or the emotionally neutral, efficient structure of the schools, were systematically eliminated from the system through
"disinterested science" and pushed to their "natural" position within society (Haraway, 1991).

The notion of testing as promoting meritocracy and supporting democracy ushered in what would become a legacy of accountability testing. In 2001, former President George W. Bush contributed to this legacy by opening the doors to an unprecedented era of testing with the creation and implementation of the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB). According to the Department of Education website (2009), this act is "based on stronger accountability for results, more freedom for states and communities, proven education methods, and more choices for parents" (ED.gov/nclb). Essentially, the act seeks to ensure that students can display competencies in key subject areas as determined by standardized test scores. If students fail to meet the standards set forth by the state, the Act calls for "corrective actions" in the form of mandated supplemental instruction, implementation of new curriculum, replacement of staff, funding reallocation, etcetera. Students who are attending "low-performing schools" according to government issued report cards have the option of transferring to other schools that are performing well. Hence, poor performance by students on these exams has system-wide consequences for other stakeholders like teachers and administrators. The Ohio Graduation Test (OGT), a corollary of NCLB, was instituted in 2001 by the Ohio General Assembly to ensure students could demonstrate high levels of mastery in reading, writing, mathematics, science, and social studies (see education.ohio.gov). This test must be passed in order to receive a high school diploma.

The ongoing impact of industrialist and capitalist values on school structures and practices is especially apparent in the rhetoric of NCLB. The U.S. Department of
Education website (2009) posted the following question and answer on the 'FAQ' webpage dedicated to explaining the purpose of NCLB and standardized testing:

Nevertheless, state assessments sound like they could take a lot of time and effort. What will be gained?

The point of state assessments is to measure student learning. A key principle of quality management is the importance of measuring what is valued (e.g., production rates; costs of materials, etc.). Such measures enable an organization to identify where and how to improve operations. In the same manner, if schools and school systems are to continuously improve, they must measure growth in student achievement. After all, the core of all activity in schools and school systems is teaching and learning, and the key question is: Are the students learning? (ED.gov/nclb)

The equation of what is valued and determination of what is learned aligns directly with historical notions of efficiency, productivity, and meritocracy. It provides a way to measure output (i.e., student learning) and discipline schools including students, teachers, and administrators to improve their "production" processes, decrease production costs, and ensure quality, efficient output (i.e., competent students who can contribute to society).

The purpose of this section is to explore the ways in which theories and practices of testing in schools, both historical and contemporary, are perceived to influence students' and teachers' communication, co-construction of roles, and, ultimately, their abilities to thrive academically and emotionally. Observations and the voices of teachers and administrators are privileged as they chose to talk passionately about these issues.
whereas students rarely spoke specifically about these standardized tests. This actuality alone is tremendously interesting given the pervasiveness of OGT talk in their lives. I presume that it is partly related to the fact that I had finished my interviews with students prior to what I will call "testing season" in the spring, but I continued to observe through OGT week. It seemed that students encountered standardized testing as something stressful, but "normal." They rarely questioned why they took the tests, and seemed to take it for granted as just another part of doing school. The Department of Education website (2009) contained the following excerpt in the 'FAQ' section describing NCLB:

What impact does testing have on children?

Although testing may be stressful for some students, testing is a normal and expected way of assessing what students have learned. The purpose of state assessments required under No Child Left Behind is to provide an independent insight into each child's progress, as well as each school's. This information is essential for parents, schools, districts and states in their efforts to ensure that no child--regardless of race, ethnic group, gender or family income--is trapped in a consistently low-performing school. (ED.gov/nclb)

This discursive construction of testing as "expected," "stressful," and "normal" seemed especially poignant because that is the exact impression I garnered from observations and student interviews prior to perusing the site. Consider this excerpt from fieldnotes:

As I walk down the hall the voices of teachers stream into the hallway--classes are preparing for the OGT. The teacher in one class prompts the students: "Okay let's start on this side and remember we need to get in OGT mode. What do you do to get full points? The students respond: Restate." I make my way past another
classroom and the teacher says "Like it or not this is the type of problem that will be on the OGT. Let's start with the equation. Okay, Molly, what did you get for practice question six? Twenty-four. Good! Does everyone see how she got that? Now let's talk about how to eliminate answers when you aren't sure which one is correct." In yet another class the teacher shouts "Come on! Only one week. You need to make me proud and you aren't getting any of these right. What's going on? Start with number one!" (03/08/2008)

During the week these fieldnotes were recorded students had one week prior to taking their exams. I sensed the stress of both teachers and students during this week especially. Instruction seemed to speed up, no class time was spent in idle chit-chat or working on class projects; instead teachers led students in OGT practice questions. Teachers repeatedly told students in some manner that they did not have control over the testing, the government did, and that they needed to prepare to pass the test. This generation of students is accustomed to inhabiting an educational system in which testing is a regular task beginning in early grades and continuing through graduation. While it seemed like a loathed, but accepted practice students most common response when asked about these tests was that they were stressful (e.g. "oh it's so stressful", "there's so much pressure", "stress, stress, stress"). Students also felt that taking the tests was one of many hoops they jumped through to earn a diploma. When asked what he thought of testing, Jack, a student responded:

There’s so much stuff that you don’t need to know that you learn that you don’t need to know for your life. Like only make the stuff that teachers have been through in life – and then make the teachers teach stuff that they know you are
going to have to need, rather than just bringing in stuff that they have for tests and stuff just to make you mad.

He, like others, perceived the tests as largely unrelated to knowledge he would need to function in society.

Teachers largely viewed testing as repressive, unfair to both them and their students, and too pervasive in school culture. The tone with which they presented the testing to students was often with a sigh or comment on how they "had" to do this (e.g., "ahhh (frown on face) take out your OGT books--we need to do our practice questions").

New teachers were generally less impervious about having to test students. Mr. Mathias pointed out that "I'm new. I don't know any different. It seems like accountability is good, but the veteran teachers HATE it." Veteran teachers conversely were especially frustrated by the increase in government mandated testing--most perceived it as taking time away from quality instruction and building relationships with students. In the words of Mr. Schramm, "I'm jumping through more hoops, it's wasting time." These teachers had been in the profession prior to pervasive standardized testing being a regular part of determining student and school success. Mr. Furguson reflected "...as soon as they come up with a standardized test for instrumental music, I'm done. I'm a Wal-Mart greeter."

Others who taught courses not in the content areas that were tested still felt repercussions as resources are diverted to courses that will boost test scores leaving some electives neglected. They still were relieved, though, to be somewhat exempt from the grasp of NCLB reform. One such teacher, Ms. Matthews stated:

I especially feel for all the teachers that have to teach to the test. I don't have to do that, I'm out of that loop, thank goodness. I don't know if I'd stay in teaching if
I had to do that. I just think it's the wrong focus, the whole *No Child Left Behind* and all that mess with these English, Math and Science teachers have to – I just feel for them. It's all about assessment, assessment. And I just think we have it all backwards in our society, but I don't know how long it will take people to figure it out. Maybe it's too late.

Every teacher indicated that accountability was important, but felt that accountability could be accomplished in more productive ways that allowed teachers freedom to teach and connect with their unique students through the best strategies--a freedom they felt was diminished by NCLB. Donlevy (2007), too, calls for assessment practices driven by and infused with teachers' knowledge of students circumstances and abilities. Mr. Cornish stated:

> My negative is that because of the way education is going, OGT, OGT, OGT, they don’t care about anything else but the OGT, I really enjoyed my resource room time because I think we were able to connect with those kids a lot better than we do today. You know what I mean? I made a suggestion [to administration] about getting some of that time back but then as soon as their question was, “Is it going to help them on their OGT?” No. “Well, then why are we wasting our money?”

Teachers often felt relationships with students were sacrificed by the time constraints involved in preparing for the tests, and also perceived the tests as overlooking large strides made by students who have special learning needs because this progress (e.g., a student who has Attention Deficit Disorder being able to discipline himself enough to sit
while completing his entire homework assignment on his own) was not measurable by the test.

Another important component of the aforementioned quote on the DOE website is the emphasis on efforts to ensure all students, regardless of socio-economic background, would have access to a quality, equitable education. NCLB represents an opportunity to be "freed" from (not trapped) in a school providing sub-standard education. High quality education is, no doubt, the goal of legislators, state leaders, teachers, administrators, parents, and students. Disagreement, however, arises over the best means to provide a high quality education to students of varied backgrounds, life goals and experiences. Most of the teachers I interviewed believed the key problem with NCLB reform is that its focus on uniform testing marginalized a large number of students and created rather than destructed barriers to learning.

Teachers and administrators felt that the tests did not adequately control for influencing factors from students’ home lives, social and economic status, and learning (dis)abilities. Students with negative influences may not be able to as easily pass these exams possibly preventing graduation; and lowering the school average which may lead to a cut in funding or the opportunity for students to leave for other schools rather than addressing the real issues which are beyond the reach of school personnel. Ms. Brown, an administrator, discusses the tension that exists between wanting to meet students where they are and push them to meet school/state expectations:

Pressure is there to get these kids to perform to the standards that have been set forth by the state. I think there is a lot of pressure there. Some kids are in a home environment where the struggle is day to day to get food and sleeping in a warm
place and we look at it as how do we expect them to come in and perform on
demand when they are dealing with a basic need situation. If you look at Maslow,
those basic needs have to be met before you get to those other needs. You have a
lot of kids in those situations, not in safe homes. And kids are in environments
where parents are fighting all night, they don’t get along. Stress amongst their
parents, there’s divorce situation that’s creating a lot of stress. Drugs and alcohol
in the family situation and unemployment. It’s kind of rampant around this area.
People in and out of their lives. You have parents who have boyfriend/girlfriend
who are in and out the situation. One minute they have all these people living in
their house, the next minute they don’t. Sometimes they bond with these people,
sometimes they don’t. It’s a negative situation. Some kids are living where they
don’t have enough food or a bed to sleep in. It’s a lot for those kids to take on. If
that was happening in our lives how well would we be working? So these are
some of the struggles that go on and that’s when you do - you look at where
they’re coming from and try to understand. But I think teachers still feel that
pressure that they’ve got to get these kids to perform. And they don’t always
know the backgrounds either.

Teachers repeatedly returned to the issues that were beyond the purview of their jobs and
abilities--like creating a positive home life for a student--as becoming issues they were
punished for when these students did not meet state standards. Standardized tests are
often perceived as providing a true measurement of intelligence; hence, external factors
should not influence student scores. This premise is based on the notion that IQ remains
fairly constant, but it is documented that environmental changes in students’ lives greatly
influence students’ scores (see Gipps, 1999). Mr. Green, another administrator, pointed to the unrealistic expectation reflected in the name of the program itself and subsequent expectations:

When that kid comes in, comes to school, what he got on that math test doesn't mean a whole hell of a lot to what happened the night before. It is so minor in their lives for some of these kids that – then we get pissed off as educators ’cause they won't do their homework. Do you think that homework is really, really the most important thing to that kid sometimes when they leave here? They don't even know if they're gonna – if anybody's even gonna come home when they're home. They don't know if there's any food in the house. There's just so – there's so many variables... I do not believe in No Child Left Behind. I believe in attempting to leave no child behind, but to be realistic, to say "no child left" – that's not realistic. Some of these kids – I don't care – the greatest educational minds in the world are not gonna reach some of these kids. They're not gonna graduate no matter who is with them and what you're – they are not gonna graduate. Now hopefully someday they go back and they'll get their GED – they'll do something and that's the other thing I see – I think that a lot of people don't – is I do all the GED testing in a four-county area and so I see all ages when they come back and the stories are – again, they vary to "Boy, was I an asshole in high school." Other ones, they had a baby so they dropped out of school– they – everybody is ready at a different time in their life to learn, to want to learn, to be receptive. There's different reasons why they don't and won't graduate but a lot of 'em do go back and will get their education, get their GED, and then some of 'em
from there are goin' to college, and so this No Child Left Behind – yeah, that's
great in theory, but it sure doesn't work.

Mr. Schramm, repeated this sentiment: "I feel No Child Left Behind is a grand idea, it’s a
great idea. I don’t think it works socially because it’s not 'real' socially. It’s not the way
people are." The way people are was an ongoing issue that teachers especially felt was
the crux of the problem with NCLB. The structures of the broader society and students'
home lives were key factors in success that they felt NCLB accounted for in rhetoric, but
was antithetical toward in practice. Again, the rhetoric of democracy and meritocracy
pushed equal opportunity for student success, yet teachers recognized that not every
student had an equal opportunity to succeed, nor was that the way society functioned. Mr.
Cornish talked about the reason he felt the program was deeply flawed:

...my ultimate feeling is on this no child left behind to me means that every person
in the United States of America is going to be successful. And we know that that’s
not going to be true because we have three classes of people. And until you get rid
of those three classes of people, you cannot make everyone successful. I – I just
don’t – I just don’t agree with it. I’m sorry, but – I just don’t get it. I know what
it's about, but I just don’t think that it’s grounded in reality.

While some teachers felt the government was wildly optimistic about students' abilities to
pass these exams, and felt teachers and administrators could repair problems that
prevented students for performing well; other teachers felt that the exams never intended
to level the playing field, but were just another mechanism to perpetuate social
stratification and support a capitalist structure.
Standardized tests are often in place to make students demonstrate that they have acquired certain competencies to proceed to the next level of their schooling or graduate. These tests are constructed as fair assessments of student learning on which any student may perform exceptionally if they chose to do so—a meritocratic philosophy. A school based on meritocracy encourages students to discipline themselves in pursuit of earning a reward based on their individual capabilities; a phenomenon Boler (1999) terms "democratically engineered individualism" (p. 47). Boler (1999) argues that meritocracy decontextualizes the student, constructing notions of success and failure as firmly in the hands of the individual: "Serving pastoral power, "failure" is blamed on the individual rather than on social inequalities that set them up to fail or on the possible cultural bias of standardized tests" (p. 47). NCLB is no exception yet accountability for learning is more dispersed than is typical. The notion of exams ensuring meritocracy is still sustained through NCLB, but NCLB adds another layer due to the "corrective actions" enforced on teachers and administrators in addition to students if students do not perform adequately. The rhetoric and practices of NCLB places students and teachers firmly in the center of meritocratic philosophies, stripping away extenuating circumstances, making them solely responsible to testing outcomes.

Students with special learning needs were at the forefront of discussions of standardized testing. One teacher spoke about the struggle to prepare all students to pass the exams; especially reaching students who have been labeled as learning disabled:

It's not a mandated thing but still, most people are now going to inclusion and we gotta get everybody to pass these tests and so yeah, what I was doing 5, 6 years ago as far as in those regular classes are different than what I'm doing now
because I don't – I didn't have an inclusion teacher, I didn't have those special ed kids that could barely read. I mean you have some kids who can't even tell time and they're in the regular class. Well, how are you gonna teach them photosynthesis and math equations and stuff when they can't even look at a clock and tell you what time it is? I'm sorry, those kids – you're not gonna raise them up to the level of what they need to be at to pass this stupid OGT test that they have to pass. I mean, there is definitely – there needs to be accountability. There is no doubt about that. I do agree with that, but where we've made education accountable and what we've made them accountable for – it's ridiculous. You don't have a home life? Well, it's our job to be their mom, their dad, their teachers, their sisters, their brothers, their – their whole life because we've gotta – that's what – that's all we have. I mean, so No Child Left Behind? Yeah, you have to be accountable for somewhat but I am not a big fan like most teachers are not a big fan of No Child Left Behind. And you know what? Mandate, mandate, mandate but don't give any money. You hear the same thing over and over again and then – it gives you excuses for all these charter schools to pop up and "Well, this public school's not doing their job" and "Well, I can't learn this way" and things like that. Yeah, I know it's a changing world but they're not – they're supposed to be accountable like we are but they're not. So they get all this money and yet we're the – the teachers are the dredges of society 'cause we're not doing our job. I'm not saying – I know I'm being negative there but I'm not a big fan of No Child Left Behind as far as "Okay, you're gonna make all this but not give us the money to do it." To not – to make some of these kids – you know what?
There's just some kids that are not going to pass your tests. They're just not gonna do it. No matter what you do. Put 'em in a regular classroom all you want. Give 'em all the attention that you want to give 'em. They're just not going to do it because I don't have anybody at home backing that up from day one. It starts when you're little and if I don't have that there to give me a background and a foundation, I don't care what I do with 'em here. They're just not gonna pass that test. So the No Child Left Behind – I don't know. Just like most teachers, it's just – I'm not a big fan of it.

Resentment over being charged with what this teacher viewed to be a futile task fueled teachers' animosity over the testing regulations and drew more attention to the lack of resources provided to accomplish the goal. Teachers perhaps felt surveilled by the government through their students’ test scores, and punished through the revocation of resources and reputation for issues they felt were beyond their control. Listening to teachers talk about NCLB allows one to quickly realize how emotional this reform is for most teachers. The structures imposed by it permeate how they practice their craft leading many to experience frustration and other negative emotions as a result.

Standardized testing posed challenges for students identified as learning disabled and their teachers. I overheard inclusion teachers (teachers charged with helping students with disabilities who were mainstreamed in classrooms) assuage students' fears about the tests: "you'll be okay. Some of these are pretty easy." Teachers noted exercising some power over the externally mandated testing by keeping students on individualized education plans (IEP) even if the student had performed well enough to not use his/her IEP during the school year:
As far as there are times when we’ll modify tests, we can’t do that on like the OGT, the standardized test, but a lot of time with the reading aloud and the extended time, our kids are able to get through it. As far as when we modify work, I try not to modify a lot of the work if I know it’s problems for the OGT. In my sophomore class right now, pretty much from now until March we’re doing almost all OGT practice and we’re writing prompts, they’re writing paragraphs, we’re reading passages and pulling out all those details. So I don’t really modify a lot of that homework because I can’t modify the test itself. I don’t know what’s on the test. That’s the bad thing because we don’t know what’s on the test. So we have to try to cram all this information in to them and they may not see it on the test. So it makes it really difficult. But a lot of what we try to do is I just go over it and over it and over it, kind of that drilling practice thing. We try to do that. So we write one of those (an individualized education plan) for each student. They end up being maybe 12 to 15 pages long. Some of them are pretty detailed, some of them aren’t that detailed. A lot of our students we kind of, they get along well enough and good enough by the time they’re in high school that they really don’t need it. But we keep them on it mainly for two reasons. The OGT, the students have to pass it to graduate. Well, our students in IEP are exempted from those consequences. So they still have to take it, but if they can’t pass a section they’ll still get a normal diploma like everyone else. They won’t just get the certificate of attendance. And a lot of our students don’t even use it but with that in place if they need help in the tutoring room or if they need to finish a test or anything like that, they’ve got that option. (Ms. Proctor)
There was frequent talk about normal students and IEP students which will be further discussed later; however, in terms of testing, inclusion teachers felt tremendous pressure to get IEP students to pass so they could earn a normal diploma, and many of the "mainstream" teachers felt frustrated because the students with IEPs tended to slow the pace of learning in the classroom. One administrator, Mr. Turner, however, felt, that NCLB had improved learning for students with disabilities:

I think from a very positive standpoint for No Child Left Behind, it’s raised the bar for students with disabilities. I think there have been – I know in our situations here, there are improvements that have been made with that population that might not have been made had the stakes not been raised on their performance on achievement tests. There are things that we’ve done because you’re being held accountable for what – that every child can learn, so we have seen improvements in our reading scores, our math scores, our writing scores across the board with that, because of the things we’ve done, how we’ve changed our special ed. delivery, the commitment we’ve made to it, all of that has come from No Child Left Behind.

The improvement of test scores signaled success to this administrator; yet most teachers still felt that NCLB was detrimental to student development, both those with and without learning disabilities.

Sloan (2006) notes that educational debates on accountability testing have grown highly polarized with each side citing evidence supporting their views. One camp of researchers has concluded that accountability based curricula and testing has improved the quality of education students are receiving and ensures that all students have access to
excellent instruction and learning opportunities (see, for example, Grissmer & Flanagan, 1998; Reyes, Scribner, Parades-Scribner, 1999; Scheurich, Skrla, & Johnson, 2000). The opposite camp has concluded that these tests and the structure of the curricula has diminished the quality of education students experience and made it more inequitable (see, for example, McNeil, 2000; Smith, 1991). How is it that these divergent findings can be explained when both sets of researchers have used legitimate research methods to yield their data? Sloan (2006) argues that we must interrogate the foci of the research that has generated their conclusions. Sergiovanni (2000), influenced by Habermas (1987), draws our attention to two facets of schools: the systemworld and the lifeworld. "The systemworld of school," states Sloan (2006), "comprises instrumentalities usually experienced in schools as administrative or management systems. The lifeworld of school, on the other hand, involves culture, meaning, and significance" (p. 120). This aspect argues that what researchers situate as figure verses ground determines the focus and subsequent evaluation of practices as positive or negative. The majority of studies documenting success through assessment practices focused on administrative practices related to systemwide success (e.g., number of students in regular or higher level classes, attendance, etc.) and relied on other administrative personnel for data rather than teachers or students; whereas most studies documenting the failure of accountability practices relied on the perspectives of teachers and highlighted the lack of attention to contextual differences between students based on culture and social differences.

The administrator quoted above, Mr. Turner, appealed to the systemworld by indicating increases in scores revealed success. He did, however, recognize the
differences between students' abilities indicating that meritocracy was not as pure as it seemed:

The part of No Child Left Behind that I still think is unfair to what we do is not just the assumption that every child can learn, but they put every child can learn to a certain level, and it’s just not – I don’t think that’s gonna happen when they say, “Hey, by 2012,” every student in your district will be able to pass the achievement test. I don’t think that’s true. I think you have to look at starting points, and unique abilities, and understand that hey, improvement – getting them as close to their potential as we can is a great thing, and No Child Left Behind has done that, but it’s built on the assumption that every child’s potential is here [holds hand up high in the air], I think that’s an unfair bar that they put out there.

Students are supposed to pass in each of the content areas to graduate, a requirement to which Mr. Schramm responded: "it assumes everyone is good at everything and if there is even one area you do not excel in you're dumb and that's just not true." By placing extreme value in exam scores and the need to pass every section to be considered "normal" the government is focusing on the systemworld. While many people, like Ms. Miller, are more concerned with the students' lifeworlds: "We put so much pressure on our teachers--test, test, test, improve grades, accomplish things, that we forget that these are children." In addition to testing, another major system that is used in schools to order, evaluate, and (de)motivate students is grading.

Grading

Most students find that receiving grades is one of the most emotion filled experiences of their schooling (see Goulden & Griffin, 1995; Janzow & Eilson, 1990;
Sabee & Wilson, 2005). For many pupils anticipation of how their performance will be assessed is deeply anxiety provoking. Fear of failure and threats to student identity and self-esteem are among some of the key reasons grading is such an emotional component of their lives (Covington, 1992; Sabee & Wilson; Sarason & Sarason, 1990; Spielberger, 1985; Tobias, 1985; Zohar, 1998). This anxiety may be met with relief and excitement upon receiving an acceptable or better than expected grade; or may be met with stress and disappointment upon receipt of a poor grade. Certainly some students are relatively unaffected by the results of their grades; yet these students are the exception rather than the norm. Grades are a tool for teachers to organize students, assess learning, and motivate students to perform well. For students, grades are either a source of motivation, pride or embarrassment, anxiety or relief, marker of success or failure as defined by society. Grades, like many other educational mechanisms discussed in previous sections, serve a normalizing function in school and the broader society. A “C” grade is described in dominant discourses as "average" creating a defined ranking of students as average or above or below average. While grades are intended to represent a “value-neutral” assessment of a student’s performance or competence, it is recognized that grading is also a moral endeavor (see Zoeckler, 2007). Grades assess what is "right” and “wrong” ultimately measuring the merit of a student and indicating whether a student “belongs” and is able to succeed in the system (Sinclair & Ghory, 1987).

*Feeling the Pressure*

In interviews, stress and anxiety were the two words students most often used to describe their emotions related to grades. Pressure to perform was described as emanating from particular sources, but, as I will argue, was dispersed throughout the system of the
school, the broader community and the world. Students were acutely aware that the grades they earned would project their future opportunities. Only high-achieving students get to go to college, you must be average or perhaps could get by with being slightly below average to earn a degree, failing would condemn you to fewer opportunities. This knowledge leads students to feel pressure, either self-induced or from others in their lives, to perform well.

For many students grades mattered deeply. These students realized that they needed to achieve high grades to enter college, please parents, maintain their identity as a “good student” or meet their own expectations. Some students like Emerson, spoke of self-induced pressure to get good grades:

I was like the type of person who had to have all A's. That's just how I am. A perfectionist. It's gotten better. My parents used to tease me all the time, like they're the only--they have the only child who like, they say, "Okay, you need to stop studying now and go to bed." That's what they always used to joke about in middle school. All the parents had to get their child to study, but it's not that bad anymore. Like, I don't like, kill myself to get an A, but I still like to have good grades. I have to have to good grades. It matters to me.

Emerson was self-motivated and viewed grades as something that mattered. Kardyn, too, worked hard to be on the honor roll and said “if I have a C, it’s failing for me.” Like Emerson and Kardyn, Jennifer felt an internal pressure to perform well in school:

I like to get good grades and I get excited because usually I don’t get that many good grades on a quiz or a test. I do all my homework and I get really good grades on that, but the tests are kind of like, uh. If I don’t get a good grade, it’s like
“God.” I’m bummed. I try harder next time. Then if I get a good grade I’m happy. I can’t wait. My mom cares about my grades but she’s not like a really strict person. She just tells me to try harder. She doesn’t punish me or anything. That’s really good I guess. I know some people who can’t do anything on the weekends because of their grades. I guess I’m lucky. I try to get good grades.

Some students indicated living in the “shadows” of older siblings. In certain cases students were trying to perform better than past siblings to avoid being labeled as a poor student or assumed they are like their sibling. Others, like Stephanie, sought to live up to expectations established by a previous sibling:

Stephanie noted that the hardest thing about high school was trying to live up to grade expectations set by her brother: I think just getting like really good grades because everybody knows my brother and he did good so they always ask me about my brother and how he's doing and so I always feel like, compared to my brother, and if I don't do as good as my brother then it's like, so I always feel like I'm compared and if I do worse than my brother they look at me like "you can do better." So I always feel like I have to do as good as my brother so I'm trying to maintain that.

While Stephanie worked feverishly from an early age to achieve highly in school, other students did not always value school. Many of these students, however, later realized that they wanted to prove themselves as a good student and create opportunities for their future. This sentiment was most often expressed by students who were juniors and seniors who noted realizing that grades mattered in terms of what they could do in the future. One such student is Jerome:
I was pretty anxious to get my report card just to show my mom and dad because they always tell me how I don't care and stuff, but I do care a lot. And so when they see my report card they know. I'm pretty happy when I see my report card.

Well, I probably hated school up to about my junior year end of my sophomore year -- no junior year was when I started liking it just because I got my head on my shoulders and out of my butt and I started doing good. (Laughter) Because ever since I could remember since elementary school every year we’d have like three or four parent teacher conferences and I’d just get grounded every time.

Jerome indicated that he wanted to prove himself to his parents. Katie, too, felt as though she had to perform well for her parents: “Especially my parents pressure me cause I know they want me to do good and everything, but it's just a lot of pressure on me to do good in everything.” When asked what she would change if she could alter one thing to reduce negative emotion, Molly answered: “ It would have to be me getting better grades cause then I wouldn't have so much stress at school.” Students noted that their most emotional days in class were the one’s in which they were waiting to receive grades. This alone was enough to induce dread and anxiety in most students. Katie stated: “ If I know that I am getting a test back or something and I know I didn't do good on or something it's like, "Oh no, I know it's coming."

For students who invested effort or had a deep desire to succeed, they knew that success was defined by good grades. While many students were intrinsically or parentally motivated to achieve in school, others lacked any effective motivating source. Boredom was the most frequently noted reason low performing students earned poor grades. Alberta, a student, stated “I'm always bored at school...I've always made my way through
with like Cs and Ds.” She did not engage with the material or find a compelling reason to do anything other than warm a seat and pass her time at school. Boredom is one of the key emotions that inhibit students from connecting with the subject matter and learning anything meaningful (see Laukenmann & Von Rhoneck, 2003). Another student, Lushina, indicated that she is failing English class. When I asked why she responded saying: “By the time I get to English class it’s after lunch and I’m already exhausted during the day, I don’t get to sleep early enough ‘cause I need to work on that or something but I’m already tired and I don’t want to do anything.” While some were intrinsically motivated, or not; other students received their motivation from teachers.

*Teachers' Motivational Tools*

Grades are frequently used as a motivational tool (Brookhart, 2004). As argued by Zoeckler (2007), student effort and attitude are often related to teacher expectations. Effort, attitude, and expectations can translate into motivation. During observations, I frequently witnessed teachers telling students what percentage of their grade was determined by a certain assignment, how important an exam was to study for if you wanted a “good grade”, and to show students that they are capable of earning high grades if they apply themselves.

Particular students have repeatedly “failed” in the educational system and typically give up (see Fassett & Warren, 2004). Teachers noted trying to encourage such students to see that they have a chance to be successful in school. Consider the following interchange between Ms. Miller, a teacher, and Spencer, a student:

“I had a student today just this last period exam who failed my class last semester and he said to me at the end – I’m like, “Spencer, I really want you to pass. Let’s
You can just fail me,” and I was like – that’s just such a sad way to look at your life. “Just fail me ‘cause I really don’t care. I’m failing all the rest of my classes.” That’s what he said. He just didn’t care, and so this nine weeks I pulled him up ‘cause I said, “Spencer, come up here,” ‘cause his grade is like a 75%, which for him is really good. And I said, “Spencer, do you see your grade?” I said, “I am so proud of you,” and those are the moments I’m like – that’s small for me but I knew it was huge for him and he’s like, “Oh my gosh. That’s my grade?” and the kid never smiles. And he was so proud of himself.

Andersen and Gurrero (1998) note that “pride is frequently the result of another’s approval that leads to positive self-evaluation and is associated with positive affect” (p. 59). Pride, in short, is a very social emotion embedded in broader cultural understandings of what is socially valued.

*Fairness in Grading*

Fairness in grading has long been the focus of conversations among teachers and students alike (see Berry, 2008). In recent years a push to create schools that are more inclusive for students with disabilities has created another layer of complexity when considering grading practices. New Haven High School had implemented an inclusion program that places students with disabilities in mainstream or general education contexts integrated with the general student population rather than in separate classrooms. This inclusion program was celebrated by some teachers and loathed by others; a common reaction in most schools (see for example, Garriott, Miller, & Snyder, 2003; Zambelli & Bonni, 2004). One of key sources of tension was defining what was fair in terms of
grading students with different abilities in the classroom. To understand teachers’ viewpoints on this issue, their deeper beliefs about fairness must be examined.

Barrow (2001) defines “fairness as the belief that it is morally wrong, in itself, to treat individuals differently without providing relevant reasons for doing so” (p. 236). This concept of fairness is engrained in the structures and practices of our broader democratic society and subsequently manifest in our schools. Hence, equal treatment of all, unless justified adequately is the driving assumption behind fairness. There are, however, exceptions to the rule of equal treatment that are supported by law, and in such cases “needs-based principles of distributive justice” are applied to remedy the situation (Berry, 2008, p. 1150; see also Deutsch, 1985). Inclusive classrooms often operate on a needs-based approach to fairness providing students who need it with extra support and instruction. All students do not receive equal support because it is based on need. Hence, if a student can read and comprehend numbers without assistance, he would not be provided a teacher to help him read and process numbers during class. The notion of fairness is achieved when students reach a “level playing field” in terms of ability to succeed in the classroom. This view of fairness, however, is not readily embraced by many teachers who believe that equality should be the dominant principle and no student should receive different or additional support (e.g., abridged exams, help reading questions during exams) or instruction than another to succeed. Intense feelings of frustration, anger, and dissatisfaction often stem from the clashing of philosophical beliefs and practices related to fairness in the classroom (Chory-Assad & Paulsel, 2004). Ms. Proctor stated:
they struggle with “How am I supposed to give this student an ‘A’ that’s a regular student because they’ve done all of it, and give this special ed. student an ‘A’ even though they’re not at the same level.” It’s because it’s their ability. You grade them on their ability. Even if they only answer five out of 20 questions; if they answered all five correctly and right and we see their thought process, how is that different than this student that’s written all 20 of them?

To many teachers, though, grading on ability seemed unfair; especially since grades are used as a stratifying device in society it seemed unfair for students to have the same grade when one was able to demonstrate exceptional performance and comprehension of the subject matter while another only completed a portion of the assignment and may have required help to understand or complete the portion on which they would be graded. Teachers have used a variety of strategies to deal with issues of grading in inclusive classrooms. One teacher reflected on a student who she knew was not going to pass her class saying “God love her, she tries so hard. I am not one of those teachers that gives a grade on trying, and it just makes my heart sink…I don’t give on my standard. I don’t give extra credit. I don’t give grades. Even if it’s a 95.2, it stays a 95 not a 96.” This teacher noted that she has a system in which she adjusts the assignment rather than the grading for students with IEP’s:

The only difference in grading is the adjustment of the assignment. I do all the adjusting beforehand. I definitely do not adjust grading…I adjust beforehand to compensate for the fact. It’s usually an adjustment of the size and number and depth of answers, instead of how they answer, or did they try. I can’t grade, “did they try.” I just can’t.
This teacher and many others used the strategy of adjusting the assignment before and then grading the answers rigorously. This was sufficient to some teachers as a fair method of assessment, but still seemed to be unsettling to many other teachers that student’s report cards would reflect the same grades. One special education teacher, Mr. Cornish, reflected on students’ perspectives on special education students earning similar grades for completing different versions of the work:

And I also think, too, the older that the kids get, the more mature they are. And it’s the same thing. If I know that if I’m the regular ed. kid and she’s the special ed. kid and I know we’re in a project and I know that she got 35 points, I got 35 points, I did all the work, it’s gonna bother me a little bit. But when I sit back and look at it, I think, “You know what? When we go to apply for the same job, I’m getting it, she’s not. You know what I mean? So I think the more mature the kids get, they also look at that. But it’s the same thing when we are fighting with a teacher we’re working with for grades. Social studies is way more liberal. I look at Jane Boston, for example. She’s got 34 percent. And I look at, say, “Well, we’ll give her a D.” No problem. Don’t worry about it. You go to the English department, and she’s got 34 percent, “Wait a minute. We can’t give her 30 points to pass her.” You know what I mean? But, you see, so we fight that. It’s not a fight. It’s just a constant.

The issue of fairness in grading evoked emotion every time I spoke with both teachers and students. Teachers, especially, experienced tensions related to grading as they had to assess student work within the expectations of the broader structures of both the school and society which sometimes seemed to contradict one another.
Summary

The importance of understanding the macro forces that influence experiences within schooling is crucial to deepening our understanding of how and why emotions are experienced and enacted in particular ways. Observation, normalizing judgment, examinations, and grading all structure students' and teachers' school lives, and provide a framework for understanding and critiquing whose interests are limited or served through the current system. Next, the social aspects of school life are examined to better understand schooling and emotionality as relational endeavors.
CHAPTER FIVE - SOCIALIZING AT SCHOOL:

SOURCES OF EMOTIONAL SUPPORT AND SABATOGE

While students solve algebra problems and practice for the school play they are often simultaneously rehashing conversations with friends or rehearsing what to say to initiate or repair a relationship with a significant other, teacher, or family member. Realizing that much of the emotion students experience at school has nothing to do with the subject matter at hand (i.e., French or Math) is easy; in fact, many of their emotions revolve around people that make up their lives both within and beyond school walls. When students were asked, for this project, to create a collage they could use to talk about their experiences and emotions related to school, all of the collages had a section devoted to relationships. In addition to the general peer group students encountered at school, friends, current or ex boyfriends and girlfriends, and family were frequently discussed as having a major influence on students' school lives. In the next two sections, the influences of these relationships will be examined to learn more about how students are socialized in relation to emotion, how these relationships both fuel and mediate emotional experiences, and, ultimately, the role these relationships play in either supporting or hindering students' abilities to succeed at school.

Peer Groups

Scholars have noted that peers are one of the most important socializing groups over the lifecourse of an individual (Waldrip, Malcolm, Jensen-Campbell, 2008). Especially during adolescence, many students begin to turn their attention away from family relationships, which have typically been the most influential up to this point, toward peer relationships. In the context of peer relationships, "adolescents learn about
what others are doing, anticipate accepted and expected behaviors, figure out how to
present themselves and find partners for trying out new behaviors" (Ennett & Bauman,
1996, p. 83). Harris (1995) argues that peers have strong socializing influence at both the
friendship and larger group level. First, I explore the influence of friendships on students'
social and emotional lives, and later will consider the impact of dating, family, and
general peer relationships.

_Friendship: The Good, the Bad, & the Ugly_

_If it weren't for friends I wouldn't be able to survive in school._ (Giselle)

The sentiment expressed in this quote seems to capture the feeling of many
students. Friends serve as sources of support and entertainment at school for participants.
In fact, all except one student responded promptly that, "socializing" and seeing people at
school was one of their main motivators for getting up every day and attending. As
students were asked to describe a typical day, every single one noted the classes in which
they had friends. In the words of Maddox, "there are people I can connect with in there."
Many students’ perceptions of those classes were based on whether or not they had
someone to chat or commiserate with and whether or not the teachers allowed them to
talk at the end of the period to get caught up on "social life." Mr. Connor, as well as
numerous other teachers, noted using time to talk at the end of a period as a motivating
carrot stick for students to behave or do their work.

For some students, friends were a desperately needed lifeline; for others friends
were a welcome break from the monotony of the school day. Kardyn expressed the
following about her friends: "Friends are a big part of my life cause I don’t know what
I’d do without them. They’re there for all of my problems and you can just- like, when
you’re bored, “Hey, let’s go do something” and get you out from doing nothing. " Every student noted deriving some sort of benefit from spending time with friends, and for some hanging out with friends was tied to deeper feelings of self-worth as expressed by Jennifer who said, "I like to hang out with my friends a lot. I just get kind of self-conscious if I’m alone." Michael, noted that the importance of having friends to communicate with by stating, "There’s somebody always there for you, you know, and when you know that then it just makes you feel better about yourself. " Multiple students noted that the support they felt from friends made them realize their own worth. As is well documented, friendships can create a secure and supportive environment allowing young people to develop social competence, self-esteem, and problem-solving skills (Hartup, 1992; Hodges, Malone, & Perry, 1997; Waldrip, Malcom, & Jensen-Campbell, 2008).

Not surprisingly, adolescents who note having positive friendships and peer acceptance are likely to enjoy other indicators of well-being (Hartup & Stevens, 1997), and are often more advanced socially, cognitively, and emotionally than their peers who lack quality relationships and acceptance (Newcomb and Bagwell, 1995). As I observed and interviewed students, I noticed a trend that supports research by Ellis & Zarbatany (2007); the students who expressed struggling the most in school, dreaded attending, and did not participate in extracurricular activities were the same students who indicated they had few if any friends at school. These students were more likely to indicate feeling negative emotions with regard to both school and relationships. One struggling student, Logan, summed up his perspective on the issue by saying "I don't like coming to school. Maybe the popular kids like coming here, but I don't." This same student finished his
collage and noticed that virtually every image and word he selected to talk about his school experience was negative: "I've got a whole bunch of stuff here still. Negative--you see I don't get much of the positive aspect from school. It seems like it's always negative by the time I come home; it's depressing. I hate it. That's why getting home is so awesome." This student described being bullied by other students and struggling to maintain good grades. Researchers have evidence to support the notion that some of these students do not have quality friends because they are at a "lower" level academically or lack effective social skills; there is also evidence to support the opposite view in which the student performs poorly academically and has weak social skills because he has not had support or an opportunity to practice such skills (see Ellis & Zarbatany, 2007).

Students who did have close friendships turned to friends in joyful moments and moments of sorrow. I listened as students described the excitement of attending school dances, sporting events, and other "fun" activities with friends. Students also relied on their strong social ties to help them cope with a bad day or difficult experience. Arty valued his friends because "they know how to pick me up when I'm down" as did Betty who noted that her friends help her put issues in perspective: "Well I know if I’m in a bad mood or something my friends will help me feel better. They’ll be like, “It’s okay, don’t worry about it.” Every single student interviewed noted that when difficult moments arose at school they would try to hide their emotion and wait until they could tell a friend their problems. Events like feeling singled out by a teacher, being bullied by a peer, being broken up with, or failing a test were occurrences that evoked emotions students did not want, in the words of Emerson, "just anybody" to witness. This desire to hide emotions from "outsiders" or "bystanders" was strongly expressed by males and
females alike—the vulnerability that comes with sharing hurtful or frustrating ordeals was reserved almost exclusively for friends and sometimes teachers and parents. Jennifer talked about feeling bullied by a teacher: "I would just try to play it off like it wasn't a big deal in class and try not to get upset until I could talk to one of my friends about it." This was a common response to questions about how they handle emotions at school. Students also described themselves and others leading a public life in which negative emotions were masked and a private life in which they shared their true feelings. Consider the words of Melia as she reflects on the disclosures of her best friend:

And like she always talks to me about her boyfriend like all the bad stuff about him which is funny because she tells everybody else all the good stuff. But she tells me all the bad stuff just because she wants to unload on somebody. So everybody else just thinks they’re like so wonderful and never fight but like-- I’m like oh they fight like every day. So it’s just funny but yeah she’ll -- she tells me like everything pretty much I’m pretty sure. We call it like this pot, and we just tell everything and nothing leaves the pot.

Goffman (1959) asserts that people often put forth a certain face or front in public life that is aligned with the role they seek to assume in that setting. For example, a girl putting forth a positive face at school because she wants to maintain her status as being popular and happy among her general peer group despite her reality of feeling unhappy. People often make decisions about what emotions to display with social goals in mind (Jones & Pittman, 1982), and this student was no exception. This example also points to the dialectical tensions involved in maintaining friendships. A dialectal perspective on friendship can help in part to elucidate seemingly contradictory trends in friendship (see
Rawlins, 1992; 2009). Friendship is often romantically viewed as wholly positive and supportive; yet as is evidenced in the stories below, students frequently maintained relationships with friends in the midst of tension filled interchanges. One dialectic, public and private, comes into play with the management of personal information between friends who seek to maintain a different identity publicly than what is revealed privately.

While all students indicated not wanting to show negative emotion, in front of non-friends, male and females tended to deal with emotionally challenging events differently. Guys often noted that their friends would take them to play sports or video games and keep them busy when they were going through a tough time. In the words of Jerome, "they're good at distracting me and making me feel better." Girls, however, most frequently talked about disclosing all the details of what happened and involving their friends more closely in the problem itself. This difference provides girls with greater opportunities for closeness and support, but also tends to leave girls vulnerable to disloyalty and friendship deterioration if a friend would share information with others beyond the close network (see also Azmita, Kamprath, and Linnet, 1998; Beneson and Christakos, 2003).

Students entrusted their friends with delicate information about relationships, grades, rumors, etcetera; many called upon their friends for much more serious issues. Lorraine learned how true a belief passed on to her from her family was in a difficult time:

My family and my brother especially always used to say 'friends give you a good sturdy ground and if you don’t have that good sturdy ground you’ll fall,' and this past year I realized that I have two very, very close friends that live here and I
have one close friend that goes to Piedmont and if I didn’t have them I would fall
time and time again. My friend that goes to Piedmont, she used to go to Solton
and the year my brother died I leaned on her a lot. She was there for me. She was
my support. If I didn’t have her to tell you the truth I probably wouldn’t be here.
I was out of my mind when my brother was gone. My brother was my closest
friend and I don’t know what it is about it but when he left I felt like a part of me
was missing. It was terrible.

For Lorraine, having a supporting, sympathetic friendship proved to be a lifeline that
enabled her to continue to move forward. Such devastating events place young people in
positions to learn about dealing with two very "socially stimulated" emotions--grief and
sympathy (Anderson & Guerrero, 1998). According to Clark (1997) sympathy is an
emotion that "provides glue for social bonds" (p.5) and "creates ties of obligation and
reciprocity" (p. 20). Young people are learning how to express appropriate emotions and
comfort one another through devastating events. Students were able to maintain their
social status, debate difficult decisions, and cope with heartbreaking situations through
the resources provided by their friends.

During adolescence, many students are engaging in behaviors about which they
do not often want their parents to know; hence, friends become key moderators in their
life dramas. Melia, a girl I had interviewed, came in looking tired one Monday morning
to her second interview. I asked if she had a rough weekend and she replied, "you have
no idea!" She paused, I sensed her contemplating whether or not to share what went on,
and then she began to talk:
You know my best friend I told you about? Well she's been doing some things lately that I don't think are good, good ideas for her. She went to a party and was drinking and she, well, she and her boyfriend had sex, and she didn't mean to and she's not on birth control. So she calls me the next morning crying and begging me to come get her. We drove around and then she asked me to take her to get the morning after pill. I didn't want to do it, but I had to because I'm her best friend. I was so stressed out. I didn't know what to do and I couldn't tell anyone.

The obligations of friendship sometimes weighed heavy on students as they were forced to sometimes compromise their own ideals or be responsible for consoling a friend in potentially life changing situations with limited experience. As argued by Rawlins (1992), "internal and external difficulties continually threaten the tranquility of adolescent friendships" (p. 87). Melia, struggled with the dialectic of judgment and acceptance--interpersonal practices that shape friendships (Rawlins, 1992). She was compelled to judge her friend's behavior as "not good for her," and felt that she was put in an untenable position, but ultimately decided to not criticize her friend, but support her in a difficult time. Part of this decision may have been related to another dialectic--affection and instrumentality. Rawlins (1992) argues that people must deal with their need for a friend and the tensions that arise as a result of having that friend. Like many "best friends" Melia noted that her and her friend shared intimate knowledge about one another's experiences, dreams, and fears. A mutuality emerges between friends that is based on the recognition that both are indebted to the other and could be exploited by the other: both parties are vulnerable (Paine, 1969). This leads to another key dialectic--
expressiveness and protectiveness. This dialectic captures the impulses to both disclose information and expose oneself fully to another and the desire to protect one's self by keeping intimate thoughts and feelings private to avoid vulnerability.

Another student, Eva noted that the peer pressure she has felt has not caused her to participate in risky behaviors, but has caused her to compromise her ideals by taking care of her friends who do. Students often found themselves ill equipped to handle the situations in which they became involved because of their friends; a number of students expressed resentment or anger as a result. Heather described the self-knowledge her best friend entrusted her with as a "burden":

And this out of the closet thing [she is pointing to a phrase she put on her collage], my best friend, he told me he was gay, and it was kinda like a really bad day for us because it wasn't, like I don't really care that he was gay, it just was really awkward situation, and I probably said the wrong thing and he was mad at me for a while, so that was bad. But we're friends again, so---and that was like the difficult thing was he only told me and this one other girl, and we're like two of his best friends. But then like our friends that we aren't - like we're all friends together but like other people don't know, and they like talk about it all the time cuz, I mean, you can kinda tell. And so like people ask me all the time, and I just lie to 'em because he doesn't want people to know before he gets out of high school cuz it's just awkward cuz no one really understands it and so -- and like accepts it. Like, he doesn't just wanna be like stereotyped as someone who's gay because people would do that, so. Yeah. So it was kinda like a, almost like a
burden, and I was kinda mad that he did tell me cuz then it was like I knew and I couldn't tell anyone.

Heather's friend had a desire to put forth a certain front while at school through it differed from his actual self. His decision driven, no doubt, by anxiety and fear of managing the reactions of his broader peer group at school. Engaging in this friendship creates dialectical tensions related to how to manage their friendship in public verses in private as Heather's friend pressured her to keep part of his identity private. Adolescent males tend to hold fairly rigid assumptions about how a male should present himself---namely stoic and tough--to align with social expectations (Oranksy & Marecek, 2009). West and Zimmerman (1987) argue that people learn to "do gender" by behaving "in light of normative conceptions of attitudes and activities appropriate for one's sex category" (p. 127). Hence, gender is a social negotiation. Behaving in opposition to the socially established norms can have severe consequences for "deviants" such as homophobic mocking (Martino, 1999; Nayak & Kehily, 1996; Phoenix et al., 2003) and other bullying behaviors that seek to elicit shame. In the words of Anderson and Gurrero (1998) shame is "the ultimate moral weapon" (p. 177) as it evaluates and condemns people that resist the norm in an effort to enforce social standards.

**Friendship Stability & Authenticity**

The benefits of strong friendships are well documented; however, finding and maintaining such quality friendships is not simple. Friendships can be complex and tension filled; contributing to negative emotional experiences and creating distractions from school work (Green, 1997; Hinebauch, 2002; Cauley & Jovanovich, 2006). In this
section I examine the stability of students' friendships, perceptions of friend betrayal, and questions of friend authenticity through a dialectical lens.

The stability of adolescent friendship is an important layer to consider in understanding students' social lives. It is estimated that over the course of a school year, only around half of all close friendships remain stable (see Bowker, 2004; Degirmencioglu, Urberg, Tolson, & Richard, 1998). These findings point to the extreme volatility students' experience in this portion of their support system. Ladd (1990) notes that having stable friendships is linked to school satisfaction and a decrease in feelings of loneliness (Parker & Seal, 1996). Yet, maintaining stable friendships seems to be an arduous challenge for adolescents, especially adolescent girls.

Exclusion, rejection, and conflict with friends tend to be more common and consequential in girls' interpersonal relationships due to girls tendency to orient their worlds around relationships (Jenkins, Goodness, and Buhrmester, 2002). The cruelty young girls impose on one another in pursuit of popularity and status within their peer groups is well documented (e.g., Brown, 1998, 2003; Lamb, 2001; Underwood, 2003; Willer & Cupach, 2008). In efforts to "confirm peer group boundaries and their own sense of belonging and acceptance" girls often engage in mean and aggressive acts toward one another (Underwood, 2003, p. 151). These acts typically come in the form of rumor spreading and gossip, social exclusion and manipulation (Putallaz, Kuperschmidt, Coie, McKnight, & Grimes, 2004). Girls tend to use very covert strategies which can be considered indirect and socially aggressive to accomplish their goals (see Willer & Cupach, 2008). Consider Tracy's experience of such covert acts on the part of her friends:
Oh, my friends – my friends are like this (motions as if stabbing something with a knife)--this is a knife – the handle – stabbing me in the back. My friends do that a lot. Well, in Color Guard there’s three seniors, and that’s, you know, an odd number and the other two are always together, so it’s like a butter knife. So the other two always hang out with each other and they always leave me out of stuff, and they’re always mad at me. They always find something to be mad at me about and talk about me. And you know how you can see people whispering, and you just know they’re talking about you? They do that a lot. I’m like, “I’m not stupid; I’m right here,” you know?

Tracy's friends engaged in social exclusion by leaving her out of activities and attempted to set boundaries between her and their now smaller desired peer group. Interestingly, Tracy describes being hurt by their actions and recognizes that they are trying to exclude her and make her feel badly, yet she still has a desire to be friends with these girls. When I asked her what she does when they behave this way toward her she responded saying "I try and make them happy. And I don’t want to make it worse." I probed further by asking if they had always treated her this way or if the other girls' behavior had gotten worse recently.

Well, freshman year was nice because, you know, there's so many people that were older than us we could all hang out with different people, and we all hung out together. But as we started getting older, that’s when they started, you know, just them two, and I don’t know. Like when – like if me and one of them hang out together I make sure I call the other one and, “Hey, you know, we’re hanging out, you wanna come?” you know. And then, you know, they always talk about,
“Hey, yeah, you’re staying all night tonight, right?” right in front of me like I can’t hear them. I don’t know. I don’t think it should make me sad, but it does. I don’t have a lot of friends at school. Well, I do, you know, I talk to a lot of people, but nobody that I’d go home and like call besides the two Color Guard girls, but I don’t really like them all the time, so I wouldn’t really wanna.

Stories like these were not unusual in my interviews with female students. I was taken aback by descriptions of interactions between them and their "friends"; feelings of not fitting in with their friends; and not having anyone that really understood and respected them. The use of the word "friend" to describe mainly hurtful, rarely supportive relationships did not make sense to me initially. In some ways, the dialectic of the real and the ideal can be used to clarify the realities of friendships. Often friendships do not meet expectations of one's ideal relationships and one is left to manage the ensuing tension of the reality of the relationship, and decide if the need for friends outweighs the costs of the relationship. Another student, Allison, described a group of girls subjecting her to social aggression, one of which she referred to as a "friend":

That’s the only bad thing. And it’s still happening right now. Then she tells other people – well, it’s in choir class. There’s other girls. One I’m friends with. I know they talk about me but then they try to act like nice to me, and I just ignore them. I just ignore the mean kids because I have this big bone right here that’s kind of weird, but I just have a bone right here and they make fun of it or whatever, and they’re just really like making fun of people. And she does it to me. We’re friends, but I don’t talk to her anymore because I know she does that and I just ignore it. It’s kind of hard, like now, today, I don’t even want to be in choir
anymore because of that. I’m tired of people talking bad about me behind my back. They tell everybody. It’s just that row. And they just kind of like, talk about you... And I hate sitting there alone because it’s like two chairs, then this whole other row, then there’s this one girl. She never talks and it’s hard to start conversations with her. And you can’t really move. I hate it because you can hear them talking about you and you try to ignore it. But it’s getting to the point where I’m tired of it. I just try to ignore stuff now, like be more mature than them. I’m trying to be like “Maybe it will go away.” I don’t know. I think it just keeps getting worse when she talks about me so I think I might move, like move up to another seat.

Again, this student describes someone who is the leader of a group who makes fun of her as a "friend." As Allison recounted the way this particular "friend" and her peers treated her every day in choir class, an outside observer may think they are listening to the description of a bully, but not a friend. I inquired as to why she thinks these girls target her:

I think it’s since I was, or I am friends with them. I think they still kind of target me. But they’ll look at other people. There’s this one girl. She wears all black and she’s kind of, I don’t know. They just make fun of her. Most people do that in choir class because she doesn’t believe in God. That’s why. They kind of are like making fun of her. She doesn’t care really. They’re like “What is she wearing today? Blah, blah, blah.” Then there’s a few other times. If somebody walks in they’ll be like “Oh, what is she wearing?” You know they’re going to make fun of them. Then the thing that made me mad too in choir is they would like, look at
me, four girls in a row. They’re all friends. I think the one girl tells everybody to look at me that sits in that row and I just feel like, awkward. I just ignore it. I don’t want to like, say anything. I’m just going to be like “Yeah, we’re still friends you know.” She’s the girl that even when you’re friends with her – I’m still friends with her, she’d talk bad about me behind my back. She’d be talking to someone. If I’m like over there, and she’s like right here, she’d still be talking about me to other people.

Social dominance theory may, in part, explain this counterintuitive occurrence of calling someone who is hurtful a friend. Social dominance theory asserts that people are predisposed to create hierarchies that allow and perpetuate social dominance (see Sidanius, 1993; Sidanius & Pratto, 1999). These hierarchies serve evolutionary functions in terms of clearly organizing a group, reducing conflict by placing certain people in power, and make it easier to prepare for attacks from outsiders. The more a leader pushes another down in the hierarchy the more power and status they gain. This sort of adaptive behavior is arguably (see Nishina, 2004) seen in social groups as well within school settings. It is theorized that aggressive children may actually be admired by peers for their ability to coerce others, be "ring-leaders" of social interactions, and preserve high status in the hierarchy (Hawley, 1999; 2002; Salmivalli, 2001). For this reason, others may desire to be a part of their group out of admiration or survival.

Another common assumption that may influence our view of such a social situation is that friendships are reciprocal by nature (e.g., Erwin, 1998; Laursen, 1993); that is, if Allison calls Amy her friend and is willing to provide her social and emotional support, it is assumed that Amy is willing to do the same. According to Vaquero & Kao
(2008), however, this is not necessarily true. People seek to be friends with others who do not reciprocate for a variety of reasons--often students just want to belong to a group so they will endure bullying (Nishina, 2004). For example, Allison stated "I'm just going to be like 'Yeah we're still friends you know'' even if she only belongs in language, but not in action. Allison may avoid causing outright conflict if she can endure the girls' social victimization. Tracy also described trying to make her "friends" happy in spite of them making her sad; and avoided confrontation in an effort not to make the situation "worse". This avoidance is common in low self-esteem adolescents (Azmita et al., 2005; Ma, 2004). Both Tracy and Allison revealed they had ongoing struggles with self-esteem and confidence.

Research indicates that cognitive advances are occurring in adolescents that enable them to "reflect on their own and others' behavior, emotions, and intentions and result in deeper and new ideas about friendship and interpretations of friendship experiences" (Azmitia, Ittel, & Radmacher, 2005 p. 24). These advances encourage young people to re-examine their expectations and beliefs about friendship (Grotevant & Cooper, 1986), and compare their philosophy about friendship with their actual experiences (Azmitia et al., 2005). These comparisons may lead students to feel discontent with their relationships and try harder to better fit within their group--seeking more acceptance, or lead students to look for new friends all together. In Azmitia et al.'s (2005) study, girls with both high and low self-esteem noted discrepancies in between their philosophical idea of what friendships should be and what they actually experienced. The difference between these two groups, however, is that the low self-esteem adolescents tended to not confront or talk with their friends about their
dissatisfaction whereas high self-esteem adolescents did in an effort to improve the relationship. Hence, low self-esteem adolescents tended to be perpetually disappointed in their relationships and had ongoing negative experiences as a result.

Others students, however, were able to reflect on the behavior, emotions, and intentions of themselves and others in a way that led them to seek healthier relationships. Betty commented on realizing the intentions of one of her "friends" with whom she used to spend time: "...now I think on it and sometimes I think she only called me because she was bored and wanted to get out of the house not because she like wanted to hang out with me." These types of realizations encourage some students to seek friends that meet their expectations of good friends. For example, Emerson said,

I have really good friends now I didn’t have that, and like, I just didn’t know who my friends were then. Like, I have like the same three friends that I pretty much talk to in all my classes. It’s nice to hear how their days are going and to see them on a regular basis.

Finding such friends creates the foundation students need to maintain emotional stability and thrive at school (Waldrip, Malcolm, & Jensen-Campbell, 2008). Heather, a self-described confident, smart student noted not wanting to waste energy on inauthentic relationships:

...there's a couple people that just really bother me on a daily basis, basically, but, yeah. There's a few people - there's this one girl, and she's probably like the most fake person I've ever met in my life. She acts like we're like best friends, but I know we just don't really like each other that much and it'd just seem better to me if we didn't talk, but she talks to me every day.
Just as there were students with tumultuous or unreciprocated friendships, there were students who had defined who their "true" friends were.

Finding friends that students connected with and shared positive experiences with did not leave them immune to other types of friendship issues; nor were males immune to friendship problems. Joel noted concern over conflicts with friends as being a distraction at school:

It's definitely a big factor because I'll be thinking about one thing. Paying attention in class but yet I'm worried about what my friend thinks or whatever, if they're mad at me or something like that. And just focused on that and thinking about why they'd be mad at me or whatever. Or if this is actually a big deal or not or if I could just play it off like it's nothing really, just talk to them about it.

Preoccupations with friendship conflicts dominated many students' days as they often saw these friends in the hallways and classes. Hannah noted the loss of a good friend who she still sees in the hallway:

I hate drama. I’m not in much drama. Just my sophomore year there was drama because there was a guy me and my best friend both liked him but I got him. Well we dated for over a year so I guess -- it was worth it. But it was sad because I lost her. Like we still say hi to each other in the hallways sometimes. But you just aren’t close anymore. We used to do everything together too. Like we hung out so much we were like sisters.

Experiences such as this one were familiar in the stories of how students lost and gained relationships. Jealousy was also frequently mentioned as damaging ties between close friends. Jealousy is very much a social emotion often stemming from real or imagined
violations of relational trust (Guerrero & Anderson, 1998). Jealousy was commonplace in students' stories of their friends going places without them, spending more time with other friends, and feeling left behind by previously loyal friends. The new friends became the rival and the object of their jealousy. Arty spoke of feeling left behind by one of his best friends:

I’m usually not a jealous person but there was something about this year in high school where like if I would see one of friends or something, you know, like with somebody that they really liked, I would kind of get a little bit jealous. I wouldn’t – I really wouldn’t go on like, you know, sharing it with everybody, you know, it was only a little bit but I mean cause it was kind of like, you know, they were giving up like one of their best friends for somebody that they like just met or something so it was kind of a negative for that.

Students would have to attend classes with their friends, and their friends' new friends, often pretending that everything was fine and they were not feeling hurt or jealous.

Male students talked substantially less about experiencing jealousy, exclusion, being subjected to rumors, and what students generally termed "drama" than female students did. During interviews girls often began talking about such dramas in their lives within minutes without being prompted. However, all of the males except one were prompted to disclose before they shared emotions related to their friendships and girlfriends. Related, I frequently overhead girls talking to other girls about their relationships, conflicts, and current problems with others in their classes; yet, rarely heard such exchanges between boys about their own relationships.
Friendships, whether supportive or tumultuous are a defining part of adolescent life and a key influencing factor on students experiences at school. Friends may both support and sabotage others emotional well-being, and serve as powerful socializing agents. Friendships are core reference groups for young students as are broader peer groups.

Peer Groups: Social Hierarchy and Socialization

We have examined the ways in which close friendships are key influences on student's emotional and social lives. Now it is necessary to examine the broader peer network in which these friendships exist. Giordano (2003) states that "by virtue of direct and indirect communication processes (adulation, approval, gossip, teasing, ridicule), adolescents learn a great deal about themselves, their social worth, and the broader cultural world they inhabit through experiences beyond the confines of close friendship" (p. 267). Through discourse students learn about and negotiate what it means to be a student and their place in the social hierarchy among peers. In this section we will examine the issues of peer socialization, the discursive construction of social hierarchies, and peer victimization.

"I'm in the Middle I Guess"

Each morning as I enter the building students are visiting with their friends before school. Similarities among students are evident; those who are standing with one another tend to dress alike and tend to communicate the same way. In one group every student has on Hollister, Abercrombie & Fitch, or American Eagle articles of clothing; in another the students are wearing ill-fitting clothes that are not name-brand; in another the students are wearing mostly black with bright colors mixed in--pinks, blues, and all of them have
their hair dyed black or have brightly colored streaks; in another group the students are
dressed "comfortably" in sweat pants, hooded sweatshirts, and baggy clothes; in yet
another each student is holding an instrument. Some students are not in a group; they
stand alone. This morning ritual makes visible the groups that form within the student
population. Interactions in a broader network of peers are especially influential on
development when they draw attention to the ways in which students are different from
other individuals or groups (Simmel, 1950). In-group and out-group boundaries are
defined by such things as the extracurricular activities one is involved in, the clothes one
wears, the place one sits at lunch, and the social activities one enjoys (Brown & Lohr,
1987). When I asked Jack, a student, if there were different cliques or social groups in the
school he answered without hesitation:

There’s the popular jocks and then there’s the jock wannabes. They think they’re
sweet, but they’re kind of weird. And then there’s the popular girls and popular
guys. And then the – trying to say this nice – kind of like the low-life people. And
then there’s kind of a middle range of people. Most of the people are in the
middle, I think. You can definitely see people always sit with the same people at
lunch. In middle school we had to sit on the bleachers after lunch. There would be
certain sections with the popular people and the skaters and stuff and then the
jocks and the cheerleaders. Yeah, there’s definitely cliques. I have friends that
play sports and are jocks and stuff. I can hang out with those people, but I’m not
with them. I’m in the middle, I guess. It doesn’t bother me.

Jack, like all of the other students interviewed, was keenly aware of the various groups
that organize peers within the school, and could readily identify where he fit in amongst
these groups. Jennifer, another student, described herself as being "above" certain other groups. Madaline stated "there's the popular and the weird people and I'm somewhere in between there." Students ranked themselves and others in social hierarchies with most students perceiving themselves to be in the "middle". Some students resist this discursive categorization, some embrace it, and still others attempt to traverse between different social strata by befriending people in multiple groups.

Students who maintain friendships across multiple cliques must be savvy at learning and performing the "normal" practices that define each group. Peer socialization is a complex process involving "tension, ambiguity, and strain" at this life stage (Allen, Porter, McFarland, March, McElhaney, 2005, p. 747). Students, like Kardyn, who considered themselves group boundary-crossers noted experiencing excessive tension from trying to learn and manage the expectations of each group:

I’m not one to be like, “Ok, I’m with this section” or “I’m not talking to you guys cause you guys don’t dress like I do” or I don’t like that. I hate that. I look for people who they are on the inside and not what they are on the outside cause I hate people that judge them. It just drives me crazy. So I have friends in every group and I have friends that you wouldn’t ever imagine. I have friends that are absolutely up there that you wouldn’t think I’d ever be with either. So I’m just kind of moderate. I love being with people. So 'sports'- I’m involved in everything. So, yeah. 'In or out' [here she is referring to a phrase she selected for her collage], sometimes like where I’m stuck in the middle of my friends. Some of my friends that are higher on the scale are like, “Well, I don’t know if we want to be friends with her because she’s friends with lower people on my scale or that
we don’t like and that she doesn’t do what we want her to do,” or like that - cause I’ve never drank or I’ve never done anything. I’m just not into it and my friends always try to have parties and they’re like, “Well, she doesn’t want to do this so I don’t know if we want to be with her” and sometimes they’re like, “Wow, she does this. Let’s whittle her in.” I just kind of sometimes feel like I’m sometimes centered in and out a lot. So I feel like I’m wanted, but I feel like I’m not. Like I’m very - I’m a girly girl. I can dress up in a skirt one day and then I’m a person that just goes and wears jogging suits or a t-shirt all the time cause I really don’t care. I’m just happy with that. But sometimes, I just feel like sometimes people look at me like, “Ok I don’t want to be with her because of that reason,” or like “I don’t want to be friends with her because she’s like,” - like they’re putting me down. Like my upper friends would be like putting me down.

Students are clearly aware of the differential status bestowed upon various groups. Kardyn's desire to break down the boundaries that divide different social groups proves difficult as her friends evaluate her against their group norms. Merely associating with groups of a different status or dressing in a jogging suit is enough to make her "high status" friends question whether or not she should be a part of their group.

Social status can be understood as discursively constructed and managed. Giddens (1984) can help us understand how social systems are (re)produced through social interactions. Giddens states that systems are "patterns of relations in groupings of all kinds, from small, intimate groups, to social networks, to large organizations," and these systems are maintained through "enduring cycles of reproduced relations" (p. 131). Students create, sustain, and/or alter these systems through discourse and practice. For
example, Kardyn draws upon hierarchical language to describe the status levels of her different friends. By doing so, she perpetuates a system in which people exist on different levels. These systems are "built" through structures which, in the most basic form, are rules and resources drawn upon by social actors (Giddens, 1984). Giddens (1984) asserts that structure "has always been conceived of as a property of social systems, carried in reproduced practices embedded in time and space" (p. 170). According to Giddens' (1984) notion of duality of structure, "the rules and resources drawn upon in the production and reproduction of social action are at the same time the means of system reproduction (duality of structure)" (p. 19). Structures become reified through discursive practices, and those structures can both enable and constrain (Giddens, 1984). By students tending to dress, talk, and behave according to norms of particular groups, and outcast others who do not follow their norms they demarcate clear boundaries within the social system. As observed by Molly who transferred to New Haven the previous year, "Students here, they put other kids in categories like Goth, prep, jock, stuck-ups...they try to fit in to one group and they can't just mingle with everybody." Creating structures that divide student groups allows a sense of security and belonging for many, but can also limit opportunities to appreciate and interact with others from different social groups and can limit students' willingness to fully express themselves individually.

Gidden's (1984) concept of structure can be more deeply understood by considering some specific rules and resources that may play a role in its formation (i.e., procedural rules, moral rules, material resources, and resources of authority). Procedural rules, or how practices are performed, such as sitting at the right table at lunch, talking to the right people, and following certain language rules influence how structures are
produced. Violating certain practices quickly *others* a student or group of students. For example, Madaline talked about a group of students that she considered lower on the social hierarchy: "They do weird things like walk around making up weird chants, or something, like during class--I don't know--like they just are weird, do things that a normal person doesn't." Madaline labeled these students as "weird" and "abnormal" because they violated established scripts for appropriate behavior. Something as simple as dressing differently can evoke negative feelings in others, and acting differently than the norm can trigger contempt in peers from other groups. Kramer and Jost (2002) capture these feelings with their analysis of "out-group paranoia" which elicits high distrust and suspicion of another group. Jerome, a student, shared his derisive feelings about students in another social group which he called the "EMOS":

*Student:* The biggest problem I have in my life right now is probably EMO kids just because they get on my nerves all the time. I can’t stand how they’re so weird like the guys I can’t stand they’re wearing girl pants. I can’t stand them wearing make-up. I can’t stand their hair...

*Interviewer:* So when you say EMO I’ve never heard of EMO before.

*Student:* Well, it’s just short for emotional that just means like see this girl right here --

*Interviewer:* Uh-huh.

*Student:*-- she’s EMO. (See image below in *Image 1. EMO Students*)

*Interviewer:* Yeah.

*Student:* That guy’s probably EMO. *The Cool Spot* (a local park recreation building) that’s where a lot of the EMO kids hangout and gothic kids. They’re
kind of freaks so I mean I don’t like going there. The -- that’s the sucky thing about high school and stuff like whenever a place that’s actually pretty decently sweet. You can go hanging out like all the EMO kids and gothic kids just overrun it. It’s where they all hangout so we have nowhere to hangout then except for homes and stuff. Other than that that’s how it is.

Interviewer: Alright. So I’m going to ask you a question. You talked about the EMO kids - so what groups do you see in the high school? Do you feel like there’s a lot of cliques or social groups?

Student: Yeah and no. I mean -- see for me like I get along with everyone. Like I can get along with EMO kids if I wanted to --

Interviewer: Uh-huh.

Student: -- it’s just I don’t because I can’t stand them because they’re so dramatic and annoying. So it’s really -- it’s starting just to be like the skateboarders -- everyone’s starting to get along with the skateboarders. I mean it used to be like the skateboarders and the jocks [against each other]. Now it’s the EMO kids and the jocks and the skateboarders. But the skateboarders they’re cool now -- I mean because they -- like they don’t smoke weed anymore and stuff and they’re not gay towards us...But we’re cool now. I mean me and my friends. I mean we have our own little group that we hangout with but I mean we’ll hangout with anyone though.

Interviewer: Uh-huh.

Student: It’s not really that big of a deal to us but the EMO kids they’re growing more and more every year and they’re getting more and more annoying because
they think they run everything and they don’t. So --I mean if you like wearing
girl pants that’s cool just don’t be around me when you’re doing it because it’s
really gay I think.

Interviewer: So why do you think they do it?

Student: Well, everyone says attention but I just think it’s because they’re stupid
and weird and gay.

Interviewer: Just do it to do it?

Student: I just -- I don’t know what would make someone to want to dress that
way. Just because probably they didn’t fit in with the jocks or people just didn’t
want to hangout with them. And then the EMO kids will accept anyone so they
hangout with them --

Interviewer: Uh-huh.

Student: -- and started dressing like them and everything.

Interviewer: Uh-huh.

Student: And then act like them. It just gets really annoying.
Making up chants, dressing in "different" clothes, acting "gay" towards others were all violations of procedural rules for the students who wanted to be ranked "higher" in the social system. These behaviors secured students as lower in the social hierarchy and as "losers" and "weird people" (to use the terms of students). Interestingly, the "EMO" label was attributed to the group that was considered most different, deviant, and in need of controlling by the broader peer network. This label is likely not coincidental given the historically subordinate position of emotion in school settings (see Boler, 1997; 1999).

Moral rules refer to certain laws or guiding morals for social action; for example, you should not date someone your friend likes or you should not drink alcohol at parties. These rules vary greatly between cliques. Many students noted having to negotiate where
they fit within the social system based on these moral rules with drug and alcohol use being a major determining factor. Heather reflected on a previous group of friends saying "I just didn't fit in with them. They all drank and did drugs and I didn't and I didn't feel comfortable always being around it. The people that I'm in choir with are like my best friends now, which, I mean, maybe people might think that makes me a geek, but I don't care, it's kind of just what we like and that kind of thing." Heather said that her previous friends were more "popular" than her current close friends, but the moral rules of the social group were a determining factor in her decision to befriend different peers. She even touched upon the status change she assumed by changing close friendship groups recognizing others may label her as a "geek."

The influence of material resources on structures are especially evident at this public school where there is no uniform required, and students, because of funding issues, had to pay to participate in sports and extracurricular activities. Students came to school with disproportionate levels of material resources which influenced the activities they could take part in, the clothes they could wear, and other defining qualities that influence peer groups boundaries. When asked what makes someone popular the most frequent answers were money and sports. Jack offered the following response to my prompt:

Sports. Money. Clothes. All of the stuff that people look for, I guess. If a new kid comes to school and they look like they play sports and wears Hollister – that kid’s cool. I want to hang out with him. But if there’s another kid that comes and he’s a nice kid, but he kind of wears raggedy clothes, he’s like, “I don’t like that kid. I’m not going to like that kid ever." There’s so much judgment that goes on.
Interestingly, not a single person talked about personality or intelligence or other qualities; every answer referenced money, talent in sports, or who someone's parents were as qualities that secured popularity. In the words of Madaline, "It kinda has to do with their family or if they're really good at sports or something, so they're like known by everybody. Cause if you're not known, they you're nobody pretty much. It kinda has to do with like how rich you are too, which doesn't seem right, but that's how the world is."

Madaline and other students were learning early lessons on living in a capitalist society in which money often equals status and power. Eva reflected on the influence of money on school issues: "Everything’s so focused on money, and it’s a separator between people."

Finally, we will consider the role of resources of authority, or the ability to make decisions or allocate resources in particular ways in social systems. At a broader level, administrators and teachers have resources of authority to make decisions about rules and governing practices of the school. They may also grant students resources of authority for a variety of reasons. Students talked frequently about frustrations over "teachers pets," "popular students," and "sports stars" being afforded privileges or being treated more positively by teachers and administrators. Jerome's words capture this dynamic well: "Jacob Delany, the beloved God of high school--I just hate how he gets treated and everything because he's a 'God.'" This sense of hierarchy and authority certain students hold over others is especially evident in sports. Melia spoke of reactions to performance in games: "If we do something bad, the lower classman or whatever...it just feels like they (the seniors) put more pressure on us. If they mess up or something it’s okay and we all go give 'em a high five and tell 'em it’s okay and stuff and shake it off or
whatever." Cadigan (2003) draws our attention to the ways in which school structure and climate may actually work to reinforce the concept of hierarchical status in students through such practices as stratifying activities by grade level, varsity and junior varsity athletics, and affording students in certain positions (e.g., seniors, prom committee members) privileges that evoke feelings of differential status. I watched as certain students were permitted to use hall passes or eat lunch in different rooms because of privileges afforded to them by teachers and administrators. Multiple students spoke with anger about the privilege certain popular students received from teachers and administrators because of their social status: "It makes me mad when teachers are like “Hi, how are you?” They talk to them more and are really nice to them, they let them do everything. It’s like, do you have any idea what they do?" (Allison). What they do, according to some students is use their power to make others' lives miserable. Consider Logan's perspective:

I’m pretty sure no one wants to come to school, but I think it’s easier for them [popular students], because they don’t have the anxiety to deal with kids. They’re the ones that are making it for others. Yeah. I’m pretty sure they have fun with that, so they have something to look forward to, whereas we don’t. Yeah, you hear these teachers talking, “Well, they come to school all the time.” It’s like, yeah, well, they’re the ones that are causing the problems. They don’t gotta deal with it. I hate it...like in gym class they just mess with you all the time when you're changing and stuff, and all the popular kids just throw the ball to each other and leave you standing there to make you feel like an idiot.
Peer victimization is unfortunately quite common at school with about fifty percent of students experiencing some form of bullying during their educational career ranging from mild to life-threatening (see Sanders, 2004). Any form of bullying heightens students’ emotional distress and compromises their well-being (Wentzel, Barry, & Caldwell, 2004). Students felt that teachers and administrators should use their power of authority to punish bullying behavior. Michael points to the ways in which he perceives teachers and administrators contribute to a bullying culture because they do not use their power of authority properly:

I used to be fat and people used to make fun of me, so, you know, I know what them people go through. Or, any type of joke about anybody, you know, I stick up for that person. Like if I'm walking down the hallway and I hear somebody say something or say knock the books out of someone's hand I rush up on em, like, you know, "What's the problem, man? Why you knock the books out of his hands?" I've made a couple people pick 'em up. You know what I'm saying? Or like football players. They're all big, you know, and they walk down the hallway and knock some books out of somebody's hand, kid ain't gonna turn around like--you know what I'm saying "Dude, what's up, I'll fight you" cause he's got his team you know? I don't know. I mean if more kids would get in trouble, you know what I'm saying, somebody picking on somebody. I've seen a couple teachers look at somebody bullying somebody and just keep walking. I've seen it happen. You know, so I walk up and break it up and then I ask the teacher---I won't tell you who it was, but I ask the teacher "I know you saw that kid getting pushed up against the locker and you do nothing about it." And, the teacher said "Well I
thought they were just playing," and I'm like "Come on, they even supposed to be playing like that in the first place?" So I asked why they didn't do nothing about it, and the teacher’s like "Well, what is there I can do?" I'm like "well you can tell 'em to stop!" Teacher was like "That'll just make it worse, though." And I can see where she's coming from, but she has authority in this building. You know what I'm saying?

In this excerpt we see a student takes a risk to assume a role of authority because he perceives that the people who truly have the power of authority will not act. He uses what Kohl (1994) refers to as creative maladjustment which,

consists of breaking social patterns that are morally reprehensible, taking conscious control of one's place in the environment, and readjusting the world one lives in based on personal integrity and honesty--that is, it consists of learning to survive with minimal moral and personal compromise in a thoroughly compromised world and not being afraid of planned and willed conflict, if necessary (p. 130).

The attitudes of teachers and administrators toward bullying hold clear implications for the school climate and the acceptability of bullying behavior (Payne & Gottfreidson, 2004). Some students find the behavior of authority figures to be irrational and morally reprehensible leaving them responsible to either adjust to the norm of acceptance or maladapt and find ways to challenge the norm and maintain personal integrity (Kohl, 1994). While few teachers and administrators condone bullying, many do not act on every instance because they either perceive that it is not actually bullying, but just a
common conflict between kids or because they feel as though they will make the situation worse by doing so (see Sanders, 2004). For example, one administrator stated:

What they consider bullying (parents), it's just kids being kids. I don't see it as bullying. To me, if you're bullying someone you're making them do something they don't want to do or wouldn't normally do, but just saying things in passing--that's not bullying. That's kids being kids. To me that's the natural progression of growing up. Gosh, to me, making fun of and bullying are two different things.

These differences in perception between faculty and students is common (Rigby, 1996), and often leads students to believe that some students are receiving preferential treatment while others remain powerless.

In addition to feeling victimized by some students who were perceived to be granted more power in the system by those in authority, students also frequently spoke about other injustices. Joel spoke of the public and private lives of many of the popular students, noting that students put on a positive face at school and hid "deviant" behaviors to maintain power:

There’s so many different things that students talk about but never mention to teachers or principals – and the principals have no idea there could be something going on. Parties that they have. Drinking, drugs that they brag about. And then teachers have no idea. And they could have stuff in their lockers that they talk about...I think it’s totally dumb. And they brag about it and think they’re sweet, but it’s really worthless because what’s that going to lead to if you do drugs or drink or something. Where’s that going to lead you to? And there’s so much stealing that goes on. There’s kids that will come to school with book bags full of
gum and energy drinks from Speedway or something. They do stuff. But they just
cover it up. Students know that they are basically worthless. And they come to
school looking alright and they’re teacher’s pets or something to try and get out of
stuff. That’s kind of a secret to do. Go to the first day of school, kind of suck up to
the teachers and then they’ll start to like you and then you can get away with
stuff. Like homework, if you forget it – “Bring it tomorrow, that will be alright.”
You know what I mean? You can definitely pick out those people who are
teacher’s pets because they will say something, like a teacher’s pet will say
something and then another kid will say it and then the other kid will get
detention or DMR or something. I just keep my mouth shut. Get through the day.

There is a certain irony that exists in the fact that students tended to feel a great deal of
frustration, animosity, and annoyance toward “popular” students. This begs the question
"what makes someone popular?" According to Allen and colleagues (2005), popularity
can be understood as a status position in a peer culture, but does not necessarily involve
being well-liked by one's peers. A more accurate appraisal would be that popular students
are well-known among their peers. Rawlins (1992) notes that achieving popularity could
be considered "akin to 'success' in adulthood" (p. 80). Popularity is often equated with
being recognized by numerous peers for public accomplishments, attractiveness, or other
culturally admirable qualities. While many of the students identified as popular exhibited
kindness and pro-social behaviors toward their peers, others demonstrated antisocial traits
and abused their status to maintain a higher position in their social world. Let us consider
the complexity of popularity further in the coming paragraphs.
Students’ inabilities to be effectively socialized into their schools world can hinder productivity, satisfaction, and academic success (Souza, 1999; Staton, 1990). Yet determining markers of "positive" or "effective" socialization is complicated. Being a part of the "popular crowd" is commonly considered evidence that a student has adapted positively to his/her social world (Rubin, Bukowski, & Parker, 1998). However, being popular (i.e., well socialized into a peer group with status) also tends to make young people more vulnerable to being socialized into delinquent behavior, which becomes increasingly common in peer groups at this stage (Allen et al., 2005; Dulchini & Adler, 1994). As quoted by Allen et al. (2005), "Almost by definition, the most socially accepted (i.e., popular) individuals at any phase of development are likely to be those who are most attuned to and skillful at meeting the spoken and unspoken norms within their peer groups" (p. 748). These students are skillful enough to engage in the behaviors and rituals that will secure them a position in their desired group, but having the skill at doing so can be just as dangerous as promising. These socially adept students are known to match their behavior with the norms of their desired group which often involves risk-taking behaviors such as engaging in alcohol and drug use, and engaging in sexual acts (Rubin, Bukowski, & Parker, 1998) Coleman (1961) conducted a seminal study on defined crowds among high school youth and their reciprocal influence on one another. Coleman found that the values of popular youth (read: highest in status) influenced all of the other groups at various lower levels of status and reputation. By definition most students at a given school are not considered popular (Giordano, 2003) leaving a relatively small group of students setting social standards for the rest of the student population. It would certainly be short-sided to assume all peer socialization stemming
from higher status groups is negative; this section reflects a bias in students' discourse which tended to reflect more negative than positive qualities.

Most stories shared with me about parties where drinking, drugs, and sex were told about popular students, or by popular students. This could be coincidental or due to jealousy on the part of some, but it emerged as an evident trend. For example, Melia shared the following with me:

There are some kids that drink all the time and have these big parties. I just don't feel comfortable going to them. There was a party when Sarah's parents went out of town and Leah, my friend, was there. She said that this one girl named Allison was drunk and there were these two guys in the kitchen doing her like both ways at once, like up her butt and you know, and a bunch of other kids they were taking pictures and videos on their phones. She used to be like popular, but it ruined her reputation. Everyone found out about it. She got made fun of so much she had to transfer schools. It was like a year ago, but she came back to prom to see some of her old friends, just visit, but everyone was still like saying stuff to her..it totally ruined her, and, oh, I can't imagine. And STDs and everything. I just feel like everything bad will happen to me. That's why I don't do any of that stuff.

Students must walk a fine line of participating in "normative deviant" behaviors for their group to maintain their status, but they must also be careful not to cross a certain line of acceptability. For example, drinking, doing drugs, or having sex were acceptable, but drinking and having sex with two men at once while others watched caused this young women to be rejected and outcast by her friendship group. Others told me of this, and similar accounts. Interestingly, the men involved did not transfer schools and were not
ostracized by their peers demonstrating an all too common double standard of sexual behavior created and perpetuated in our broader social system (see Weedon, 1987).

Accounts like these point to how consequential discursive choices are as they relate to behaviors, peer groups, and, ultimately, students' well-being. Regardless of the complicated nature of being popular or seeking popularity it is still upheld as a social accomplishment and a status from which other groups are often evaluated. Students are clearly aware of these status attributions, and often use this information to assess their self-worth and esteem (Tarrant, North, Edridge, Kirk, Smith, & Turner, 2001).

Realization that one is a member of an unpopular group can negatively affect students' self-evaluations (see Brown & Lohr, 1987; Buhrmester, 1992). Students react to this realization in different ways; some seek to assume identities that are better aligned with what is socially acceptable or "normal", while others reject traditional social roles and hierarchies (Eder et al., 1995; Kinney, 1993, 1999). Still others engage in reasoning that enables them to deem themselves "better off" than a higher status group (Tajfel, 1978).

The impact of peer groups on socialization is apparent both in the broader relational system of the school; and in everyday discursive practices. Peers' influence on establishing and regulating social expectations is explored next through the examination of masculine identity management by students.

"That's So Gay": Masculine Identity and the Management of Emotion

Outside of family, students’ identities are most strongly influenced by peer groups (Parkinson et al, 2005). Social expectations apply to issues of behavior within schools, and more specifically to expectations of how to "perform" gender within school walls. Bandura (1976) argues through social learning theory that peers work to discipline
students into self-regulating their own behavior. Bandura contends that self regulation is the product of social learning and that we learn self-regulation from models, of which parents and peers are prominent. He also posits that we go through stages in this self-regulating process which will be explored later in this section.

During adolescence, boys and girls are practicing "doing" their gender more consciously than ever (Oransky & Marecek, 2009). West and Zimmerman (1987) note that doing gender consists of enacting certain practices with the knowledge of or under the influence of "normative conceptions of attitudes and activities appropriate for one's sex category" (p. 127). Gender should not be viewed as a set of fixed personal attributes; rather, gender should be considered an ongoing, active negotiation (West & Zimmerman, 1987).

This negotiation of gender was evident in observations of students and analysis of their perspectives on emotion. When I asked boys and girls alike what they thought of when they heard the word emotion, over three-fourths of the responses mentioned crying. When pressed, students elaborated to reveal they pictured a girl crying. Not a single person mentioned boys or men in response to the prompts "emotion" or "emotional." Perhaps this can be best understood by examining the social expectations for males within peer cultures. As argued by Oransky and Marecek (2009), toughness and stoicism are deeply entrenched in male culture as ideals and norms for enacting a heterosexual male identity. In their study of male adolescent boys, students described hiding emotions that demonstrated care, concern, and/or physical or emotional hurt. Rather than share such emotions with their peer group, boys centered their interactions with each other on "taunting, mocking, and shoving around" (p. 218). Most interesting was the language
used to discipline one another in relation to this performance of gender and emotion; any expression by a male that demonstrated care, concern, hurt, or worry was mocked as "gay" or "girly." These labels capture the continued view of emotion as weak, feminine, and abnormal in mainstream male discourse. These findings were also evident in my research.

Following the norms of masculine identity, male students most often noted hiding feelings when asked what they do when they experience emotions at school. One male student, Leo, reflects on how guys handle the break-up of a relationship: "I don’t know why, but the guys, they try to act unaffected though. Unaffected – some of ‘em are, but some of ‘em actually are hurting, but they play it off. Yeah, I – I actually did that. I actually didn’t do too bad at playing it off." Males frequently noted recognizing what emotions others were probably feeling, but they repeatedly noted that they and others hide their emotions. Like Chu (2005), I discovered that boys were adept at sensing when others were hurting and could recount their own experiences of emotion related to similar circumstances, but did not use their relational senses to talk with those students or comfort one another. When I posed the question "What do you do if you're upset about something going on outside of school when you're in school?", another student, Michael replied immediately saying " I hide it." This was the response I most frequently received and without hesitation. Not a single male indicated that they would show that emotion at school. When I asked Michael, "Why?", he replied " I don't know, it's probably like, I don't know, I don't want other people to know what's going on in my household. You know what I'm saying? Other people they walk around like their life is so great and then, you know, they see this other kid over here who's telling everybody what's going on and ,
you know, so, I don't know. I keep it to myself." Most students expressed a desire to hide emotions that would invite unwanted others into their emotional lives. Moreover, males seemed to work very hard to maintain their masculine identity within their peer culture at the expense of acknowledging others' emotions or seeking comfort from others for their own difficult experiences. Other researchers argue males are motivated by a fear of being vulnerable to others and ultimately being labeled as wimpy, girly, or gay for their disclosures of worry, concern, or hurt (see Kimmel, 1994; Martino, 1999; Nayak & Kehily, 1996).

Bandura (1976) articulated social learning theory, a view which posits that "people are neither driven by inner forces nor buffeted by environmental stimuli. Rather, psychological functioning is explained in terms of a continuous reciprocal interaction of personal and environmental determinants. Within this approach, symbolic, vicarious, and self-regulatory processes assume a prominent role” (p. 12). Through vicarious learning students are able to see how others are disciplined to be masculine. And, through direct consequences of behavior, students learn that acting in ways that do not portray masculinity, they will be disciplined. In that way, they develop self-regulation mechanisms that orient them toward the masculine and away from perceived “non-masculine” behaviors. Bandura articulates four stages of learning theory: physical intervention, social sanctions, substitution of symbolic and external controls, evaluative consequences. Of Bandura's (1976) four stages, I observed the second and third stages—the social sanctioning and the substitution of symbolic codes. Particularly, I witnessed how students learned various social sanctions for acting in ways contrary to masculinity. Those sanctions were deeply embedded in their use of labels so that symbolic short cuts
like “that’s gay” could be used rather than more direct pressure. The labeling of expression of certain emotions as "girly" or "gay" suggests the meanings many boys ascribe to these terms, and subsequently their ideologies about social roles in society representing the symbolic stage. Their outright fear of being thought to have feminine or homosexual qualities was evidenced in observations and interviews, and is confirmed by previous research (see Kimmel, 1994; Nayak & Kehily, 1996; Phoenix et al., 2003). Expressions of "soft" emotions such as sharing hurt, depression, crying in front of another, etc. were said to be for girls, and comforting and talking over such emotions was what "girls do." Hence, women engage in comforting and consolation behaviors, but men do not. Women display vulnerability and lack of emotional control through public displays of emotion and men should not. Expressing worry or concern about relationships and school performance were both taboo. In my observations, caring too much about school was also disciplined among male peers. The following except illustrates one scene in which other males "police" a boy's behavior in relation to an exam:

The teacher says "today is a real fun day, testing day!" A collective "no" and sighs pass throughout the room. The students are taking an assessment test to see what they remember from last year. One boy announces to those sitting around him “Kyle's a loser, he studied for this!” Another boy asks, Kyle, "You studied? That's gay." (fieldnotes, 8/28/07)

Kyle's decision to care about his class performance and study was disciplined as inappropriate. Comments of this nature were commonly heard as students interacted with one another in classes. Expressing eagerness in any fashion demonstrated a threat to male identity as evidenced in a simple interchange between two male friends in class: Jack
said, "I asked my dad if I could hang out with you before (the football game). Are you busy?" Sam replied, "You're so gay. Homo." Something as simple as a friend indicating a desire to hang out with another was stepping over the line of appropriate interaction between male friends. The reaction to this seemingly minor infraction on male friendship norms points to the reason many male students may hesitate to share what are often considered "soft" emotions even with friends.

Boys often sent messages to others about what a male should feel when he is in violation of the heterosexual masculine norms. One day the students were sitting in their desks when a male teacher entered Mr. LeBronski's room, and mimicked Mr. LeBronski's typical hand gestures and teaching style for a minute and then left. A male student commented loudly, "That was so embarrassing! What kind of queer stands up in the classroom and pretends to be him (Mr. LeBronski)?" He overtly commented on the other teacher's behavior deeming it "queer" and also made clear what emotion he ought to feel given his behavior--embarrassment. Comments such as these let other students know what social expectations are in place to assume a proper masculine identity. Any behavior or circumstance that might threaten such an identity must be remedied, which we will consider next.

Male students seemed to find themselves in tension frequently at school because they wanted to do well academically, but to do so they sometimes had to participate in school activities that they felt threatened their masculinity. In the following excerpt from fieldnotes, a male student made fun of himself as a way to redeem his masculine status:

A class project required group members to do a skit on the Declaration of Independence; a male student has been assigned the role of Benjamin Franklin--a
role for which he must dress as the character and create a poster with a group.

When practicing for the presentation the student in charge of the group offers him a pale pink sash to wear as a prop to which he replies: "I'm not wearing that." The teacher asks him, "Do you have a copy of the Declaration of Independence?" To which he replies, "No, why would I? It's gay!" (the teacher and all the students smile). This same student stands up to present the following day. Upon looking at the poster behind him he comments "Our bridge looks so gay." He puts on the glasses he is supposed to wear for a prop and stated, "Now I feel gay." Abbey, a popular cheerleader shouts:" Faggot--ha, ha, ha!" The same boy standing in front with glasses on pulls his shirt up and rubs nipples and gyrates his pelvis. The boy standing next to him yells "get away from me; don't ever do that again!"

This excerpt illustrates the complex ways in which males often tried to negotiate what they needed to do to succeed in class with what was socially acceptable among their peer group. This student participated in the project, but asserted himself as masculine and mocked the project while simultaneously displaying a sexual side that asserted himself as dominant. The fact that he was touching himself, while standing beside another male, was also disciplined by the other male who did not want to be considered "gay" by virtue of standing next to him during his sexual display. This student knew the cultural code for masculine behavior did not align with the behaviors he would have to enact to pass his group project so he resourcefully co-opted and improvised the dominant codes to make them fit the social situation and allow him to maintain his preferred identity. In such ways, dominant masculine cultural codes can work against male academic achievement (see Clark, Lee, Goodman, & Yacco, 2008). The ways in which males become active
agents in interpreting, perpetuating, or challenging idealized conception of gender are most important in understanding adolescents' complex strategies of self-presentation (Oranskey & Marecek, 2009). Another example follows of a student trying to maintain his preferred identity:

As students sit in class, the P.A. system comes on and an announcement is made about the last day to drop a class. One male student says loudly and in a joking manner, "I'm going to drop this class because it's gay." The teacher, who is sitting right next to him, asks him to go into the hall. He again says loudly, "that can't be good." The teacher and student step into the hall, and the teacher asks the student to reach a poster on the wall and pull it down for her. No mention is made of the comment. (fieldnotes, 1/11/08).

This student was failing the class and rather than display his weakness he attacked the class, likely in an effort to restore his masculine image. As in many previous cases, the student's comments were not reprimanded.

Through observations, I realized that teachers frequently let "teachable moments" or opportunities to correct students’ language choices pass. I recorded over 50 instances in which a teacher heard a student refer to something they felt was stupid or in violation of a norm as "gay" or "retarded," yet did not correct the student or discuss the implications of their language choice, further ingraining these discourses as an acceptable part of the school culture. As noted by Oranskey and Marecek (2009), teachers, parents, and coaches might sometimes "tacitly condone homophobia and sexism" though very few of them endorse these beliefs outright (p. 221). Teachers frequently noted the importance of "picking their battles" when disciplining students. In the moments when a teacher did
correct such language choices the most frequent response was "don't say that", but no additional explanation was offered. Consider the following examples from fieldnotes recorded in two different classes:

A well dressed young man walked past the classroom and waved in at the teacher.

One student asked, "who is that?" Mr. Johns, the student teacher." Male student: "He looks gay." Teacher: "Don't say that." (fieldnotes, 10/1/08)

The teacher is working though an interpretation of a reading and says, "Molly is mentally confused. How else could you say that?" Boy: "She is retarded."

Teacher: "Don't say that but how else could you say it?" (fieldnotes, 1/11/09).

After spending months observing in classes, I began to better understand why many teachers failed to interrogate students’ language choices further. While classroom cultures differ, it was not unusual for me to witness a teacher reprimanding students 15-20 times for other behavior issues in a 50 minute period (in which students were expected to be on task), which means every few minutes a teacher must break from the lesson to correct student behavior.

Up to this point, friendships and peer groups have been explored. Another relationship that was repeatedly noted by students and teachers as being highly influential was a romantic relationship. The unique nature of this relationship during the adolescent life stage is examined below.

**Romantic Relationships**

Romantic relationships in adolescence often involve embarking on new emotional territory. Students have typically learned about and engaged in friendships for years, providing a repertoire of scripts and experiences to draw upon as relationships shift,
develop, or deteriorate (Girando, 2003). Romantic relationships, however, are new to most adolescents and involve unchartered or heightened emotional territory (Larson et al., 1999). For example, feelings of passion and powerful attraction are often manifest in romantic relationships, but not friendships (Hatfield & Sprecher, 1986). Negative feelings such as jealousy can be intensified in romantic relationships (Girando, 2003). In this section, emotionality in adolescent romantic relationships is explored including the social construction and regulation of such relationships.

Appropriate expectations and prescriptions for romantic relationships often emerge out of interactions with friends and other peer groups (Simon et al., 1992). Rules materialize and gain traction through such interactions (e.g., you should only date one person; you should engage in sexual activities with your dating partner; you should be jealous if your partner talks to someone else). These scripts in turn influence how romantic relationships are enacted. Eyre, Auerswald, Hoffman, and Millstein (1998) note that the way adolescents enact or resist normative relational scripts displays which personal and moral values are most salient in their lives (e.g., fidelity, honesty). Consider the following observation:

Sarah walked up to Troy and said "I heard I can't hug you anymore because your girlfriend gets really mad. We've been friends since sixth grade. I think I pull a little rank." Troy just shrugged his shoulders as if to say 'that's the way it is now.' (fienotes, 10/10/2007)

This short interchange was one of many I witnessed as students negotiated boundaries of appropriate behavior once involved with a romantic partner. I listened as girls told Sarah before class started that the Troy's new girlfriend was "crazy jealous," and "didn't let him
Adolescent romantic relationships develop within a broader peer network that can play a deeply influential role in shaping and sanctioning dyadic relational behavior (see Brown, 1999; Connolly & Goldberg, 1999).

Expectations and norms are circulated socially most often through gossip, something every student noted being subjected to or participating in. Gossip serves as a powerful form of social control in regulating appropriate relational scripts (Girando, 2003; Willer & Cupach, 2008) which will be detailed in the coming paragraphs. As I sat in the back of classrooms and walked through hallways, I realized the prevalence and power of gossip in high school life. The bell would ring and it seemed that many students lived for the few minutes between classes to share "news" and spread information. Any violation of relational norms fueled the gossip circuit. In the words of Michael "people got big mouths." Molly offered this advice to prevent being the center of the latest gossip: "Don't tell anything to people you can't 100% trust." Arty noted how gossip travels quickly in a technological age: "It's through word of mouth, MySpace, texting on the phone and stuff. People will say something they shouldn't have and then it gets forwarded or just someone hates someone so they start a rumor about them to try to make them look bad." Giselle had this to say about the tenor of the high school world:

Drama is 24/7 in high school and I can't stand it. Everybody worries about who’s dating who, who’s doing what, what they’re doing that weekend, or – it’s ridiculous. It’s – I don’t even know. A girl gets mad if the guy that they like is dating some other girl that she doesn’t like. Drama! It all starts and it’s ridiculous.
Like Giselle, numerous students expressed being fed up with the drama gossip brings, but often in the same interview participated in some form of gossiping. The content of most gossip was focused on romantic relationships, and the consequences of being the focus of such gossip could be severe. Gossip was described as everything from a service to others (e.g., she needed to find out that he was cheating on her and nobody would tell her so I spread the word) to malicious (e.g., I don't like him so I made up a rumor that he has genital herpes) to entertainment (e.g., It's just something to do). Regardless of the intent, gossip was undeniably effective at influencing student relationships.

According to Rose (2002), early adolescent romantic relationships are often characterized by over-analysis and dwelling on interactions, increased levels of drama, and tentativeness. Students have a tendency to dramatize their relationships, and often use gossip as a mechanism through which they create and sustain drama to learn key scripts about relationships. Perhaps this is illustrated by the fact that students spent comparatively more time in interviews discussing the dissolution of or problems in their romantic relationships and less time discussing the positive aspects of engaging in such relationships. As students traverse through the complexities of dating they most frequently rely on friends to make sense of anxieties, uncertainties, and romantic feelings (Eder, 1993). The focus of these conversations about romantic relationships is most often on problems in the relationship or what has been referred to as "troubles-talk narratives" by scholars who study such discourse (see Buttny, 2004; Drew, 1998; Edwards, 2005). Speech events that are centered on the person or object that is problematic when he/she/it is not present are categorized as a "troubles-talk narrative" (Ouellette, 2001). During interviews, these narratives were commonly shared by both males and females. Maddox
shared this narrative describing the relational, and related emotional, challenges he had faced over the last year:

I think the biggest negative emotion is basically relationships. Like that – in high school you know that’s kind of where you’re kind of looking for somebody, you know, to maybe spend the rest of your life with, or you know have a really serious relationship with, where as in middle school it was kind of like you know, date this person for a couple months or whatever and then you break up- It really hits you whenever that happens cause, you know, it’s just like, you know, oh I’m kind of tired of this, you know, can – you know, and then it is really negative experience and that can send you into a downward spiral basically with your emotions. Especially this year, a lot of things like, you know, depression or something or something like that, it’s kind of – it’s gone both ways like I was in a relationship and that kind of just kind of stopped and everything and we went our separate ways and everything but we still – we were still pretty good friends and everything and we talked and everything so that kind of – but before – like right after we broke up, we really didn’t talk or anything like that so it was kind of like, you know, I basically felt like crap. And then about two weeks after that happened I actually asked another girl out and we started going out and then I found out that the girl I was going out with previously still had feelings for me. So it was kind of like mixed emotions and everything where like, you know, I thought you know everything was ended and we were just going to stay really good friends but I guess she had different plans so – and then, you know so that kind of got me down. And then about two months ago, the girl I date – I asked out after my first
girlfriend, she broke up with me and that basically took me down into another spiral. And I really didn’t want to have to go through that again so I kind of shut myself off from everybody and I just wanted to be alone a lot of the time and then, you know, I kept my friends really close though and I talked to them about everything and so I kind of got through it. I mean there’s still that little, you know, feeling in the back of your head where you’re like maybe I could have done something different or what did I do or - and you kind of still feel depressed and everything and you still want to be with that person and you still have feelings for them but at the same time you know nothing’s going to change. So it’s kind of like, you know, I have to deal with it.

Maddox's narrative captured the rumination, reliance on close friendships, and emotional turmoil that is part and parcel of adolescent romantic life.

What is unique about his narrative is that it depicts an experience that is much more likely to be attributed to a female than a male. Much has been written about gender differences in expectations, disclosure, presentation of self, and emotionality in romantic relationships (see Giordano, 2003; Laner & Ventrone, 2000; Vangelisti, 2002), and as we will examine, many of these finding ring true in the discourse of students who participated in this study. However, monolithic statements about gender differences between males' and females' expectations for and behavior in romantic relationships do not capture a genuine picture of the experiences of the students who participated in interviews. A more accurate portrayal would capture the fact that males and females both tended to talk about problems in their relationships such as breakups and issues of fidelity rather than positive aspects, and the ways in which they talked about these issues varied
more so by personality and friendship group than by gender. I listened to both genders
describe heartbreak in "vulnerable" emotion laden terms, and both genders describe
similar experiences in emotionally-neutral terms or in very brief nonchalant comments.

While the tone of student disclosures about relationships varied, most were
focused on troubled aspects of their relationships. One explanation for this is that students
tended to think of "emotions" in terms of the stereotypical depiction as primarily negative
(see Boler, 1997; 1999). Hence, my prompt of talking about "important influences on
your school experiences and related emotions" led them to speak of troubled times.
Another explanation is that problems just tend to stand out more in one's mind when
reflecting on the course of a relationship. Adolescents are apt to deem troubled times in
their relationships as more self-defining than more peaceful times (McLean & Thomas,
2003). As argued by Bruner (1990), problems drive stories and propel identity
development because they disrupt communal life and involve storied negotiation to reach
resolution. Interactions between romantic partners in a tumultuous relationship require
thoughtful rhetorical choices. Conversations with romantic others and friends about
troubles in relational life culminate in repertories of scripts that partners and friendship
groups can draw upon to assume various conversational positions in relation to talking,
reacting, consoling, and coping (see Korobov & Bamberg, 2004; Korobov & Thorne,
2007). Students make decisions about which scripts to draw upon and subsequently
which subject positions to assume (e.g., the heartbroken ex-boyfriend or the tough,
emotionless male). Molly, a student who had recently experienced a breakup with a
boyfriend, described assuming an unaffected and "cool" persona while at school:
... when we broke up I didn’t tell anybody at school. Like people were just like oh I just saw your boyfriend in the hallway. I was like sweet you know. ‘Cause I just didn’t want anybody to be like oh, my gosh, are you okay? Like if I wasn’t okay do you think I’d tell you, like do I talk to you on a regular basis? No. Why are you asking me? And like I’d be okay if my friends came up to me like oh, my gosh ‘cause I’d tell them. Yeah, I didn’t tell anybody and one day the girl that told me she saw him in the hallway, she’s like 'I talked to Colin today'. I was like 'that’s cool.' ‘He said that you guys broke up.' I was like 'yeah, two weeks ago.' She’s like 'why didn’t you tell me' and then she was like 'oh' hugging me like 'I’m so sorry' and I’m like 'oh it’s cool!', like I’m over it, it’s fine you know.' That’s why I don’t really like having relationships like with somebody in your school ‘cause when like you’ll see them afterwards and you just like can’t really get away. Like I see, I went down the other steps today ‘cause I kept seeing Collin right when I walked out of my English class...

Molly's account of managing her breakup represents a few reoccurring themes in students' discourse on relationships. All students expressed a desire to keep details, especially negative details, of their romantic relationships out of school conversation with general peers. This is not surprising considering the extent to which students feared being the topic of the latest gossip, and expressed a desire to be seen in a certain light by their broader peer group. Molly, as well as others, talked with me about how they managed their communication and identity differently at school than they did at home or with close friends. Students viewed school as their public life and strove to keep dissolution of
romantic relationships and related emotional turmoil firmly in their private social networks (i.e., at home and with close friends).

Goffman's (1959) metaphor of a drama captures the essence of students' negotiation of public and private domains in their lives, and aids in our understanding of the meanings that are attributed to others in social interaction. Goffman notes that people are like actors on a stage, putting on a certain face for a particular audience. While on "front stage", which could be equated to time at school, students may draw upon what Goffman terms "expressive equipment" to generate a presentation of one's self that creates or maintains a desired impression. For example, in Molly's interview, she said that others would probably describe her as laid back or cool and she did not want her peers to think otherwise. Yet, on "back stage", or her private life, she may not assume the same demeanor. Students often tailored their communication practices with the receivers in mind; modifying their position where necessary to assume a particular role (see Buttny, 2004; Drew, 1998; Edwards, 2005). Goffman (1967) terms this practice "gauging."

Sophisticated rhetorical devices are often employed to present one's self in a preferred manner. Students regularly engaged in negation or mitigation of relational problems to present a desired face. For example, Molly said, "it's cool, like I'm over it, it's fine you know" to the girl engaging her in conversation about the breakup. She resisted the subject position her peer was trying to impose on her of the sad ex-girlfriend, and asserted herself as cool and unaffected by the breakup. Molly had to make the performance convincing enough to the other to maintain the "face" or "front" she sought to put forth. Students skillfully engaged in mitigation which "refers to the rhetorical
softening of attenuating (but not negation) of a potentially negative hearing, thus allowing the speaker to save face" (Korobov & Thorne, 2007, p. 937). Students typically found themselves in situations where they had to admit to the existence of a problem because of others knowledge of their relational life; however, they typically engaged in practices that acknowledged the problem and then attempted to diminish perceptions of a negative impact. Using idioms like "that's cool" or "whatever" dilute perceptions of the severity of the problem (Korobov & Thorne, 2007). Alexa, a student, talked about the word "boyfriend" that she had placed on her collage: "'boyfriend' is rocky. I don’t know. I just broke up with my – well, we broke up on Friday, so. Rocky, yeah. But hey, that happens." Alexa, like other students, chose to bring up potentially difficult relationship issues when talking about their collages, but made a point to appear unconsumed by the problem. This delicate dance between acknowledgement and not appearing too emotional was common not only in talking about romantic relationships, but also in general high school life.

Managing simultaneous public and private roles (e.g., assume the role of student and boyfriend) is challenging, especially when problems in student's private lives collide with their public roles. Arty, a student, offered this story of problems he and his girlfriend were experiencing:

My girlfriend and I have been fighting lately. Well, I haven't really been fighting back with her. She thinks I'm cheating on her. Me and one of my friends were just hanging out this weekend or whatever. It was three or four of us. And then he was just — this one girl called him or whatever and said she wanted to hang out so he just picked her up. And then we just sat around and talked and he took
her home. And she thought that, I don't know—that I was cheating on her...I have
three or four classes with her (his girlfriend). It's definitely awkward.

Arty's story of his troubled relationship was not uncommon nor was his assessment of the
awkward and, for some, painful situation experienced when taking classes with a current
or ex-dating partner. As noted by Ms. Matthews, a teacher, many things impact students
being able to concentrate in class including aspects from their social lives: "It's not just
what's going on in their family, but what's going on with their friends and their
boyfriends or girlfriends."

Despite students’ best efforts, private matters occasionally "leaked" into their
public domain leaving them vulnerable to social repercussions. Sex was a reoccurring
topic of conversation among students as they pondered or managed the consequences of
engaging in sexual practices with another, and weighed in on judgments of others sexual
behavior. Dating relationships can create difficult circumstances that early adolescents do
not feel capable of dealing with on their own. In such circumstances, friends are often
called upon for support and advice (Korobow & Thorne, 2007), and sometimes the need
is immediate requiring discussion of private issues at school. This creates situations
where other students, like Logan, may become an unintended audience for one's drama:

I was even hearing these girls behind me in study hall about a month ago and one
girl was upset because she was afraid she got pregnant from her boyfriend, and I
was like, "Oh my god, you’ve gotta be kidding me," and this girl behind me, she’s
14. I was like, "What?" I was literally going out of my mind. I was like, "Oh my
god, you’ve gotta be kidding me." They’re constantly saying don’t do that stuff,
and the girls telling her behind her, "Well, if you get and do this on one of these
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two dates, then you should be fine, but if you do it so many days after your period,” stuff. I was like, “Oh my god, you’ve gotta be kidding me.” Yeah, crazy. They were whispering it, but I saw a tear going down her face. I turn around and I see what’s going on. I was like, “Wow.” Some part of me says, “Well, serves you right anyways for being that stupid.” But you can’t help but to feel bad, because now if that’s true, then she’s gonna have to lose out on all childhood, basically. Before we ended health class a while ago, they had these speakers come in – they actually had a couple from school that’s in the high school right now that had a kid, and they talk about it, and they told us about how it totally changed their lives and now he’s working two jobs to try to get child support paid.

Most often these conversations occurred behind closed doors, but occasionally entered school through cases like the one above, gossip, or even topics in class.

A romantic relationship in adolescence often represents one of the earliest relationships in which students believe sexual activity is a defining part (see Bearman and Bruckner 2001; Brewster 1994; Furstenburg et. al. 1987; Lauritsen 1994; Meier 2003; Udry and Billy 1987; Upchurch et al. 1998). Many students become sexually active because of cultural expectations from their peer network; yet, many are woefully ignorant of the consequences of such behavior. Ms. Belle, a teacher who tutors a girl who had a baby and was struggling to pass her classes, had this to say about the student:

She doesn’t even know how she got pregnant-- I had to give her a health test while I tutored her and then when she turned it into me she goes, “My grandma can’t believe that you guys are teaching us this stuff.” The exam was talking
about eggs and sperm and she’s like, “My grandma can’t believe that you guys are teaching us this.” “Oh, you just had a baby. You used all those organs to produce the baby inside of you,” and she has no idea. She just took the final over the same information, didn’t know one thing. Doesn’t even know how her baby was conceived.

Adolescent dating relationships exist in an interesting life stage in which students are often caught between the role of a kid and an adult (Giordano, 2003). They often begin enacting roles in relationships without fully appreciating the potential consequences, and sometimes find themselves living fully a real drama rather than just manufacturing drama through gossip.

Previous research reveals that males and females do tend to hold different in dating scripts with males assuming more traditional gender roles with sex as an expression of masculinity rather than a relational act (Gagnon & Simon, 1973; Laner & Ventrone, 2000). This could be explained by biological forces, gender-socialization, and other messages males encounter about masculinity. Gendered conceptions of the role of sex in dating did exist, but were not monolithic. Leo shared his impressions of female perceptions of the role of sex and love:

I noticed typically like a lot of girls this – at this age, they think they’re going to find – they’re looking for love. A lot of ‘em are are looking for just sex, but – Now, I’m just gonna be honest. But, I know but – but at the same – but a lot of times, they’re looking for both because they think that’s an – sex is an expression of love, and usually a lot of – a whole lot of the guys, not a big – a big amount – a large amount of the percentage of the guys just want the sex. Like with the girls –
with girls, I just heard in my biology class, one girl said I’m sick and tired of trying to find true love. And we’re thinking you’re 17. You’re 18. I mean because we were in like lab groups, and we heard another group, and we heard – there was a group of girls talking. But it’s just like it’s ridiculous. I mean really. You don't need to be looking for that. That’s not something you need to be worry about right now.

Leo raises the issue of males and females having different meanings attached to sex (i.e., for women it is an expression of love or relational, and for men it is recreational). Out of a desire to maintain a relationship with another, some girls noted contemplating engaging in sexual intercourse. For example, two girls were talking in class about problems one was having with her boyfriend. The following advice was offered by the friend: "Well if you sleep with him that problem won't be there." This sort of advice encourages peers to engage in risky behaviors they are not emotionally ready to handle. As I looked through student schedules, two student workers talked about their friend, Tamera, and the problems she was having with her boyfriend: "She doesn't know what to do because he always wants to go farther (sexually) than she wants to go. She's just not ready to go there yet, but he keeps pressuring her to." While many resist the pressure to have sex before they feel ready, others give in to the pressure often leaving students feeling regret or disappointment.

Regret and disappointment theories note that people take these emotions into account when making decisions (Bell 1982, 1985; Sugden 1982, 1986). According to these theories, decisions are made in part with a desire to avoid emotions of regret or disappointment over outcomes. This commonsense notion was certainly evidenced in
interviews. Some students talked about decisions not to have sex noting religious beliefs, family influence, fear of pregnancy, sexually transmitted diseases, or loss of respect. But how do we make sense of the many students who do decide to have sex in adolescence [estimated by the Kaiser Foundation (2005) at about half of high school age students]? As one teacher, Ms. Williams noted, "some of them just don't think it will happen to them [i.e. pregnancy, STD's]. They understand reproduction, but they just think they're invincible." This applies to some of the students, but other theories capture the complex reasoning processes students engage in when making decisions about risky behavior. According to Caffray and Schneider (2000), "the majority of these theories either implicitly or explicitly suggest that adolescents are motivated by their desire to enhance or avoid particular affective states" (p. 544). For example, students may weigh the positive affective states they will feel from engaging in the behavior against the negative affective states in making a decision. Social rewards such as feeling a part of the in-group, having a good time, or excitement may outweigh the affective "costs" of engaging in the behavior (e.g., disappointing parents, worrying about pregnancy) (see Cooper, 1994). This cost/benefit analysis is highly influenced by the value students place on relationships with peers verses parents and other important stakeholders in their lives, and personal goals they hold for themselves (see Caffray and Schneider, 2000).

During my fieldwork, I encountered four students with babies. I was expecting my own child, and as I became more visibly pregnant, these girls started asking me about my pregnancy and showing me pictures of their babies. The students were excited that they shared something in common with me. As one student with a child walked away from asking me about what I was going to name my son, a teacher, Ms. Johnson, noted
that she resists showing interest in these students' babies because she does not want to 
"give them props for that kind of behavior." She fears that giving these students positive 
attention for having a child will encourage them to continue engaging in unprotected sex, 
or lead them to believe that being a parent will cause people to pay more attention to 
them. She was not the only teacher that communicated with these students in a manner 
that signaled lack of acceptance in an effort to create a culture that supported students 
academically, but not their risky behavior.

Ms. Belle, who teaches a course in which one unit is devoted to dating 
relationships, reported being shocked at the sexual activity and expectations of her 
freshman students:

Oh, I can’t even believe all the stuff I found out about sex. I’ve got my freshmen. 
We were talking about dating and I said, “Raise your hand if you know somebody 
that’s in your grade” – and they’re all 14. They’re not even – no. Yeah, they’re 
all 14. They haven’t turned 15 yet – “that’s had sex.” Every single one of ‘em 
raised their hand and I said – this was in the first nine weeks still. I said, “So I’m 
assuming all these people you know, this didn’t take place this year while they 
were in high school.” “Oh no, Ms. Belle. They were dating a while in seventh 
and eighth grade.” I said, “How do you date a while in seventh and eighth grade?” 
“Well, you know, we do have serious relationships in middle school Ms. Belle 
and sometimes it just happens.” This is what they said to me. Sometimes it just 
happens or if they got drunk and then they did it, and I’m like, “Are you kidding 
me?” When I was in middle school I didn’t even know what oral sex was. I 
didn’t. I did not know what that was until I was in high school, and I’m blown
away that these kids are having sex in middle school. I think back and I’m like, “What was I doing at that age?” I think about what I was doing and I’m like – when they all told me that they knew people that had sex and were having sex I was like, “I can’t tell you the decisions you should make.” I said, “All I can tell you is,” I said, “is that there is no need to rush.” I said, “You have so much time in front of you to be able to experience that, that right now you can’t even comprehend the consequences you can face doing that.” I’m like, “Not only STD’s but pregnancy and the emotional baggage that comes along with doing that.”

During certain classes students had opportunities to learn about reproduction and the risks of sexual intercourse. Ms. Belle talked about class as an opportunity for students to hear about others' perspectives on sexual activity noting "there's different morals in the room, and I think it's good for them to see someone who thinks it's not right because they might not get that at home or with their friends." These opportunities to learn and talk about such issues are important in forming and altering "dating scripts" that influence expectations in relational behavior (Paik & Woodley, 2005). Everyday interactions, messages students encounter at school, from family, friends, and the media consolidate into scripts students draw upon to shape their expectations for, satisfaction with, and behavior in dating relationships.

Summary

Students’ relational lives are deeply complex. Friendships can both enable and constrain students' abilities to thrive at school. Peer groups serve strong socializing functions teaching and regulating students on how behave appropriately according to
dominant scripts. Finally, romantic relationships provide unique comforts and risks for students as they may offer support or encourage risky behaviors. In chapter six, a predominant influence on a student's life will be deeply examined: their home lives.
CHAPTER SIX - THERE'S NO PLACE LIKE HOME

Students' orientations toward education and their emotional communication are both strongly influenced by interactions with family members and/or caregivers starting at an early age (Anderson & Gurrero, 1998; Naylor, 1989). Socializing messages received at home carry over into students’ lives at school and sometimes collide with messages from teachers, peers, and others they encounter. It is where home and school life intersects that students must negotiate the proper management of emotion and a sense of identity as a student among myriad discourses of learning and being. The consequences of caregiver choices, behaviors, and beliefs become strikingly clear within school walls as adolescents strive to perform the role of student as best they know how; some with ample cognitive, social, emotional, and material resources, others with very few. In this section, familial influences on students' approaches to education, communication of emotion, and general emotional well-being are examined. Theories of socialization, narrative, and boundary management serve as frameworks to understand these issues.

The Socialization of Emotional Communication

Caregivers are key socializing agents who engage in communication processes teaching the next generation how to label, express, and regulate emotion (Ferguson & Stegge, 1995). Even within the same community, understandings about the proper role of emotions in one’s life vary greatly. These differences become apparent when children leave their family unit or co-cultures of their community and enter a formal schooling environment. In my study, the majority of students shared common understandings of emotion (e.g., that emotion was antithetical to reason, that crying was considered "weak"
and should be hidden) circulated in dominant discourses, but most could not explain why they held and regulated their bodies according to these beliefs. Others, however, had very disparate views of how to handle emotional communication, views primarily based on messages and examples received from their parents.

Ferguson and Stegge (1995) identified four processes through which children learn how to manage and interpret emotion: parental modeling, parental directives, parent expectancy effects, and overt parental reinforcement. From an early age children begin mimicking and modeling others behaviors. This is one of the key ways they learn about the expression and inhibition of emotional experience. Within familial cultures certain emotions are prescribed as appropriate while others are deemed inappropriate (e.g., it is appropriate to express joy, but not sadness; it is okay to yell when you are angry). These early and ongoing modeling behaviors often begin to differentiate males from females as parents typically display fewer or different emotions in front of boy than they do girl children (Brody & Hall, 1993). Consider the two quotes offered below, one from an administrator and one from a student, that speak to parental modeling:

So many kids I have here for four years never have any drama. Well, you meet their parents, and you never know exactly what it is, but their parents are never caught up in, “Well, did you see Jimmy’s mom?” They just kinda go on and do their business, and their children bring that with them. (Administrator, Mr. Turner)

The people that look like they’re arguing – I have a bad memory of my parents arguing and I’ve been around arguing my whole life and I just don’t like it. (Student, Lorraine)
The behaviors students witness in their homes provide them examples of how to handle emotional situations they are confronted with in other contexts. Some even learn to create emotional situations by perpetuating the drama cycle, no doubt influenced by parental communication modeling. Other students like Lorraine, may not like the example they have seen at home (i.e., frequent arguing to handle conflict), but she may lack knowledge or modeled alternatives that could serve as options for her to act otherwise.

Parental directives, active instruction and feedback on how to handle emotion are key sources of socialization for young people (Ferguson & Stegge, 1995). These directives begin early to train children about how to handle emotion-laden situations like experiences of disappointment, anger, or sadness. Statements like "don't cry" when a child does not get a toy they want, or "just relax" if a child is upset about something someone else said to him. Children are frequently taught to say they are "sorry" if they behave inappropriately, and in American culture, often punished for the expression of negative emotion like anger (especially girls) by being sent to one's room or losing a particular privilege (Stearns, 1989). Consider the quotes below from two different students about the parental directives they had received.

Well, my mom has told me that if I’m mad about something and then somebody says something to make me even more mad, like try to just let it go, and not like snap because I’ve snapped a couple times on a couple people. So—I try to think of something else. (Eva)

Well, whenever we were in elementary school we went to a school down the street and I remember kids always made fun of us cause of our different skin color, that’s when it was really bad, they didn’t like us at all. So my Mom told us
that if they made fun of us, we should beat 'em up. I remember my brother, he’s a little bit slow, he’s semi mentally retarded and he has the mind of a 10 year old now but they used to make fun of him all the time and my Mom told him – he’s like, “I just sat there, I didn’t do anything.” She’s like, “You better fight for yourself, because if you’re not gonna fight for yourself they’re just gonna keep on doing it cause it’s fun and they’re just gonna keep messing with you.” He had a cast and he beat 'em up with his cast, like he hit 'em with his cast. Yeah, she’s always – she taught us to stick up for ourselves and stick together and stick up for each other and if one of us is in trouble we need to be there. No matter what.

(Lushina)

These two directives juxtaposed against one another show the contrast in parental perspective on how to appropriately handle anger inducing or unjust situations. Both students were given feedback on the way they have handled a situation previously and told to enact a different behavior this time. The opposite nature of the socialized behavior between these two students illustrates why problems arise when trying to live and learn in the same place.

Parental expectancy effects are strongly held expectations parents communicate to children for how they should behave emotionally (Ferguson & Stegge, 1995). These expectations are often formed through parents own early socialization or learned through broader cultural discourses, and may be enabling or constraining. They communicate standards of behavior for children, and may also lead children to conform to parental expectations over time (Jones, 1977). The perpetuation of gendered expectations for affect displays is common (Condry & Condry, 1976). These expectations are often
underlie other processes. For example, the parental expectation that you should never physically harm someone when you are angry would influence emotional behavior.

The final process identified is overt parental reinforcement during which parents overtly reward good behavior by offering love, attention, or external incentives like an allowance or desired privileges (Anderson & Guerrero, 1998). Children learn through these compensatory rewards that behaving as they ought to provides implicit and explicit resources. One student, for example, noted that his parents let him go on trips with his best friend if does not get any detentions during the semester for acting out.

The aforementioned processes, though discussed separately, are intertwined and lack clear lines of division. These socialization processes teach young people how to manage their emotions in socially or culturally appropriate ways. Once students enter school, their adeptness at performing appropriate emotion scripts is judged by a broader audience. This is when some students seem to be abysmally prepared to be emotionally competent members of society or a sector of it—the school. To fully understand students’ approaches to and beliefs about education and communication one must further examine their home lives.

Home Sweet Home

The notion of being at home is often imbued with idealized meanings constructing it as a place of comfort, safety, warmth, and love (Lupton, 1998). Home is time and again discursively constructed as a place where you can be your true self with family and let down the guard you hold up in public places like school or work; a place free of unfair judgment and full of unconditional love (Nippert-Eng, 1996). These images of home are circulated in everyday discourse through sayings like "home is where the heart is" or
"nobody knows you like family." *Home* certainly was a nurturing place for some students whose home lives were stable, supportive, and loving. Eva for instance said: "I love my family. I have a really happy family…I really kinda look up to my sister as a role model."

Eva like others noted that the interactions she has with her family shapes her attitude toward and behavior in other aspects of her life. She went on to note that for the most part she is "happy and content" at school and that the "bad doesn't stick." Students who described positive home lives counted on their family when they needed assistance or advice, and tended to enter school with a more positive outlook perhaps due to their basic needs being met. These students often noted that they had family members to help them talk through and make sense of emotional issues that arose in their lives. For example, Melia turned to her mom when she was experiencing challenging situations at school:

I remember my mom always like talking me--talking to me through it and she would be on my side and like help me--to know that there’s somebody that’s helping me out. And then she’ll ask me when I come home 'how’d it go?' So I know like that helps me to know that somebody does care and they do want to know, and she’ll talk to me and tell me her experiences and what she thinks. That’s why I’m grateful about my mom because like a lot of parents are like “oh it’s just high school” or whatever. But my mom’s like “no this is your life right now and that’s what's important to you.” And she realizes that. And that’s really cool that she does that.

Families who talk about emotions and talk with one another about how to handle difficult situations create healthier home environments, and enable young people to learn how to deal with emotional situations in constructive ways (see Grusec & Hastings, 2007). This
idealized image of home and family, however, is only true for a portion of the students who participated in my study, and a portion of people who live in this country (see Harter, Berquist, Titsworth, Novak, & Brokaw, 2005).

Numerous students noted that their home life was a source of stress, hurt, neglect, or anger. While some were resilient in spite of negative family experiences, most brought the baggage of those experiences with them each day as they attended school. Lacking positive models of how to handle emotion seemed to correlate to many students’ self-identified inability to manage their emotion constructively. Michael was one such student:

I hold resentments a lot. And, I hold things in. It's just the way I was raised pretty much. Cause I never had a father to talk to about anything and my mom was always gone. So I just learned to stick it out by myself, yeah. But sometimes it builds up and like, but sometimes it can be bad. Like I'll get, you know, real angry at times over dumb stuff. Or it can be good like when somebody's coming to beat me up and I know I'm gonna get beat up, I just think about all these bad things and what goes on.

Learning to "stick it out by himself" left Michael with an impoverished set of skills to handle his anger and resentments. He noted channeling this negative emotion to prepare for a fight which is likely to perpetuate his experiences of negative emotion. Giselle, too, did not find or seek the support she needed at home for emotional experiences that arose at school:

I have certain people that I go to talk to. Like I said, I go to Ms. Johnson whenever I’m upset or whatever and I have a few friends that I go to talk to, and
yeah. I usually don’t go to my parents about it. I don’t know why ‘cause a lotta kids that I know they go to their parents to talk to them about stuff. But I can’t – I just don’t feel like I can go to my mom and talk to her about that kinda stuff – the kinda stuff that goes on ‘cause I just don’t think she needs to know what goes on. Some things, yeah, she does need to know what’s going on in my life. Stuff that’s going on at school and everything if it’s between friends and whatever, there’s no reason so she’ll just say it’s drama and that’s all it is. But there’s some things that do make people upset.

She did not believe that her mom would validate problems with her friends as anything other than drama and chose not to share information about that part of her life with her and instead sought out a trusted teacher as a confidant. It was not surprising to me that Giselle did not find emotional support at home. Prior to her first scheduled interview she saw me in the hall and explained that she would have to wait to do the interview because she did not have anyone to sign her consent form at the moment. Here is what she told me:

Oh, I’m so sorry. My mom and her boyfriend, I was living with them because my dad didn’t want me to live with him, and then they got into this huge fight and he called me a bitch and my boyfriend a nigger, and he's not even black, and I’m going to live with my friend now. But I don't have the address and I can't get anyone to sign this [her IRB consent form] right now. I don't know when I will be able to. [Please note that IRB consent was later obtained]

This news was delivered to me with little fanfare as students around us hurried to classes and chatted about new outfits in the hallway. Giselle had just transferred to this school
because of moving from one parent’s house to the other because her dad had a girlfriend and he did not want reminders of his previous marriage (i.e., his children) around. It seems living with a friend is the only way she can avoid having to transfer back to her old school and that is assuming her father would in her words "let her live with him" if she did. Unfortunately, stories like Michael 's and Giselle's were all too common. I was repeatedly taken aback by the stark contrast of heart-wrenching disclosures shared amidst the backdrop of upbeat, superficial conversations in the hallway or at football games. These stories remind us students' lives are not always simple as they may be dealing with significant life traumas or the residue of failed relationships.

In addition to "adolescent" issues, students are not immune to the major life setbacks and daily hassles familiar to adults (Mould, 2003; Roberts, 1995; Ruffin, 1993). Students often find themselves caught up in the setbacks of those whose lives with which they are intertwined, namely family, in addition to their own and forced to reckon with the resulting emotions. Consider the stories of two different students below:

This is my family (points to picture on collage of a family)–I cut my mom’s head out because my mom and dad are divorced, but I still see her all the time. But she’s on the line because she was the one that ripped our family apart. But, you know, I still love her, so she’s on the line. (Alberta)

And I have another friend and her mom had a baby three years ago and now they're tight for money and then like she just found out her mom's pregnant again and she doesn't really know what to do about it. And like she called me and cried about it. (Heather)
These stories represent three common problems students mentioned dealing with: divorce, growing families through pregnancies or blending children when parents meet new partners, and concerns about money. In addition to many social issues, some students struggled to even get their basic needs of shelter, nourishment, and safety met. A teacher, Ms. Sackman, talked about one of her students:

I mean the one girl in here, her mom is almost lower-functioning than she is. They were found in despicable conditions and they have home healthcare that comes to help them manage their money. Sometimes she said there's no breakfast. So when she comes to school sometimes she's really hungry.

Other students, too, arrived at school with no basic knowledge of good personal hygiene, no clean clothes, and went home to unsafe or unstable environments.

During my study I was in the presence of students dealing with divorce of parents, deaths of friends and family members, serious chronic illnesses of parents and siblings, abuse, learning disabilities, teen parenthood, mental illness, incarceration of family members, fear of safety for siblings fighting in the Iraq war, moving frequently and "starting over", alcohol and drug use, unstable homes lives due to financial issues and unhealthy relationships, providing care for siblings so parent(s) can work, depression, and feelings of being unwanted by family and friends. The stories poured out during interviews and exchanges in the hallways. Recognizing the issues many are dealing with makes one realize how difficult it can be excel in school each day. As articulated by Ms. Brown, an administrator:

If that was happening in our lives how well would we be working? So these are some of the struggles that go on and that’s when you do - you look at where
they’re coming from and try to understand. But I think teachers still feel that pressure that they’ve got to get these kids to perform. And they don’t always know the backgrounds either. It’s always amazing to me – the kids, their level of resilience. You can have a kid come from a horrible background and be able to move forward, and others that just can’t do it because of what their resiliency is.

Few students are immune to the difficulties and challenges that sometimes arise in the course of daily life. One administrator, Ms. Miller, noted trying to encourage teachers to view students as individuals with unique circumstances and understand that sometimes as a teacher you need to be more compassionate than disciplinary:

  And I often tell teachers, “well, listen to what’s happened” or share with them some information, they’re just like, “oh my gosh,” but the compassion skyrockets all of a sudden:  “well, maybe I can cut them a break or give them a little more time, or I’ll have a pencil for them.” Then they understand, they’re empathetic; all of a sudden we can do all kinds of things.  We can’t lose site of the fact that these are individual people. Absolutely not.

  Certainly it is easy to become swept up in heart-wrenching, compelling stories of student trials and tribulations. I reflected numerous times on why these stories seemed to be the rule rather than the exception. Perhaps a certain type of participant was drawn to take part in a study on emotion--one who had experienced strong, defining emotional experiences and wanted to talk about them. Perhaps the stories were impacted by the pervasive belief that when one talks about emotion influencing one's life it refers to a negative influence. Perhaps negative emotional experiences are more defining or simply the most hidden publicly and these students wanted to talk and make sense of their
identities in and through these defining emotional experiences. They seemed to have few venues to tell their story without judgment or repercussion. Regardless of the reason why these stories took a more downbeat tone, I feel I would be doing a disservice to these participants if I did not tell their stories as they told them: the negative privileged. Next, the intersections between students’ public and private lives will be further explored.

When "Home" Comes to "School":

Blurring the Boundaries Between Public and Private

It’s a Look that Comes from Knowing

I was attendance officer, and I would go to the houses of little kids who weren’t going to school, and so many times it wouldn’t be the little kid not wanting to go to school. It’s a mom and dad issue, nobody getting them ready, no clean clothes, but that little kid would be so nice, so pleasant, and they would have that bright-eyed look, even though their home life was horrible, but at a young age, I don’t think they realize that. Hey, this is just how it is. Then I see those same kids now where I’ve seen them when they get to the high school, and they’ve got this look in their eye, it’s a hard look, and it’s a look that comes from having to – they’ve had to fend for themselves, and it’s a look that comes from knowing, “I got dealt a pretty bad hand here,” and that’s the frustrating part, because they carry that hardness into them. It’s hard to break through that barrier again and get back to that little kid that didn’t realize that somebody didn’t really love them enough to take care of them. –Mr. Turner, School Administrator

This narrative captures the transformation process some children experience as they progress through the educational system. The young, bright-eyed student does not yet
fully understand the reality of his home life, but begins to as he grow more mature and interacts with other students whose lives are diametrically opposed to his. This awareness often strips students of their naïve innocence and leads to a particular disposition—one most often described as hard or defensive by educators. Strong negative emotions often accompany students’ thoughts of their family lives as they perceive that they did get “dealt a bad hand.” Consider the following exchange between a teacher and student:

The same student that told me he didn’t respect me and wanted his mom to die; today him and I talked about maybe 5 to 10 minutes about why he’s so unhappy in life…and he’s like, “Yeah, when I was little I was so happy and you wouldn’t have even thought I was the same person.” And it made me sad that – I was like, “So you’re just not happy at all now?” and he was like, “No.” I was like, “Why do you feel unhappy?” He’s like, “Pretty much I have two retarded parents” – I was saddened by that just ‘cause I felt bad for him…I was like, “So who are you closest with your family?” and he was like, “I’m closest with my grandparents but they live in Tennessee,” and I was like, “When do you get to talk to ‘em?” He’s like, “Well, I’m lucky if it happens once a month,” and he hates his parents. No one else is near him. I just wonder how these situations happen. How is it okay to let your kids hate you? Something must – he just met his dad at 13 years old and his dad’s too busy now to talk to him. How do you become too busy to talk to your kids at 16 years old? (Ms. Belle)

This student’s animosity toward his parents transferred into how he interacted with teachers and peers when he entered school walls. On another occasion, the same teacher told me that he frequently made derogatory comments about his family in class:
I was standing up in my unit doing stuff but he was talking to his group and
telling his group how much he hates his mother, how much if she died he would
laugh. And then he said that he would piss on her grave, and I said, “That is so
inappropriate.” I said, “I don’t care how you feel.” I said, “Maybe you need to
show a little respect,” and he goes, “Well my mom doesn’t deserve respect.” And
I said, “Really?” He goes, “Yeah, and I don’t care. You can fail me for saying
that. I don’t like you,” and I’m like, “Well, that’s okay. You don’t have to like
me. You just have to respect me as a teacher,” and he goes, “well I don’t respect
you either.” And I said, “Well with that comment you can go to the office ‘cause
that’s insubordination.” So he was like “Oh, that’s insubordination?” (mocking
tone)...and I just wanted to freak out...He obviously doesn’t think anything of his
mom and hasn’t had a great role model so he probably sees other adults like
“They don’t give a shit about me and I’m not gonna give a shit about them.” He
doesn’t respect women...it’s him fighting against the world.

This student was hardened by realizing that he was born into a family that he did not love
or respect, perhaps because he felt they did not love or respect him. While this student’s
attitudes and behaviors may seem extreme these same issues of respect, self-control, and
anger surfaced in many students’ narratives and actions. During observations another
student, Dwight, sat next to me in the back of the class and told me about his family life;
how his dad and mom did not take care of him and never knew what to expect when he
went home. He told me about how he would like to live with his father, but he had a
terrible temper that left him uneasy. Later in the school year, I passed a policeman
entering the building. Dwight had punched a student in the face after words were
exchanged between him and another student at the beginning of a class. The cycle of anger and destructive behaviors continue as Dwight takes up the practices of his family. While these examples are very specific and negative, many students noted that their family life more generally influences the attitude they arrive with at school. Alexa, for instance, noted how a positive attitude can improve her relationships:

I think if you get in an argument with your dad or mom before school it just makes school even more worse. Like you’re already mad. Then you might like snap at your friend, and your friend’ll be mad at you and it just gets out of control from there. So I just think if you have a good attitude with your family then, you know, you come to school and you’re happy and you see your friends and it’s good. It’s easier to get along with people when you have a good attitude throughout the day.

Like students, teachers find themselves in certain moods as a result of home experiences or interactions with students and their environments. Teachers, particularly can become stressed and frustrated from dealing with students who misbehave, are disrespectful or have a bad attitude. Teachers described moments when they have reminded themselves that not all students arrive at school with the same resources or support. This reminder may diffuse negative feelings toward the students as is the case for Ms. Johnson:

I’m thankful that I did have kids before I taught because I’m not sure I’ve would have been as aware of students’ needs. I constantly think, “What did that kid go through before they came into my room? Were they put down, did they not have anybody there to do anything for them that morning, did they sleep in a box?” And it only takes – and even when I’m like, in a pissed off mood or something, it
just takes that one kid to make me – and then I can just melt down so easily. It’s like I start giggling and I think, “Why am I being so grouchy,” or whatever. Palmer (1998) reminds us that “…a good teacher must stand where the personal and public meet, dealing with the thundering flow of traffic at an intersection where ‘weaving a web of connectedness’ feels more like crossing a freeway on feet” (p. 17). The interactions that comprise students’ and teachers’ days can be overwhelming at times, but one must connect with one another to truly embark on the learning process.

As has been examined in this section, caregivers have a profound impact, positive or negative, on the emotional and social development of the young. The early and ongoing emotional experiences and socialization messages students receive often define the emotional orientation students take into the world beyond the walls of home. Next, the ways in which students navigate various roles and cross the boundaries that define each is explored.

Boundary-Crossing

In 1969 Karl Weick pointed out that work roles only comprise part of a whole individual. He argued that people assume myriad social roles and have both public and private lives. Similarly, I argue that students are more than just students. They may also be siblings, children, friends, even parents, church members, sports fanatics, employees, etcetera. Being reminded of the complex identities these young people assume helps one realize that their lives may not be easily compartmentalized around these various roles. Studies of the management of work and home life roles provide evidence that these two domains often bleed into one another and create tension for people trying to balance what is considered “private” and “public” life (e.g., Kirby, Golden, Medved, Jorgenson, &
Buzzanell, 2003; Medved, 2004). Often, what are deemed private emotions enter the public realm. Traditionally, emotion has not been welcome in the rationalized bureaucratic world of organizations and schools (Mumby & Putnam, 1992; Putnam & Mumby, 1993), but because people are not machines emotion is an ongoing perpetrator in public domains. When assuming the public role of student, individuals may attempt to diminish or ignore their private roles in their families, but traversing between these public and private domains often proves challenging. Just as adults experience tension when enacting multiple roles so too do students.

Ashforth, Kreiner, and Fugate (2000) draw attention to the ways in which people traverse across boundaries to assume different roles in their lives. Katz and Kahn (1978) described the role as “the building block of social systems and the summation of the requirements with which such systems confront their members as individuals” (pp. 219-220). Ashforth et al. (2000) view a “role” as a position that an individual assumes that is accompanied by particular “requirements” (see p. 473). Transitioning between the roles of “daughter” and “student,” for instance, may require that an individual transition physically (i.e., from home to school), psychologically, and emotionally. The degree to which someone’s identity changes when they traverse between roles varies greatly. Some people find that they make little to no shift in how they behave socially and emotionally while others transform themselves considerably. Over time, role transitions become less difficult as scripts and schemas are developed to guide the individuals’ behaviors and thoughts making repeated enactments more automatic or mindless (Ashforth et al., 2000; Langer, 1989). As students strive to enact their roles, they are sometimes interrupted by demands or circumstances from another role domain forcing them to work even harder to
fulfill their appropriate role demands and determine which role gets primacy (Burke, 1991). These role demands are often understood as crossing between a role at home (e.g., son) to one at school (e.g., student), but can be understand as roles associated with different identities assumed within one culture as well. For example, one student, Lushina, shared a story of a young man who viewed his primary identity as a “tough football player” and his identity as a student came secondary:

One of my teachers was talking about how everyone wants to fit in and they find their clicks and she said that...she had a kid in art and was really, really good and he was on the football team and stuff. And so she told him his stuff was being put up in the art show because it was really good and she wants everyone to see it. And he was like, “You can put it up but don’t put my name on it.” And she put his name on it and he ripped his name off cause he doesn’t want anybody to know that he does art or he’s good at drawing because that would totally change his image to everybody else on the football team which I think is really stupid. He shouldn’t care what people think.

For this student these two identities/roles were very segmented; he did not want one to cross over into the other. Individuals vary in the degree to which the various roles they assume are integrated verses segmented. Many students, for, example, presented a consistent self to parents and friends. While others, hid and revealed different parts of themselves and enacted different behaviors within each social domain.

Highly integrated roles are easier to transition between because significant changes are not made; however, highly segmented roles present major changes as identities assumed in different contexts may be deeply divergent. For some students,
boundaries are rigidly maintained for fear of one role “contaminating” another. In spite of efforts to prevent one role from affecting another, the “moods, stress, and thoughts that are generated in one role domain often influence or spill over into other domains” (Ashforth, Kreiner, & Fugate, 2000, p. 477; see also Williams & Alliger, 1994). Social domains (e.g., home, work) are defined and differentiated by the creation and maintenance of boundaries (Nippert-Eng, 1996a). These boundaries are real to the extent that individuals and groups believe and act as though they exist. These boundaries allow people to order their environment, but may cause challenges when one is called upon to cross into other domains and assume a different role. Various metaphors have been used to describe these boundary-crossing transitions including “crossing a bridge” and “crossing an abyss” (see Durkheim, 1965; Simmel, 1955).

In the section It is a Look that Comes from Knowing you read about students who harbored anger from their private lives and carried it into their public lives. Others, while experiencing negative emotions related to one role, I noticed however, were very good at hiding it. Part of their socialization in relation to emotion was learning how to disguise problems and negative experiences from home. This socialization process becomes evident when you compare students beginning in elementary school to those in high school. As stated by the district social worker, Ms. Miller, students at the elementary schools "...just don't cover it [problems from home] up as well" as those in high school. Another, teacher, Ms. Williams observed this in her class:

They play it pretty cool– it’s funny because the older they get, the less they’re willing to share in class. You know your younger kids “Yeah, I went home last night and my Mom was drunk so we didn’t have dinner,” you know you hear
those things but the older they get, they learn how to mask everything and they
learn what they can say and what they shouldn’t say. So you don’t get a lot of
sharing here.

Realization of what is deemed normal or abnormal, healthy or unhealthy for family life is
learned and then what is shared in the public sphere is often regulated accordingly. Those
who maintain rigid boundaries most often manage their emotions, especially negative
emotions, through masking or inhibition while enacting their school roles. Michael, a
student, for example, told me he hides negative emotions at school. When I asked why he
said “you know everybody’s walking around like their life is so great and everything so
you don’t want people to know that it’s not like that for you.” This sentiment was
expressed by multiple students. Student did not want to draw attention to themselves or
inhibit their ability to fully assume their current role of student. Historically, students
have been encouraged to do just that: hide emotions. Teachers did not feel it was their job
to attend to the social and emotional needs of students (see Boler, 1999); however, these
general beliefs are changed among many teachers, especially those who graduated more
recently with their degrees as they were likely exposed to education on managing such
issues. Ms. Johnson, for instance, indicated wanting to be able to detect when students are
down or under stress from their home lives:

I hate it when a student is good at hiding it. I had one student as a freshman that
I have again as a junior, she was really good at hiding it. I hated that because
you’re so busy that you don’t notice it sometimes. All of those are the ones that
are in trouble, and she was in trouble. She’s doing really good now, but boy, I’ll
tell ya’, I hated it that I didn’t pick it out right away. Then I kinda get on myself
and say, “Ah.” I like to think that that’s my purpose in the classroom. Yes, I’m supposed to teach English; absolutely, and I will. Moreover and above that, I think my purpose as the teacher is to notice and help do something about it. I don’t have a problem doing that, so when I miss something, it really is upsetting.

This teacher, as well as many others, recognized that students are more than just students; they have complex identities that come with unique demands and challenges.

Miller, Considine, and Garner (2007) wrote about “emotion at work” as a key concept that helps one understand Weick’s (1969) original notion of partial inclusion or a work role only being a single part of a person's identity. "Emotion at work" refers to instances in which emotions and moods from home are carried over into work. This concept could fittingly be expanded to encompass students’ primary “work” which is at and related to the school. When asked what she thought was the biggest trigger for emotional experiences in her class Ms. Williams said, “I don’t necessarily see it when it’s corresponding with anything we do in class; I think its stuff that happens outside of class that they bring in with them.” Related, an administrator, Mr. Green, who is partly responsible for disciplining students, reflected on those who most frequently ended up in his office:

I'd say the repeat customers, the kids I see most often and more often, I would say yeah, there's probably some constants in their life, things that are lacking. But again, you can never say 100 percent, "Yeah, this is the way it is." But yeah, a lot of those kids have – they don't have good home lives. There's no stability at home. A lot of those kids have been labeled from elementary school all the way up as some type of outcast. They don't wear the right clothes. They don't fit into
any of the social groups except the one – the outcast group that always gets pushed to the back, pushed aside. Those kids – those are the type of kids, a lot of 'em, where there's no sense yellin' at 'em. They've been yelled at their whole lives. They're immune to it. Yeah, you could scream, there's no change in emotion. There's no change in anything. It's just – it just bounces off. It doesn't affect them. They've been yelled at, they've been beaten, they've been abandoned, they've been moved around different places, they've probably lived with grandma, grandpa, aunt, uncle, who knows? Dumped several different times, many different times. Those are the kids that are immune and those are the kids that have no motivation to make themselves better. They don't have any motivation to learn. They don't have any motivation to follow the rules. They've never seen anybody follow rules. "What do you mean, 'rules'? We don't follow rules."

Those are the type of kids that you see most often. They don't – they've never had positive structure in their lives. There's not the stability. It's just not there. It's never been there and never will be there. Yeah, and unfortunately, once those kids leave the doors – go out those doors every day, most of the time, we have no idea what they're going to, whether it be home or not going home, what's happenin', whether they're being fed, whether – we have no idea for the most part what they're goin' through. Then when they come here every day – and again, I understand, yeah, we got a set of rules for everybody. We got a set of regulations for everybody. But sometimes it doesn't fit everybody. (Green).

To successfully assume the role of student one must follow the rules and regulations determined by the school administration; failure to do so leads to discipline in hopes of
more closely aligning student behavior with the requirements of that role. These particular students, however, often lack any socialization in how to follow rules, motivate themselves, respond to feedback, maintain relationships, or communicate their needs effectively. In the words of this administrator they are “immune” to messages relayed through yelling whereas another student who is rarely yelled at would be deeply affected emotionally. Virtually all students experienced some sort of role negotiation related to the others relationships in their lives. Being a friend and also a student was very difficult for many as students traversed between the different role requirements. Others brought their concerns and related emotions (read: “emotion at work”) with them as described by Mr. Turner, an administrator:

Emotions related to relationships – that’s the one I see, and I’m thinking of some conversations we had related to some certain students and their emotions day to day. One day I’ll see them in the hallway, and, “Hi, yeah,” and they’re so smiling, and they wanna tell you about the test they took, they wanna tell you about how they’ve got a birthday coming up, whatever it is, and you see that same student the next day, withdrawn, totally just different, and you say, “Hello,” and you get a, “Hello,” and right on, and I mean my best guess on why those are, are the relationships they have either with the significant people in their life, their parents or their guardians, brothers, sisters, and those relationships – sometimes I don’t know if it’s an insecurity, if it’s a lack of trust, but it’s something that they’re bringing in that they can’t leave at the door, and you just know. I know when I see them that I will not be surprised whether it’s in a half hour, two hours, that they’re sent to me because something happens in a class, and I see that, and
it’s frustrating, and sometimes I will. I’ll just say, “Hey, come here. What’s the matter,” and try to remind them, “Hey, now don’t – you’re not gonna solve this problem by creating another one,” but it seems like so much is relationship driven...Maybe mom and dad are having problems, or maybe they’re putting more pressure on them. “Hey, it’s time you get a job. College is coming.” Even with the kids who are good students, “Hey, college is coming. You haven’t made your choice yet. I need you to fill out these scholarship forms.” You see those kids. They just get this look on their face like they’ve got the biggest problem in the world and they’ve got no idea how they’re gonna solve it,” and so many times then that leads its way into another issue, so I think that the negative side, and a lot of those are anxieties about relationships. Maybe with some of those kids, it’s not anxiety about their tests or whatever. It’s the anxiety about relationships gone bad or they don’t have, and as they get older, they realize that, because they see the kids that do have positive ones, and they compare more, and realize that, “I don’t have that,” and it comes in with them.

The boundaries that define various roles are often blurred as emotions from home spillover into school. The quality of students’ family relationships at home varied drastically. While many students came from loving, supportive, stable homes; others knew only belittlement and chaos. Multiple students indicated seeking and finding relationships at the school to stand in for absentee or ignorant parents. The nature of these relationships and role-spanning activities of teachers in these relationships with students is discussed below.
"It's a Fatherly Thing"

During my fieldwork it became evident that numerous students looked to certain teachers as role models, mentors, confidants. Students would come early or linger after school to talk to a teacher about a problem they were having, share good news, or ask for advice when making a decision. Some teachers spent their lunch time and planning periods counseling students who just needed someone to talk to who would genuinely listen. They sensed that particular teachers cared for them and were there for them when they needed it. Mr. Cornish, a teacher, described the connections fostered through such relationships as being the most meaningful part of his job:

Probably mine is most of our kids struggle with their home lives. We get very few kids in a percentage that have two-parent homes or, you know what I mean, even a one-parent home that really takes an interest in their lives. So I would say that what’s probably better than anything for me is when you see kids leave, whether they end up going to Walnut [a local vocational school], whether they stay here, when you see ’em leave and they come back, or you see ’em on the street when they’re 22-23-25 years old that they remember you, that they speak to you, they have the smile on their face. Because whether you know it or not, you could have affected their lives some way, somehow. I mean that’s probably my thing.

Taking an interest in students beyond worrying what grade they earn in your class or what score they earn on an exam set some teachers apart from others. One such teacher, who was repeatedly named by students as a teacher who supported students in both
academic and personal endeavors, had this to say about his approach to relating to
students:

I don't know, that's just a fatherly thing or something, you know. I guess
emotionally, I try to take care of them as much as I can and like this office we're
in right now - if they really need to talk or something they can get a pass and
they'll come down here and that's happened, you know, kids are just stressed
about school or something happens at home or whatever, you know. And they
come in and we sit and talk and - just like you and I are talking, you know. Try to
talk through things with them and stuff. And if it's really huge and I don't think
that I can handle it, you know, I'll call the social worker and say, "Hey, you need
to try to talk to so and so." And she and I have worked together on some things.
But a lot of the things are so trivial, you know, and when you get a kid to like see
it in that kind of a light instead of it being their whole world-- like it's big to them.
So I try to do that as much as I can for them, without having to send them
somewhere or whatever, you know. (Mr. Furguson)

By developing these sorts of relationships with students, this teacher, like some others,
expanded the traditionally conceived role of a teacher. He extended beyond the usual role
requirements and students began to see him as more than just someone to teach them a
certain subject matter. This teacher continued by saying:

There's two particular girls that are juniors right now that have lost their dads in
different ways in the last four or five years, and they've really become - like
they'll tell me, it's really neat because they feel like they have a dad here.
Mr. Ferguson traversed between the public role of “teacher” and the usually more private role of “dad” all within the public realm. Some students, too, viewed their personal concerns as being dealt with “privately” in the public realm because of calling upon teachers and administrators with whom they had developed quality relationships. One student, Kardyn, even recalled a time she was uncomfortable at a party and needed to call an adult:

My friends decide that they just like summer parties and that they’re going to have friends over. They invite me over and it was just supposed to be me staying the night. I find 15 other people there, and they have alcohol. I was literally the only person that didn’t - it was like I can’t contribute to this. My parents were out of town so I had to stay. I was kind of- I had to try to find somewhere to go. I called Mr. Ferguson.

This teacher cared deeply about the safety and decision-making of students and sought to be supportive in all aspects of their lives.

Thus far the effects of caregiver choices and socialization on students’ emotions, social lives, and academic choices have been examined. Next, the sometimes competing emotional and social worlds of home and school are further analyzed from a narrative perspective. Narrative provides a lens for deepening our understanding of how and why students story themselves as they do and the ways in which students’ identities and choices are driven by a particular repertoire of stories.

Narrative Habitus

Places like schools make one recognize how inevitably intertwined our lives are with others, whether we desire to be or not. Though students, teachers, parents and
administrators become characters in each others’ stories, they often share vastly different values, backgrounds and perspectives. Frank (2002a) discusses the concept of a narrative habitus, which refers to the repertoire of stories a person uses to live, tell about, and evaluate their actions and ideas as well as those of others. This concept offers a theoretical lens through which to make sense of the difficulty and tension that arises when attempting to establish common social and emotional codes at school. In this section, narrative theory is advanced as a lens through which the interconnected nature of individuals’ stories; organizational and societal stories; and scholarly narratives about emotion and education can be interrogated. A narrative perspective illuminates how characters lives are interwoven and negotiated over time, and how their experiences develop in situated contexts and moments. According to Frank (2002a),

habitus comprises the embodied habits, tastes, and dispositions that are acquired through growing up in families and neighborhoods (in which people eat certain food, wear certain clothes, risk and care for their bodies in certain ways), having friends who value this and deprecate that, going (or not) to schools and churches, having jobs, living in local worlds of practice and preference (p. 17).

Frank develops this notion of habitus from the work of Pierre Bourdieu (1998) who believes that people become “caught up” in games (e.g., games of education, careers, parenthood, good health, etc.). People feel as though the games have high enough stakes they ought to pursue them, and the more people play the games the more they are invested in them. This getting “caught up” is part of habitus. Thoughts and actions become habituated and people tend to orient to the world and others in and through their habitus without always consciously realizing.
Moral images tend to arise in and through habitus. According to Putnam (1987), a moral image is “a picture of how our ideals and values hang together with one another and of what they have to do with the position we are in” (p. 51). We use this picture as a compass for the kind of moral lives we desire to lead. Moreover, people use their moral images to make judgments about their own lives and others. Taylor (1989) introduced a similar concept, known as “hypergoods,” or higher order ‘goods’ that particular people value. What people hold to be the most important hypergoods (e.g. for a teacher, perhaps, the development of a peaceful citizen), is used to judge what others value. These judgments often provoke conflict, which can serve a productive purpose or create competition. Often power dynamics come into play as one group tends to try to impose its hypergoods on another. This imposition is influenced by the inequalities present in relationships, economics, and organizations (Frank, 2002a).

Frank’s (2002a) notion of a narrative habitus is inspired by the work of the aforementioned scholars. By focusing on the role of narrative in people’s lives, Frank came to understand that with a particular habitus comes particular stories. If we understand life as lived, thought about, and told about in and through stories (see Carr, 1986), then narrative becomes a vitally important part of one’s habitus. A central part of the formation of a self and habitus is learning about and telling stories. In doing so, people become caught up in the telling and living of particular stories that form their identity, dispositions, tastes, and morals. People develop tastes for certain types of stories and may choose not to attend to others; moreover, people develop a sense of what experiences in their lives can be narrated. Stories come to be evaluated based on whether it is the type of story a person like them would tell and whether they find the story
compelling or useful for living life. Consider the football player who did not want to narrate the story of his art work being chosen for a show; or the popular young woman on prom court I met who did not want others to know that under the influence she slept with her boyfriend. These were not stories someone like them would tell. Other students who did chose to narrate life experiences that did not readily align with their identities or dreams seemed to embrace the stories as learning and sensory devices to help them understand their lives more deeply. The following story of a student named Kardyn relays this story when telling me about her struggles with self-esteem and ultimately the goals she would like to achieve in life:

I have this picture [points to collage], because it’s a boy and his dad. It looks like my dad and I really don’t have a big bond, as I said. He’s really not there. He and my mom got divorced whenever I was 9? So my brother was like 4. So, it kind of was like a big deal and he was there on and off for a while. But then, he’s completely separated and he got remarried on New Year’s without asking me and my brother and kind of like- she has 2 kids and he tells us that they’re more better kids than what him and, like, my brother and I are and that his daughter - that her daughter’s more of a daughter to him than what I am. And he just said some nasty things and he’s never there. He goes to all her sports and never comes to anything of mine. So he’s just never around for me ever. He doesn’t give me a dime unless he’s like, “You only come to me when you need money” or something and I’m like, “Well, you’re my dad.” So I pay for the majority of my stuff by myself, but he tells me I don’t have to go to college and it’s just kind of like - it’s very stressful. He just causes a lot of my - sometimes he causes a lot of- my confidence
is very low from him, cause he always made me feel so down. So that’s why in high school I finally got [a coveted leadership position in the band] and everything and I’ve realized that it doesn’t matter what he does. I have what I have. So-I’m like, “I’m not involved in anything bad like on the corner or anything,” and he just doesn’t understand that I’m doing a lot of stuff.

This student chose to narrate her story. In the telling of her story she makes moral judgments of her father and relays the tension she experiences between the pride she feels in her accomplishments yet an ongoing emptiness that stems from her father not understanding or taking part in her life. She ends the story by sharing her realization that he should not have power over her anymore and that he cannot hold her back.

As argued by Frank (2006), stories become used as selection-evaluation devices disposing us to pay attention to particular things and also allowing us to evaluate various ideas and actions. The narratives people choose to guide their actions and beliefs become durable and serve to orient people to their worlds. A school administrator, Mr. Turner, shares a story of his interaction with a parent who was angry about his son being punished for wearing a coat in the school building (a policy prevents students from doing so to ensure they are not carrying in weapons or controlled substances):

The one I just had, that one wasn’t as much of a conflict to say, “How can we work through this? You tell me what you know, here’s what I know,” you find the commonality of it, and then hopefully you can solve something from there. I would say most of the time it happens just that way where you still may agree to disagree at the end of it, but you understand each other’s points better.

Sometimes it doesn’t work that way. A few weeks ago I had a guy that boy, he
just – and once again, it was over the jacket issue, and hey, he was cussing, he
was swearing, “I’m gonna f– and a– and this,” and I just was happy with myself,
‘cause from five years ago, at one point he said, “Hey, you just meet me outside.”
Probably five years ago I’d have said, “Okay, I’ll be there,” but what I said, “I’m
gonna be here in my office. You come on in and we’ll talk about it,” and he came
in, and there was nothing that he was gonna hear, or see, or listen to that was
gonna solve it, so he came in, he got his son, and he left. And so many times
those parents, I always think, “Boy, they must’ve had a really horrible experience
in school to think that everybody here is out to get ‘em or out to screw ‘em.”

The administrator perceived his actions as fair and honorable in his desire to ensure that
students were safe in the school. He did not desire to single any student out, but to
enforce the rules consistently. The father, however, perceived the administrator’s actions
as discriminatory and unfair. His storying of the same incident is likely dramatically
different from the administrators because of the way his habitus drives him to select and
evaluate information.

During interviews, students were asked “what do you think other people, who
don’t know you well, think you are like?” To this question I received many interesting
answers that drew my attention to the fact that students have a desire to story themselves
in a particular manner and they get upset when others do not accept or view them as
being how they hope to be perceived. Michael, a student, responded to the above question
by saying “They probably think of me, I don’t know, as a bad person probably.
Yeah, a lot of people do just ‘cause of my race, you know? Yeah there's only like ten of
us (students who are not Caucasian).” Michael talked about how he tries to be friendly,
support others, and do the best he can at school, but he is constantly pushed back, he believes because of the narrative habitus of many people—a habitus that believes African-Americans cannot be trusted. He continues by sharing a story to illustrate his point:

Like, people think I lie about things. Like I say, I was in Mr. Green’s office - my friend Tommy, he came down here and talked to one of the counselors today, ‘cause his mom was hitting on him last night and kicked him out of the house. He’s only like 14 years old, 15 years old, and he stayed at my house and then my mom brought him down here to talk to the counselors. I had an orthodontist appointment. I had to cancel it, ‘cause my mom was here and I was watching my brothers at the house. Well, she came home and I walked here, signed in and asked Mr. Green, you know, my mom was here at the school. And, she had to cancel my orthodontist. And, he was like, “Well, I don’t believe you. You ain’t telling me the truth.” And, I’m like, you know what I’m saying, ask Ms. Adams, Ms. Adams will tell you the truth, what happened. And, he was like, “Well, all I know is you're not telling me the truth.” And, I was like, I slammed his chair in his desk and I was like, “Well, forget you then,” you know what I’m saying? I’ve got nothing but respect for you. How many, you know, in the hallways, I always say, “What’s up?” to Mr. Green. You know, “How you doing Mr. Green? You having a good day? All right. See you later.” You know, how many other kids really actually try, you know what I’m saying, ‘cause people hate him. You know what I’m saying? And, I see why now. So, you know, I ain’t gonna show appreciation for him and what he does if he don’t, you know what I’m saying,
believe me if I’m not respected. And, then, there’s like the secretary here, I didn’t know her. She didn’t know me. I come in here one day. I say, “Can I have a pass to come down here to one of these college visits. And, she looks me dead in my eyes and says, “Are you even going to college?” You know what I’m saying? I’m like, “What business is it of yours?” You know what I’m saying? (I nod my head in agreement) It’s like people look at me like I’m different than everybody. But, it’s OK, though, it just makes me a better man. You know what I’m saying? (I nod my head) If I can get through the struggle that they putting on me, you know, it makes me stronger than them.

Fassett and Warren (2004) interrogate this feeling many individuals experience of being pushed back or set up to fail in schooling. They note that much educational literature examines only an individual’s authenticity, success and failure absent examination of broader social structures that work to keep people in particular socio-economic strata. Such people often develop a habitus based on these stories of struggle and it becomes enduring. While the habitus is durable, it is indeterminate, always changeable. As people encounter new stories they may shift their habitus to accommodate a changing view or taste.

When people share common values and morals, their habituses overlap. Many people, however, become caught up in stories that are different than and sometimes diametrically opposed to those of others. For this reason, people may be disrupted by the narratives of others, an experience Frank (2006) refers to as “narrative ambush.” People may be ambushed by narratives they did not expect hear or were not in a position to hear, or moved by narratives they did not expect to be moved by. When ambush occurs, a
person’s habitus may be challenged and even changed. Even so, change does not happen
instantaneously but as a process over time. One student, Hannah, was living what she
described as a happy and normal life until she was ambushed by a story about her father
that would change her:

_**Hannah:**_ I did it like this [points to word 'happiness' on collage--it has been torn
apart and taped back together] because...even though I’m really happy it’s really
fragile--I guess it’s kind of symbolism. (See image below in *Image 2: Student's
Symbol of Happiness*)

_Alane:_ Yeah.

_Hannah:_ Like because I did have like the perfect life and I thought I did. But then
I found out my dad was -- he was accused of raping a girl and stuff. I looked up
to him so that was really hard. And he was in jail for like six months. And we
had to like move out of our old house like the one I was telling you about.

_Alane:_ Oh, yeah?

_Hannah:_ Like it’s just me and my mom now because my sister just got married.
So it’s all changed and like I’m still happy but it’s like it fluctuates up and down
all the time.

_Alane:_ Yeah, it would make it more of a challenge for sure.

_Hannah:_ And my grandma died like a year ago and I haven’t talked to my dad in
a year. So it’s all hard but yeah -- but I’m happy otherwise.
The story of her father’s actions ambushed Hannah leaving her to reevaluate her life, her view of her father, and learn to manage the emotional ups and downs that became a part of her life. Hannah spoke later of drawing upon her relationship with God to cope with the trauma of the experience. While this story is a sad one, narrative ambush should not be understood as having only a negative connotation. Ambush could be a story of good will or racial harmony that challenges or alters held beliefs about something or someone. In fact, some teachers felt it was their role to ambush students with stories that were antithetical to their current beliefs in hopes of encouraging students to see other perspectives. Ambush may be a means through which teachers and other students can
break through a student’s habitus that has been formed through poor parenting or ongoing dysfunctional socialization. Ms. Belle described a class period in which students were met with a realization that their habituses were very different:

We were talking about how socializing and that sort of thing, and she (a student) was just saying how her dad has four kids. The girlfriend’s got four kids and they just are always fighting and, “I thought my dad was gonna break up with her yesterday and I was so happy… I don’t get along with her daughters at all.” Most of the students were like, “Man, you must have a really violent home,” and for her that’s normal but for someone else that sounds so dysfunctional.

Some teachers hope to broaden the available scripts students have to think with and story their lives. Through stories, class discussions, and activities, students may develop a wider repertoire of skills to deal with relationships and conflict more effectively. There are some habituses that are so deeply cultivated through generations of families that they are difficult to alter no matter how destructive their behavior becomes. Consider Ms. Belle’s story about one of her students, Samantha:

It’s just scary and it makes me so mad (that her student had a baby last year that she does not properly care for). I just literally sometimes look at her and she came to me and she’s like, “Your community service, you’re just gonna have to excuse me from that because I have a baby,” and I said, “Well, we do most of it in class, Samantha,” and I said, “If you really think maybe you can’t do one hour of work outside of school for one class I think you need to take another class. You should drop my class because this class is not for you if you can’t give me one hour in a whole entire semester outside of school.” She’s like, “Well, baby’s
bugging me, this and that. If you just—and when I get home he just needs my
attention all the time. He just needs my attention. I can’t do any schoolwork at
home anymore,” and I’m just like, “I have three other students that have babies
and not one person has said, ‘I can’t do this.’” But I really think it’s ‘cause she’s
so low-functioning and she has this child that she shouldn’t have. She was more
concerned when she was pregnant about becoming skinny again and she was
gonna come back to school and nobody would recognize her, and I’m like,
“Gimme a break.” I feel bad being mean about it but—‘cause it hurts me…upsets
me. It’s because the baby. There is a family that I know would love to have this
child and instead it’s gonna be brought into this family and probably procreate the
exact same way that this baby was procreated and then create the cycle so much
more. I feel a lotta kids down here it’s just a cycle. “Oh, my mom had me when
she was 15,” and I found some letters where it was freshman in high school. She
was writing to her girlfriend. “My boyfriend and I tried to have sex once. It
didn’t—or tried to have a baby. It didn’t work so we’re gonna try again.”
Freshmen in high school trying to have babies, and it’s like marriage isn’t even an
option now. It’s like, “Why wait till you’re married?” If that would happen to me
now I would still be devastated. I’d be happy but my—I’d like to do it in order. I
wanna get married and then I’d like to have a baby.

In this case, the habitus of the student was developed through generational views that
were opposed to those of her teacher on child-rearing, marriage, and responsibility in
school. As Frank (2006) notes, sometimes teachers’ narratives unite or collide with those
of others. The collision in this case makes obvious the ways in which these people
become characters in one another’s stories and how, in this context, people negotiate to accomplish school.

When students arrive at school, they are far from being blank slates. Each student, though young, has developed a repertoire of stories and related dispositions that guide her/his decision making, beliefs, and actions. Typically, students and teachers tell, live, and listen to stories among their families, a particular friendship network, and members of their schools. These experiences offer insight into the types of stories students may be caught up in or caught between. Students may be placed in a difficult position, forced to navigate two very different social and moral orders, when their familially cultivated narrative habitus is challenged or vice versa. Burke (1964) argues that stories are equipment for living which explains in some part why students live very different lives. Students whose lives differ markedly from what is considered acceptable in the school must find ways to manage. Students must perform according to the appropriate scripts at school and at home and for many this may mean traversing between stories or having a flexible narrative habitus that offers a repertoire of stories that meets the needs of two different dispositions and actions. Certainly many students are fully caught up in the school’s institutional narrative, and their private and public lives work in harmony. Deep reflection, however, is necessary on the part of educators and administrators about how students can thrive in the midst of conflicting stories. The concept of narrative habitus provides a rich lens through which to understand the complex nature of students’ and teachers’ lives; how their lives are intertwined and collide. Beliefs about the roles of students and teachers in schooling, discipline, what knowledge students should accrue, and what skills they should develop all make up a part of each teacher’s habitus. Some
teachers feel they should only teach a subject matter; others they feel it is their duty to
develop and support students socially and emotionally.

As this exploration of the ways in which students home lives intersect with their
lives at school closes, consider the perspective of, Ms. Miller, the district social worker
who manages the intersections between home and school life:

I just think kids come in more and more all the time with so much on their plate –
generalized anxiety. Kids come in stressed out about grades, fitting in, filling out
applications, parents lost a job, how am I gonna pay for something, parents are
going a divorce. I just think what we have done to our children, taking away
their youth and their innocence, they just come in with so much burden that it’s
hard to get to work on a math paper or reading because you have so much
baggage by the time you come in. I just think that, kids just have a lot to deal with
before they can get to their education...

Getting to their education will always remain a key goal of educators, but one must
remember that the journey to the classroom is fraught with the residue of the social and
emotional history of each student. This examination of familial influences on students'
approaches to education, communication of emotion, and general emotional well-being
should remind us how deeply interconnected each context of a student's life becomes
through the process of schooling.
SUMMARY

Chapters three through six were intended to display the fruits of my labors so to speak. I sought to represent the complex existence of a student through the voices of students themselves. While a primary goal of these chapters was to highlight the experiences of students, I position student experiences and understandings of the emotional/social world as unavoidably co-constructed with teachers, peers, parents, and other stakeholders. I hope that these chapters have illuminated the messiness involved in teaching and learning in hopes of deepening our awareness of the powerful discourses, material, and embodied factors that shape the process of learning each and every day.
CHAPTER SEVEN - DISCUSSION

Over two decades ago I entered formal schooling and, I realize in retrospect, planted the seed for this dissertation. Early on, I developed a deep love for learning that persisted through the years that would follow; a love that would eventually guide my journey toward graduate school. Throughout those years I navigated classes and the broader school environment through a combination of book and emotional knowledge. Though it was not written about in the books I read, I knew that emotional knowledge shaped my desire to learn, my decision making about academics and relationships, and ultimately influenced my ability to thrive at school. Emotion, for me, was both enabling and disabling in my academic pursuits. When I reached graduate school, the role of emotion in learning was never so apparent. This project represented an opportunity to more deeply interrogate the role of emotion in teaching and learning from, primarily, a discursive perspective. Placing emotion at center stage, rather than on the periphery as it has historically been positioned provided exciting opportunities to view the ways in which emotion and communication blur traditional boundaries and construct and enliven experience. My approach allowed for the creation of a simultaneously broad-sweeping and nuanced portrait of this mysterious co-pilot in our learning lives: emotion.

This project attempts to disrupt dispassionate views of schools that ignore the emotional realities of teaching and learning, and, conversely, explore the ways in which emotion both enables and constrains students' abilities to learn and thrive at school. In so doing, I draw attention to taken-for-granted ideologies and practices shaping emotional experience, and interrogate the ramifications of dominant societal and educational discourses about emotion. Of particular importance are the ways in which these
discourses pervade student life and guide students' and teachers' decisions about how to
manage their emotions at school. I enter into perennial discussions of the role of emotion
in the public sphere to argue that emotion should not be viewed as antithetical to reason,
but should be considered a form of reasoning. Moreover, I seek to dislocate clear
boundaries between students' public and private lives calling instead for recognition of
the dynamic interplay between public and private spheres that becomes evident though
the medium of emotion. Ultimately, I contend that we sacrifice deep connection with and
understanding of students in educational organizations by striving to create emotionally
neutral domains for learning detached from the broader landscape of students' lives. I call
for new emotional scripts that could enlarge possible subject positions for stakeholders,
and enhance learning in the classroom.

Before presenting the theoretical and practical implications of this research, I feel
compelled to share a few personal reflections on the research process. As researchers we
strive to uphold high quality standards for our research. Scholars often share common
methodological understandings and practices, and seek to conduct personal research in
alignment with accepted scholarly standards. These standards encourage rigorous
research, but when we become deeply immersed in the language and practices of the field
we may lose sight of the fact that we are individual, unique people in the field. During
my fieldwork, I reflected numerous times on the fact that my journey through this process
including my interactions with participants, the moral tensions I experienced, and the
level of caring, emotion, and responsibility I felt toward the participants could vary a
great deal from another researcher in the same site.
There were moments in my fieldwork when I felt a tension between being a *good* researcher and a *good* person. While observing in the school I sought to blend in as much as possible to minimize disruption to the normal routine of the students and teachers. I was very successful in this endeavor, which allowed me to witness behaviors that left me managing a moral tension. For instance, I observed students cheating on their work multiple times. A key goal of mine was to be viewed, especially by the students, as someone who can be trusted, who would not tell other people information that could damage them, and someone who was not an authority figure who could punish. This created a problem when I watched students cheat and knew it was *wrong* and *unfair* to others, but risked being thought a tattle who could not be trusted by students should I disclose my observations to the teacher. Moreover, I felt that I would lose respect from the teacher if they learned I had witnessed cheating in their classrooms and did not share that information with them. There were times when I sat silently as students copied answers; there were other times when I told the teacher he/she might consider collecting work at the beginning of the class period, or not allow students to share calculators during exams as a way to indicate that students were taking advantage, but I chose not to "out" any particular student.

I also witnessed students using derogatory language use towards other social groups or individuals on a daily basis. "That's so gay"; "riding the short bus"; "dumb slut"; and "go pound your drum and smoke your pipe (commenting on an American Indian)" were just a few of the phrases I heard that made my stomach turn, my mind scream, and my mouth want to open to correct their language choice and explain why it was hurtful and inappropriate. Again, I experienced the same sort of tension as with
cheating: the *good* person would intervene and raise awareness so as to correct the *wrong* behavior, while the *good* researcher should maintain a distance as planned and integrity as someone who can be trusted not to punish a student. Again, there were moments I sat silent, but there were also moments when I intervened and encouraged the student(s) to reflect on what they were saying (as most did not intend hurt, but were seeking inclusion into a group through a shared vernacular), and be mindful of the implications of their choices. Some students were embarrassed, some said thank you, and others were resentful (either of me bringing attention to them or because they sought to hurt others and I was interrupting their goal). I often questioned which had more potential to change the state of the world; those teachable moments, or the discourse I would yield (because students trusted me) in interviews and through observations across multiple students that I could present in this dissertation. Yet a bigger question emerged; what fosters more trust--the researcher who is more distant, who would not "tattle", or the researcher who intervenes and perhaps creates ripples of change in the research site while she is there?

A second tension I felt as a researcher was related to determining how involved I became in the lives of the participants. While assuming the positionality of researcher who was also an emotional, empathetic, caring human being, I frequently thought about how the emotions I witnessed and experienced provided a powerful source of knowledge about how to navigate this project. This knowledge worked in tandem and sometimes competed with traditional "rational" knowledge derived from studying research methods. At times, my mind and body were screaming to reach out and hug a student; to offer to help them with a problem outside of school; or even to invite a student to my home who did not have a stable home environment to sustain them. Yet, fear of being viewed as
unprofessional, crossing the lines of appropriate physical interaction (e.g. How will hugging be perceived? Would it be welcome to the student or make him/her uncomfortable?), or creating a situation in which students valued my advice enough that they became dependent on me and then I would eventually leave the research site and town. While I left the research site physically, I never fully left mentally or emotionally. I carried a deep concern for the well-being of the students I encountered while at the school. I hoped I had said the right words to comfort them, did not seem too distant or too close, and reached out to the students when they needed it the most.

Theoretical Implications

The following section synthesizes findings from across the major themes, and advances theoretical implications based on the results. The section is organized around the three research questions posed at the end of chapter one which guided my study. In reflecting on these research questions in light of the results of this study, I hope to illuminate the ways in which this research contributes to our understandings of time-honored theories of emotion, instruction, and organizing for education.

Research Question One

My first research question asked: How do students, teachers, and administrators co-construct understandings of and experiences with emotion? This question was posed to investigate the everyday interactional nature of the educative process as socially constructed and emotionally influenced. More specifically, this question was intended to evoke information on how participants understood the role of emotion in their lives, and, ultimately, how this understanding shaped and retrospectively made sense of particular experiences. This question set the stage for a communicative lens on understanding the
nature of emotion and schooling, and is supported, in part, by each theme presented in the results chapters. The interactional nature of emotional experience is explicated in each theme reminding us that emotion and education are deeply social processes. These processes are profoundly influenced by discourse which is discussed below.

The power of discourse in shaping human experience was evident in the results of this study. Dominant discourses of emotion in society permeated the talk and actions of students and teachers. These discourses had profound influences on participants' understandings of emotion (e.g., that it is typically irrational) and experiences of emotion (e.g., how they enacted identities, managed emotions, disciplined and were disciplined in relation to emotion). The strong socializing function of discourse becomes evidence in analyzing participants' talk and actions; yet socialization in school often remains hidden to the socialized. Kapferer (1981) observed that "...unlike instruction, socialization is a largely covert operation, dealing with the inculcation of culturally defined ways of perceiving the world and acting within it" (p. 258). Rendering visible the personal and political motivations for talking about and managing emotions in particular ways can make possible resistance, contestation of, or informed willingness to perpetuate current ideologies.

Giddens (1979) addressed the notion of temporality and noted the importance of our existence in space and time, drawing attention to the “process” of socialization as it has traditionally been considered, often with a particular time in which it starts or stops, that is, after society has imprinted the individual (see p. 130). It was evident in my research that socialization is continuous. People have the power to construct meaning, practices, and patterns in their schools and beyond in their lives, and the exercise of this
power is deeply shaped by discourses circulating in their lives. This is aligned with Giddens (1979) view that socialization is “most appropriately regarded not as the ‘incorporation of the child into society,’ but the succession of the generations” (p. 130). This raises concern for the process of socialization as students may succeed the current generation with equally as limited views of emotion and its role in their lives revealing the challenge to encourage understanding emotion as a knowledge producing resource.

I appreciate Giddens' (1979) exchange of the notion of dualisms for duality recognizing signification as constituted “in the communication of meaning and interaction” (p. 98). Hence, meaning is not determined, but can be re-defined. According to Giddens', symbols are not presumed to have rigid boundaries; an example of this is the notion of student as it is created day in and day out at NHHS. The notion of what it means to be called a student or a peer, the meaning of the word emotion, and what means to be emotional could been re-defined from more traditional views and may shift and change as a result of agents (re)producing structures. According to Giddens (1984) notion of duality of structure, “the rules and resources drawn upon in the production and reproduction of social action are at the same time the means of system reproduction (duality of structure)” (p. 19). The notion of duality of structure frees us to realize that the ‘system’ can be different and that everyone has agency to influence the way they experience everyday life by changing their everyday taken-for-granted practices. I realize the role agents take in (re)producing those structures, students and teachers alike, and believe recognition of the duality of structure has the potential to breathe fresh life into our study of communication within educational contexts. As argued by Planalp (1999), "Emotions are neither good nor bad in themselves, but they give you important
information about how you are orienting toward the world" (p. 5). My hope is that this project opens others to a way of seeing emotion that shifts and enhances possibilities for living through and with emotion. My hope is that "when we say someone is 'emotional'" we do not usually mean irrational (Sutton & Wheatly, 2003, p. 328).

Research Question Two

The second research question asked: How do emotions shape students’ abilities to thrive at school? This question was intended to focus on some of the social, physiological, and psychological aspects of emotional experience on students. To cultivate the possibility that emotion can be understood as a knowledge producing resource, one must understand the outcomes of emotion on students' abilities to thrive at school; that is, the ways in which emotions are viewed and experienced as either enabling, constraining, or both. Additionally, this question was intended to tap into the consequential nature of emotional experience in general recognizing that emotions stem from a variety of sources (e.g. interactions with friends, challenging tasks in the classroom, situations at home). This knowledge provides insight into how best to facilitate learning and use/manage emotions stemming from non-educational sources. Finally, a key goal in posing this question was to learn about how emotion from all aspects of students’ lives, not just emotion specifically directed toward or stemming from learning tasks, impacts learning and school experience.

Each theme presented in the results chapters speaks to this research question in some way piecing together a nuanced portrayal of the ways emotion cuts across public and private boundaries both in relationship and context to ultimately shape students' well-being and ability to thrive at school. The first theme, Classroom Life: "Peaks and Valleys,
"Peaks and Valleys," offers the most direct understanding of academic emotions in the classroom and emotions related to instructional communication. An overriding message of this theme is to focus on cultivating positive emotional environments in learning through the use of immediacy behaviors, and democratic philosophies and practices in the classroom. The exercise of caring on the part of teachers may also enhance students’ experiences, though we should be cautious of the emotional costs and benefits of engaging in caring for teachers. Structure, Power, and Politics in Schooling aided in a broader understanding of how the material and philosophical structures of schooling contribute to students’ emotional experiences. This section offered insight into why students engage in emotion work to manage their emotions at school, key practices in schooling that evoke emotions (e.g., testing and grading) and pressure to manage emotions in particular ways. The third theme, Socializing at School: Emotional Support and Sabotage, points to the extremely social nature of adolescents’ lives by highlighting the nexus of relations of which each student is a part and the impact these relationships have on students' abilities to concentrate and excel at school. Friendships and romantic relationships presented dialectical tensions for young people to manage and sometimes enhance and sometimes hinder their abilities to thrive at school. Peer groups also served as strong socializing agents in relation to emotion regulating emotional expression, experience, and labeling. Finally, the theme There's No Place Like Home challenges the notion of clearly defined boundaries between students’ public and private lives by articulating the ways in which emotion travels so to speak across these boundaries and compromises clear divisions for good or ill. Laing contends that we cannot divorce our understanding of a person from the nexus of relations in which he/she grew up in and
lives within. This is apt to consider in light of student behavior in the classroom. Students are frequently blamed for their disposition to and actions in the world without recognizing the root cause, which often stems from their nexus of relations and whether or not they were confirmed as a human being. Many students were insignificant to their parents, or as Laing describes were the "furniture of their lives" (p. 119). This was one of the main reasons students experienced negative emotion at school; though it is seemingly unrelated to the specific task of learning. Conversely, positive home experiences were also evidenced in students' emotional dispositions and subsequent experiences with learning. Emotion traveled across boundaries that, at least in theory, divided students' lives into different contexts.

Research Question Three

The third, and final, research question asked: What strategies do students, teachers, and administrators use to manage emotions at school (e.g. expression, masking, channeling)? Students, teachers, and administrators recognized that the management of emotion was tied to cultural codes and expectations for assuming particular roles in society. Both students and teachers described inhibiting and masking as the primary means to manage emotions that were too negative or positive to meet the emotional order of the school. While many expressed the desire to manage strong emotions in private, these authentic emotions were still present in the public realm of school, just hidden. There were cases, however, of authentic emotion being witnessed by participants. It is noteworthy that participants relatively consistently talked about strong negative emotion displays when asked to recall instances of emotion being expressed at school.
In addition to the general management of emotion, students had to become savvy at managing their emotions across different emotional and social orders in each classroom environment. The theme *Classroom Life: "Peaks and Valleys, Peaks and Valleys"* especially captures students' knowledge of the unique emotional challenges of each class. Some classes required more emotion management to avoid contagion or to prevent embarrassment or displays of anger when the climate was less emotionally supportive and warm. Students also learned that emotion traverses across traditional notions of public and private boundaries, as they managed the inherent relational tensions of friendships and romantic relationships which is evidenced in the theme, *Socializing at School: Emotional Support and Sabotage*, and home life relationships detailed in the theme *There's No Place Like Home*. Peer groups proved to be strong sources of emotional evocation and also socializing agents for managing emotions according to cultural expectations. Recognition of this fact has important consequences for the study of how emotion expectations are co-constructed and concertively controlled among peers.

Finally, the theme *Structure, Power, and Politics in Schooling* draws attention to the ways in which emotion is conceived of and enacted in educational settings. The focus on the structures and practices of schooling here allow us to see the ways in which power circulates though educational systems and shapes the experience, understanding, and display of emotion. Understandings students' and teachers' emotional expression as *disciplined* through, especially, observation and normalizing judgment provides key avenues for organizational scholars interested in relations of power in social forms.
Practical Implications

The most practical implication of this research is to be mindful of the language we use in our everyday talk. A discursive analysis of emotion and education draws our attention to the ways in which our words create a reality that may enable or constrain our ability to live an associated life. When what people say, do, and create coalesce to form discourses, these discourses are/become constitutive of knowledge and values which may be taken as “common sense” and no longer questioned (During, 1999). During (1999) states that the power of signifying practices and discourses lies in their ability to make something seem “natural, universal, and eternal” when it is actually very “political, partial, and open to change” (p. 5). As is evidenced in the results chapters, students, teachers, and administrators primarily referred to socially constructed perceptions of emotion and social expectations as natural or the ways things are. Absent deep reflection on how and why things came to be the way they are, understandings and experiences of emotion as a knowledge producing resource are limited. Being mindful of the ways we perpetuate unproductive images of emotion through metaphors, jokes, and stories can begin to shift the tides of understanding. The same is true of raising awareness of discourses that are hurtful and evoke unproductive emotions in students and teachers.

The Ad Council, which produces public service announcements on contemporary social issues, is currently running a “ThinkB4youSpeak campaign.” A main goal of this campaign is to raise awareness of and decrease use of anti-LGBT language (Ad Council, 2009; see Appendix F for example of a campaign publication). Hollywood stars like Hilary Duff and Wanda Sykes are featured in commercials for this campaign as well as “everyday people.” In one commercial, there are two female cashiers talking behind a
cash register about not having permission to go out that night to which each responds to the other by saying "that's so gay." A customer who overhears the interchange approaches the young women and, seeing the names on their name tags, says "that's so Emma and Julia." The cashiers look perplexed and ask "why did you say that's so Emma and Julia?"; to which the customer replies, "you know, when something is dumb or stupid you say 'that's so Emma and Julia'." The cashiers respond saying "who says that?" The customer smiles and says "everybody." Then a voiceover is heard saying "Imagine if who you are was used as an insult. Do you realize what you say? Knock it off!" (see www.adcouncil.org to view PSAs). These campaigns have been running since 2008 and a recent study indicates that perceptions among teens of commonly used derogatory phrases like "that's so gay" and "dyke" when referring to something being stupid or uncool has changed to be more negative; and more teens note reducing or eliminating their use of these phrases due to exposure to the campaign (Presgraves & Fisher, 2009). Campaigns like these focused on everyday language use have the power to transform learning environments for students who have been bullied, demeaned, or felt ostracized. The strategy of this campaign could be used to attempt to alter traditional views of emotion and reason as dichotomous as well by drawing attention to the inadvertent ways many people use the word emotion or emotional in a derogatory manner. At New Haven High School there was a student run news program that aired at the school every morning and in the community each week. Having students create their own campaign to raise awareness about limiting language use that could be disseminated through the airwaves and visually through posters etcetera in the schools could be an effective way to begin to affect change. These efforts encourage people to unlearn what Kohl (1994) refers to as
"habits of inclusion and exclusion" in our perceptions, behaviors, and talk (p. 20). We need to remember that moments of discomfort can be some of the most powerful learning opportunities and can transform the way we see the world (Boler & Zembalyas, 2003). Making students feel uncomfortable talking in a way that creates an unproductive learning environment for some of their peers could be a positive first step.

Part of raising awareness of the discursive positioning of emotion and power of our communication styles could be achieved through short, interactive information sessions. These sessions could model common situations that arise in the classroom and display communicative behaviors that are likely to create the most productive emotional environment and deepest learning from students. These sessions could be created based on the key challenges and issues that emerged in participants' discourse. For example, a student session could be create that focused on the commonly used phrase "that's so gay" with the purpose of educating students on the interrelationships between their language choices and the experiences and subject positions they make possible. Students could be asked to act out a short scenario that could then be discussed in groups with a facilitator leading/managing the session to ensure students are led to understand the empirical and practical findings related to the subject at hand. A teacher session could be facilitated on enhancing the emotional climate and culture of the class to reduce problem behaviors, foster healthy student-teacher relationships, and encourage learning. Sessions could be focused on immediacy, the reduction of verbal aggression, and how to employ democratic practices in the classroom where appropriate.

Short sessions hold some merit in raising awareness and shifting behavior, but such changes must be instantiated in the culture of the school and society to ensure long-
term change. Social and emotional learning programs that are embedded in schools have the potential to develop competencies heretofore unacknowledged in most formal schooling environments (Smith-Sanders & Harter, 2007). Yet, these programs are significant investments of time and resources, and must be looked at with cautious optimism, too, as they may perpetuate limiting views of what emotions are deemed positive or negative in the learning environment and limit subject positions available to students (Boler, 1999). However, they do have transformative potential in schools when created mindfully and tailored to the developmental and social needs of the students (Jones & Compton, 2003).

The success of short sessions, long-term programs, or everyday interactions lies not only in the willingness of participants, but on the knowledge and skills of the leaders, teachers and administrators, many of whom lack knowledge of how to teach or learn about socio-emotional aspects of education and relationships (Palomera, Fernandez-Berrocal, & Brackett, 2008; Sutton & Wheatly, 2003; Weare & Grey, 2003). As noted by Palomera et al. (2008) "it is not possible to teach a competency which one has not acquired" making the training of teachers in schools and pre-service teachers imperative (p. 440). Teaching involves daily social interaction and emotion work calling for skill development in effective teaching and coping to heighten emotional well-being, social relationships, and ultimately academic performance for both students and teachers (Brackett & Caruso, 2007).

Schools must respond to changes in society to fully prepare students for their futures beyond formal schooling. Because we increasingly live in a "knowledge society, where the ability to collaborate, communicate, create and live in community are highly
valued," teachers must be trained, perhaps, differently than they were in years past to create and respond to the student learning environment (Hawkey, 2006, p. 137).

Unfortunately, very few schools have emotional competencies as part of their curriculum to train pre-service teachers (Malm, 2009; Sutton, Mudrey-Camino, & Knight, 2009). In addition to encouraging the inclusion of this competency in pre-service teacher training, effective teacher mentoring programs in schools could be a relational site in which teachers could begin to explore emotion knowledge in their teaching practices (Hawkey, 2006).

Additionally, it is important to include the community in any changes made within the school and clearly communicate with parents about teaching goals and school expectations for how students ought to respond to one another while at school. Students are sometimes placed in compromising positions as they traverse between the knowledge of their household and the lessons of schools. When these two sets of knowledge collide (e.g., a student is taught to refer to African-Americans as "ghetto" in his home, yet corrected for this behavior at school; or taught to punch someone if they bully him at home, but punish for this behavior at school) students must either "adjust" and align themselves at school with the standard or "maladjust" and find ways to exist in this world that differs from how they have been taught to be by family and friends. This "maladjustment" is a creative way to exist in two different worlds and often works within the system to defy it (Kohl, 1994). Students may also use outright defiance at school which is usually perceived as bad behavior when a student is actually trying to maintain their integrity (Kohl, 1994). Teachers must be mindful of the complexity involved in
shifting discourses and practices in the school because they will always be deeply tied to familial and societal expectations as well.

Teachers are often told to use new strategies in the classroom and alter time-honored practices with few resources provided. I believe it would be deeply beneficial to facilitate an appreciative inquiry session to reflect on what is right with the school and their current methods in hopes of fueling positive reflection, appreciation, and creativity. Appreciate inquiry is a method of organization development that asks organizational members to reflect on the key question: What is right with the organization? (Cooperrider & Sekerka, 2006). Participants may recall a time when they felt especially valued, a project that students were excited to complete, or kind letter written to them by a colleague. Engaging organizational members in this mode of inquiry invites them into a more positive, knowledge generating state. As a communication scholar, I firmly believe that the language we use to talk about our experiences shapes our reality. As such, by engaging in deficit or negative talk frequently about one's work experiences, one begins to create a more negative perception of and subsequent experience in the environment. It became clear that positive emotional climates contributed to students' emotional well-being; hence, it would seem reasonable to follow that appreciative inquiry could set leaders on the right path to achieving a positive environment. Moreover, teachers frequently mentioned seeking out informal mentors and friends to help them manage the emotional rigors of teaching. Appreciative inquiry could be used as a group to talk about methods they have used to reach perhaps difficult students or manage an ongoing problem in a way that prevents emotional burnout.
Teachers and administrators ought to spend time in dialogic conversation about how to best thrive in a school system in which testing is key component on which students must be prepared to perform. Testing was mostly loathed by teachers and served as a key source of tension in their teaching and conversations with administrators. Approaching the topic with the goal of finding the best possible solution to relieve the core tensions teachers and administrators feel related to the issue could create better classroom atmospheres for students and teachers. Staff meetings are often formatted in an autocratic style leaving little room for discussions of this nature. Altering that communication pattern could open the door for fruitful conversations.

Finally, New Haven High School had recently implemented a new schedule that was designed to create more instructional time in the classroom. A key change to create this additional instructional time was a shortening of the lunch period. Students and teachers were allotted thirty minutes to eat lunch and many students ate lunch off campus due either to personal preference or lack of space in the school cafeteria; hence, driving, eating, and parking, for many students happened within thirty minutes. Most students returned from lunch rushing, flustered, and still eating as they walked toward the school building. One of the students most frequently offered suggestions to improve the quality of their learning, and emotional experiences at school was to extend the lunch period by twenty minutes. In theory extending instructional time seems as though it would improve learning; students however, viewed the time they had to eat their lunch and converse with friends as invaluable to their ability to concentrate in class and their general emotional well-being. Most noted that their attention span rapidly deteriorated as they digested from their hurried lunch and were further drained by the extra time they were expected to be
engaged in the classroom. The extra lunch time served them both physiologically and psychologically as time to recharge and prepare for the latter half of the day. Based on the pervasiveness of this suggestion by both students and teachers, I would caution administrators to critically interrogate the actual academic and emotional costs and benefits of lengthening instructional time by considering the interplay between each of the aforementioned factors (see Lupton, 1998; Parkinson et al., 2004).

Limitations

A key limitation of this study is related to conducting student interviews. Permission from the New Haven Board of Education to interview students was contingent on the fact that I abide by the same rules that teachers and other school employees do for reporting student disclosures of abuse, neglect, contemplation of suicide or violence, or participation in illegal behavior. When students and parents signed consent forms, they were informed that any disclosures of this nature or suspicions on my part would lead me to break our confidence and share information with a trusted school administrator. Knowledge of this possibility may have, in some cases, led students to withhold information they would have been likely to share otherwise, or to alter their disclosure to discuss the actions and beliefs of "friends" or "people they know" rather than themselves. Though students shared very personal information fairly readily, it seems logical to assume that certain information may have been censored (e.g., their personal participation in consuming alcohol or experimenting with drugs; or, full details of negative or potentially abusive relationships with others at home or school).

Though extensive discourse was gathered, this study could have been strengthened through interviews of parents in addition to students, teachers, and
administrators. Knowledge of parental socialization effects was garnered through student and teacher accounts and limited observation of parents who entered the school for meetings or to pick up or drop off a child. Interviewing parents firsthand would have enhanced the understanding of emotional experiences in students' home lives and early socialization messages.

This study utilized a generative approach to research by having students create collages that represented their emotional experiences. The creation of these collages, I believe, enabled participants to recall, process, and more descriptively explain their experiences before they were called upon to talk about them in an interview. This process, however, would have been further strengthened had I fully embraced the generative process by guiding students through the sensitizing and immersion stages. Students were told about the purpose of the study and that they should begin reflecting on their experiences and emotions related to all aspects of school, yet students could have possibly activated more memories and connections had they been invited to participate in the aforementioned phases more fully. The decision to abridge the process stemmed from a desire to make the project a feasible pursuit without adding undue stress. Students seemed stressed from homework and out of class activities and responsibilities, and they were sacrificing their study hall time, in most classes for two to three days, to create and tell the story of their collage and answer my questions.

Finally, the scope of this project was ambitious. By seeking to understand the broader landscape of students' emotional lives, and by approaching this goal using a reflexive methodology my project began very open and emerged while in the field. This approach yielded valuable and extensive discourse from participants, but presented me
with the challenge of making sense of copious amounts of information. Moreover, the breadth and depth of the discourse required ongoing, deep reflection on numerous reflective themes and theories rather than analyzing the discourse through to a core theoretical lens. This posed a formidable challenge in organizing the discourse and articulating which key theories best illuminated the voices and experiences of participants.

Directions for Future Research

In the theme Classroom Life: Peaks and Valleys, Peaks and Valley I discussed the significant body of research related to teacher immediacy behaviors in the classroom. This instructional communication research could be further enriched by more qualitative accounts documenting immediacy behaviors of both teachers and students and outcomes. A qualitative lens would provide a fresh perspective on the constructs of immediacy and verbal aggressiveness as their study has been dominated by variable-analytic epistemologies. Qualitative analyses also hold the potential to further illuminate and bring to the forefront underlying emotions that are part of the constructs themselves and the responses they evoke in others.

Most studies of students' emotional experiences have been developed exclusively based on what happens in the classroom. My hope is that by presenting a multifaceted portrait of students' lives more researchers will be encouraged to take a holistic approach to understanding how students participate, or not, in the education process. My interests in both organizational and instructional communication prompted this approach in an effort to capture students' experiences with emotion and learning in their broader cultural milieu. Students are often seen as one-dimensional people whose primary responsibilities
are to related to excelling in school. Many students, however, forge complex lives with competing demands. Viewing students in this manner takes on step closer to seeing students as living breathing organizational members who co-construct the learning environment rather than exist as objects of a system. Positioning schools as organizations enables researchers to more easily envision how cherished theories like organizational socialization and emotional labor apply to or can be expanded to explain students' and teachers' experiences, and how the lens of emotion for understanding organizational experience blurs many traditional boundaries that have been constructed around organizational life (e.g., public/private).

Miller (2007) draws our attention to the ways in which organizational communication scholarship has begun to shift in recent years stating that “while research was once directed toward information flows, knowledge networks, and optimal decision making, scholars now turn their attention toward emotional labor, social identity and relationships with coworkers and clients” (pp. 223-224). I seek to further contribute to this growing body of research which examines issues of emotional socialization, “emotional work” (Miller, 2002), “work feelings” (Mumby & Putnam, 1992), and “emotional labor” (Hochschild, 1983) in organizations. Feminist scholars call for more theorizing of organizational processes through the lens of emotion to more deeply understand the social components of organizing (see Boler 1997, 1999).

Finally, this project has merely begun to articulate and support the claim that emotion can be understood as a knowledge producing resource. A hallmark of quality research is that it raises questions and encourages continued inquiry. My hope is that this
project spurs others to continue to investigate both the promise and problems of embracing emotion as a form of reasoning, generally, and in educational contexts.

Concluding Remarks

Bakhtin (1981) reminds us that discourses and people should be understood as always “unfinalizable,” meaning that they are ever emergent in the moment and never solidified as the “way they are” or the “way things are.” Viewing the world as static, limits opportunities for new ways of being and ultimately for change. Perceiving the world as unfinalizable, however, opens us to endless opportunities to improve our existence. During (1999) calls for us to “produce knowledge from perspectives lost to and in dominant public culture” (p. 25). I hope that reading this dissertation may compel more people to talk about the role of emotion in education, and to talk about and enact it in new ways. Conceiving of emotion as important to the schooling process; a resource to be honored rather than always hidden, could enhance the experiences of students and teachers in our school systems and beyond. Moreover, viewing the roles of student and teacher as unfinalizable creates the possibility for growth, discovery, and deep connection through the generation of novel discourses and embodied acts of learning and being.
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Appendix A: Interview Protocols

Tentative Student Interview Protocol

Introductory Questions
Tell me about a typical day at school.
What do you like most about school?
What do you like least about school?
Describe how you feel before, during, and after school of a typical day.

Reason
What do you think of when you hear the word “emotional”?
What do you think of when you hear the word “rational”?
How, if at all, do emotions help you make good decisions?
How, if at all, do emotions keep you from making good decisions?

Emotions and Learning
What emotions do you feel most frequently at school?
What activities at school make you feel happy? Why?
What activities at school make you feel unhappy or frustrated? Why?
Can you think of a time when emotion helped you learn something?
Can you think of a time when emotion made it difficult for you to learn something?
Tell me about your favorite hobby. What do you like about it? Why? How does it make you feel to do it?
Is there a certain class you feel most comfortable in? Tell me why?

I am going to say a word and I want you to say the first words or emotion that come to mind. If you want to, you can tell me why you said what you did when we’re done.

School Tests
**Emotions and Social Relations**

Do you and your friends talk about how you feel about school?

What emotions do you think your friends feel most often?

When you feel angry or upset at school, what do you do?

When you feel excited or happy about something at school what do you do?

When you are embarrassed about something at school what do you do?

How do teachers handle students’ emotions?

Do you ever see your teachers express certain emotions? If so, what ones/kinds?

What messages do you receive from teachers (parents, and peers) about how to handle your emotions at school?

How do you feel when people ask you about a grade you received on a test or assignment?

What, if any, are expectations for how you will handle your emotions while at school?

When, if ever, do you dread going to school? Or, what, if anything, makes you dread going to school?
When, if ever, do you look forward to going to school? Or, what, if anything, makes you look forward to going to school?

*Outside Forces*

What are some things outside of school that influence (positively or negatively) your ability to thrive while at school?

*Emotions and Health*

How, if at all, do you think your emotions have impacted your health?

*Future*

What are your favorite places to be at school? Why?

Who are your favorite people to spend time with at school? Why?

If you could change your school to make it a better place to be and learn, what would you change?

Think of something related to school that makes you feel bad. What is it and what do you think needs to happen for it to change?

*Closing Questions*

Are there experiences you would like to talk about that I haven’t asked you about?

Is there anything else I should know?
Tentative Teacher Interview Protocol

Introductory Questions

Tell me about a typical day at school.

Describe how you feel before, during, and after school on a typical day.

What do you like most about teaching?

What do you like least about teaching?

What emotions do you feel most frequently at school?

What, if any, are expectations for how you will handle your emotions while at school?

Do you think that other teachers are pretty competent at handling their own and their students emotions?

Emotions and Teaching

What emotions do you think your students feel most frequently?

Can you think of times when a student clearly expressed an emotion in class? Was it appropriate?

How do you handle “emotional outbursts”?

What activities related to school do students seem to like the most? What one’s seem to upset or frustrate them the most?

Do you think there are times when emotion helps students learn (focus, motivation)? How do you bring out or control emotions in students?

Reason

What do you think of when you hear the word “emotional”?

What do you think of when you hear the word “rational”?

How, if at all, do emotions help you make good decisions?

How, if at all, do emotions keep you from making good decisions?
Anticipating School

When, if ever, do you dread going to school? Or, what, if anything, makes you dread going to school?

When, if ever, do you look forward to going to school? Or, what, if anything, makes you look forward to going to school?

If you could change your school to make it a better place to be and learn, what would you change?
Appendix B: Consent Forms

Student Consent Form

Title of Research: An Exploration of the Interplay between Communication, Emotion, and Education

Principal Investigator: Alane Sanders
Department: Communication Studies

Federal and university regulations require signed consent for participation in research involving human subjects. After reading the statements below, please indicate your consent by signing this form.

Explanation of Study
The purpose of this project is to learn more about communication patterns within your school and emotional experiences related to schooling. Through this research, I hope to better understand the interplay between emotion, communication, and schooling. I will be conducting interviews with you and other students to gain insight into your experiences related to these topics. Prior to the interview, I may ask you to write reflections to a couple of questions about school in a journal. During the interview, I will ask you to create a collage that highlights some important experiences related to school that evoked emotion. I may ask you additional questions after you explain your collage. The length of the interview will vary with each person. After the interview, your participation in the project will be complete.

Risks and Discomforts
There are no known risks or discomforts as a result of participating in this study. Should you feel uncomfortable or upset by the interview process, you may choose to end the interview at any time. You are also encouraged to discuss any upsetting issues with your school guidance counselor.

Benefits
This research will provide a deeper understanding of how communication, emotion, and schooling intersect and influence one another. The results will be shared with the school in hopes of improving school practices and students’ experiences, and will be shared with the broader educational community through the publication of articles and/or newsletters.

Confidentiality and Records
Interviews will be audio-recorded. The recorded interviews, transcripts, written records, journals, and collages will be kept confidential and will be stored in a locked office. Only the primary researcher (Alane) will have access to the information obtained. The recordings and records will be destroyed once the project is complete in April of 2008. Information that is shared with others will be shared in summary form and in the case of
quotes fictitious names will be used to protect identities. Please Note: If you share information about personal participation in illegal activity, thoughts of suicide, or abuse or neglect, I am obligated to report this information to Principal Turner. Outside of these issues, confidentiality will NOT be broken.

Compensation
There is no compensation for participating in this study.

Contact Information
If you have any questions regarding this study, please contact Alane Sanders at (740) 630-7483 or e-mail her at as225302@ohio.edu.

If you have any questions regarding your rights as a research participant, please contact Jo Ellen Sherow, Director of Research Compliance, Ohio University, (740)593-0664.

I certify that I have read and understand this consent form and agree to participate as a subject in the research described. I agree that known risks to me have been explained to my satisfaction and I understand that no compensation is available from Ohio University and its employees for any injury resulting from my participation in this research. I certify that I am 18 years of age or older. If I am not 18 years of age or older, I certify that I have obtained the signature of my legal guardian. My participation in this research is given voluntarily. I understand that I may discontinue participation at any time without penalty. I certify that I have been given a copy of this consent form to take with me.

Signature ___________________________ Date ______
Printed Name__________________________

I certify that I have read and understand this consent form. As the legal guardian of this student, I grant him/her permission to participate in this study.

Signature (Legal guardian of individual indicated above if under 18 year of age):
_____________________________ Date ______
Printed Name ________________________________
Faculty Consent Form

Title of Research: A Reflexive Exploration of the Interplay between Communication, Emotion, and Education

Principal Investigator: Alane Sanders
Department: Communication Studies

Federal and university regulations require signed consent for participation in research involving human subjects. After reading the statements below, please indicate your consent by signing this form.

Explanation of Study
The purpose of this project is to learn more about communication patterns within your school and students’ emotional experiences related to schooling. Through this research, I hope to better understand the interplay between emotion, communication, and schooling. This project is focused on students’ experiences and as such, I will ask you questions about your perceptions of students’ experiences and the messages you believe they receive about emotion. I will also ask you some questions related to the emotions you feel while at school. The length of the interview will vary with each person. After the interview, your participation in the project will be complete.

Risks and Discomforts
There are no known risks or discomforts as a result of participating in this study. Should you feel uncomfortable or upset by the interview process, you may choose to end the interview at any time.

Benefits
This research will provide a deeper understanding of how communication, emotion, and schooling intersect and influence one another. The results will be shared with the school in hopes of improving school practices and students’ experiences, and will be shared with the broader educational community through the publication of articles and/or newsletters.

Confidentiality and Records
Interviews will be audio-recorded. The recorded interviews, transcripts, written records, journals, and collages will be kept confidential and will be stored in a locked office. Only the primary researcher (Alane) will have access to the information obtained. The recordings and records will be destroyed once the project is complete in April of 2008. Information that is shared with others will be shared in summary form and in the case of quotes fictitious names will be used to protect identities.

Compensation
There is no compensation for participating in this study.
Contact Information
If you have any questions regarding this study, please contact Alane Sanders at (740) 630-7483 or e-mail her at as225302@ohio.edu.

If you have any questions regarding your rights as a research participant, please contact Jo Ellen Sherow, Director of Research Compliance, Ohio University, (740)593-0664.

I certify that I have read and understand this consent form and agree to participate as a subject in the research described. I agree that known risks to me have been explained to my satisfaction and I understand that no compensation is available from Ohio University and its employees for any injury resulting from my participation in this research. I certify that I am 18 years of age or older. My participation in this research is given voluntarily. I understand that I may discontinue participation at any time without penalty or loss of any benefits to which I may otherwise be entitled. I certify that I have been given a copy of this consent form to take with me.

Signature________________________ Date_______

Printed Name________________________
Appendix C: Collage/Map Canvas
Appendix D: Toolkit for Collages

Images for Toolkit
DETENTION ASSIGNMENT

Today's date: 31/5/01
Student: Ambreen Rayfish
Reason: Public Display of Underwear
Teacher's Signature

(Teacher MUST provide student with a pink copy)

---

Name: Peter
Date: July 20, 2004

---

1. He came up with the heliocentric system
   A. Isaac Newton
   B. Nicolaus Copernicus
   C. Galileo Galilei

2. The Plutonic system asserts that
   A. the stars shape the laws of gravity
   B. the sun has a gravitational influence on the planets

3. Johannes Kepler
   A. discovered the law of the motion of the moon
   B. discovered the law of the orbit of the moon
   C. lived in the 17th century
   D. was a member of the English Parliament

4. Galileo Galilei
   A. discovered the law of gravity
   B. discovered the law of the orbit of the moon
   C. lived in the 17th century
   D. was a member of the English Parliament

5. He discovered the law of electrical force
   A. Baron A. de Cordero
   B. Edward Hulbert
   C. Carlo A. E. de Cordero
   D. Carl David Anderson

---

3. Find x

32 in

I Found It.
Attitudes are the Real Disability
### Words for Toolkit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accomplishment</th>
<th>Cheating</th>
<th>Expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attitude</td>
<td>Comparison</td>
<td>Embarrassment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger</td>
<td>Confusing</td>
<td>Emotion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annoying</td>
<td>DMR</td>
<td>Friends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticipation</td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>Fighting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black &amp; White</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Frustration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boredom</td>
<td>Expression</td>
<td>Foreign Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence</td>
<td>Excitement</td>
<td>Fitting in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothes</td>
<td>Easy</td>
<td>Freshman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changing</td>
<td>Elementary School</td>
<td>Failure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Juniors</td>
<td>Relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fake</td>
<td>Job</td>
<td>Rationality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades</td>
<td>Learn</td>
<td>Structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gym</td>
<td>Listen</td>
<td>Spirit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happiness</td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>Sports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homework</td>
<td>Music</td>
<td>Sophomores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Sticking out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invisible</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>Seniors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jealousy</td>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siblings</td>
<td>Tools</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Struggle</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Success</td>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>When the bell rings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>Freedom</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix E: Sample Student Collages
fag·got (fag’ət) 1. there was a time when the word “faggot” meant a bundle of sticks, but then people started using it in an insulting, offensive way and things changed. so when you say things like “homo,” “dyke” and “that’s so gay” trying to be funny, remember, you may actually be hurting someone. 2. so please, knock it off. 3. get more information at ThinkB4YouSpeak.com

Source: www.adcouncil.org