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Abstract

This study explores the ambivalent affective intensities surrounding a four-year student voice in a school reform initiative at a comprehensive coeducational public Australian high school. Student voice, an educational movement with rationales that zigzag between standpoint epistemology, dialogue, critical pedagogy, and school improvement, does not necessarily “feel empowering” in its enactment (Ellsworth, 1989, my emphasis). Propelled by prior affective perturbations, I engaged, over a year of participatory ethnographic fieldwork, in processes of methodological and conceptual experimentation with students, teachers, parents and the philosophical resources of Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari. Deliberately working with the problematic concept of voice, I sought to think and feel voice beyond the autonomous liberal humanist subject, to attend to what exceeds the verbal and linguistic in and beyond schools, and to map the simultaneous liberations and co-options of voice.

The question What can ‘voice’ do? is concerned with the capacity of voice to affect and to be affected – as a concept, as a felt force, in methodological configurations, and in writing. I examine common sense ways of knowing students’ voices, emotions and bodies: according to age, ability, emotional expression, and imperatives to produce data demonstrating progress. Deleuze and Guattari’s concepts of affect, assemblages, lines, order words, desire, and concept creation are employed to rethink the political, pragmatic and affective dimensions of the communicative act and social (re-)production in schools, and to re-tool participatory and ethnographic methods.

Mapping what voice does, I explore the refrains that murmured and metamorphosed around voice in a school reform process: respect, understanding, responsibility and change, and their intersections with affects articulated in language as doubt, fear, shame and joy. I argue that what student voice can do depends on conceptions of the body of the speaker, and the opportunities available to trouble these conceptions. What student voice can do depends on the ways in which relations between bodies are felt and interpreted, the configurations and conditions of communicative events, and how student voice events are evaluated. Creating accounts and theories with students about student voice in school reform compels attunement to the dynamic movements of the concept of voice, the material force of language and affect in the formation of subjectivities, the porousness of boundaries between bodies, and the fluidity of the authorial I.

This thesis contributes a theorisation of the relationship between affect, desire and voice to the literature on student voice in school reform. Theories and processes of collaborative concept creation with students offer conceptual and methodological tools to affective methodologies. Pedagogically, this thesis contributes to broader conversations about the words, relations, educational configurations and environments that compound positive affects between bodies, augmenting the capacities of bodies to act and the mutual learning that is possible.
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List of student pseudonyms and self-descriptions

Students who participated in research activities requiring signed consent forms were invited to choose a pseudonym and write a self-description late in 2013, after most focus groups had been completed, during collaborative analysis days (see Chapter 5). As a result of this late methodological decision, there are a number of students without self-selected pseudonyms or self-descriptions. I have given pseudonyms to these students, but I have not written a description for them. In the table below (Table 1: List of student pseudonyms and students’ self-descriptions), I indicate when I did not write a description with a dash (-). I indicate when students wrote a pseudonym but not a self-description with the following words: [Not given by student].

In addition, this thesis includes ethnographic conversations and observational data from students beyond the study’s organised research activities. For the conversations and observations that I discuss in this thesis, I have chosen a pseudonym for the student. I include these students in the table below. The symbol # next to their name indicates that they were not involved in the study’s focus groups or collaborative analysis activities.

Not all participating students (nor teachers or parents) are quoted in this thesis, although all (in)form the authorial voice. Some students’ contributions to this study are beyond the linguistic: for example, works of art created and included as Figures (see Chapter 5). In listing the names of students’ self-chosen pseudonyms and their self-descriptions in the preliminary pages of this thesis, I make transparent the inclusions and exclusions that I have made as a researcher.

See Chapters 1 and 5, and Appendices B and C for further discussion of this study’s research methods and procedures, consent processes, and the use of pseudonyms and self-descriptions.
Table 1. List of student pseudonyms and students’ self-descriptions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student pseudonym (listed in alphabetical order)</th>
<th>Self-chosen, or given by Eve Mayes (Eve)?</th>
<th>Student’s year group in 2013</th>
<th>Student’s self-description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abdul</td>
<td>Eve</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abu George</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Small &amp; weak &amp; can’t lift anything</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adema</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>[Not given by student]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adnan #</td>
<td>Eve</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adrian</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>[Not given by student]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alisha</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Big eyes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tall girl (Year 9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nice girl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ayman</td>
<td>Eve (and approved by Ayman)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Any description I don’t mind.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.J.</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>[Not given by student]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Batata</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Confident, energetic and helpful person who likes sports. I’m pretty smart, love research, discovering new things and relationships. Kind not aggressive, pretty mature doesn’t really like school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayder</td>
<td>Eve</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bella</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>[Not given by student]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bing latin</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>I’m very tall and sexy and I love to play/watch football and I am 18 years old</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>[Not given by student]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian</td>
<td>Eve</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooke Davis</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>A persuasive young lady</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chatterbox</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>I would describe myself as a very negative person. It affects me because I begin to think about what is the use of learning? Going to school? Relaxing? When we are all going to die. [* See below]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian Stewart</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>[Not given by student]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cristiano Suarez Ronaldo</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>A professional soccer player who loves chicks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circuit blade</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>[Not given by student]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dale</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Dale an atheist who likes maths and science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doshua Doshua</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Very tall and successful and (crossed out words) and can lift everything</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faisal</td>
<td>Eve</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hagrid</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Big, scary, Loving, loud, caring, confident, musical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamad</td>
<td>Eve</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hares #</td>
<td>Eve</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>[Not given by student]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holly #</td>
<td>Eve</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hussein</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>[Not given by student]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ike</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>[Not given by student]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issac</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>I don’t really know how to describe myself.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issa</td>
<td>Eve</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>James is a person who loves and values school who loves to learn and share his knowledge of different things</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jarryd Hayne</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Tall nice looking guy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I was born in Australia and my background is Lebanese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Interests/Personalities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Seid</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Cool, mysterious, sexy, built like a house, strong as a brick wall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Stiman</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Brown long hair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Citizen Smith</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>[Not given by student]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Dixon</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>A cyrpiot legend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnathan Rudd</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>A funny well educated committed student, that likes to have fun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.T.</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>[Not given by student]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juliet Roberts</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>[Not given by student]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leila</td>
<td>Eve</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madhuri</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>It is in my nature to love, to live, to learn, to grow, to help others, to explore, to be fascinated with the unknown, to seek compassion for justice, to love good food, to travel, to see the greatness in everyone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria #</td>
<td>Eve</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mia Rose</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>• Good, well committed student – trys her best to achieve. Like to conduct research&lt;br&gt;• Wants students to have a voice and equality between teachers and students&lt;br&gt;• Believes that even if you are in the lowest class, people in all classes should be given the same equality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micheal Johnson</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>[Not given by student]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monique</td>
<td>Eve</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natalia #</td>
<td>Eve</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Describe me in any way you want.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onetwothree</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Smart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca</td>
<td>Eve</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rima</td>
<td>Eve</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>[Rima was overseas when focus groups and collaborative analysis days were held]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodger</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Unique personality, abs, tall, built</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roger Tuivasa-Sheck!</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>I think that I am an intelligent person when I focus and put my head to it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roselina</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>[Not given by student]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samantha</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17 year old Lebanese gal. Independent, assertive and a curious learner. Passionate about leadership and excelling in education. Interested in the world around me and love to question everything.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samir #</td>
<td>Eve</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savannah Smith</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>[Not given by student]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaniqua</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>I am a very positive person and I always like to grow a relationship with my teachers. I’m unique, not as smart but still smart. I’m loud, happy. I find myself to be a bit funny. I love making people laugh. I listen in class so I would call myself a good student.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaza</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>A Year 9 male, with a passion for sports and challenge for keeping high ranks in learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soraya</td>
<td>Eve</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spiderman</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>[Not given by student]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Black and funny&lt;br&gt;Love to meet new people, confident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pythagoras</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16 year old male Pakistani Background&lt;br&gt;Interests:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The professor</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Everything English related</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Leadership (Vice Captain)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Thinks independently</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Loves to question</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Thinks critically</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xPeke</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Likes basketball and is about 179 cm tall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Umprikash</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Unique (my way)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuma</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Short year 9 boy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zein</td>
<td>Eve</td>
<td>[Not given by student]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* I spoke to Chatterbox about this self-description as soon as I had read it, and asked if she wished to speak to someone further. Chatterbox did not, and said that she was okay. See Chapter 5 for a further discussion of an immanent relational approach to research ethics.
List of student puppet productions

Puppet productions are listed in order of appearance in this thesis.

Puppet production 1A: “I got sent out.” .............................. 57

Puppet production 2: “Bok.” ......................................... 80 and 180

Puppet production 3: “How does this benefit us in life?” ............... 150

Puppet production 1B: “Hmm. Maybe I could change things a little bit.”

................................................................. 160

Puppet production 4: “We are trying to change” ......................... 206

Note: The transcript for Puppet Production 1 is in two parts (1A and 1B) and Puppet Production 2 appears twice in this thesis.
Preface and note on transcription

*What is lost in transcription is quite simply the body [...] which, in a dialogue, flings toward another body, just as fragile (or frantic) as itself.*

- Roland Barthes

*The Grain of the Voice*

This thesis explores what happened when students *had a voice* in a school reform process. With this preface, I foreground the perplexing processes of transcribing and writing about physical voices, before a more extensive discussion of the concept of *voice* in the body of the thesis.

Each voice has its own distinct aural qualities: textures, timbres, grains (Barthes, 1974; Yancey, 1994). The qualities of a speaking voice can define and segment a person’s identity in relation to others; the pitch, intonation, and cadences of the voice can be associated with gender, class, racial, and sexual categories. But a voice, too, fluctuates in volume, pitch, pace, rhythm, intonation and musicality, morphing and shifting across environmental and social contexts and with the passage of time (Simon, 2009). A voice, and its modulations and uses, can suddenly erupt or sharply retract. A whisper can burst into song; a tremble can become a shout. Voices can murmur, stutter, speak, shout, sing, become muted, or combine with other voices or with technological amplification to form a more powerful voice. Multiple bodies can speak at the same time, or be silent together, or sing with one another, and these interwoven voices may harmonise or be dissonant. Voices mould and are moulded, affect and are affected.

Voices are physical and material, issuing from bodies and felt by bodies. Lines of breath rendered resonant by the vibrations of vocal cords become speech in material and social configurations. Voices respond and intermingle with their sonic
and social environments: pitch levels of speakers may align when speakers are in agreement, or escalate in volume in situations of conflict, or mimic the contours of other voices when power relations are asymmetrical (Roth, 2011). Sometimes, in the moment of speech, something else surges forth that breaks “bodily boundaries” and suggests “the emphatic involvement of guts”: a blush springs to the surface, tears spill out, rage burns up, laughter escapes (Katz, 2000, p. 322). The spoken voice is also inextricably bound up with silence (Mazzei, 2003, 2007). The physicality of a voice can alter the material environment – the force of a cry can enliven an object to vibrate, or combine with other proximate frequencies to compose a soundscape (de Freitas & Curinga, 2015).

Physical voices can speak words that carry meaning to others or confound sense. With a word, a speaker can interpellate – call forth a subject into being: to say, You are... a student, teacher, good, bad, intelligent, ignorant, author, reader. When someone, for example, calls out to a body walking away: hey you – you dropped that piece of rubbish – the body who turns to respond is hailed and becomes a litterbug (Althusser, 1971). Words with meaning (litterbug, for example) can be in dispersed with what Barthes (1974) has called “threads”, and “expletives of thought” (p. 4; his emphasis). These are “scraps of language” like uh, mmm, but, you know, so, I guess, like, yeah, do you know what I mean? These “unassuming” words, to Barthes (1974), are “appeals, modulations – shall I say, thinking of birds: songs? – through which a body seeks another body” (p. 5). These threads also reach out, attempting to call forth and “hook” another body as a listener (p. 5, his emphasis and my emphasis). Silence, too, has “many ‘voices’” that simultaneously stretch forth and retreat (Mendes-Flohr, 2012, p. 15). Spoken words, and silences too, can be nonsensical – defying meaning or intention (MacLure, 2013b).

These physical voices and silences can be recorded by an apparatus – like an audio recorder or video camera. The recording of the voice changes it: the apparatus misses or amplifies certain frequencies of sound, alongside white noise; only a sample of the first utterance is heard in the playback (cf. Barad, 2007). Captured, distorted sound waves are listened to again, transcribed to form typed or handwritten lines on a page. A researcher who desires to morph a spoken voice into textual, transcript format makes decisions about what to render as text and what to omit – whether to transcribe
every word, and what to do with the scraps of language, stammers, silences, and pauses. The transcriber makes a cut, deciding whether or not to use notations or symbols to attempt to represent the volume, intonation or emphasis of a spoken voice. This written script rendering of the spoken voice transmutes its embodied entreaties and the material circumstances of its formation, “embalm[ing]” speech “like a mummy, to preserve it forever,” castrating it from the body and the world (Barthes, 1974, p. 5). The transformation of spoken voice to recorded voice to written voice “extinguish[es]” the song of a body stretched out to another body, rendering it “gauche, flat, ridiculous” (Barthes, 1974, p. 5). Sometimes, words are used in parentheses or brackets before a transcribed utterance to ascribe an emotion to the ambivalent tones of the voice: (sadly) or (hesitantly), or to indicate the presence of other sounds surrounding the utterance: [a door slams] or [laughter] or [points to a sign on the wall]. These added words falteringly suggest but fail to recreate what was happening in a moment of embodied speech – how a body drew towards or retreated from another body; how matter and space shaped and were shaped by speech. The lines of the written or typed parentheses or brackets demarcate words spoken from emotions felt, and the words from the world. This transcribed voice changes the spoken voice, changes its audience, and, in turn, changes its subject, ceasing to coincide with the body and personality of the speaker and her/ his setting.

These mutations of the voice from spoken to written format have rendered it a site of methodological perplexity. Researchers have formulated innovative methods to “elicit” voices, technological apparatuses to “capture” voices and silences, and ethno-methodological tools to analyse the qualities of voices and silences. Quotations ripped from bodies and contexts are understood to stand in for an authentic, if physically absent, autonomous speaker “expressing” himself, and the researcher has traditionally sought to understand what the speaker is intending to say. Even with these escalations of methodological techniques, however, feeling is not arrested or contained (Hage, 2010; Thrift, 2008); emotions are in “motion” (Bruno, 2002); the authentic self and “true feeling” (Berlant, 2011, p. 65) are elusive. It is not easy to draw lines between spoken words and “self,” between “truth” and performance, between spoken words and the world, between thought and feeling, between researcher and researched (Butler, 1990, 1993; Deleuze & Guattari, 1980/ 1987; Derrida, 1976; Foucault, 1970;
Jackson, 2003; Jackson & Mazzei, 2009). Words, feelings, bodies and worlds are on the move.

The ethics of asking another body to give an account of herself or himself (Butler, 2005) and the ethics of representing another are also contested. To ask another to say, definitively, what s/he thinks or feels or believes, or to tell a story from their community to the researcher, has been critiqued as a mode of colonialism – “inquiry as invasion” that appropriates a story for the consumption of others (Tuck & Yang, 2014a, p. 811). Responding to the oppressions of speaking for others (Alcoff, 1991), claiming to “represent” them, researchers have attempted to speak with others and to form collaborative accounts of selves, events and worlds (see Chapters 2 and 5). Even these accounts are not without their own – if modified – relations of power. Yet, to eviscerate research that works with physical voices may also be an ethical failure. To include the quoted voices of others in research texts seems to do something. Transcribed voices in a research text can move – can raise the hairs on the back of one’s neck, or produce a smile, a blush, or tears for readers in configurations distanced from the site of the utterance.

Accordingly, to craft the authorial voice of a researcher – to give an account of what happened and what people said and did during a period of research – is fraught. The authorial voice is a concept used to describe the I that composes and narrates a research text – who may speak for others, or attempt to speak with others. This I cannot know in advance how the reader will read and interpret who this I is and what she is doing. You, dear reader, will be compelled to assess the strength of my authorial presence – whether I have sufficiently given an account of my positionality, my research processes, my analytical choices, and my representation of this school and its students, staff and parents. An authorial voice is meant to have authority and to inscribe her self with textual tactics, and to decide how to form lines between her voice and the voices of others. The authorial voice is privileged in position; the I is hewn in a different temporality to the physical, spoken voice who spoke to her in an interview or focus group. The spoken voice is “dangerous because it is immediate and cannot be taken back,” but in writing, we “censure and delete our blunders, our self-sufficiencies (or our insufficiencies), our errors, our complacencies, sometimes even our breakdowns” (Barthes, 1974, p. 4). The authorial voice can strategically quote
from some great white man like Roland Barthes to grant herself some authority – and to be ironic, since Barthes also declared the author to be dead (1977/ 1984).

With these perplexities foregrounded, Table 1 lists the transcribing conventions used in this thesis. I urge the reader to remember, while reading, the unsettled questions that are raised when the lines of the voice are transmuted into recorded and then written form.

Table 2. Transcribing conventions used in this thesis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>“Hello? Hello? Can you hear me?”</th>
<th>Italicised words with quotation marks are used for transcribed quotations from research participants. Punctuation is added that suggests the speaker’s intonation and pauses.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(.)</td>
<td>Parentheses with a full stop indicate a brief pause – up to half a second.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>Parentheses with a number indicate a longer silence – number of seconds indicated in brackets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(laughs)</td>
<td>Parentheses with italicised words indicate other sounds made by the speaker or other speakers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[other contextual events]</td>
<td>When brackets are used with italicised words, further contextual information is provided about action occurring around the utterance – e.g. movements and gestures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underlined word</td>
<td>Underlined word or syllable indicates a syllable, word or phrase emphasised by the speaker.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Em dash indicates interruption – the speaker interrupting him/herself, or another speaker interrupting the speaker.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=</td>
<td>Equals signs indicate when two utterances overlap.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[word or explanation]</td>
<td>When brackets are used with non-italicised words, I have either changed a word to preserve anonymity, or provided further words to contextualise the content of the utterance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(inaudible)</td>
<td>Parentheses and the italicised inaudible are used when there is murmurings or speech that is not decipherable on the recording.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[…]</td>
<td>Ellipses in brackets indicate that some speech from the transcript has been omitted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A note on apostrophes: Citation styles are for readerly pleasure, consistency and clarity. I do not always adhere to APA conventions. Specifically, when forming possessives for singular words ending in s (like Willis, Habermas, Little Hans, James, and Pythagoras), I choose not to add an additional s. I hope the reader will forgive my privileging of aesthetics over accuracy.
Chapter 1: Sketching contexts, moving questions

This study explores the use of student voice in a school reform process at a comprehensive coeducational public high school in Australia. Between 2010 and 2012, a representative group of approximately twenty students from Year 9 (14-15 years old), and a cross-age group in 2013 (12-17 years old) were positioned each year as co-researchers in a year-long collaborative inquiry into an aspect of teaching and learning. This group was informally called the Steering Committee, although official school documents referred to it as the Students as Co-Researchers or Students as Researchers group (abbreviated to SaRs). Over the four years, a refrain that I heard from students was that the Steering Committee was about “changing the school” and “making it a better place.”

A number of teachers, Head Teachers and Senior Executive teachers were involved with the Steering Committee across these four years. As a teacher at this school, I was part of proposing and then facilitating the Steering Committee group in 2010 and 2011. Ms Frazzle, a full time Human Society and its Environment (HSIE) teacher employed on a temporary contract, was the teacher-facilitator from October 2011 until the end of 2013. An academic partner with expertise in participatory research with children and young people worked as a consultant to the school throughout the life of the group.

In February 2013, after a year and four months away from the school, I returned as a researcher, on leave without pay from my permanent teaching position. Between February 2013 and February 2014, I visited the school between 2-5 days a week, for 2-8 hours each day, engaging in interviews, focus groups, participant observations and collaborative analyses with students previously and currently in the Steering Committee, and with other students, teachers and parents. I was interested in how, over time, students, teachers and parents made meaning of these experiences of student voice.

My ethnographic fieldnotes detail informal and formal conversations with over 200 students, staff and parents, not including others who also participated as part
of the acoustic textures, murmurs and tremors of the school. A total number of 100
students, staff members and parents were involved in 68 formal interviews and focus
groups that were formalised through the signing of consent forms. The shortest
recorded interview was twenty minutes, and the longest recorded focus group was two
hours. I recorded a total of 57 hours of audio recordings from formal interviews and
focus groups, and wrote approximately 700 000 words of fieldnotes and transcriptions
from interviews, focus groups and participant observations. At the end of the
transcription process, I printed off fieldnotes, transcripts, and other analytic memos,
filling six A4 binders. In addition, students and I took over 400 photographs, and
recorded over twenty hours of video footage from focus groups, collaborative analysis
days and Steering Committee meetings. I also collected artefacts from Steering
Committee meetings (e.g. post-it notes, butcher’s paper, Word documents,
PowerPoint presentations, emails), and school processes and activities (e.g. welfare
and disciplinary referral proformas, policies, surveys, reports, meeting minutes,
newsletters).

During this year of research at the school and afterwards, I attended to what
people said in words about the Steering Committee and student voice. I was unnerved
by the dissonances between the accounts of differently positioned bodies – a
“cacophony of competing voices” (Reay, 2006, p. 179) speaking about how this
reform strategy felt in its enactment (Ball, Maguire, & Braun, 2012). Yet, there
seemed to be much slipping through and in excess of the boundaries between speech
and silence, thought and feeling, words and world, past and present.

To introduce the perplexities and contexts that propelled this research, I start
in the middle, with a drawing produced during my first focus group with a group of
students. I then juxtapose this drawing with extracts from dissonant spoken accounts
of the event that it sketches.
A sketch drawing and dissonant voices

In 2013, Madhuri, a Year 10 student formerly in the Steering Committee, created the rough drawing above in a focus group (see Figure 1 and List of pseudonyms and student self-descriptions). In this focus group, three students and I talked about and then created texts surrounding their memories of the Steering Committee. Madhuri sketched what she articulated as “confusion” felt by a group of Year 9 students when they presented their research findings at an after-school staff meeting:

Madhuri: This is my perspective of the staff presentation that we [the Steering Committee] did. It’s not neat, because I was trying to make it messy. This is all the um confusion we were feeling that day. [...] Do you get it? And there’s question marks because they’re representing anxiousness and nervous – that’s what we were feeling. And some people – although some people were confident, the majority were like, “oh my god, what are the teachers going to think?” And the teachers, some teachers were shocked – you can see the expression on their face (.). And you could see that – look at the teachers. They’re like so big and we’re like little, we’re just thinking, “oh my god.” And we’re placed in the spotlight. And we’re just like, “okay then.”

Eve: Is this yellow the spotlight?
Madhuri: Yellow is just like—we’re here like. We were placed here, sitting here and then some of them were on that side. [...] We’re just like that picture [points to the sketch drawing]—we’re really anxious and nervous. [Year 10 focus group]

This staff presentation that Madhuri sketched was one of three staff research presentations made by the Steering Committee between 2010 and 2013 that I had been part of as a teacher-facilitator. As Madhuri drew and spoke about students’ “confus[ion],” “anxiousness,” and “nervous[ness]” when students were “placed in the spotlight,” a well in my stomach opened again and churned. In this focus group configuration in a side room of the school library, amongst the lines on the A4 paper, the coloured marker fumes, the cadences of Madhuri’s voice, the attentive listening of the other two students, memories of another collective event were enlivened and reconfigured. I recalled a time, towards the end of 2010, when students stood up in front of staff and shared their research about The School I’d Like. I had organised this research presentation event. As students spoke, there seemed to be a thick charge in the air. I had not anticipated the disequilibrium that was felt and that circulated afterwards.

In 2013, during the research that this thesis reconfigures, some teachers gave accounts to me of the emotional registers of these past student research presentation events. A member of the Senior Executive said that she had felt “goosebumps,” felt “an evolution.” For other teachers and Head Teachers, the students’ presentations had “triggered” a response of “oh, yes, yes’” and of “oh yeah that’s really good’”; it “open[ed] my eyes,” “made me sit up,” that it was “enlightening” and “beautiful.” But others spoke about “the mood” in the room, of other “teachers getting their back up.” A number of teachers gave an account of the responses of those sitting around them: “it’s hard to form your own opinion when they are sitting next to you and they’re going [deep pitched murmuring].” One teacher said that the meeting was “burned into my brain”—pumping her palms rhythmically at the sides of her skull and turning her skull from left to right. Others described “eye rolling” around them, and responses during the meeting and afterwards: “’uh how can they [students] expect us to change when they don’t listen to us and they’re disrespectful?’”
What was happening in these earlier student research presentation events was explained in various ways. One teacher explained that students did “not understand” the complexities of the teaching and learning that they researched: “there’s a lot of holes in their perspectives, because they are young, and we are all subjective, and their understanding of our world – we can’t expect them to understand.” Another wondered if students had been “empowered too much” and it had “gone to their heads.” Another cited the aphorism: “‘a little bit of knowledge is a dangerous thing,’” because the students “got a taste of something, but they didn’t fully comprehend it.”

Yet, there was not consensus among teachers about the effects and affects of the students’ work. One teacher stressed that the students’ work was important for the school: “How else were we to know how [the students] were feeling? It had to come from them.” Another wondered aloud about the roots of some of the more critical responses: “what’s happening in that teacher’s classroom that they can’t see the forest for the trees?” One teacher interpreted some of these responses as “apprehension about the implications of having the kids jump in and have a bit more of a say.” Another teacher said that, “portions of the [teachers’] criticisms were unfounded” and from a “subjective perspective.” Another questioned: “are the teachers taking into account what’s being said by the kids?”

In an interview with Ms Frazzle, she described the “message” that the students communicated in this first staff presentation in 2010 as “abrupt.” At the time, she had been a teacher in the staff common room listening to the students’ research presentation.

**Ms Frazzle:** I did feel (.) – and I don’t have conclusive evidence – but I did feel that it was quite (.) abrupt, um (.) an abrupt message. Um, and not because it was communicated abruptly but because it wasn’t experienced before. (.)

**Eve:** Yeah. That’s interesting.

**Ms Frazzle:** Yeah, and so I just kind of went, “oah! Even though I’m not particularly insulted, or not particularly um upset about what had been said, I don’t agree with this notion of, “you [teachers] need to give us [students] respect before you get respect” – I don’t agree with that” um but uh (.) at the same time I know that, I think
a lot of people did go, “this is just (.) – we’ll just entertain it because it won’t last, or this is not what teaching is about.”

Eve: Yeah. That’s – I find it interesting the way you describe it as “abrupt,” not in the way that they presented it but because it was a new idea. The abrupt idea. It was like a rupture in -

Ms Frazzle: It was a rupture. It was a rupture. It definitely burst a bubble. (.) No it did – it burst probably a lot of people’s bubbles. You know?

Eve: What bubble – what was the bubble?

Ms Frazzle: The bubble of what a teacher is and what the teaching space is and what education is about. And it did. It definitely burst it.

This staff presentation event, from these accounts, seemed to rip a tear in the fabric of school life, from uncertain causes and with unforeseen effects and affects. Something happened the first time that students stood up in an after-school staff meeting to report how students felt about school, teaching and learning. But what was it that had happened?

What happened?

This study was generated in and through the ambivalent affective intensities surrounding a student voice initiative, and concomitant questions about what happened and what was felt. Across research encounters with students, staff and parents, spoken accounts were formed about these events. Words like respect, understanding, responsibility and change shifted in meaning and use across speakers, times and territories, like a lullaby’s refrain sung with slightly different melodies and words in different neighbourhoods. Around these words, the “mood” of these past and present events confounded categorisation. It was unclear why it was that these configurations of students’ and teachers’ bodies were so disorienting, and how particular intensities came to be later articulated in language in particular terms.

Emotion has been flagged as a challenge throughout the student voice literature, but the status of the emotion (“confusion” or “apprehension,” for example) is often taken as self-evident, ascribed to a speaker or listener. Previous studies of student voice have worked with particular assumptions about the phenomenological
voice and power relations, even as recent re-conceptualisations of voice have incorporated tactile, embodied, visual and spatial modes of communication and poststructural approaches to power/knowledge relations (see Chapter 2). The tone of some analyses of student voice work teeters, at times, towards celebratory optimism about what student voice can do, while at other times, analyses evoke a suspicious pessimism. While previous studies have constructed thick descriptions of students’ and teachers’ accounts of participatory experiences (e.g. Hampshire et al., 2012; Hill, 2006; Morgan, 2009; Rudduck & McIntyre, 2007), these ambivalent feelings between bodies in schools have been less explored, particularly in their relation to lived power relations.

This study builds on previous insights from discursive analyses of power/knowledge relations in student voice work, threading these insights together with analyses of the ambivalent feelings associated with student voice. Attempting to shift the focus from atomised individuals who speak and who listen, to the blurred boundaries between bodies in and beyond schools, I needed an analytical approach that would decentre the speaking subject and move with these ambivalent feelings. In order to explore the consequences of feeling in student voice and schools for the formation of schooled subjectivities and relations, I needed to analyse modes of being and relating (ontology) alongside relations of knowledge (epistemology). This is to explore the ontological status of voice alongside considerations of who is positioned as knowledgeable about schooling.

Initially attempting to explore accounts of student voice over time, I came to additionally be concerned with what voice does and how and how voice works discursively, affectively and materially. By voice, I refer simultaneously to the physical voice that forms and is formed by human bodies, and to a political concept that drives a popularised education movement, and to its methodological and textual manifestations. When I italicise the word voice, I refer to it as a concept (see below). When the word voice is left unitalicised, I refer to its heterogeneous physical manifestations, encompassing utterances and embodied and silent dimensions of communication. The term student voice refers to an educational movement that I introduce further below.
This study considers the intensities and politics of voice in schools, responding to calls for “new and productive ways to theorise” student voice (Robinson & Taylor, 2007, p. 15), while simultaneously rethinking the boundaries between theory and praxis, student and teacher, and voices, bodies, texts and worlds. This study also responds to calls for further analysis of “the emotional aspects of various critical pedagogies” (Zembylas, 2007, p. xiv): specifically, the felt dimensions of student voice in school reform. In attempting to re-think feeling and to feel differently about the events that happened at this school, I have sought not to justify or critique what happened, but rather to find “a different way of feeling: another sensibility” (Deleuze, 1962/1983, p. 198).

In my attempts to explore the imbrication of voice and feeling, words and world, and the force of feeling in motion – the voices of the philosopher Gilles Deleuze and the activist and psychoanalyst Félix Guattari became other interlocutors. I have thought with (Jackson & Mazzei, 2012) Deleuze and Guattari’s concepts in my own re-thinking and experimentation with student voice in school reform. Deleuze and Guattari are associated with French poststructuralism, even as they simultaneously draw on, break from, and re-fashion core Marxist and psychoanalytic concepts (see Chapter 4). Poststructural is a flexible term used to denote a diverse body of work in continental philosophy and critical theory written in response to structuralism and phenomenology, although many of the theorists associated with poststructuralism rejected this label (Poster, 1989, pp. 5-6). Indeed, Guattari (1989/2013) resisted both the “contorted refusal” of “preaching the rehabilitation of ruined transcendental values” as well as the “cynical acceptance” of “giving in to the disillusioned delights” associated with poststructuralism (p. 1). Deleuze and Guattari’s individual and collaborative work affirms the capacity to engender change not only through corporeal forms of action, but also through “rethinking the social issues one is hoping to change” (Hickey-Moody & Malins, 2007, p. 1). Their work is concerned with the conditions of thinking and creating new people, relations and worlds.

My perplexed question, “What happened?” is a question that Deleuze and Guattari also asked in relation to the novella – a text not unlike the research text (see Chapter 5). For Deleuze and Guattari, the novella is organised around the questions:
“‘What happened? […] Whatever could have happened for things to have come to this?’” (1980/ 1987, pp. 192, 194, their emphasis). In the novella, and in this study, something happened, but what has happened is “unknowable and imperceptible”; “something” that may be “nothing,” but may also change everything (Deleuze & Guattari, 1980/ 1987, p. 193).

Before I elaborate on the utility of Deleuze and Guattari’s mode of thought for exploring what happened here, however, further contextualisation is needed of the student voice movement, this school, and how it came to be that student voice was adopted as a school reform strategy. This first chapter introduces these variegated contexts and the questions that emerged during this study. I begin with the historical context for the educational movement called student voice, and the political voice of young people beyond educational institutions. I then discuss the political context that funded this school’s experimentation with student voice. The school and the work of the student voice group between 2010 and 2013 are further detailed, before introducing the research questions that drive this thesis. In all its fluctuations and digressions, this thesis pivots on analyses of feeling in and beyond school: feeling that forms connections, wants to affect and to be affected, and hopes for things to be otherwise.

**Sketching contexts**

In constructing an account of the historical, political, school, and methodological contexts that were entangled with this study of voice in school reform, I draw lines of a sketch map that is not the “real” territories where voice moved and is moving. Territories, as I explain in future chapters, can be historical, political, physical, intellectual, linguistic, and existential (Deleuze & Guattari, 1994/ 2009, p. 68). Territories are in constant processes of composition and decomposition. Historical contexts – or territories – shift in their tellings and retellings, and from the angle from which they are constructed. Political contexts – territories – move according to positions and relations of power, shifting the ground that is stood on and the name for this ground. School contexts – or territories – fluctuate and change as bodies, relations, structures, texts, materials, environments, and the atmosphere ebb and flow.
Approaching these contexts methodologically thus requires an approach that can travel with these movements.

My account of these contexts does not trace the territories where voice has been – as if these territories can be pinned down, and as if the concept of voice can be affixed to them (Deleuze & Guattari, 1980/1987, p. 12). A tracing of these historical, political and physical territories would attempt to discover and represent their deep essential, stable, universal components, drawing an accurate, life-like copy of periods of time, events, intentions, and places. My account of these territories is, instead, akin to a sketch map in the sand. Sketching a map of histories, politics and physical territories that are constantly shifting, I work with “lines of movement”, making “no claim to represent a certain territory” (Ingold, 2007, p. 84). A sketch map is “open and connectable,” “detachable, reversible, susceptible to constant modification” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1980/1987, pp. 12-13). This sketch mapping of the territories where voice moved has multiple dimensions: historical, political and geographic. Below, I draw links that intersect territories, people and times where I have not lived with territories, people and times where I have lived, moved, taught and learned.

The historical context of student voice

Student voice is an educational movement that has emerged in a “new wave” in the past twenty years (Fielding, 2004a). Contemporary student voice work can be connected to historical examples and prefigurative practices of “radical education” (Fielding & Moss, 2011) – as “roots.” I sketch a history of diverse educators and schools that repositioned students and teachers in democratic relations of reciprocity. They are linked by their engagement in a “radical collegiality” and “utopian realism,” working in the “here-and-now towards profound social and political change” (Fielding, 1999a; Fielding & Moss, 2011, p. 148).

For example, Summerhill School in the UK, led by A.S. Neill, was known for its participatory General Meetings of students and teachers (Neill & Fromm, 1960/1977). The state school St George-in-the-East in the working class area of Stepney, led by Alex Bloom, similarly worked to supplant the “[f]ear of authority” and “fear of punishment” with a spirit of “friendship, security and the recognition of each child’s
worth” (Bloom, 1952, pp. 135-136; see Fielding, 2005). In Northern Italy, the preschool movement of Reggio Emilia, first led by Loris Malaguzzi, has been thoroughly researched as an example of early years education committed to a pedagogy of listening to “the hundred languages of children” (C. Edwards, Gandini, & Forman, 1998; Rinaldi, 2006). In Lawrence Kohlberg’s “Just Community Approach” in North America, students “experimentally […] ma[de] the school themselves” for the cultivation of a more just and compassionate society (Kohlberg, 1980, p. 35; see Zizek, Garz, & Nowak, 2015). In Australia, alternative schools like Lynall Hall Community School in Brunswick, Victoria have “regarded shared decision-making as essential” to their philosophy of lived democracy (Holdsworth, 1982, p. 16). Beyond examples from the global north (Connell, 2007; Smith, 2012), present student voice practices are thoroughly indebted to the work of Paolo Freire in Brazil and beyond, as I discuss in Chapter 2.

I also connect contemporary student voice work to a history of social movements outside of educational structures, organised by and involving young people. While this is not a thesis about new social movements, a line can be sketched between these movements and a broader definition of student voice as “any expression of any student, anywhere, anytime about anything related to learning, school or the educational experience” (Fletcher, 2015, para. 1). The Penguins’ Revolution in Chile (2006-2010) is a notable recent example of student protests against educational inequities (Chovanec & Benitez, 2008; J. Williams, 2015). Young people also organised and participated in campaigning for political and economic change in the Occupy movement, a self-described social movement of the 99 per cent that followed the global financial crisis in 2008/9 (Giroux, 2013; Reimer, 2012). Other recent political movements involving young people have included the Umbrella Revolution in Hong Kong, the Arab Spring in Egypt and Tunisia, as well as involvement in far right parties including, for example, Golden Dawn in Greece (e.g. see Ali & Macharia, 2013; Koronaiou, Lagos, Sakellariou, Kymionis, & Chiotaki-Poulou, 2015).

These recent movements, and other modes of online political participation, political consumerism, lifestyle politics and symbolic action have challenged sociological boundaries and categories of “politics,” “resistance,” and “democracy”
(see Banaji, 2008; Brooks & Hodkinson, 2008; Marsh, O'Toole, & Jones, 2007; Pilkington & Pollock, 2015; Portwood-Stacer, 2013). Connected, perhaps, to these manifestations of political feeling, the physical movement of young bodies across national borders to join political and “religious” causes has generated local and global concern. To be young and “radical,” in some contexts, has become synonymous with being “at risk” (Coppock & McGovern, 2014; Kundnani, 2012; Youdell, 2011). Surrounding these social, political and physical movements, there have been debates about the limits of critique, lawful and unlawful expressions of political dissent, and the emotional dimensions of critique. In later chapters, I extend these sociological debates and re-conceptualisations of the political sphere, political feeling and resistance to analyses of student voice in schools (see Chapters 3, 9 and 10).

To return to schools, over the last 25 years, across educational jurisdictions, adults have advocated for student voice in schools. In the 1990s, following the ratification of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (United Nations, 1989, see Chapter 2), a wave of researchers and practitioners advocated for greater institutional respect and recognition of the rights and standpoint knowledge of children and young people. Early advocates were located in the UK (Fielding, 1999a; Rudduck, 1999; Rudduck, Chaplain, & Wallace, 1996), North America (K. Cushman, 2003; Fullan, 1991; Kozul, 1992; Shor, 1996) and Australia (Groundwater-Smith & Downes, 1999; Holdsworth, 2000). However, student voice practice and research has also been advocated and reported beyond English-speaking countries and Western ways of knowing, in China (Cheng, 2012), Chile (Prieto, 2001), Brazil (De Carvalho, 2012), Kenya, Tanzania and South Africa (C. McLaughlin & Kiragu, 2012), Lebanon (Bahou, 2012), United Arab Emirates (Dickson, 2013), Spain (Pomar & Pinya, 2015), Italy (Grion & Cook-Sather, 2013), Greece (Mitsoni, 2006), and Sweden (Bergmark & Kostenius, 2009). Student voice, in these various territories, has been variously termed “student participation” (e.g. Holdsworth, 2000), “pupil participation” (e.g. Hulme, McKinney, Hall, & Cross, 2011), “pupil voice” (e.g. Macbeath, Demetriou, Rudduck, & Myers, 2003), “students as researchers” and “students as co-researchers” (e.g. Atweh & Bland, 2004).

Advocates for student voice are concerned about students’ exclusion from reform processes, as the “consequential stakeholders” (Kriewaldt, 2015, p. 94) whom
schools are “ostensibly designed to serve” (Cook-Sather, 2002, p. 3). Lines of connection are drawn between contemporary student voice practices and historical women’s, workers’, civil rights, (dis)ability and queer movements, as similarly arising in reaction to marginalisation from decision-making processes and as seeking “a more just and equal society” (P. Thomson, 2011, p. 21). Student participation in reform processes is argued to foster dialogue between students and teachers, to forge lived experiences of empowering democratic relations, and to distribute leadership within schools (Brasof, 2015). Such inclusion is argued to be “the missing link” in “school transformation” (Beattie, 2012, p. 158). Before I further discuss the rationales for student voice in school reform and their critiques in Chapter 2, however, I outline and intersect another territory: the Australian political context where an “Education Revolution” was declared. Within this context, the language of stakeholders, democracy and participation also came to be employed.

The political context of an “Education Revolution”

That schooling does not serve all groups of students equitably, and that schooling must become otherwise is a repeated refrain in educational research, sung differently across political and theoretical territories. To narrow the focus to Australia, for decades, educational researchers working from critical theoretical orientations have argued that differential experiences of pedagogical relationships, access to culturally valued curricular knowledge, and the distribution of resources between schools have profound consequences for what students can do and who they can be and become (Connell, 2009; Connell, Ashenden, Kessler, & Dowsett, 1982; Hayes, Mills, Christie, & Lingard, 2006; Smyth, Hattam, & Lawson, 1998; P. Thomson, 2002; see Chapter 3). In the period immediately prior to this research, Richard Teese (2006) argued that “the quality of a school system” is to be evaluated by the “experience” of those facing the greatest challenges within it (p. 121). Teese persuasively argued a case for schools serving socio-economically disadvantaged communities, where “the fundamental question of a child’s relationship to learning in a social environment is posed in its most acute form”, to experiment with “innovations that get to the root of the teaching relationship” for the purpose of “system-wide change in the fundamental qualities of teaching and learning” (2006, pp. 158-159).
In 2008, the (then) Prime Minister, Kevin Rudd and Deputy Prime Minister, Julia Gillard declared an “Education Revolution” (2008): the need to “fundamentally transform the way schooling takes place” (p. 29). This statement ostensibly echoes Teese’s exhortation for innovation and change and student voice advocates’ calls for transformation in educational reform processes. The cornerstone policy document of this Education Revolution, *Quality Education: The Case for an Education Revolution in Our Schools* (2008), highlighted Australia’s “too long a ‘tail’ of underperformance linked to disadvantage” concentrated amongst students from low socio-economic status (SES) families and Indigenous students (p. 16). Rudd and Gillard’s Foreword (2008) to this policy document set out the purposes of education for this period in Australian history:

> Education not only drives productivity but also empowers individuals to reach their full potential, and helps overcome disadvantage.

> Beyond economic growth, education creates social benefits that help build social capital. Societies with a strong commitment to education enjoy higher levels of civic participation, greater social cohesion, lower levels of crime and disadvantage, and a more trusting, equitable and just society. (p. 5)

Lines of connection are rhetorically drawn and interwoven in this Foreword between “productivity” and “empowerment,” and “a strong commitment to education” and “a more trusting, equitable and just society.” Hattam, Prosser and Brady (2009) wondered at the time whether “such a revolution will involve the urgent need for pedagogical innovation” (p. 160) that had been recommended by educational researchers for decades.

The Commonwealth and NSW Governments signed three Smarter Schools National Partnership agreements in November 2008: *Improving Teacher Quality, Literacy and Numeracy, and Low Socio-economic (SES) School Communities* (Council of Australian Governments [COAG], Dec 2008). The National Partnership for Low Socio-economic (SES) School Communities agreement, which funded the reform strategies employed at the school discussed in this thesis, aimed to:

- Transform the way that schooling takes place in participating schools and address the complex and interconnected challenges facing students in disadvantaged communities, and
• Improve student engagement, educational outcomes and wellbeing in participating schools and make inroads into entrenched disadvantage. (Australian Government [DEEWR], National Partnership for Smarter Schools, & NSW Department of Education and Communities, 2012, p. 5)

The National Partnerships reform documents advocated partnerships between schools and communities and the “participation of and consultation with key stakeholders” including staff, students, parents and community groups (Australian Government [DEEWR] et al., 2012, p. 8; cf. Ministerial Council on Education Employment Training and Youth Affairs [MCEETYA], 2008, pp. 4-5). Across these reform documents, the language of transformation, participation, engagement and democracy resonate with the language of earlier democratic educators, student voice advocates and education researchers.

Partnerships and transformations were not only called for, forged and felt in Australia, and in the particular National Partnership enacted in this school, however, but were connected with global movements of education “reforms.” The Australian Education Revolution, along with the National Partnerships funding, inaugurated a “national schooling policy ensemble” (Lingard, 2010) that included the introduction of National Assessment Program for Literacy and Numeracy (NAPLAN) testing (2008), the creation of the My School website displaying data about individual schools’ performance in NAPLAN (2010), and the development of an Australian national curriculum from 2008 (see Lingard, Thompson, & Sellar, 2015; Scanlon, 2015). These reform strategies were not unique or isolated to Australia. Critical policy scholars have mapped the lines of global “flows,” “networks” and “borrowing” of education reform policies, discourses, strategies, resources and measurement instruments across porous national borders (e.g. Ball, 2016; Exley, Braun, & Ball, 2011; Lingard, 2010; Rivzi & Lingard, 2010; Steiner-Khamsi & Waldow, 2012).

These trends in educational policy reform strategies, discussed further in Chapters 2, 3, 8 and 9, are mobile, malleable and mutable.

During the same period as these reforms were enacted in Australia, the Gonski Review of Funding for Schooling (2011) produced evidence “that some parts of the schooling system are becoming increasingly stratified according to socio-economic status” (p. 111), and that “concentrations of disadvantage at the school level
accentuate underperformance” (p. 124). The Gonski Review’s call for changes to funding arrangements alongside a focus on high expectations, innovative school cultures, quality teaching and community connections (p. xix) was politically contested throughout the period of this research. While reform, participation, and equity were prominent terms in educational policies during this period, the methods through which reform and equity were to be pursued were by no means settled.

**The school context**

The school discussed in this thesis is a point in my sketch map of these interconnected local and global networks, connected inextricably to these historical and political territories by imperceptible threads. I view schools as open territories connected to other territories from all directions, in constant movement (Deleuze & Guattari, 1983, p. 96). The territory of this school has changed since the period of ethnographic fieldwork. Bodies have come and gone; matter has moved and shifted; affects have circulated, stuck and come unstuck; other texts have been composed in and about it; other territories beyond its ostensible gates have plugged into and unplugged from it. The school changed even during the period of fieldwork, in continual motion – like a kaleidoscope turning. Below, I give an account of some of this school’s demographics at a particular point in time.

This school is a comprehensive, co-educational public high school in the suburbs of a large metropolitan Australian city. In 2013, the year of my ethnographic fieldwork, approximately 586 students were enrolled, with 86% of students from a Language Background Other than English (LBOTE) and “an ever increasing refugee population” (Annual School Report, 2013, p. 1). The school is described in the 2013 Annual School Report as “a community that believes quality education is the result of a reciprocal partnership between staff, students and family” and that “takes pride in providing an inclusive learning environment for its multicultural student base” (p. 1). In 2013, the ratio of male to female enrolments was 3:1. The school was reported in the 2013 Annual School Report to be allocated 54.9 staff members, including 43.9 teachers, 8 Head Teachers, 12.5 Administrative and Support Staff, one school counselor, two Deputy Principals (with an additional Deputy Principal funded through the National Partnership for Low Socio-economic Schools funding) and one Principal.
In this study, I invited students to choose their own pseudonyms and self-descriptions (see List of Student pseudonyms and self-descriptions and Chapter 5). Pseudonyms are not used for staff members, except for the facilitating teacher of the student voice group, Ms Frazzle (a pseudonym that she chose). Staff members are identified by role status (School Liaison Support Officer, Teacher, Head Teacher). The term Senior Executive teacher is used for both Deputy Principals and the Principal to preserve anonymity. I have not given a pseudonym to the school.

The year of fieldwork was a period of significant transition in NSW school funding arrangements. The school was in the final year of four years of additional funding granted through the National Partnership for Low Socio-economic Schools program (2010-2013). According to a Senior Executive teacher, the school was allocated “$1 000 per student above what [a school would] normally get to run” each year through this National Partnership (interview). The school also began receiving funding in 2013 from the Improving Literacy and Numeracy National Partnership. This Partnership was described as aiming: “to improve the performance of students who are falling behind in literacy and/or numeracy” through “the effective use of evidence-based approaches in participating schools to lift the performance of these students” (Australian Government & NSW Department of Education and Communities, 2013, para. 1). As a school previously funded under the Priority Schools Program, 2013 was also a year of change. The Priority Schools Program had allocated additional funds, staffing supplementations and consultancy support to schools “serving the highest densities of low socio-economic status families in New South Wales” (NSW Department of Education and Communities, 2009, para. 1). In 2013, all NSW schools were transitioning to a devolved Resource Allocation Model (RAM) under the NSW Government’s “Local Schools, Local Decisions” policy (NSW Department of Education and Communities, 2011). Under this policy, principals, teachers and school communities were to be “giv[en] greater control over school decision making,” accompanied by increased accountability for the management and use of resources (p. 3). In 2013, schools formerly funded as Priority Action Schools received Transitional Equity Funding to assist with this shift to the Resource Allocation Model (RAM) (Parliament of NSW, 2012).
At the same time as I attempted to enable students, teachers and the school to give their own accounts and descriptions of themselves, the previous paragraph’s account of the funding received by the school has simultaneously hailed the school as low socio-economic, creating a context and shaping your reading of the events narrated in this thesis (Ball et al., 2012). Schools in communities facing challenging circumstances can be and have been described in terms other than this blanket descriptor allows: for example, as “communities of promise” (Heath, Mangiola, Schecter, & Hull, 1991). To describe a school as low socio-economic homogenises a community, muting how individuals within a community are differentially disadvantaged across a range of intersectional axes, including socio-economic status, English language proficiency, Indigeneity, and disability, as well as other marginalisations associated with gender, sexuality, and religion. To describe a school community as low socio-economic strips and de-politicises the historical, socio-economic and political circumstances, policies and practices through which certain communities experienced disadvantage more acutely, while other settings and groups enjoy privilege and sustain and enhance their children’s advantages. These circumstances, policies and practices will be discussed further in Chapters 3 and 10.

In the following section, I introduce a particular reform strategy funded through the National Partnerships for Low Socio-economic Schools program: a student voice initiative. The purpose of this introduction is not to exhaustively describe the activities of the group; these have been detailed elsewhere (Groundwater-Smith, Mayes, & Arya-Pinatyh, 2014; Mayes, 2013a; Mayes, Davis, et al., 2013; Mayes & Groundwater-Smith, 2010, 2011, 2013; Mockler & Groundwater-Smith, 2015a, pp. 53-68) and are summarised in Appendix A. Rather, this overview of the Steering Committee’s work contextualises the events discussed in this thesis.

**A student voice initiative: “The Steering Committee”**

The Steering Committee included students from across classes, friendship groups, perceived ability groupings and cultural backgrounds. While in the first year, teachers approached students to assemble a full cohort (of 20 to 25), the numbers of students
who expressed interest in becoming part of the group increased each year. By 2013, students from the 2012 Steering Committee interviewed and selected the 2013 group, and received over 100 applications. Membership in the group remained optional; some students opted out of the group after a few meetings and during the year.

Each year of the National Partnership for Low Socio-economic Schools reform funding, the Steering Committee engaged in a focused research inquiry: The School I’d Like (2010), The Teachers I’d Like (2011), The Learner I’d Like to be (2012), and What I’d Like to Learn (2013). These broad topics were initially suggested in 2010 by the academic partner, and were re-visited each year in discussions with the Senior Executive, the facilitating teachers of the group, and the students. Throughout each year, students and facilitating teachers negotiated the inquiry’s trajectory (see Mayes & Groundwater-Smith, 2010, 2011, 2013; Groundwater-Smith, Mayes & Arya-Pinatih, 2015; Mayes et al 2013). At the beginning of each year, students in the Steering Committee engaged in a series of workshops about research methods and ethical principles, organised by the facilitating teachers and the academic partner. In 2011, 2012 and 2013, students from the immediately previous Steering Committee facilitated some of these research induction activities. These workshops also offered an environment where students could articulate and collaboratively explore their experiences of school, teaching, learning and curriculum. Students became familiar with qualitative methods including interviews, focus groups and ethnographic participant observation, the development and analysis of surveys based on qualitative data, and visual and embodied methods. Students appraised these research methods and, over the year, generated their own research questions. They also experimented with different research roles: interviewer, focus group facilitator, photographer/ videographer, observational scribe, data analyst, and writers and presenters of research. Research findings were produced each year – about the school students would like (2010), the qualities of effective teachers (2011), the qualities of effective learners (2012), and how students and teachers might collaborate in curriculum change (2013). Their research was presented within the school, as well as, at different stages, at other schools and in other settings (see Mayes, Davis, et al., 2013). The extent to which their recommendations were attended to will be explored in this thesis. In Appendix A, I summarise the work of the
Steering Committee each year of the reform period, and the students’ research findings.

**What can voice(s) do?**

Having sketched a map of these historical, political and geographical territories, this section outlines my research approach and questions. Imbricated in this student voice work, driven by perturbations felt in contact with immanent intensities of voice, I crafted an approach that enabled connections to be made between theory and praxis, ethnographic and participatory methods, inside and outside, and between the book, the author and the world. Michael Fielding (2001), a key figure in the student voice movement, advocates a “transformative ‘transversal’ approach” to work and research that seeks to reconfigure student/teacher relationships (p. 124). Deleuze and Guattari’s work has offered conceptual tools to think and enact such a transversal approach.

Deleuze and Guattari’s engagements in simultaneous theory and praxis suggest the utility of their concepts for re-thinking and re-working student voice in school reform. In Guattari’s political activism and his clinical practice at the La Borde clinic, he enacted a re-thinking of the psychoanalytic conception of desire and of institutional power relations (see Dosse, 2007/2010; Genosko, 2002; Genosko, 2003). In “transversal” relations at La Borde (in experiments like a patient becoming “cook for a day”), traditional patient and clinician hierarchies were interrupted, refashioned, but also “productively inhabit[ed]” (Ringrose, 2015, p. 399; Walkerdine, 2013). Deleuze and his student Claire Parnet similarly scrambled conventional teacher/student and interviewer/interviewee relationships (Albrecht-Crane, 2005; Stivale, 2003) in their collaborative text Dialogues (2006/1977) and their co-construction of the documentary text L’Abecedaire (Boutang, 1996), where Parnet, the student, interviews Deleuze, her supervisor. Deleuze and Guattari’s concepts enable examination of how “common sense” understandings, relations, institutions and the social order are constituted, and experimentations with creating new concepts and modes of existence. Their questioning of prevailing binaries and common sense thought make their work of particular interest to those working to re-configure
student/teacher relations in schools. Their cautious approach to claims of emancipation also offers tools for nuanced analyses of student voice work. I do not seek to think and do what Deleuze and Guattari thought and did, which was thought and done in a context that has passed. Instead, I read their texts “as philosophical detective novels”, experimenting with the utility of their concepts for “local situations” (Lawlor & Wiame, 2016, p. 2). I appropriate their concepts in working with present educational perturbations. I argue that Deleuze and Guattari’s concepts, in combination with concepts created alongside students, staff and parents, potentialise new ways of thinking and working with voice in schools and research.

The research question *What can voice(s) do?* is concerned with the capacity of voice to affect and to be affected: physically, conceptually, methodologically and textually. This question moves away from questions of what a voice is or what students’ voices mean: how to define, delimit or interpret students’ voices. The focus, instead, is on the effects and affects of voice.

This question, *What can voice(s) do?* is a modification of another question asked by Deleuze and Guattari. Their question, too, is an appropriation of a question asked by the seventeenth century philosopher, Baruch Spinoza: “What can a body do?” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1980/1987, p. 256). The word body encompasses human and non-human entities: living beings, emotional intensities, thought, voice and matter (Deleuze, 1992b, p. 256). I do not consider human bodies to have a monopoly on voice; I explore how human voices are formed in relation to historical, material, textual and affective elements beyond human subjects. Deleuze and Guattari’s question can be understood in relation to another question that they ask: “Of what affects is a body capable?” (p. 257). I replace their word “body” with “voice” to foreground my interests:

> We know nothing about a [voice] until we know what it can do, in other words, what its affects are, how they can or cannot enter into composition with other affects, with the affects of another [voice], either to destroy that [voice] or to be destroyed by it, either to exchange actions and passions with it or to join with it in composing a more powerful [voice]. (Deleuze & Guattari, 1980/1987, p. 257)

Asking the question, *What can voice(s) do?*, I explore the relations between voice and affect, and the conditions that enable the capacity of a body to speak and to act. My
concern is primarily with human bodies in school territories, and their relations with affects, discourses, signs, materials, and spaces. This question opens up a range of conceptual, empirical, methodological and authorial explorations of voice. Below, I introduce four variations enfolded within this broader question. As I outline these questions, I introduce key concepts that inform this study: affect, assemblage and lines, desire, concept creation, common sense, and the minor. I also introduce how these questions and concepts shaped what was done during my time in the territory of this school.

**What can [the felt force of] voice do?**

This first variation of the question, *What can voice(s) do?* examines the pragmatic consequences of the physical voice: what words do to bodies, relations and subjectivities, and how words participate in ordering the world. Voice is felt before it is cognitively processed, affecting the body before the body articulates how s/he feels and who s/he is. Exploring this question involves listening to and beyond the verbal and linguistic voice: attending to affects.

*Affects*, after Deleuze and Guattari, are intensities before and beyond human perception, distinguished from *emotions* which are the labelling of these sensations in language (Grossberg, 2010; Massumi, 2002). *Feelings* (related to, but not synonymous with those in circulation in the student research presentation events) are affects (*affectus*, in Spinoza’s terms) – transitions, variations or passages from one state to another in encounter with another body (Deleuze, 1988, p. 49). Affects precede and exceed what is articulated in language, and affective processes are in constant motion. Affects circulate about, between and through human and non-human bodies rather than residing in the interior self. Affects can destroy or be destroyed, exchanged or conjoined (Deleuze & Guattari, 1980/1987, p. 257). When a voice speaks, emotions are articulated. Emotional articulations are narrations of affect, composed through the lenses of common sense (Manning, 2007; Massumi, 2002). “*Confusion.*” “*Apprehension.*” Articulations of emotions are generally spoken within the political boundaries of what is acceptable and unacceptable to be said (Ahmed, 2004; Boler, 1999; Gannon, Charteris, Mayes, Nye, & Stephenson, 2015).
The spoken voice is threaded through with affects, speaking from collective assemblages beyond the individual body and affecting others. Assemblage is a key concept in my exploration of what the felt force of voice does. Assemblage is the English translation for the French word *agencement*, both a noun and a verb: simultaneously an “arrangement” and the act of “arranging” (translators' note 30, in Guattari, 2000, p. 82). Assemblages are processes whereby heterogeneous human and non-human elements – bodies, voices, texts and matter – constitute and re-constitute individuals, groups, and societies. To study assemblages is to map unforeseen, divergent and productive connections in motion rather than to discover essences (Buchanan, 2015; Colebrook, 2002b; Phillips, 2006; Puar, 2012). Assemblages arrange desire in connections and flows, as well as codifying and blocking desire (see Chapter 4). This concept of assemblage is not simply “another way of saying something is complicated”; the analysis of assemblages always concerns “questions of power” (Buchanan, 2015, p. 382): power operating through arrangements and relations of desire. Assemblage is a pivotal concept for analysing the making, unmaking and remaking of subjectivities and relations in schools.

The *I* that speaks and is addressed is an event existing each moment at the intersection of a range of processes (Guattari, 1995; Puar, 2007, 2012): assemblages composed of lines. Assemblages of individuals, groups, and institutions form, deform and reform in “a multiplicity of dimensions, of lines and directions” (Deleuze & Parnet, 2006/ 1977, p. 100). Deleuze and Parnet (2006/ 1977) and Deleuze and Guattari (1980/ 1987) describe three types of lines that make up assemblages of individuals or groups: the line of rigid segmentarity, the molecular line, and the line of flight. The line of rigid segmentarity is binary, linear, classificatory and hierarchical, dividing from all directions (Deleuze & Guattari, 1980/ 1987, p. 208; Deleuze & Parnet, 2006/ 1977, p. 93). *Adult/ child. Teacher/ student. Voice/ silence.* The second type of line – the molecular – traces subtle modifications and detours, slightly diverging from the line of rigid segmentarity through new linkages and configurations (Deleuze & Parnet, 2006/ 1977, p. 93; Guattari, 1989/ 2013, p. 52). A configuration where a student interviews a teacher, perhaps, might comprise molecular lines: slightly differing from the traditional teacher/ student relation, although remaining close in formation (Mayes, 2013c). Lines of flight are the third type of line, where a rupture breaks with the segmentary or molecular line – in
moments of immanent experimentation where things suddenly shift. These lines of flight may be productive or destructive, and must be analysed for what they “enable or effect in specific space/time configurations” (Ringrose, 2011, p. 603, author's emphasis). While distinct, these three lines overlap and are tangled, “caught up in one another” (Deleuze & Parnet, 2006/1977, p. 94). To explore what the felt force of student voice does is to examine the shifting assemblages that surround the communicative act, and the potentials that these assemblages open up and close down.

Investigating the generative and destructive felt force of voice is important because of the profound educational consequences of feeling in schools for present subjectivities and lived futures. Sociologists of education have closely analysed the consequences of power relations and emotional intensities in schools: from the “hidden injuries” (Furlong, 1991, p. 296) connected to students’ rejection of schooling, to the “high affective” (Munns & Sawyer, 2013, p. 24) relations and pedagogies that contribute to student engagement. In exploring what the felt force of voice does, this study contributes to discussions of the constitution of schooled subjectivities and the arrangements and blockages of pedagogical desire in schools. Examining processes of communication and the “lived surfaces” of everyday life in schools (Stewart, 2007, p. 4), this study aims to contribute to broader conversations about the words, relations, educational configurations and environments that compound positive affects between bodies, augmenting the capacities of bodies to act and the mutual learning that is possible.

In ethnographically exploring the felt force of voice, I mapped the variety of manifestations and responses to student voices across the school, participating within but also beyond the 2013 Steering Committee. I was enfolded, at different stages, within various groups, events and routines in the school’s life: assemblies, recesses and lunchtimes, staff meetings, and NAPLAN tests, for example. I used a range of ethnographic data collection processes, including participant observation and the writing of fieldnotes within and beyond the Steering Committee, document and artefact analysis (e.g. school policies, newsletters, signs, reports) and informal conversations with students, staff and parents. I moved in and out of participation in a particular art project organised by an art teacher in the school’s Support Unit for
students diagnosed with autism, as well as a roll call group ("Talk Time") that involved mainstream students and students from the Support Unit engaging in unstructured conversations. Across these territories, I read, thought, participated in, and wrote about the felt intensities of voice.

**What can [the concept of] voice do?**

This study simultaneously explores voice as a concept: *What can [the concept] of voice do?* A concept like *voice*, for Deleuze and Guattari, is not presupposed and pre-ordained as a category, like Kantian representational modes of thought (Deleuze, 1968/1994; Deleuze & Guattari, 1994/2009). A concept, rather, zigzags and passes through other problems, concEmanpts and planes, metamorphosing as it moves (Deleuze & Guattari, 1994/2009, p. 18). This variation of the research question explores the movements of the concept of *voice*. *Voice* has its own history and geographies, connecting with a constellation of contemporary local, transnational and global social, economic and political concepts, territories, discourses, and affects. Around the concept of *student voice* in schools murmur other voices that worry about and monitor *im mature, inarticulate, irrational and underperforming* voices (see Chapter 3). To explore the concept of *student voice* and its conceptual connections is significant because these other concepts, murmuring associations and territories refract what *voice* does. Exploring these movements, I consider the conditions surrounding the concept of *voice* that enable affirmative transformations for bodies and schools.

Mapping the movements of the concept of *voice* involved examining its discursive deployments: how students, teachers and parents spoke about students’ physical voices and bodies and the concept of *student voice*. In student focus groups, students spoke about their experiences of student voice, responded to scenarios from the student voice literature, and created their own scenario related to student voice. In formal interviews and focus groups with staff and parents, we spoke about their perceptions of student participation in school decision-making. In processes of analysis that I describe in Chapter 5, I drew sketches of dissonant discursive refrains – shifting uses of the words *respect, understanding, responsibility* and *change* across territories, mapping their common sense logics. And yet, as I discuss below, I sought
also to work with voice beyond the linguistic – in embodied methodological experimentation.

**What can [our] voices(s) do [together]?**

This variation of my research question experiments with voice methodologically, in research assemblages with students, teachers, and parents. To question: *What can [our] voice(s) do [together]?* is to explore the conditions that enhance and diminish the capacity to act and speak, and the participative alliances that enable new, potent compositions of voices. Spinoza and Deleuze and Guattari’s question *What can a body do?* is premised on the potentiality of bodies: the infinite variations possible in different configurations (Tarulli & Skott-Myhre, 2006). Relatedly, as voices are infinite in possible variations, interpretations, amalgamations, appropriations and representations, what voice can do in ethnographic participatory encounters is full of possibilities.

As I explore in Chapter 2 and 5, after poststructural and postcolonial critiques of voice, it can no longer be assumed that an “authentic” voice is “expressed” by an autonomous, self-present subject, “elicited” and “captured” by the qualitative researcher. Neither can it be assumed that participatory modes of research are necessarily empowering, nor that participatory research will necessarily escape common sense ways of thinking. Since “direct access to the individual is not possible, or it is misleading”, there is need for “methodological reassessment of research in the human sciences” (Guattari, 2015, pp. 61-62), including ethnographic and participatory methodologies.

This methodological question explores how students and I could speak and write, and also draw, move and create “collective elaborations” and concepts (Rolnik, 2004/2008, p. 10) about student voice and schooling, in an open-ended *praxis* that is attentive to its own dangers. In their late work *What is Philosophy*, Deleuze and Guattari (1994/2009) define philosophy as a practice of concept creation: where concepts are “not given” to then be analysed, but are “created” and “to be created” (p. 11). During this study, the research task became to experiment with “a thousand tiny methodologies” – methodologies as “non-totalisable, sometimes fugitive, also
aggregate, innumerable, resisting stasis and capture, hierarchy and totality” (Lather, 2013, p. 635). Methodological experimentations in this study included the creation of puppet productions and drawings in focus groups, and collaborative analyses and writing processes. On two collaborative analysis days with students from the previous and current Steering Committee groups, students analysed the scenarios created in student focus groups and engaged in other theorising surrounding student voice (see Chapter 5). Yet, these methods and collaborative processes did not always “feel empowering” (cf. Ellsworth, 1989). This thesis also maps the constraints, tensions and ambivalent affects felt within research relations and writing processes, as I re-think what voice methodologically does (see Chapters 5 and 8).

Interrogating methodological uses of voice is significant because of the explosion of encouragement for participatory methods in research with children and young people (see Chapter 2). I consider the dangers in the assumptions of liberation and progress when the concept of voice is invoked. However, I simultaneously wonder whether eviscerating voice potentially bolsters silencing practices in schools. I trouble but still work with voice, questioning how to escape an unquestioning reification of “‘raw voices’” (Mazzei & Jackson, 2012, p. 745), as well as avoid muffling their “presence and power” (Cook-Sather, 2006, p. 360).

What can [authorial] voice(s) do?

Voice is a felt force, a concept, a site of methodological perplexity, but is also an imperative for the doctoral candidate: to craft a cohesive, persuasive, elegant authorial voice, and to create original thought (Honan & Bright, 2016). This final variation of the question is concerned with the authorial voice of the thesis text. In listening to voices, mapping the movements of voice as a concept, and experimenting with voice methodologically, I wondered how to write differently – how to move away from a fixed grammar and patterns of social reproduction in schooling.

Deleuze and Guattari praise writers of what they call “minor literature”: writers who carve out “a non-pre-existent foreign language within” a major language (Deleuze, 1997a, pp. 109-110). The “minor” is not less in number, but rather exceeds and escapes from the confines of dominant majoritarian identity categories (e.g.
student/ teacher, child/ adult, human/ non-human, language/ nonsense). A “minor literature” is constructed from a marginal position; they praise the work of Franz Kafka: a Czech Jew writing in German, and Samuel Beckett: an Irishman writing in French (Deleuze & Guattari, 2006, p. 16). These writers disturb and reconfigure the major language’s dogmatic image of thought and its grammar from within it. By dogmatic image of thought, I mean dominant representational common sense ways of knowing that recognise, classify and measure subjects and objects: this is a teacher; this is a student; this is an adult; this is a child; this is respect, understanding, responsibility and change (Deleuze, 1968/ 1994, p. 148). Stable categories subordinate multiplicity and difference to universality and sameness. Writers of a minor literature disrupt the relation between fixed terms. Grammar, too, is often thought to be fixed and stable as a structure. Deleuze and Guattari reject this conception of grammar in favour of the contingencies and flux of language (1980/ 1987; see Chapter 3). A writer of “minor literature”, becomes “a stutterer in language”, making “the language itself scream, stutter, stammer, or murmur” (Deleuze, 1997a, pp. 109-110). Such writing is always political (Deleuze & Guattari, 2006, p. 17).

In order to think and feel differently about voice, student voice and schooling, it has been necessary to attempt to listen to “minor” voices, to disrupt a dogmatic image of thought about schooling relations, and to stutter the “grammar” of schooling. Bishop (2011) has used the term “minoritized” to refer to those ascribed with characteristics of a minority: “not necessarily in the numerical minority” but “treated as if one’s position and perspective are of less worth” (p. 110). I wondered whether I – a woman in a school where I am not quite a teacher anymore, and students – those speaking (and drawing, creating, acting, and not speaking) from “minoritized” positions within schooling’s majoritarian relations – might construct minor literatures in and beyond writing, in literal co-writing configurations (see Chapter 5). I wondered if and how we might disrupt a dominant image of thought – that recognises and orders students according to age, ability, emotionality and data produced about them (see Chapter 3). I wondered whether we might stutter a dominant grammar of schooling. This phrase alludes to the work of Tyack and Tobin (1994): functionalist educational researchers who trace the apparently remarkably fixed “grammar” of schooling’s structures, relations and pedagogies. Writing this text, I attempted to re-think habitual,
familiar ways of writing about schools, to apprehend this writing’s contingent formation, and experiment with the possibilities of writing about schools differently. I avoided bringing my language (of the adult English teacher writing in an academic register) into narrative union with students’ language (in its verbal, written and non-verbal variety). Instead, I attempted to write differently, to perhaps momentarily disrupt totalising language about student voice and its empowerment (see Chapter 2), to force a crack in a dominant image of thought that recognises students according to what they lack (see Chapters 3 and 4), and to stutter the language of theory that can obfuscate (see Chapter 5). It is my hope that something new might emerge from these disruptions, cracks and stutterings.

These endeavours entailed experiments from within the thesis text – interruptions to my authorial voice. While I use majoritarian terms like student, teacher, researcher, school, voice, data and methodology, I interrogate these terms with each use. Like St Pierre, I refuse the “primacy of voice” and attempt to think “simultaneously with everyone’s ideas” (2008, p. 330): students’, teachers’, other staff members’, parents’, other educational researchers’, and cultural theorists’. St Pierre (2008) argues that writing with simultaneity may, for example, engender creative insertions of “data from participants in[to] the literature review” and “the review of theory” (p. 330). In this thesis, rather than wait until after outlining the methodology of the study to introduce participants’ voices as data, quotations from participants are part of the thesis from its beginning (including this introductory chapter), “interrupt[ing] the expectations of the major” (Honan & Bright, 2016, p. 4). I do not view data as separated from the field, the researcher and texts written about data, existing “out there somewhere in the real world to be found, collected and coded” (St. Pierre & Jackson, 2014, p. 715; see Chapter 5). Data are thus enfolded into this text from its beginning, as voices among the other voices that I read and engaged with.

Accordingly, as I discuss the rationales for student voice in Chapter 2, quotations from students are integrated with quotations from the literature. Chapters 3 and 4 include a transcript and photographic stills from two puppet productions created by students, threaded into discussions of the order of schooling and analytic approaches to schooling inequalities. Photographs of an art project are enfolded into
Chapter 5’s discussion of methodology. In Chapter 8, I deliberately interject footnotes alongside the authorial voice. I fold into the thesis, at times, words in *italics* but without quotation marks – to indicate that they are not necessarily quotations attributable to particular voices, but rather fragments from research encounters, texts, or thoughts. Throughout, I italicise the words *respect, understanding, responsibility* and *change*, as mobile refrains that circulated and morphed in use. Quotations from Deleuze and Guattari and students are re-arranged at the beginning and end of a number of chapters. These re-arrangements are aligned right and re-assembled into a form akin to a poem (cf. Goldsmith, 2011). Where quotations include non-standard or American spellings, or unusual grammar, these spellings and grammars are retained. Juxtaposing quotations from students, staff, researchers and Deleuze and Guattari with puppet productions, photographs, footnotes, italicised words, conventional and unconventional spellings and grammars, I attempt to form new relations. These new relations may not always “make recognisable sense”, but “express intensities” “capture forces” and “act” (Lecercle, 2002, p. 195) to make a “different sense” (St. Pierre, 2008, p. 330).

At the same time as this thesis texts experiments with and beyond writing, these writing experiments are not necessarily e/affective, and are accompanied by their own ethical ambivalences (see Chapter 5). In engaging with this writing, you might also become a co-researcher (Spivak, 1993, p. 22) in thinking about how to write differently, listen differently, and teach, learn and research differently.

**Ordering disordered voices**

I began this chapter in the middle of the study, with a sketch drawing of a student voice research presentation event, and dissonant accounts of past events. I then mapped this study’s moving contexts: the historical, political, school and methodological territories of *student voice* in school reform. I outlined the contexts of current advocacy for student voice and educational change, and introduced this school, before summarising the previous work of a student voice group. I introduced this study’s central research question and its variations.
This thesis text necessarily imposes order on the multiplicities of my engagements with students, teachers, other staff members, parents, other researchers, and Deleuze and Guattari. I order this thesis according to dimensions in motion that I establish, and then come to thread together. Chapters 2-5 lay down the dimensions that order my analysis of what voices can do, and Chapters 6-10 bring these dimensions into relation.

In Chapter 2, I introduce one dimension of voice: rationales for the political concept of student voice. These rationales include a standpoint epistemological rationale that argues that students possess important knowledge, a liberal humanist rationale that calls for dialogue in schools, a praxis rationale that calls for student empowerment, and a school improvement rationale that promises to strengthen outcomes through student voice. These rationales are accompanied by poststructural, postcolonial and psychoanalytic critiques. I suggest that further interrogation is needed of processes of subjectification in and through student voice work.

Chapter 3 introduces a second dimension of voice: the order words of schooling. Voice, in schools, is not only associated with standpoint knowledge, dialogue, empowerment and school improvement, but is also associated with a history of ways of classifying and ordering students’ bodies (and voices) in relation to their age, ability, emotionality, and in the construction of data about them. I argue, working with Deleuze and Guattari’s pragmatic approach to language, that work is needed to map what happens when voices speak: what the felt force of voice does in arranging subjectivities in schools.

Chapter 4 outlines a third dimension of voice: modes of interpreting voices in schools. I map how critical, resistance, discursive and psychoanalytic theories have shaped various analytical approaches to voice in schools, and raised concerns about schooling’s reproduction of inequalities. I explain the utility of Deleuze and Guattari’s approach to desire for analysis of the social production of deficit, for experimenting with alternative relations in schools, and for extending the insights of previous analytical approaches.
In Chapter 5, I detail this study’s embodied, participatory, ethnographic experimentations with voice. I outline how I conceptualised and enacted researcher positionality and research ethics, and give an account of processes of concept creation and writing over the year of ethnographic fieldwork.

Chapters 6-9 bring various configurations of these dimensions in motion into relation, threading together a rationale for student voice, an order word, an interpretive lens, and an element of methodological experimentation. Chapters 6-9 each start with one of the ambivalent refrains introduced in this chapter: respect, understanding, responsibility and change, and explore the vacillating affects that accompanied these refrains. Deleuze and Guattari’s conceptual tools of lines, affect and desire are central to these analyses.

Chapter 6 explores the question What can student voices do? in the domain of the classroom, in relation to the ambivalent refrain respect and the affect of uncertainty. I entwine a discussion of standpoint knowledge (students are to be respected for their insights), the category of age that orders relations of respect, the transformations that are effected through language, and diverging uses of the word respect. I examine how students articulated and dramatised the categorisation of voices and bodies according to rigid segmentary lines of age. I consider the potentiality of the felt force of voice for shaping and remaking schooled subjectivities.

In Chapter 7, I consider what student voices can do in the dialogical event, in relation to the refrain of understanding and fear. The second rationale for student voice: dialogue (intended to engender mutual understanding), is brought into relation with the order word of ability (where students are ordered by their ability to understand pre-established knowledge), psychoanalytic interpretations of fear (where misunderstanding breeds anxiety), and the ambivalent uses of the word understanding at this school. I examine movements of molecular lines in dialogical encounters – that slightly diverge from rigid segmentary lines, but that carry their own dangers.

Chapter 8 moves with the concept of voice back to the classroom, after the dialogical event associated with student voice. I explore what students’ voices can do in relation to the uses of the refrain responsibility and the affect of shame. The third
rationale for student voice: praxis for empowerment (where young people take responsibility to change their world) is intersected with the ordering of students’ voices according to their responsible expression of emotions, and with critical theoretical approaches’ attention to the silencing of students’ dissenting voices. I attend to the ambivalent movements of shame, and my own responsibility in the events that unfolded. This chapter works with the ruptures that lines of flight make, and enacts this in a sudden crack in the authorial voice.

In Chapter 9, I evaluate what happened at this school by the end of the reform period. I travel with the refrain of change and seek out joyful affects. Evaluating what voices can do in a process of school reform, I connect the rationale for student voice as changing schools, the ordering of schools through data that looks for concrete changes to outcomes, and resistance theories’ analyses of how students’ expressions of agency change and shape what happens in schools and in their lives. Working with Deleuze and Guattari’s conception of desire as productive, seeking connections, and as beyond the human subject, I unthread and rethread lines of regulation and liberation.

Chapter 10 lays down an alternative theory and praxis for voice that works with Deleuze and Guattari’s ontology of becoming: radical relationality. Bringing together the concepts created with students, staff, parents and Deleuze and Guattari, I argue for the potentiality of an ontology of radical relationality for student voice, as an educational movement that unsettles the student/ teacher binary, even as becoming also challenges liberal humanist assumptions about subjectivity. I explain how becoming reworks conceptions of respect and age, understanding and the dialogical encounter, response-ability and emerging praxis, in turn changing and even re-forming modes of evaluation of what happens in schools. I draw implications for the student/ teacher relation, for engagement in school, for research with children and young people, and for modes of evaluation of what happens in and beyond schools. This thesis concludes with affirmation of the radical force of becoming and re-forming for feeling, thinking, speaking, listening, acting and living otherwise.

With this thesis trajectory in mind, the following chapter continues this sketch map of the history of the movement of the political concept of voice.
Chapter 2: Mapping a concept, doubting foundations

Every concept always has a history,
even though this history zigzags,
though it passes, if need be,
through other problems
or onto different planes.
- Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari

What is Philosophy?

The concept of voice

Voice is a concept with a zigzagging history, passing through other problems and planes (Deleuze & Guattari, 1994/ 2009, p. 18). This “fashionable” term voice is invoked in a wide variety of projects, policies and settings (Hadfield & Haw, 2001): from government social policy documents, to school improvement initiatives, to citizenship education curricula, to research efforts, to consumer market research, to reality television programs where viewers have a voice on which contestants stay or leave the show. The concept of voice traverses other constellations of concepts, diffracting as it encounters obstructions or conjoining with other concepts (Gough, 2007). Each appropriation and invitation to have a voice in different territories re-works the concept again, and shapes how others might take it up.

This chapter maps the movements of the concept of voice over recent history and in specific contexts, from early arguments for women’s voice to its current place in school reform. My purpose in this chapter and the following two chapters is not to define or seek an answer to the question, “What is voice?” but rather to map the pragmatic and contingent uses of the concept of voice: where, when and how voice functions, and what the concept of voice does. I purposely use the term voice to make connections with recent discussions of the ambivalences of voice in qualitative research, common sense understandings voice in schools that associate excessive voice with disorder (see Chapter 3), and analytical approaches to voice in schooling (see Chapter 4). Understanding these varied uses of the term voice will support
critical analysis of its enactment: what *student voice* (as a concept) does as it moves in and through the territory of a school.

This chapter continues the mapping of the movements of *voice* that I began in Chapter 1. I have already introduced territories as in constant flux, with comings and goings; what I elaborate in this chapter as *deterritorialisations* and *reterritorialisations*. Deterritorialisations are movements that produce change, where something escapes or departs from a given territory and new connections are made (Deleuze & Guattari, 1980/ 1987, p. 72). When a mouth is eating and then speaks, the mouth deterritorialisates – detaches – from the territory of food and its arrangement with the digestive system, and is directed towards another combination of breath, the vibration of the vocal chords and the respiratory system (Deleuze & Guattari, 2006, pp. 19-20). In a similar way, the concept of voice may be deterritorialised – lifted – from historical emancipatory rationales towards market-driven school improvement rationales. Processes of reterritorialisation accompany movements of deterritorialisation. In movements of reterritorialisation, deterritorialised elements do not return to the original territory, but rather recalibrate and enter into new combinations and relations (Patton, 2010). When the mouth returns to the territory of the food after speaking, the territory has changed, and the mouth has changed. When voice is reterritorialised to emancipatory rationales after it has been deterritorialised by market-driven discourses, it also changes and is changed.

I structure this chapter with a contextual introduction to the educational movement known as student voice and its rationales. I then examine the movements of four rationales for student voice: a standpoint epistemological rationale that argues that students possess important knowledge, a liberal humanist rationale that calls for dialogue in schools, a *praxis* rationale that calls for student empowerment, and a school improvement rationale that argues that student voice will improve institutional outcomes. These rationales are accompanied by various poststructural, postcolonial and psychoanalytic critiques. In the following chapter, noting the tendency for *voice* to be framed as the possession of the autonomous speaking subject, I outline Deleuze and Guattari’s contrasting approach to voice and subjectivity.
Student voice

In the last thirty years, there has been a rhetorical explosion of words and programs associated with voice, participation and consultation. It is now a “new orthodoxy” (France, 2004, p. 45) that young people should be directly included in research and decision-making on issues affecting their lives. Student voice and student participation in schools has been the topic of journal special issues, including in *Forum* (Fielding, 2001a), *Educational Review* (Rudduck, 2006), *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education* (Fielding, 2007), *Improving Schools* (Russell, Byrom, & Robinson, 2007), *Educational Action Research* (2007), *Theory into Practice* (Zenkov & Dutro, 2009), *Management in Education* (Czerniawski & Kidd, 2012), *Instructional Design* (Könings, Seidel, & van Merriënboer, 2014), and the *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies* (Bourke & Loveridge, 2014). During the period of this research, a number of books were published that advocated for and critically analysed student voice and participatory research with children and young people. These included the edited collection *The Student Voice Handbook* (Czerniawski & Kidd, 2011), and books exploring student participation in elementary school (Mitra & Serriere, 2015), high school (Brasof, 2015), and tertiary settings (Cook-Sather, Bovill, & Felten, 2014), and across a range of research, practice and community settings (Groundwater-Smith, Dockett, & Bottrell, 2015; Mockler & Groundwater-Smith, 2015a).

This chapter traces the ancestries for student voice that are drawn in the literature. Even while student voice has been argued to be under-theorised and praxis-oriented (Carol Taylor & Robinson, 2009, p. 161), various histories have been chosen and traced for it – histories that sometimes overlap and sometimes diverge. The rationales for student voice have implicit or explicit theoretical foundations that I connect with modernist assumptions about the autonomous subject, the rationality of communication, and the progress of individuals, institutions and society.

As I map the implicit or explicit theoretical foundations constructed for student voice and review critiques that have been made of these rationales, I am not disputing the necessary intervention of student voice work, nor the formative and generative potential of these rationales. Indeed, these rationales and their theoretical
foundations have catalysed my own critical praxis as a teacher and researcher. I am thoroughly committed to radical democratic educational practices and relations. However, in preparing to examine the movement of the concept of student voice in one school, it is important to contextualise the theoretical debates surrounding this concept. Examining these critiques may help to form more complex conceptions of student voice (cf. Chadderton, 2011) that account for the simultaneous potentiality and danger of voice in schools.

Rationales for student voice and critiques of these rationales

*Students’ knowledge: The standpoint epistemological rationale*

Even bad students have a voice.

- Rodger, Year 9/8 focus group

Student voice researchers argue that students’ knowledge and experience make them “expert witnesses” to schooling (Rudduck, 1999); students are the “treasure in our very own backyards” (SooHoo, 1993, p. 390). The epistemological rationale is that students “experience a reality relatively unknown to the adults who govern their school experience” (Silva & Rubin, 2003, p. 1), and that students should be positioned as resources and producers of knowledge (Bragg & Fielding, 2005) as primary “stakeholders” and “beneficiaries” (Atweh & Burton, 1995; Zion, 2009).

Advocates for children and young people’s standpoint knowledge have drawn connections to the first wave of feminist theories and practices in the Western world. Feminist standpoint theory in the 1970s examined the “relations between the production of knowledge and practices of power” (S. Harding, 2004a, p. 1), honouring women as agents, critics and creators of knowledge rather than as objects of knowledge (Reinharz, 1992, p. 11). Standpoint theory works with the “inversion thesis”: that those subject to structures of domination may be “epistemically privileged”: knowing “different things” or knowing “some things better” than those comparatively privileged, and thus able to make “constructive contributions” (Wylie, 2004, p. 339).
This “‘logic of a standpoint’” or “organic epistemology” (Harding, 2004, p. 3), originally applied to early feminist problematisations of gender relations, was extended in the 1990s to generational relations by scholars working in the New Sociology of Childhood. These scholars argued against conceptualisations of children and young people as passive, and for their re-conceptualisation as active subjects making sense of and creating their worlds (Alanen, 1994; Alanen & Mayall, 2001). Critiquing developmental psychological constructions of children and young people, where children and young people are understood as in the process of becoming adults, these scholars argued for the status of children as beings (exemplified in James & Prout, 1990). Piagetian developmental psychology’s view of children as adults-in-the-making was rejected for its temporal focus on children’s future becoming and the implicit dismissal of the everyday realities of children’s existence. The body of knowledge called “Child Development” was argued to view the child in deficit terms, as lacking the adult’s full possession of agency, competence and independence (Qvortrup, Bardy, Sgritta, & Wintersberger, 1994; Woodhead & Faulkner, 2000; see Chapter 3). For these researchers, positioning children and young people as beings with standpoint knowledge moves away from their research objectification; voice research positions itself at a distance from research on children and young people that speaks about them, instead seeking to speak to and with them (Best, 2007; Fielding, 2004b; Malewski, 2005; Mayall, 2000; Wyn & White, 1997).

Student voice researchers and practitioners have drawn links between these standpoint epistemologies, the work of New Sociology of Childhood scholars, and students’ knowledge (Cook-Sather, 2007; Mitra & Serriere, 2015; Mockler & Groundwater-Smith, 2015a; P. Thomson & Gunter, 2007). Grace (1995) critiqued the deficit assumptions of a dominant “ideology of immaturity” (p. 202) that views students through the lenses of developmental psychology as incompetent, irrational and unformed, needing to be institutionally shaped and formed. A number of student voice advocates have argued that young people are increasingly responsible, competent and involved in complex relationships outside of school, but schools’ structures and patterns of relationships have remain locked in hierarchical modes of relating that justify the exclusion of students from classroom and school decision-making (Bron & Veugelers, 2014; Rudduck, 2002; Rudduck & Flutter, 2000).
Rudduck and McIntyre (2007) have argued for the need for “respect” “in both
directions” (p. 53). This argument, that celebrates young people as “autonomous
actors” who “‘can do everything’” (Wood, 2015, p. 406), depends for its success on
the recognition of students as beings: competent, rational, responsible and agentic
subjects.

**Standpoint’s shaky ground: Poststructural critiques**

While student voice has been established on standpoint epistemology’s grounds, these
epistemological territories have moved with poststructural and postcolonial critiques.
Poststructural thinking questions the construction of the Enlightenment subject as
independent, unitary, rational, self-present, and capable of self-knowledge (A. Y.
Jackson & Mazzei, 2009; Lenzo, 1995; Mazzei, 2007). Postcolonial work analyses the
politics of knowledge that sustain colonial and neo-colonial power, and critiques
imperial representations of subaltern groups (Alcoff, 1991; Bhavnani, 1990; P. H.
Collins, 2000; hooks, 1990; Lugones & Spelman, 1983/2000; Spivak, 1987; Trinh,
1989). While there has been significant debate and scholarship surrounding
poststructural and postcolonial critiques in feminist standpoint theory (see the special
issue of Hypatia introduced by S. Harding, 2009; S. Harding, 2004b), these critiques
of voice and standpoint knowledge have been raised but less debated within the
student voice literature (see Bragg & Manchester, 2012; Chadderton, 2011; Fielding,
2004b; Fielding & McGregor, 2005; Carol Taylor & Robinson, 2009; P. Thomson,
2011). This section summarises critiques of standpoint theory’s implied views of
subjectivity, the de-contextualisation of the linguistic/transcribed voice, and the
modes of communication implied in voice.

Earlier feminist formulations of women’s voice that argued for the authentic
knowledge of particular groups were critiqued for essentialising the identity of these
groups and erasing differences within groups of women. Feminists of colour in the
United States critiqued women’s voice in liberal feminist emancipatory research for
appropriating the voice of the Other and remaking Other women into their own image
warned that the feminist who claims to describe and represent the situation of others
may be “speaking in place of them, that is, speaking for them”, representing “the
other’s needs, goals, situation, and in fact, who they are” (p. 9). Even pluralising the term, from voice to voices, was argued to maintain the essential category of the group that the researcher speaks about (Ellsworth, 1989; Fuss, 1990; Grosz, 1995), focusing on “units of voice rather than dimensions of voice” and the “rich texture of vocality” (Jackson, 2003, p. 706).

Poststructural critiques of the subject dismantled assumptions that there is a singular, stable core self who possesses knowledge that may be transparently known and expressed through language. The possibility of the subject expressing authentic knowledge was also critiqued for its presumption of transparency and self-knowledge. Instead, feminist poststructuralists foregrounded the internal contradictions of knowledge: knowledge as situated, split, emerging, “tenuous” (Pillow, 2003) and “stitched together imperfectly” (Haraway, 1991, p. 193). Spivak (1987), in Can the Subaltern Speak?, questioned how an oppressed group can speak for themselves and know their conditions when they are inscribed within a colonial system and language that determines their knowledge and speech. Derrida’s deconstruction (1976) undermined the stability of consciousness and transcendental meaning implied when researchers present voices as speaking for themselves. Letting raw voices speak for themselves has been critiqued for obscuring the salient role of the researcher in organising and representing individuals (Jackson, 2003). Mazzei and Jackson (2012) argue that researchers “are always already shaping those ‘exact words’ through the unequal power relationships present and by our own research agendas and timelines” (p. 746). Representational accounts of voices are argued not to reflect a ‘reality’ of a person or group’s words, experiences, and meanings, but rather to produce reality, experiences and meanings (Bragg, 2007b; Lather, 1991; Spivak, 1988).

A focus on the verbal and linguistic voice has also been argued to decontextualise, disembody and marginalise other non-verbal and aesthetic modes of communication (Chadderton, 2011; P. Thomson, 2011). The meaning of silences may be unintelligible or indiscernible (Mazzei, 2003, p. 366), intractable, unreasonable, unanalysable (MacLure, Holmes, Jones, & MacRae, 2010), escaping “easy classification” or “easy sense” (Mazzei & Jackson, 2009, p. 4). Following these critiques, hearing and representing the standpoint knowledge of another is not so straightforward.
Student voice advocates have responded to these critiques largely through warnings around voice. Researchers working with children and young people have called for attention to the heterogeneity of voices within schools (Arnot & Reay, 2007; Cook-Sather, 2007; Fielding, 2007; Hadfield & Haw, 2001; Ravet, 2007; P. Thomson & Gunter, 2007). Practitioners and researchers working with children and young people have been advised to be aware of the situated, partial and particular nature of voices, not to take student responses as unwavering truth, or to assume that giving voice is the pathway to an authentic, core being (Bragg, 2010; Gallacher & Gallagher, 2008; Hynds, Faircloth, Green, & Jacob, 2014; James, 2007; Komulainen, 2007; Spyrou, 2011; P. Thomson, 2011). Thomson (2011) calls for greater attention to gaze, expressions, stance, gestures, adornment, body art, clothes, apathy, loyalty, and silence in an individual’s communication that are “intended to ‘speak’ and to indicate something of the individual’s chosen identity, attitudes, interests, pastimes and affiliations” (p. 23).

These recent student voice studies commendably expand restricted interpretations of students’ communication beyond the verbal and linguistic. In addition, further attention is needed to the effects and affects of a rationale that continues to focus the researcher’s attention on students – watching and listening to them more closely in order to write about them more authentically. As I discuss further below and in Chapter 5, I have wondered about the (unintended consequences) of the researcher gaze, intended to enable students to speak for themselves but, perhaps, heightening processes of subjectification. But first, I continue to outline the rationales for student voice and their accompanying critiques.

**Students’ and teachers’ dialogical understanding: The liberal humanist rationale**

[Student voice] breaks the barrier that I think that we have. For example, I know when you first start school, there’s always like, “this is the teacher, this is the student” - like a barrier between the two.

And having a student voice is sort of the bridge in between that barrier that allows us to connect with the teacher – not just,
In response to critiques of *standpoint* as too unidirectional in focus, dialogue could be argued to be a rationale for student voice that is more inter-subjective. Student voice has been rationalised as facilitating dialogue between students and teachers and among students (Alexander, 2008; Ferguson, Hanreddy, & Draxton, 2011; Lodge, 2005). In student voice research, the metaphor of the bridge has been used to characterise modes of engagement where students and teachers reach an understanding between divergent positions and perspectives (Atweh & Bland, 2004; Groundwater-Smith et al., 2014; Mitra, 2005, 2006; Mockler & Groundwater-Smith, 2015a; Taines, 2013). De-stabilising student and teacher “roles” in voice encounters is argued to engender “restless encounters” (2011, p. 79) that enable students and teachers to “re-see” each other as “persons, not just as role occupants” (Fielding, 2011b, p. 13), in turn producing a “joyfully felt mutuality” (Fielding, 2004b, p. 296), and a “positive classroom climate” for learning (Pollard, 2007, p. 1). Rudduck and Flutter (2004) contend that dialogical encounters enable teachers to “look at things from the pupil perspective” (p. 141), “gain a deeper understanding of […] teaching and learning processes” and “change the way they think about pupils and their learning” (Flutter, 2007, p. 343). These arguments for the value of student voice stress the positive affects, new understandings and solidarity built through student voice.

Student voice is framed as a form of speaking *with* students: adults and young people speaking together (e.g. Cahill, 2007).

Habermas’ (1984) ideal speech situation and assumptions about communication underpin this rationale for student voice (Mockler & Groundwater-Smith, 2015a; Robinson & Taylor, 2007). In brief (see Honneth & Joas, 1991; McCarthy, 1978/1981; Porter & Porter, 2003), Habermas defines social interaction as an “exchange of communicative acts”, where language use is “orientated towards reaching an understanding” (1984, p. 44, my emphasis). Habermas (1984) theorises language as social and rational, premised on reasoned argument and cooperation (p. 86), and towards "achieving, sustaining and reviewing consensus” that rests on “the intersubjective recognition of criticisable validity claims” (p. 17). This rationale
foregrounds human agency, rationality, and the possibility of understanding (Robinson & Taylor, 2007, p. 8). While the Ideal Speech Situation has been stressed to be an “aspiration” rather than a reality (Mockler & Groundwater-Smith, 2015a, p. 15), I am interested in the implicit assumptions about communication that transfer to student voice work, and their effects and affects. Indeed, Mockler and Groundwater-Smith’s (2015) question will become important in exploring the movement of the concept of voice in this particular school: “‘how […] is it possible to maintain an openness to dialogue without it becoming a power struggle?’” (p. 16).

(Mis)understanding dialogue: Postcolonial critiques

The second rationale for student voice: that it builds bridges to mutual understandings between students and teachers, has also been troubled by, in particular, postcolonial, poststructural and psychoanalytic work. Critiques of dialogue have questioned the abstracted premise of the Ideal Speech Situation, as removed from concrete, situated territories where power, knowledge and desire circulate (Porter & Porter, 2003). Said (1989) lampoons the “scrubbed, disinfected interlocutor” and the “entirely academic or theoretical environment” of Habermas’ ideal speech situation as “a laboratory creation with suppressed, and therefore falsified, connections to the urgent situation of crisis and conflict” (p. 210). For Said, neutrality and equality in the colonial dialogical encounter is impossible; one party will always need to speak according to the categories and linguistic norms of the party with greater power. The colonised will be at first driven to speak within the terms of the other party, and may then either have their voice eroded into the categories of the coloniser, or refuse to speak, or decide that “the only interlocution that is possible with colonial power” is a “radically antagonistic, perhaps violent riposte” (Said, 1989, pp. 209-210). The interlocutor may then be dismissed as uncivilised or unworthy to participation in further dialogue.

Theories of communication that presuppose that a subject can understand the other and that two parties can come to a point of joint understanding have also been troubled by psychoanalytic and poststructural perspectives as tending to slip too easily into a premature resolution of difference. Phelan (1993), from a psychoanalytic perspective, argues that the expectation for understanding, and the experience of “always failing to feel and see it”, commits us, “however unwittingly, to a concomitant narrative of betrayal, disappointment, and rage”, so that “we accuse
[ourselves or] the other of inadequacy, of blindness, of neglect” (p. 194). Dialogue, far from a neutral zone of encounter, is a “political struggle” (Alcoff, 1991, p. 15), deeply entwined with assumptions about communicative norms and rationality that privilege those from particular classed, gendered and racialised positions and invalidate the speech of others (Arnot & Reay, 2007). Dialogue may be a space where common sense ways of thinking, interpreting speech and classifying others are perpetuated rather than challenged.

Parallels have been drawn between discussions of postcolonial speech and the speech of students in low socio-economic communities, with discursive violence done in the name of dialogue in both territories. In both the colony and the classroom, the speech of the ‘subaltern’ is at the mercy of those in power permitting this speech. When uttered, this speech may still remain outside the bounds of what can be heard by those in power. Like Said’s analysis of the imperative for the colonised to speak the language of the coloniser, Arnot and Reay (2007) demonstrate how students also must communicate according to the “implicit rules of classroom interaction” (p. 321). Whether the student is recognised as a legitimate speaker and whether or not the utterance is deemed significant depends on who they are understood to be, the style and language of the utterance (Alcoff, 1991), and whether their modes of communication and identities align with those valued in the school (Cruz, 2014; Felten et al., 2013; Rosiek & Heffeman, 2014). “Calling out, yelling, or walking out… does not constitute voice” (Holdsworth & Thomson, 2002, p. 6, cited by Arnot & Reay, 2007, p. 321). Some voices are “too strident, too offensive or too irresponsible” (Fielding, 2004, p. 303) or are understood as “too adversarial” (Cremin, Mason, & Busher, 2011; Taines, 2013, p. 169).

The dialogical space of student voice, then, might be a dangerous space for students where the possibility of further subjectification is amplified. Student voice might inadvertently, serve as a “dividing practice” separating confident, articulate students from those who “don’t fit the dominant discourse and academic aspirations of their schools” (McIntyre, Pedder, & Rudduck, 2005, p. 155), entrenching hierarchies based on linguistic skills (Silva, 2001). The promise of equalising power relations in hierarchical institutions through dialogue may, as Fielding (2007) warns, “presume too much” (p. 307). To further explore the ambivalent zones of dialogue,
conceptual tools are needed that unthread the tangled lines of concrete, immanent experiences of dialogical encounters, without smoothing over dissonances and differences.

**Students’ empowerment: The praxis rationale**

*Abu George:* We got to have a voice of what we want to choose and so did the teachers. So it made us practically equal. […]

*Sarah:* All the things we used to complain about that we can’t do – instead of complain, we’d do something about it.

- Year 11 focus group, talking about the Steering Committee

A third rationale for student voice, as critical, transformative *praxis* confronting historical and present institutional injustices, can be traced to the critical pedagogical work of Paolo Freire and to emancipatory feminist research. The concept of *praxis*: acts which shape and change the world, is rooted in Karl Marx’s imperative to “change” the world rather than only “interpret” it (1978, p. 145). Paolo Freire’s critical pedagogy, developed in the context of political and social injustices in Brazil in the 1960s, aimed to foster illiterate adult workers’ capacity to read the “word” in order to read and change “the world” (Freire & Macedo, 1987). Freire worked to break a “culture of silence” (1998, p. 503) that socialises people into patterns of conformity and acceptance of the status quo, to build radically democratic communities.

Freire’s ideas have since been deterritorialised – moved from – Brazil, transported to Western school territories. Critical pedagogues argue against students’ positioning as “silent witnesses” (Smyth & McInerney, 2012, p. 3), and the undermining of educational empowerment (Freire, 1985; Giroux, 1983a; Shor, 1980). Critical pedagogies interrogate visible operations of power in hierarchical relations, decision-making, surveillance and norms that position the student as passive spectator (Giroux, 1994). Reclaiming one’s voice is framed as a practice of freedom (Houston & Kramarae, 1991; McLaren & Giroux, 1995; Smyth, 2011). Critically interrogating power structures and relations and taking collective action are considered to be forms

Since Freire, the legal binding of the right for children and young people’s knowledge to be recognised within and beyond the school, in the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child ([UNCRC], United Nations, 1989), strengthened the case for children and young people’s participation in institutional decision-making and research about issues that affect their lives (Payne, 2009; Veerman, 1992). The UNCRC, ratified by Australia in 1990 (Australian Human Rights Commission, 2007), is argued to provide a legal foundation for students’ participation (Groundwater-Smith et al., 2015; Noyes, 2005). In particular, the provision of children’s rights in Article 12 focuses on children and young people’s expression of views: “the right to express those views freely in all matters affecting the child, the views of the child being given due weight in accordance with the age and maturity of the child” (United Nations, 1989).

Over time, modes of participation have been represented in models that have suggested progressive levels of empowerment in participation (e.g. Bland, 2006; Fielding, 2001b; Fletcher, 2011; Hart, 1992, 2008; Holdsworth, 2000; Lodge, 2005; Mitra, 2008; Mitra & Gross, 2009; Shier, 2001; Treseder, 1997). Participatory methods of research with children and young people have been argued to “combat unequal power relations” (Barker & Weller, 2003, p. 36), “balance” power (Mitra, 2008) and “give” power (Grover, 2004) to children and young people. Student voice in schools and participatory research beyond schools are thus positioned as emancipatory.

(Dis)empowering voices: Feminist poststructural critiques

Feminist poststructuralist scholars have interrogated this critical pedagogic rationale for voice, underlining the impositional potential and inadvertent oppressions of empowerment. These critiques of critical pedagogy from the late 1980s worked with a Foucauldian view of power as productive. For Foucault, power is relational, dynamic, and productive rather than a possession that one has or does not have or a structure that one is positioned within. Power circulates within local, unstable relations and
networks and is produced from moment to moment in everyday, mundane relations and practices (Foucault, 1976/ 1990, pp. 92-94). This conception of power shifts examination from macro-level critiques of power to micropolitical forms of analysis, as subjects simultaneously are subjected to and exercise power (Foucault, 1980, p. 98, see Chapter 4).

Thinking with Foucault, feminist poststructural critiques of critical pedagogy warned that critical pedagogy may reinforce rather than break down relations of domination in the name of the telos (goal) of liberation (Ellsworth, 1989; Gore, 1993; Luke & Gore, 1992; Maher, 2001; Orner, 1992; Weiler, 1991). These scholars complicated critical pedagogy’s modernist assumptions of power/ knowledge as a property that a person has or does not have, binary constructions of oppressor/ oppressed, disempowered/ empowered, silenced/ speaking, and assumptions of progress. Ellsworth (1989) argued that framing the critical pedagogue as “liberator” is paternalistic and naive to the subtle workings of pedagogical power (pp. 306, 310). Following Foucault, these scholars argued that “everything is dangerous” (1983, p. 231): that critical pedagogues are “always implicated in the very structures they are trying to change” (Ellsworth, 1989, p. 310), that “‘liberatory’ and ‘emancipatory’ discourses have no guaranteed effects”, and that the educator must “constantly question the ‘truth’ of one’s thought and oneself” (Gore, 2003, pp. xv, 11).

Subsequent researchers have extended these critiques, for example, into the use of participatory research with adults in development studies (Cooke & Kothari, 2001; Kapoor, 2005), and participatory research with children and young people (e.g. Alderson & Morrow, 2004; Gallacher & Gallagher, 2008; Gallagher, 2008; Holland, Renold, Ross, & Hillman, 2008), cautioning about the over-enthusiasms of assertions that participation will necessarily empower. Participation, rather, may overlook the significance of increasing inequalities and differences between groups of young people (Wierenga, Trenbath, Kelly, & Vidakovic, 2003), and may even create new inequalities (Black, 2012; Kennelly & Dillabough, 2008; Olssen, 2004; Smith et al., 2002; Wood, 2015).

Scholars and practitioners of student voice have considered these critiques, warning against “the impositional potential of an ostensibly liberatory impulse”
in student voice. A number of scholars have mapped the complex power/knowledge relations at work between teachers, researchers and students (Boler, 2004a; Bragg, 2007a; Fielding, 2004b; Flynn, 2014; Hill, 2006; Kellett, 2011; Lomax, 2012; Mayes, 2016; Nelson, 2014; Robinson & Taylor, 2013; Schäfer & Yarwood, 2008; Silva, 2001; Spyrou, 2011; Carol Taylor & Robinson, 2009). Yet, there is a danger that the insights (Cook-Sather, 2007) from poststructural and postcolonial critiques may just be enfolded within established normative understandings of student voice (Robinson & Taylor, 2007, p. 7). A conception of the subject as autonomous and agentic, and a view of power as property to be distributed or shared may linger, unaltered. A number of scholars have called for alternative conceptual resources to further power as simultaneously enabling and constraining, and the interdependencies of adults and young people’s voices and agencies (Bragg & Manchester, 2012; Cook-Sather, 2007; Fielding, 2004b; Mannion, 2007). Returning to the unsettling affects surrounding student voice introduced in Chapter 1, I add that further conceptual resources are needed to map the movements of affect and desire entwined with movements of power: how it is that these participatory processes do not necessarily “feel empowering” (Ellsworth, 1989). Interrogating the relationship between power, affect and desire does not negate the need for children and young people to have rights, but also considers what happens when these rights are exercised. In Deleuze and Guattari’s words (1994/2009), this is to examine the “immanent modes of existence of people provided with rights” (p. 107).

**School improvement: The institutional reform rationale**

*We were trying to make this school a better school.*

- **Hamad, Year 12 focus group, speaking about the Steering Committee**

Finally, student voice is advocated as an essential element in school reform. The above rationales (standpoint knowledge, dialogue and empowerment) are entwined in the affirmation that student voice can improve schools. Listening to students’ voices is posited as offering “new angles of vision” (Cook-Sather, 2009) on educational challenges and to be “an important catalyst for change” (Flutter, 2007, p. 344). In addition to standpoint, dialogical and empowerment rationales, advocates argue that
student voice strengthens students’ engagement, teachers’ professional learning, and schools’ cultures.

Advocates argue that student voice improves students’ engagement and motivation, self-esteem and confidence (Jelly, Fuller, & Byers, 2000; Mitra, 2004; Rudduck et al., 1996), leadership and citizenship skills (Holdsworth, 2000; Hoskins, Janmaat, & Villalba, 2012; Kirby, 2001), and attitude and behaviour (Paley, 1986; Raymond, 2001; P. Thompson, 2009). Advocates stress the learning that occurs for both students and teachers in student voice encounters (Demetriou & Wilson, 2010; Ferguson et al., 2011; Flutter, 2007; Lincoln, 1995; Raymond, 2001; Smyth, 2007; Wright, 2015). A range of studies have explored students’ perceptions of good teaching, arguing that understanding students’ perceptions may contribute to professional discussions of what constitutes quality teaching (Bakx, Koopman, de Kruijf, & den Brok, 2015; Beishuizen, Hof, Putten, Bouwmeester, & Asscher, 2001; Bishop, 2010; Brown & McIntyre, 1993; Noguera, 2007; Telli, den Brok, & Cakiroglu, 1993; Woods, 1990).

Student voice advocates argue that involving students in school decision-making is an important contributor to fostering a positive school “climate” (e.g. Phelan, Davidson, & Cao, 1992, p. 701), “ethos” (e.g. Covell, 2010, p. 47), “positive emotional energy” (Seiler, 2011, p. 375), “atmosphere” (e.g. Sebba & Robinson, 2010, p. 19) or “environment” (e.g. Shallcross, Robinson, Pace, & Tamoutseli, 2007). These studies associate positive school cultures with mutual trust, a sense of belonging, emotional safety, feeling known and recognised, cared for, connected, and respected (Aldridge et al., 2015; Covell, 2010; A. Graham, 2012; John-Akinola, Gavin, O'Higgins, & Gabhainn, 2014; Phelan et al., 1992; Sebba & Robinson, 2010). Student voice is argued to highlight the importance of these emotions and, in the process of discussing these emotions, generate them. Such positive school cultures, in turn, are connected with school effectiveness and improvement (e.g. Lubienski, Lubienski, & Crane, 2008; MacNeil, Prater, & Busch, 2009; Rutter, Maughan, Mortimore, & Ouston, 1979), particularly for schools in disadvantaged communities (e.g. Gaziel, 1997; Muijs, Harris, Chapman, Stoll, & Russ, 2004). School effectiveness and school improvement rhetoric has enfolded this language of student
voice into calls for schools’ continuous improvement in consultation with key stakeholders.

(De-)forming improvement: The contradictory logics of student voice in school reform?

Sceptics of student voice in school reform work have questioned the extent to which school institutions and the state have deterritorialised – taken up and changed – the language of participation and voice, and accommodated students’ voices for the purposes of governance and school marketing.

Critics of the institutional discursive deployment of voice and participation argue that these terms have become neoliberal “weasel words” (Watson, 2005) that veil inequalities under a façade of democracy. These critiques argue that government agendas may co-opt “the egalitarian mythology of voice as a concept […] to shift attention away from increasingly aggravated social inequalities” (Arnot & Reay, 2007, p. 311; Black, 2011, 2012; Bragg, 2007b; Smyth, 2014; Whitty & Wisby, 2007). While it is beyond the scope of this review to map the contested definitions of the origins and manifestations of neoliberalism (see Connell & Dados, 2014), it is important to clarify what I refer to when I use the term neoliberalism (Rowlands & Rawolle, 2013). The term neoliberalism refers to the revival and transfiguration of classic liberalism following World War II (Foucault, 2010; Harvey, 2005), and the reconstitution of government as “facilitator of and handmaiden” to free markets (Layton, 2014, p. 161). Neoliberalism became a “fully fledged global movement” through the transnational effects of British and American political economy in the late twentieth century, touching “every nerve” of Australian society in its wake (Pusey, 2010, pp. 126-127, 125). Neoliberalism, while sharing certain principles with classic liberalism, replaces competition for liberalism’s logic of exchange (Foucault, 2010). Politically, the form and functions of the state reconfigure from government to governance, from hierarchies to heterarchies (Jessop, 2002). Neoliberalism is both social and psychic in scale; a political rationality realised and constituted in the banal, immediate practices of everyday life (Ong, 2007), including micro-practices surrounding reform in school.
Critics of recent manifestations of student voice note apparent “inconsistencies” (Robinson, 2014, p. 9) and “contradict[ions]” (Rudduck & Fielding, 2006, p. 223) between student voice, as a movement seeking to build democratic relationships of solidarity in schools, and the accountability pressures, competition and individualism that bolster hierarchical relations between schools, teachers and students. Student voice can be used as a form of “branding” (Bragg & Manchester, 2012, p. 150) to help the school boost its market appeal and articulate its “acceptable public face” (Cremin et al., 2011, p. 592). Starkey (2005) has critiqued some of the student voice literature for its “pragmatic” and “de-politicised” tone: voice becomes more about “customer feedback” than about richer discussions of “democratic principles” and “issues of gender, race and class” (pp. 306, 307). Fielding (2004) analyses how institutional uses of the concept of student voice may defuse and accommodate “potentially disruptive perspectives” to maintain institutional equilibrium (p. 298). Voice then becomes wedded to choice; voice co-opted in an educational climate of competition. What has been termed “neoliberal student voice” (Fielding & Moss, 2011, p. 152) is thus associated with instrumentality, competition, individualism, de-politicisation and the reconstitution of the student as a consumer-citizen (cf. Ball, 2008; Beck & Beck-Gernsheim, 2002; Lazzarato, 2009; Mol, 2009).

In particular, a number of Foucauldian critiques (Anderson, 2013; Bessant, 2003; Bragg, 2007b; McKay, 2014; Raby, 2014; Robinson & Taylor, 2013) have analysed how student voice may position students as self-governing and responsible for their own behaviour and learning (Foucault, 1991b). According to Foucault, disciplinary environments are divided and structured to mould and produce “the useful individual” who is governed through “hierarchical observation, normalising judgement, and the examination” (Savat, 2009, p. 46). Individuals are subjected to surveillance and monitored both to establish norms and produce subjects who accord to the norms of the institution in their speech, behaviour, use of time, and use of the body (Foucault, 1991a, p. 178). Attending to the detail of the individual’s behaviour, the disciplinary machine operates to make speech, behaviour and the use of the body visible, in order to more effectively regulate it (Foucault, 1991a, p. 139). Foucault (2007) argued that disciplinary societies’ patterns of governance are in the process of being slowly overlaid by governance through mechanisms of choice, “incentive-regulation” (p. 354) and self-responsibilising processes. The person is re-framed as
“homo œconomicus” – an “entrepreneur of him[her]self” (Foucault, 2010, p. 226), with teachers and students seeking “[c]ontinuous feedback from stakeholders” and becoming responsible for “output control” (Krejsler, 2007, p. 473). Foucault analysed processes through which individuals are encouraged take responsibility for their speech, behaviour and learning, as well as to choose to adopt the norms of the institution. These disciplinary modes of power intervene through care and reward, as well as punishment, to modify the individual’s internal state and external behaviour.

Critics of institutional uses of student voice have argued, following these Foucauldian insights, that choice and voice may become mechanisms through which the student is encouraged to manage and control his/ her own speech. Student voice, then, can become another instrumental strategy to use in governing students, with the focus of inquiry remaining squarely on the student’s learning and behaviour in school rather than on processes of transformation involving adults and young people (Black, 2011; Cockburn, 2005; Fielding, 2004b, 2011a; Fielding & Moss, 2011; Kehoe, 2013; Lodge, 2005; Whitty & Wisby, 2007).

Further analysis is needed of what have been called inconsistencies and contradictions in enactments of student voice as a reform strategy, and the intersections between these apparent contradictions and students and teachers’ subjectivities. The logics of neoliberalism have been described as not forming coherent or consistent logics, as contested and often contradictory (Harvey, 2005), shifting and changing over time, like a “moving target” (Rowlands & Rawolle, 2013, p. 262). Arnot (2006) describes the “unique coupling” of “market-oriented modes” and the appropriation of “egalitarian critiques of such markets” in the “performance-based pedagogies” as “paradoxical if not pathological/ schizoid” (p. 72). While Foucauldian analyses of neoliberalism have cogently analysed the practices that encourage people to become enterprising subjects, I agree with the psychoanalyst Layton (2014) that “something gets lost” amidst these analyses (p. 165). In particular, and as I explore further in the following chapters, I am interested in how desire intersects with governance: Do students want to be governed through student voice? What other dynamic movements of formation, re-formation and de-formation of subjectivity are at work? “[N]ew weapons” (Deleuze, 1992c, p. 7) are needed to create nuanced analyses of the intersecting, chaotic logics of student voice in its
enactment in school reform, that do not simplify it to being either a strategy for student governance and school marketing, nor a strategy for uncritical celebration (Mockler & Groundwater-Smith, 2015b). Complex narratives need to be told of the dynamic movements of voice as it moves through and beyond the territory of the school, mapping simultaneous co-options and liberations, resistances and acceptances, particularly as they intersect with students’ and teachers’ subjectivities and reform imperatives.

This chapter has mapped the movements of the concept of student voice – the various territories, histories, temporalities, political, economic, social contexts through which student voice has passed. I have analysed the rationales that have been formed for student voice, and voices of dissent to these celebratory claims. While student voice has been argued to position students as knowledge producers, to engender dialogical encounters, to empower students, and to improve schools, its claims about the subject, the possibility of dialogical understanding, power and improvement have also been troubled. Voice may listen, understand, empower and improve, but it may also essentialise the subject who speaks, flatten dissenting views through consensus, perpetuate binary relations between oppressor/ oppressed, liberator/ liberated, and be used to further govern students. Further interrogation is needed of processes of subjectification (see Chapter 3) in and through student voice work. In particular, exploration is needed of how desire and power flow in the enactment of student voice work, and the dynamics of the apparent inconsistencies and contradictions of student voice in a neoliberal milieu. This focus works in the noted “gap” between the ideals of student voice and its enactments (Carol Taylor & Robinson, 2009, p. 163).

To work in this gap, it is necessary to further examine the constitution of voices in schools, and other associations that murmur around the invitation to have a voice. It is with this chapter’s review of the celebrations and critiques of student voice as a concept that the following chapter introduces Deleuze and Guattari’s approach to the social order, voice, subjectivity, and the constitution of order in schools. Working with Deleuze and Guattari’s pragmatic approach to language, I focus attention to what happens when bodies speak: how words form and are formed by their shifting environments, and what voices do to bodies and subjectivities. Voice is not only
connected with standpoint epistemology, dialogue, praxis and school improvement, but is also associated with a history of ways of classifying and ordering students’ bodies and voices in relation to their age, perceived ability, and emotional expression. While the rationales for student voice discussed in this chapter suggest that student voice might catalyse change in schools, the history of how students’ voices and emotions have been encountered and interpreted suggest other potential responses to voice.
Chapter 3: Feeling school, ordering voices

The compulsory education machine does not communicate information; it imposes upon the child semiotic coordinates possessing all of the dual foundations of grammar (masculine-feminine, singular-plural, noun-verb, subject of the statement-subject of enunciation, etc.).

- Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari
  A Thousand Plateaus

Apprehending voices

Before it is possible to explore what students’ voices can do, it is necessary to consider how students’ voices have previously been apprehended and ordered in and through schools. The concept of student voice does not exist in isolation. Chapter 2 introduced how the concept of voice zigzags through history, passing into and through particular territories, with entangled rationales that include standpoint, dialogue, empowerment and school improvement. In this chapter, I introduce Deleuze and Guattari’s approach to language and social order and other associations that murmur around the phrase having a voice (cf. Deleuze & Guattari, 1980/ 1987, pp. 77, 84). These associations are “open-ended and subject to constant change”, transformed and transforming “as in a kaleidoscope” (Deleuze, 1999/ 1986, p. 17).

This chapter serves two purposes. The first purpose is to introduce Deleuze and Guattari’s approach to the function of language in forming order from chaotic multiplicities. The concepts of codes, indirect discourse and order words will become important in exploring voice in future chapters. The second purpose of this chapter is to interrogate the murmurs around the concept of voice in schools: the ways in which students’ voices, emotions and actions have been and are presently apprehended, understood and formed. These murmurs vary across discursive, historical and sociological territories, forming links with other codes, order words, subjects, objects, concepts, events, practices and processes. These murmurs are defined by “inherent
lines of variation” (Deleuze, 1999/ 1986, p. 7). To listen to the voices of students or teachers without attending to their associated murmurs would be to “botch” the assemblage (cf. Deleuze & Guattari, 1980/ 1987, p. 82). In particular, it is important to analyse the historical and sociological murmurs that intersect with the concept of voice because they are inextricably entwined with taken-for-granted ways of knowing students’ voices, emotions and actions. Taken-for-granted, or common sense ways of apprehending voices effectuate the conditions of possibility for speech and shape variations of speech in schools (Deleuze & Guattari, 1980/ 1987, p. 85).

Below, I explore these taken-for-granted ways of apprehending and ordering students’ voices, emotions and bodies in interaction with a puppet production. Three students in Year 9 and one student in Year 8 created this puppet production (see List of Pseudonyms and Student self-descriptions). The puppets dramatise the habitual ways in which students’ voices are apprehended, understood and ordered in schools. I thread together quotations from the puppet production transcript with a discussion of Deleuze and Guattari’s concepts. In Chapter 5, I methodologically contextualise the students’ creation of these puppet productions, and in Chapter 6, I explore students’ interpretations of this particular puppet production. In this puppet production, a student-puppet enters another classroom, having been “sent out” from another classroom, and enters into further conflict with a teacher-puppet. I approach this puppet production in a similar way to Deleuze and Guattari’s approach to the novella - or the detective story – discussed in A Thousand Plateaus (1980/ 1987). As I explained in Chapter 1, in a novella, everything is organised around the question, “‘What happened? […] Whatever could have happened for things to have come to this?’” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1980/ 1987, pp. 192, 194, their emphasis). In a similar way, the event dramatised in this puppet production impels an examination of the codes, order words and collective assemblages surrounding students’ speech in schools: whatever could have happened that might make sense of such modes of relating?

The rest of the chapter proceeds, following this puppet production, with a discussion of Deleuze and Guattari’s pragmatic approach to language, and their concepts of codes and order words. I then construct an overview of three order words that circulate and intersect with the concept of voice: age, ability and emotion. I then
discuss the role of data ordering-assemblages in the production of order in and about schools. These order words complicate the standpoint, dialogical, emancipatory and school improvement rationales for student voice in school reform that I reviewed in Chapter 2.

**Puppet production 1A: “I got sent out”**

*Hussein (teacher-puppet with purple dress):*
Hello class. Today we will be speaking about index laws.

*Rodger (student-puppet with orange hair):*
Oh how boring [student-puppet’s arms open wide, head tilts backwards].

*Alisha (student-puppet with yellow hair):* Oh my god. Sir, can we do anything new?

*Hussein (teacher-puppet):* No, we have to finish this subject first – this unit.

*Rodger (student-puppet with orange hair):*
[Sighs heavily and nods head forward vigorously.]

*Hussein (teacher-puppet):* If we put A plus A, it will say [Student-puppets turn towards one another. Student-puppet with yellow hair turns her back to the teacher-puppet and is whispering to the back of the room.] Blah blah blah blah blah, blah blah, blah. Blah blah,blah, blah, blah. Blah blah blah, blah, blah.

*Student-puppets:* [Whispering] This class is so boring. [Student-puppets turn towards each other and talk while the teacher-puppet is talking.]
Rodger (student-puppet with yellow cap):
[Pops up on teacher-puppet’s side of desk. Student-puppet with orange hair is nodding vigorously.] Sir. (.) I got sent out. [Nasal tone of voice.]

Hussein (teacher-puppet): Go stand at the end of the room.

Rodger (student-puppet with yellow cap):
[Sighs loudly. Moves towards back of the room.]

Alisha (student-puppet with yellow hair): [To the student-puppet who has been sent out] Hey! Hello. [Student-puppet with orange hair turns to student-puppet with yellow cap and they start nodding heads, as if whispering.]

Hussein (teacher-puppet): Don’t speak to him.

Alisha (student-puppet with yellow hair): [To the student-puppet who has been sent out] Shh shh. [Student-puppets turn away from each other.]

Hussein (teacher-puppet): Blah blah blah, blah blah blah. Blah blah blah, blah blah blah. Blah blah blah, blah blah blah. [Student puppets sigh, one snores. Student-puppet with orange hair tilts head back in exasperation. Student-puppet with yellow hair collapses head forward.]

Alisha (student-puppet with yellow hair):
[Over the teacher talking] Recess.

Rodger (student-puppet with orange hair):
[Yay recess! [All student-puppets bop their heads, talking excitedly, as they cross the desk to leave.]

James (student-puppet): Let’s go!

Hussein (teacher-puppet): Alright kids – have a good recess.
Student-puppets: Bye bye. [Teacher-puppet sighs. The speaking student-puppets disappear from the table. The pig, rooster and sheep student-puppets remain perched on the table.]


Hussein (teacher-puppet): [Moves towards student-puppet] Yes?

Rodger (student-puppet with yellow cap): You know – your lessons are (.) let’s say, boring (.) because, you know, the way you speak and things like that and your room is so [looks up and around] not vibrant, so dull. Your students were really talking about something else so not on, so not from the topic. I mean, you should really improve on your teaching and the way your classroom looks. You never know: your students might be more engaged and more (.) more uh, more respectful.

Hussein (teacher-puppet): (.) Um (.) don’t tell me what to do. I’ve been teaching for more than 10 years.

Rodger (student-puppet with yellow cap): [Louder, exasperated] Ugh, whatever, I’m going. [Student-puppet nods, turns around quickly and walks away.]

Ordering student voices

The student-puppets’ and teacher-puppet’s mode of interaction above is saturated with taken-for-granted ways of apprehending and making sense of students’ voices, emotions and bodies that I explore in relation to Deleuze and Guattari’s approach to language. Their concepts of codes, indirect discourses and order words will become

---

1 This is the first half of the transcript of this puppet production. The transcript of the second half of the puppet production is presented and explored in Chapter 6.
important in later unthreading the conditions that form and shape what voices can do in schools.

Deleuze and Guattari situate their approach to philosophy in the empirical tradition: a tradition, following David Hume, that emphasises the role of sense perceptions in the formation of knowledge, ideas, philosophical concepts and common sense. Modes of communication, for Deleuze and Guattari, are built from micrological affective intensities into codes: the implicit presuppositions or common sense logics of a group, institution or society. Flows of affect and desire shift and move, forming connections in shifting assemblages. Bodies “receive sudden jolts that beat like arteries” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1994/2009, p. 201). These affective intensities, or vivacious atoms of experience, tend towards resonance, like musical notes (Goodchild, 1996). “[Sighs [...], snores [...], tilts head back in exasperation].” These intensities, associated with similar experiences (and the experience of other proximate bodies), become expected, so that when comparable intensities repeat, particular communicative conventions and habits become encoded. Codifying these flows “see[s] to it that no flow exists that is not properly dammed up, channelled, regulated” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1983, p. 33). “Go stand at the end of the room.” There become “implicit presuppositions” and “social obligations” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1980/1987, p. 79) that shape what is understood as a common culture, linked together “according to a minimum of constant rules” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1994/2009, p. 201). Codes become abstracted from the multiplicitous intensities felt at the level of the body and felt exchange of force between bodies. “Don’t speak to him.” The reduction of chaotic multiplicities helps to make sense of the world. These habitual codes are daily repeated and reiterated. In this way, codes become common sense: senses felt and brought into relation with other senses and discourses to categorise experience. Structures come to seep under our skin through these codings of sense (Ahmed, 2010). Common sense forms through the senses.

Language, rather than presuming subjectivity, produces subjects. Deleuze and Guattari were deeply sceptical of linguistics and language: the “idea that we can only think within a language and that language structures our perceptions” (Colebrook, 2010, p. 308). At the same time, they took an “active part” in the linguistic turn, elaborating a “Continental brand of pragmatics” (Lecercle, 2002, p. 28). Pragmatic
linguistics troubled the structuralist linguistic introduction of a “natural order” (Saussure, 1959, p. 9) and the imposed separation of language (langue) from speech (parole), to instead foreground speech-acts and grammatical markers as markers of power (Austin, 1975; Searle, 1969). This view of language is distinguished from representational theories of language (where language represents the world) as well as from discursive theories of language (where the world is constituted in language). Unlike the Derridean conception of language as a free play of signifiers, the material force of language effects transformations (Massumi, 1992, p. 18). Words are inseparable from the world, caught in and intervening in the world “as a cog in a machine, as a component in an assemblage of power” (Lecercle, 2002, p. 81). The focus, then, shifts from the individual subject who speaks and what they say to “the necessarily social character of enunciation” and the collective assemblages from which utterances are spoken (Deleuze & Guattari, 1980/1987, pp. 79-80).

**Subjectification**² – the production of subjectivity – is effected through language: “You will be a subject, nailed down as one, a subject of the enunciation recoiled into a subject of the statement – otherwise you’re just a tramp” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1980/1987, p. 159).

Deleuze and Guattari call the “‘first’ language, or rather the first determination of language” “indirect discourse”: the “all manner of voices in a voice, murmurings, speaking in tongues” (1980/1987, pp. 76-77, their emphasis). These indirect discourses – murmurs – are not only citations or paraphrases of what I have heard before (for example, replicating the phrases my teachers used when I was a student), but are the expansive echoes of received sayings, clichés, hearsay, wisdom beyond me and my history (Cole, 2013; Grisham, 1991). When I use a particular phrase with a student, I am not quite sure whether these words have come from my past, or a textbook, or a television show, or somewhere else. “[D]on’t tell me what to do.”

Even before an order word is spoken in a classroom, these indirect discourses are the “prior orders” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1980/1987, p. 75).

---

² I spell this word as **subjectification** after Deleuze and Guattari’s spelling in *A Thousand Plateaus* (1980/1987), and keep this spelling consistent throughout this thesis. I acknowledge, however, that Murphie (2001) makes a distinction between **subjectification** (“a thoroughly stratified or captured position”) and **subjectivication** (“subjective operations which, although operating within social machines, use the processes of these social machines to form lines of escape from them”). For Murphie, both concepts “involve one’s implication in contemporary social machines” and both are “pragmatic” (Murphie, 2001, p. 1315).
The “elementary unit of language” is not an innate structure or cognitive capacity, but “the order word” (p. 76). The order word is inextricably bound up in codes or common sense logics, and entwined with indirect discourses. *Mots d’ordre*, usually translated as “‘order words’”, are not necessarily commands, but may be sentences, questions, or promises that connect prior orders, implicit presuppositions and social obligations, with localised effects (Deleuze & Guattari, 1980/1987, p. 79).

“*[W]e have to finish this subject first – this unit.*” “Words of order” create, arrange and reinforce political arrangements and classifications of bodies in relation to other bodies, spaces and things (Massumi endnote, Deleuze & Guattari, 1980/1987, p. 523). As I introduced in Chapter 1, bodies and subjectivities are segmented in a “binary fashion” and a “linear fashion”: “You’re not at home anymore” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1980/1987, p. 209). Spaces, too, are socially segmented in order words: striations demarcated for specific purposes and bodies (1980/1987, p. 208). “*Go stand at the end of the room.*” These order words impose the lines of rigid segmentarity introduced in Chapter 1. “*Don’t speak to him.*” Language organises bodies in society.

These “dual foundations” of the social order are “impose[d] upon the child” through the “compulsory education machine” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1980/1987, pp. 75-76). “[D]on’t tell me what to do.” Speech is used in classrooms not only to convey (curricular) content, but also to effect identity categories and power relations: who is permitted and not permitted to speak, to make knowledge claims, and to initiate change. “*I’ve been teaching for more than 10 years.*” Speech cannot be separated from the field of implicit presuppositions about who can speak, who should be silent, and how the world and the institution operate. These order words shape what voices say, condition how students’ voices are heard, and enable and constrain what voices can do. In Chapter 6, I further explore how order words effect transformations in subjects, forming, re-forming, and de-forming lines of subjectivity along lines of rigid segmentarity and molecular lines.

Yet, even as these order words “‘flow’ around places of learning like the routing of electricity in plasterboard walls” (Cole, 2013, p. 95), shaping subjectivities, they are radically unstable. These order words, the relations between them and their
e/affects are in “constant variation” and are “constantly subject to transformations” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1980/1987, p. 82). There are “pass-words beneath order words. Words that pass, that are components of passage” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1980/1987, p. 110). Sparks of flight are not containable; order words are accompanied by insurgent murmurs and mutations that leave an affective remainder. For Deleuze and Guattari, “transformational research” is concerned with the “variation of order words” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1980/1987, p. 83). Conditions for these transformations are the focus of the remaining chapters of this thesis.

The speaker is thus not author of her/his communication, but rather speaks as an effect of the operation of collective assemblages: collections of codes, indirect discourses and order words. Statements uttered in classrooms are spoken in the midst of “collective assemblage[s] of enunciation”; statements are fragments extracted from a “crowd” or constellation of voices (Deleuze & Guattari, 1980/1987, pp. 3, 84). This conception of enunciation does not give up on words or voices, but rather entangles them in their socio-political, affective and material milieus (Mazzei, 2014).

The next section constructs an account of some of the order words of schooling. This account of these particular order words was constituted from entanglements of my experiences in this territory, students’ and teachers’ words spoken to me, and my reading of educational sociological research and cultural theory. Order words, like concepts, are not pre-existing – the bedrock of the social order to be unearthed by the researcher. Rather, order words and accounts of order words form and are formed from the researcher’s experiential interaction in, with and among words and things.

**Ordering age: The young voice**

When the concept of students having a voice is invoked, other associations murmur around the statement: understandings of students’ voices that apprehend and understand voice through the speaker’s age. What the student-puppet says may be
understood in accordance with his\textsuperscript{3} young age: as an indication of his developmental immaturity, or of adolescent “storm and stress” (Hall, 1904). These conceptions of childhood and adolescence are contingent, contested and unstable, shifting and changing in and within historical periods, societies, cultures and institutions (Best, 2007; Burman, 1994; Hendrick, 2000; James, Jenks, & Prout, 1998; Lesko, 2001; Wyn, 2015).

Particular order words that codify understandings of students’ voices and emotions according to age are informed by key historical conceptualisations of childhood, even as these conceptualisations overlap, diverge and contradict one another. “Objective” studies of the child aimed to establish the origins of adult behaviour and the stages of natural processes of development: from Freud’s psychoanalytic studies of psychosexual development (see Chapter 4) to Piaget’s (1977) studies of cognitive development. Later psychoanalytic and linguistic theories, like Bowlby’s (1982) theory of human’s biological programming for attachment, and Chomsky’s (1965) theories of the innate structures of language acquisition, aimed to determine natural, universal processes of social and linguistic processes. In turn, Stanley Hall’s (1904) conceptualisation of adolescence as a period of “storm and stress” naturalised perceptions of young people’s emotional volatility: their limited self-control (“storm”) and a sensitivity to stimuli around them (“stress”). These conceptualisations of the child’s development oriented the gaze of the adult towards children and young people’s physical, emotional and intellectual deficits in comparison to adults, and separated the individual from others as a site of observation and regulation (Burman, 1994; Hendrick, 1990).

These studies and theories intersect with contested conceptions of children and young people’s place in the social order. Marshall (1950, p. 14) argued that children and young people are citizens \textit{in potentia} only and not “full members” of the \textit{polis} until they become “complete” as adults, where they enjoy both “rights and responsibilities.” Such a view of citizenship parallels the logics of natural development through time (Cockburn, 1998; Lister, 2007; Roche, 1992). Children and

\textsuperscript{3} In discussing student-puppet personae in this thesis, I use the gendered pronoun that students used in their discussions of the puppet production. Indeed, the gender pronoun used by the students suggests some of the order words of schooling: which gendered bodies are associated with deficient and/or excessive \textit{expressions} of voice.
young people’s citizenship is evaluated against the standard of the (apparently) competent and complete adult citizen (James, 2011; Lee, 2001; Moosa-Mitha, 2005). However, Mannheim’s (1928/1952) theory of social generations questioned the naturalness of the category of age, analysing the contingent ordering of generations and relationships between generations in different historical periods and societies (Jenks, 2005). More recently, sociologists of childhood have analysed the impact of socio-historical positioning/location, arguing that generational positioning shapes subjectivities in much the same way as social class, culture or gender (Alanen, 2001; Mayall, 2002).

Even as theories of age and the social ordering of generations have been contested, understandings of children and young people’s progression through predictable developmental patterns in linear time have “pervaded societal structures” (Hogan, 2005, p. 32). Bodies are segmented in a binary and linear fashion in the education system, the justice system, and political participation processes. Within schools, young people’s words, emotions and actions are commonly understood in relation to normative developmental psychological stages, pathways, and/or deviations (Woodhead & Faulkner, 2000; Wyn, 2007). These logics legitimise a view of school and schooling as “something ‘done to’” children (Devine, 2002, p. 312), to prepare students for future political participation (Hahn, 1998). Monitoring, controlling and channelling adolescents’ desires to develop character and responsibility become a critical part of developing “‘citizen-workers of the future’” (Lister, 2007, p. 697) and securing national order and progress (Lesko, 2001). As Chapter 6 explores, young bodies are exhorted to respect those who are older and those with authority.

Thus, age is one order word that shapes how students’ voices are apprehended and understood. According to developmental ways of knowing students, the student-puppet may be interpreted as immature according to his age, lacking expertise in comparison with the older teacher-puppet (who has been teaching “for more than 10 years”). These ways of knowing and making sense of students’ voices in accordance with the age of the speaking body will be revisited in Chapter 6. These prominent but contested order words surrounding students’ age complicate the standpoint rationale
for student voice that positions children and young people as beings: resources and producers of knowledge in the present (see Chapter 2).

**Ordering ability: The linguistic voice**

What the student-puppet says and how he says it is apprehended and appraised not only in relation to the age of his body, but also in relation to his perceived *ability*. This *ability* is evaluated in relation to how he speaks, expresses emotion, and deports himself, intersectionally interwoven with order words that speak of and order his gender, race and class. The student-puppet may be understood to lack the literacy, numeracy, and/or intellectual skills to *have a voice* at school. This order word of *ability* murmurs around the statement that students should *have a voice*, complicating calls for students and teachers to form joint understandings through dialogical encounters (see Chapter 2).

Theories of differential linguistic “codes” have (explicitly or implicitly) reinforced a “professional folklore” (Smyth & Wrigley, 2013, p. 97) that appraises the linguistic capacities and *expressions* of students from non-dominant backgrounds in deficit terms. Bernstein (1971) distinguished between the “restricted” language code of working class families, where language is used to refer to immediate objects, people and circumstances, and an “elaborated” code used by middle class families to communicate “context-independent” linguistic meanings. According to Bernstein, success at school depends on children having acquired this “elaborated” code. Jones (2013), in a more recent appraisal of Bernstein’s codes and later theories of linguistic deficit, argues that since Bernstein’s “restricted” and “elaborated” codes are defined in “paired” relations of “relative deficiency”, “deficit is inherent to the model” (p. 164). I do not subscribe to Bernstein’s classification of students’ differential linguistic codes as a structure of language (see Atkinson, 1985; Bernstein, 1971; Danzig, 1995; A. D. Edwards, 1976; Gordon, 1981; Halliday, 1978; Hasan, 2002; L. A. Jackson, 1974; Jones, 2013; Rosen, 1972 for further debate). Thinking with Deleuze and Guattari’s pragmatic linguistics (cf. Labov, 1972), Bernstein’s declaration of the presence of such linguistic codes is not a declaration of a pre-existing structure of language, but rather a performative speech act: words that order bodies and shape
how these bodies are known, ordered and treated (see Chapter 6). I introduce Bernstein’s codes here as a significant example of academic order words that can be taken up in schools to “offer theoretical respectability” to common sense judgements of a “profound and intractable deficiency” in students’ capacities and family backgrounds (Rosen, 1972, p. 3). I am interested in what such codings do (their pragmatic consequences): how the declaration of the existence of “elaborated” and “restricted” linguistic codes focus the critical “spotlight” (Gordon, 1981, p. 132) on the student and home as the origin of perceived deficits (Rosen, 1972, p. 7), and shift attention from the school and education system as a machine of social stratification.

These early judgements of students’ linguistic capacities or abilities have powerful consequences for how students’ bodies are ordered, and how their voices continue to be understood and shaped throughout their time in and beyond school. Students’ modes of speech, emotional expression and bodily deportment are closely entwined with educational sorting and selecting, with powerful consequences for students’ access to educational opportunities. Students from classed and raced backgrounds with modes of speech and bodily deportment most similar to those valued by dominant (white, middle class) groups in society are more likely to be streamed in higher ability classes, and to experience academic success and a sense of achievement (Apple, 1979; Bernstein, 1971; Bourdieu, 1977; Bourdieu & Passeron, 1977). In these ability streams or tracks, students are given or withheld access to knowledge and skills associated with social power and reward (Anyon, 1980, 1997; Boaler, William, & Brown, 2000; Haberman, 1991/2010; Johnston & Hayes, 2008). In low ability classrooms, where students from non-dominant class, language and racial backgrounds are over-represented, classroom communication is frequently dominated by teachers’ voices (Barnes, Britton, Rosen, & LATE, 1969), and students’ “vernacular voice[s]” are muted (Smyth & Wrigley, 2013, p. 109).

The classroom experiences that students are offered (or not), in turn, order their voices and their sense of themselves as learners. The differential “educational experiences and curriculum knowledge” made available to students has been described by critical scholars as the “hidden curriculum” (Anyon, 1980; Giroux, 1983b). Hargreaves (1982) argued that ability groupings and differential curricular opportunities can shape a “sense of failure”, “powerlessness and hopelessness” and a
“destruction of dignity” (p. 62). The message systems of curriculum, pedagogy and assessment in classrooms and schools, taken up in recent research on pedagogy in low socio-economic school communities, communicate “engaging” or “disengaging” messages about students’ knowledge, ability, their place in society, and the value of their voice: who they are and who they might become (McFadden & Munns, 2002; Munns, 2007; Munns & Sawyer, 2013; Sprange & Munns, 2015). These differential classroom messages and social conditions of learning shape how students understand their voices and their capacity to effect change in their classrooms, schools and lives.

Students’ subsequent success or failure in school can be understood in relation to their background or internal qualities or deficits, with “deficit thinking” (Valencia, 1997, 2010) serving to further order and reproduce cycles of classifications according to ability. Challenges that particular students face in schools are then attributed to “alleged cognitive and motivational deficits”, and/ or genetic pathology, immoral behaviour, asserted deficits in material family circumstances, and family linguistic and communicative resources (Valencia, 1997, p. 9). The student-puppet’s voice in this puppet production might be understood, according to such deficit thinking, as lacking communicative resources to “appropriately” and diplomatically articulate his opinions – even as this assessment of ability may be filtered through the lenses of his perceived raced, classed and gendered identity. The student-puppet, in turn, may understand himself as the kind of student who gets “sent out”, who does not speak in a register or manner that a teacher will engage with: “Ugh, whatever, I’m going.” In Chapter 7, I return to these ways of apprehending and ordering students’ communicative resources and capabilities, in interaction with dialogical rationales for student voice work.

**Ordering emotion: The emotional voice**

The ordering of students’ bodies according to age and ability, however, does not contain the affective expressions of students’ voices. The student-puppet’s voice, apprehended and understood as overly emotional, may be subject to disciplinary or psychological intervention. The order word of emotion murmurs around the call for students to empower themselves by having a voice (see Chapter 2).
A wealth of feminist scholarship has mapped how bodies have been ordered and understood according to codes segmenting rationality (associated with males) from emotionality (associated with females). Earlier feminist scholars unthreaded taken-for-granted gendered norms surrounding emotion and rationality that construct women as a threat to social order, dialogue and rationality (Bordo, 1987; S. Campbell, 1994; Jaggar, 1989; Lloyd, 1984; Spelman, 1989; S. J. Williams, 2001). More recent feminist scholars have further explored how voices and bodies are known and understood through taken-for-granted conceptions of emotion (Ahmed, 2004; Boler, 1999; Brennan, 2004). These scholars have traced how the subject is commonly understood to be “energetically and affectively self-contained” (Brennan, 2004, p. 2), expressing emotions from the “inside-out” (Ahmed, 2004, pp. 8-9). These ways of understanding emotions are critiqued for their marginalisation of the political question of “who decides” what emotions are acceptable and unacceptable (Boler, 1999, p. 98).

In schools, psychological understandings of emotion have produced explanations, classifications, regulative devices and programs to remedy the internal issues of isolated individuals (Henriques, Hollway, Urwin, Venn, & Walkerdine, 1984), sorting and sifting the “abnormal” or “at risk” emotional student from the “normal”, “rational” student (Harwood, 2006; Youdell, 2006b), and constituting the teacher as “guardian of the mouth”, particularly in relation to the “threat of minority orality” (Niccolini, 2009, pp. 41, 42). Order words imputing emotionality have concrete consequences: those who are considered unable or unwilling to control their emotions are more likely to experience surveillance, punitive discipline, suspension or expulsion, or to “drop out” or be “push[ed] out” (Fine, 1991; Laws & Davies, 2000; Ruglis, 2011; Tuck, 2012; Youdell, 2006b), and/or to be diagnosed with a behaviour disorder (L. J. Graham, 2007; Harwood, 2006; Harwood & Allan, 2014). More recently, decisions of a small group of young people to leave school and join overseas transnational movements such as Dā‘ish are explained through psychological lenses, as effects of psychological vulnerability or emotional dysfunction (Coppock & McGovern, 2014; Fekete, 2004; Furedi, 2004; Kundnani, 2012).

Psychologising order words effect transformations on young people, and individualise and abstract emotions from their social and political contexts.
Classifications of emotional disturbances are inconsistently applied to particular cultural, classed, raced and gendered communities (Ahmed, 2004, 2010; Blackmore, 1999; Boler, 1999; Burman, 2009; Hage, 1998; Niccolini, 2009; Zembylas, 2007). The onus falls on the individual to adjust to different expectations of “appropriate” modes of communication across diverse settings; “easy interaction” with family and friends “may be treated as disrespectful and rude” and as indication of “deficiency” within school (Smyth & Wrigley, 2013, p. 8). A range of educational scholars have analysed how the “individualistic gaze” (Gillies, 2011, p. 195) of psychological discourses mark, marginalise and exclude from educational institutions those perceived to display “excess” emotion and to lack “control of this excess” (Laws & Davies, 2000, p. 215). Such order words are thus critiqued for apprehending and understanding young people’s expressions of emotions in terms of what they lack.

More recently, order words surrounding emotions in schools have positioned the student as part of the process of emotional reflection and re-shaping. The student is guided to govern and take responsibility for their individual emotions (Ecclestone, 2007; Ecclestone & Hays, 2008; Furedi, 2004; Gillies, 2011; Illouz, 2008). “Emotionality as ethos” (Gillies, 2011, p. 185) has been articulated through constructs and associated programs of emotional intelligence (e.g. Goleman, 1995; Salovey & Mayer, 1990), emotional literacy (e.g. Gardiner, 2011), positive psychology (e.g. Seligman & Csikszentmihalyi, 2001), and positive behaviour (e.g. Luiselli, Putnam, Handler, & Feinberg, 2005; Shield, 2012). Whole school systemic positive behaviour interventions encourage the individual to identify, understand and regulate their emotions, in order to understand and manage the emotions of others.

These positive psychologising order words have been critiqued for their implicit individualism: rewarding students individually and teaching students to think about their emotions as individualised and a-political (Ahmed, 2010; Blackmore, 2011; Boler, 1999; Boler & Zembylas, 2003; Burman, 2009; P. Cushman, 1995; Ecclestone & Hays, 2008; Moskowitz, 2001; Zembylas, 2005, 2007). Positive approaches to developing students’ emotional capacities towards a “calm, emotionally flat [white, middle class] ideal” (Gillies, 2011, p. 191) thus become another way to govern students (Fielding & McGregor, 2005; Kenway & Youdell, 2011; Zembylas, 2005). I introduce these ways of ordering students’ voices emotionally here because
the Positive Behaviour Interventions and Supports approach was adopted by the NSW Department of Education and Communities during this period, introduced at this school as a reform strategy, and became entangled with the work of the Steering Committee (see Chapters 8 and 9).

According to the order word of *emotion*, the student-puppet’s words and actions might be understood as indicators of his need to learn to manage his emotions more effectively, while the teacher-puppet’s emotions might be interpreted as a natural or justified response. These order words surrounding students’ voices and emotions and the critiques above will become important in Chapter 8’s discussion of emotionality in classrooms and the imperative to be *responsible* for individual speech. Such ways of apprehending and ordering voices condition what students’ *empowered* voices can do.

**The voice of quantitative data and schools**

In the previous sections, I constructed an account of particular order words that code chaotic multiplicities and instantiate order. In this section, I turn to the production of quantitative data about students, teachers and schools. These data form ordering-assemblages that constitute another *voice* murmuring around the call for schools to encourage students to *have a voice*. The apprehension of the student-puppet’s voice according to his *age*, *ability* and *emotionality* is tangled up with the data that is produced about him. In turn, reconstituted pedagogical relations in schools around data shape what is said, felt and done by the student-puppet and his teachers.

The “Global Education Reform Movement” (Sahlberg, 2011) has been accompanied by waves of national “policy borrowing” (Lingard, 2010), as I introduced in Chapter 1. These national and global *reforms* have altered how students, teachers and schools are composed, known and evaluated, with ambivalent effects on the composition of schools and bodies within them. *Reforms* promoting *school choice* have contributed towards a “steady exodus from comprehensive public schools” (Ho, 2015, para. 3), enhancing the choices of middle class families, while exacerbating inequalities across educational systems (C. Campbell, Proctor, & Sherington, 2009;
Forsey, 2010; Gonski et al., 2011; Keels, Burdick-Will, & Keene, 2013; OECD, 2012; Windle, 2009). According to critical studies of the effects of standardised testing that use a range of quantitative and qualitative approaches, these reforms have contributed, in schools located in low socio-economic communities in particular, to a narrowing of the curriculum, constrained pedagogical approaches and educational experiences, and have amplified differences between classrooms and schools that focus on “the basics” and those that give students opportunities to access creative and critical modes of knowledge (Au, 2009; Boldt, Salvio, & Taubman, 2009; Hardy, 2014; Klenowski, 2011; Madaus, Russell, & Higgins, 2009; Polesel, Rice, & Dufier, 2013; Reay & Willam, 1999; G. Thompson, 2012; G. Thompson & Cook, 2013a). Thompson and Harbaugh (2014) report, from their survey findings of Western Australian and South Australian teacher perceptions of the impact of NAPLAN on curriculum and pedagogy, that pedagogical responses to the test “has flow on effects of promoting less inclusive classrooms where students have less voice” and where “less conversation between teachers and students occurs” (p. 310). According to these accounts, this heightened emphasis on academic performance exacerbates classificatory practices that know students through the skills and attributes expected at their age level and that form assessments of their ability.

Quantitative data have become a key mode in these global and local reforms to construct, know, analyse and govern the work of students, teachers and schools (Apple, 2005; Biesta, 2010; Hardy & Boyle, 2011; Lingard, 2010; Lingard & Sellar, 2013; Lingard et al., 2015; Readings, 1996; Rivzi & Lingard, 2010; Shore, 2008). Ball (2003) has described the ways in which such data about performances become evidence by which individuals and organisations are evaluated:

> The performances (of individual subjects or organisations) serve as measures of productivity, or output, or displays of “quality”, or “moments” of promotion or inspection. As such they stand for, encapsulate or represent the worth, quality or value of an individual or organisation within a field of judgment. (p. 216)

This climate of performativity compels schools to demonstrate change through the production of data. Schools need to construct progress narratives (Gannon, 2013) that accord with developmental, teleological visions of growth over time (Connell, 2013). As data are generated, knowledge about students is generated and divided up; individuals are rendered “‘dividual’ material to be controlled” (Deleuze, 1992c, p. 7).
This production and strategic assembling of data, entering into relation with students’ and teachers’ bodies and classroom spaces, can amplify the ordering of students by their apparent deficiencies or excesses in emotional expression. Ethnographers of schooling in the UK and US have argued that increased emphasis on performance, competition, compliance, and the more visible sorting and selecting functions of schools have exacerbated student resistances and forced confrontations between, in particular, students and teachers in low socio-economic communities (Arnot, 2004; Haywood & Mac an Ghaill, 2001; Mac an Ghaill, 1994; Sewell, 1997; Youdell, 2011). It is not only that teacher-centred pedagogies associated with standardised test preparation potentialises conflict between students and teachers. Smyth and Wrigley (2013) argue that this climate of performativity has given rise to a “new form of deficit theory” applied in practices of “naming, shaming, and blaming schools” and teachers for “poverty-related underachievement” (pp. 138, 131).

This “new form of deficit theory”, applied to schools, has been argued to have created a “climate of fear” that “undermines the formation of supportive relationships with young people” (Smyth & Wrigley, 2013, p. 135). Critical education scholars, reporting variously on teachers’ experiences of the effects of standardised testing and accountability mechanisms, name a range of emotions: “uncertainties” (Ball, 2003, p. 222), “anxiety” (Coffield, 2012, p. 132), “demoralisation, depression, frustration and stress” (Ball & Olmedo, 2013, p. 90), “[dis]comfort” (Polesel et al., 2013, p. 14), and “deep-seated ambivalence” (Niccolini, 2009, p. 42). Demands to shape and manage performance to meet external requirements may produce “game-playing, or cynical compliance” (Ball, 2003, p. 222) on behalf of executive and teaching staff (see, for example, Forsey, 2007). Thompson and Cook wonder whether these reforms are slowly reconstituting the language and logics surrounding how good teaching is known, in turn re-shaping teachers’ subjectivities and ways of knowing students: from “non-statistical ways” such as “student responsiveness, depth of understanding of key concepts and student engagement” to that which can be measured (2013a, p. 254); from “care to codes” (2012b, p. 579). Fielding (1999b) questions the impact of logics of accountability on teachers’ subjectivities and student/teacher relationships:
How many teachers [...] are now able to listen openly, attentively, and in a non-instrumental, exploratory way to their children/students without feeling guilty, stressed or vaguely uncomfortable about the absence of criteria or the insistence of a target tugging at their sleeves? (p. 280)

Further work is needed on how these reforms impact on evaluations of students’ voices.

To return to the puppet production above, the response of the teacher-puppet to the student-puppet who is “sent out” might be understood in the context of this sharpened focus on teachers’ work and student outcomes. In a climate where teachers are continually advised by a cacophony of distant policy-makers and politicians about how their work should be done, and evaluated through their students’ performances, how might a teacher feel when a student adds another voice to this cacophony? How might this climate shape the order words that the teacher-puppet speaks in this chapter’s puppet production? To listen to students’ voices may be challenging both for practical reasons (finding the time to listen) as well as psychically. The interplay of students’ physical voices, teachers’ voices, and the voices of data will be further explored in Chapters 8 and 9.

**Analysing and transforming the order words of schooling?**

In this chapter, I introduced Deleuze and Guattari’s concepts of codes and order words, in conversation with a puppet production created by students in Years 8 and 9. I then produced an account of how students’ voices have been previously apprehended and ordered according to the codes and order words of schooling. I brought together previous research surrounding the ordering of students according to age, ability and emotionality. Reviewing recent research on the proliferation of quantitative data in global and national calls for educational reform, I questioned how these productions of data intersect with the order words of age, ability and emotionality. These order words and data assemblages will be analysed in Chapters 6-9 in relation to students’ voices and this school’s reform efforts.

I have only gestured, through the research that I have cited, towards how students’ voices and these order words may be analysed, and how these order words
that negatively impact on particular bodies might be changed. A range of analytical approaches can be taken to analyse students’ voices, the order words of schooling, and to changing this order. Indeed, this chapter risked painting a picture of schools as tightly ordered, as if there were some fixed “grammar of schooling” (Tyack & Tobin, 1994). Thinking with Deleuze and Guattari (1983), a social machine (including, here, a school or school system) is “defined as a system of interruptions” (p. 36, their emphasis). Even as order is instantiated and reinscribed daily, there are always cracks effected, leaks made, and desiring-productions that leak and scramble the order. Within a school, gaps and leaks in the order are felt every day: voices that will not be quiet, bodies that will not sit still, collective hums that rise in volume in the playground or staffroom. There are those who “[scramble] all the codes” of schooling (Deleuze & Guattari, 1983, p. 15). In collective events like the puppet production discussed in this chapter, it becomes perceptible that apprehending, ordering, and interpreting intensities, emotions and voices is not so straightforward. It is precisely this autonomy and ungovernability of affect that is so perplexing (Massumi, 2002). In the following chapter, I map a number of key analytical approaches to the order words of schooling and the voices and intensities that exceed this order. These analytical approaches – that attend to power and knowledge, resistance, discourse and psychoanalytic concepts – raise questions about whether these order words of schooling inevitably reproduce themselves, or whether they might shift and change. I explain my analytical approach as listening, simultaneously destroying and generating, connecting, and experimenting with potential escape routes from current codes and habits of teaching, learning, relating and living.
Chapter 4: Proliferating interpretations, desiring-analysis

|D|esire produces reality,  
|or stated another way,  
|desiring-production is  
|one  
|and the  
|same thing  
as social production.

- Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari
  Anti-Oedipus

In moving towards analysing what students’ voices can do, this chapter introduces previous modes of analysing students’ voices and schooling. In the previous chapter, I constructed an account of the murmurs around the call for students to have a voice: the codes, indirect discourses and order words that order bodies in schools. I reviewed previous work on shaping and moulding students’ voices, emotions and bodies according to age, ability, emotionality, and the ordering of data.

This chapter locates the analytical approach taken in this study in relation to previous analyses of students’ voices and the order words of schooling. While the previous chapter explored how schools have attempted to understand and change individuals, this chapter examines how researchers have attempted to analyse and change schools. I map the theoretical angles from which schools and students’ experiences of school have been analysed, and argue for the productivity of Deleuze and Guattari’s analytical tools for exploring the movements of voice, desire and social production. In Chapter 2, I introduced phenomenological and liberal humanist modes of analysis of students’ voices, as well as their postcolonial and poststructural critiques. This earlier chapter argued the need to attend to issues of power beyond the subject who speaks, to trouble subjectivity, and to entwine analysis of desire. This chapter explores particular modes of analysing schooling’s structures and students’ bodies and voices: critical analyses, analyses of resistance, discursive analyses, and psychoanalytic analyses. I consider their respective contributions: what they render
visible and what they mute, particularly in relation to questions of power, desire and social (re)production. I contend that Deleuze and Guattari's conceptual tools work with the “wild profusion of existing things” (Foucault, 1970, p. xv), “proliferat[ing]” analyses (Lather, 2006). Rather than rejecting Marxist and psychoanalytic thought, Deleuze and Guattari “retool” them (Buchanan, 2013, p. 11). In a similar way, I appropriate Deleuze and Guattari’s concepts to “extend and elaborate” (Ringrose, 2011, p. 600) critical, resistance, discursive and psychoanalytic approaches to the study of students’ schooling experiences. I work with their conception of desire as productive to craft a mode of sociological desiring-analysis that simultaneously analyses relations of social production and desiring-production, attending to the cracks and pathways out of social reproduction. I argue that desiring-analysis re-works Marx’s early injunction to not (only) “interpret” the world but to also “change” it (1978, p. 145), in experimental entanglements with words and the world.

Below, I explore four analytical angles from which students and schools can be analysed in engagement with a puppet production. This puppet production was created by four Year 9 students towards the end of the year of their involvement in the student voice group. Chapter 5 methodologically contextualises the creation of the puppet productions, and Chapter 7 further explores students’ analyses of this particular puppet production. In this puppet production, a student-puppet “speaks” like a chicken, and is unintelligible to the teacher-puppet. Another student-puppet in the class suggests that a focus group is conducted to “solve this issue.” The puppets move into a focus group formation, and the chicken student-puppet momentarily speaks intelligibly, telling the teacher-puppet, “I’m [...] scared [...] of you” before returning to “speaking” like a chicken. In this chapter, I use this puppet production in a similar way to Deleuze and Guattari’s (2007; 1980/1987) discussion of the particular case of Little Hans, a child with an apparent fear of horses who was treated by Freud with information provided by Little Hans’ father. Deleuze and Guattari work with this case to critique Freud’s analytical approach, and to invent their own. In a similar way, I consider how the puppet-voices and school might be analysed through particular interpretive lenses, and introduce my analytic approach.

This chapter opens by introducing Deleuze and Guattari’s discussion of the case of Little Hans, foregrounding their warnings about interpretation and their
conception of desire. I then present the puppet production transcript. I consider critical, discursive, resistance, and psychoanalytic approaches to the issues that this puppet production raises. The final section of the chapter argues for the utility of desiring-analysis for extending the insights of critical, discursive and psychoanalytic approaches and for reorienting interpretation to experimentation.

**Little Hans and interpretosis**

Freud’s analysis of Little Hans provides a classic case of the dangers of interpreting children’s words (Deleuze, 2007; Deleuze & Guattari, 1980/1987; Deleuze & Parnet, 2006/1977). Deleuzian scholars have acknowledged that Deleuze and Guattari’s critique of Freud may, at points, over-simplify Freud’s theories (Buchanan, 2013), and romanticise childhood (Hickey-Moody, 2013a, p. 281). However, their critique of Freudvaluably foregrounds the “unfortunate tendency” to “ignore” what children say and “put words in their mouths” (Buchanan, 2013, p. 10), attends to the potential of desiring flows (Hickey-Moody, 2013, p. 281), and re-orientsthe concept of desire from lack to production. Deleuze and Guattari’s discussion of Little Hans illustrates the complex assemblages of power and desire at work in social arrangements and highlights the dangers of attempting to find the “meaning” of a child or young person’s words, emotions or actions. I use the case of Little Hans as an entry point to explore various interpretations of students’ voices and the work of schools, and to note what confounds and exceeds these interpretations.

Freud, according to Deleuze and Guattari, takes Little Hans’ fear as, at first, representing an anxiety about being away from his mother. Later, this “horse-phobia” is interpreted as fear of the horse’s “pee-maker”, with the horse representing Little Hans’ father (Deleuze, 2007, p. 99). When Little Hans questions these adults’ interpretation of his horse-phobia, protesting, “But a pee-maker doesn’t bite”, Freud corrects Little Hans and encourages Little Hans to re-frame his experience through Oedipal lenses. Little Hans is gradually silenced: his initial “moments of irony when he senses that the adults are going too far” is reduced:

… he hides [his irony] more, he agrees with everything, he recognises everything, resigns himself, yes, yes, I wanted to be the mama, I want to be the papa, I want a big
pee-maker like papa’s… just so they leave him alone, so that he can finally forget, forget everything, including those annoying hours of psychoanalysis. (Deleuze, 2007, p. 101)

Little Hans’ resistance to the idea that he knows his own desire is slowly worn down (Buchanan, 2013).

For Deleuze and Guattari, Freud’s analysis of Little Hans is an archetypal example of interpretosis. Interpretosis is any attempt to fix the subject’s pathology, identity, or the meaning of what they say or do in time according to a particular interpretive framework. The child’s utterance is “reduced to a prefabricated and predetermined grid of interpretation” that the child “cannot escape” (Deleuze, 2007, p. 89) – in this instance, the “family-territory” – so that everything is interpreted as representative of the mother, father and Oedipus (p. 90).

Freud’s analysis is critiqued for its failure to listen, its disconnection from the machinic assemblage of the street, and the blockages it effects. Freud does not allow Little Hans to “speak for himself” (Buchanan, 2013, pp. 9-10) – about his situation of being forbidden to go into the street and his “horse-becoming” endeavour (Deleuze & Parnet, 2006/1977, p. 59). Freud’s interpretation separates the horse from the machinic assemblage of “building-street-nextdoor-warehouse-omnibus-horse-a-horse-falls-a-horse-is-whipped” – multiplicitous circulating and transforming affects, smells, movements, bodies, animals, desire (Deleuze & Parnet, 2006/1977, p. 59). The horse, is “not representative but affective” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1980/1987, p. 257). Freud’s interpretation crushes and stifles the intensities circulating in the street-horse event, freezing Little Hans with worry, guilt and “sad affects” (Deleuze, 2007, p. 98). Seizing and demolishing Little’s Hans’ utterances about the horse thus prevents desiring-assemblages “from circulating freely and really changing” (Deleuze, 2007, p. 100).

Turning to a puppet production created by four Year 9 students, the reader might consider the diverse ways in which what happens (and does not happen) in this puppet production might be understood. I introduce four approaches to what happens in this puppet production, and consider what they make visible, and the questions that they leave in suspension. This exploration of the puppet production leads into a
discussion of an alternative mode of analysis offered in Deleuze and Guattari’s conception of desire.

Puppet production 2: “Bok”

[The scene is set at the table in the school’s Executive meeting room. On the left side of the frame, the teacher-puppet (with brown hair and purple dress) is standing, facing the student-puppets. Four student-puppets are behind one side of the table: a student-puppet wearing a blue cap, the chicken student-puppet, the sheep student-puppet and a student-puppet with orange hair. Adjacent, on the other edge of the table, is the student-puppet wearing a yellow cap. The teacher is starting a lesson.]

Isaac (teacher-puppet): Okay class, we've been learning about travel. Does anybody have any questions? [All students are upright at side of table. Chicken student-puppet is closely flanked by the student-puppet with a blue cap and the sheep student-puppet.]

xPeke (chicken student-puppet): [Quietly] Bok.

Isaac (teacher-puppet): Yes, chicken?

xPeke (chicken student-puppet): [Loudly] Braaaaake. [Raises open beak to the ceiling]

Isaac (teacher-puppet): I’m sorry. Can you please repeat that?

xPeke (chicken student-puppet): [Loudly] Braaaaaeek. [Opens beak to ceiling.]

Isaac (brown hair teacher-puppet): Um. I don’t understand you.
**xPeke (chicken student-puppet):**
[Loudly] Bok bok, braaaaake.

**Isaac (teacher-puppet):** Okay chicken, stay with me after class.

**xPeke (chicken student-puppet):**
[Plaintively] Breaara. [Chicken student-puppet slowly collapses forward on table, beak down.]

**Umprikash (student-puppet wearing yellow cap):** [Hands wide. Puppet body shakes as he speaks.] It seems we have a communication error.

**Isaac (teacher-puppet):** Okay.

**Umprikash (student-puppet wearing yellow cap):** Why don’t we conduct a focus group to solve this issue?
[Student-puppet with orange hair nods vigorously and then puts head face down in lap.]

**Isaac (teacher-puppet):** Sure thing.
[Teacher-puppet moves closer, and all puppets move closer to each other.]

**Umprikash (student-puppet wearing yellow cap):** Why did you put the chicken on detention?

**Isaac (teacher-puppet):** I didn’t understand what he was saying in class.
[Chicken student-puppet taps beady eyes on table three times.]

**xPeke (chicken student-puppet):** [Lifts head from table quickly and quietly says] Mmrrrrra. [Replaces head on table,
face down. Taps table with beady eyes twice.] (1)

**Shaza (student-puppet with orange hair):** Maybe you’re just misinterpreting what the chicken’s trying to say.

**Isaac (teacher-puppet):** I will try now.

**Shaza (student-puppet with orange hair):** Go ahead. [Turning body towards chicken student-puppet and teacher-puppet.]

**Isaac (teacher-puppet):** What’s your problem, chicken?

**xPeke (chicken student-puppet):**

[Slowly, lifting head from table. Puppet arms are on side of beak, in protection. The human voice of the puppeteer still has the cadences of a chicken’s squawk]

Bbb, bbb, (.) I’m (.) –

**Isaac (teacher-puppet):** Yes?

**xPeke (chicken student-puppet):** - scared (.) –

**Isaac (teacher-puppet):** Yes?

**xPeke (chicken student-puppet):** - of you. (.) Broooaak.

**Isaac (teacher-puppet):** Are you scared of me? (1) [Student-puppet with orange hair slumps head forward in lap.]

**xPeke (chicken student):** Yes. [Student-puppet with yellow cap nods head emphatically.]

( )
Isaac (teacher-puppet): Why?

xPeke (chicken student-puppet):

Mmmm. [Taps beady eyes on table twice] Bruuuk. (I)

Analysing voices and schools

The event enacted in the puppet production, like the case of Little Hans, may be approached from a variety of interpretive angles. These angles render visible different constitutive components of the machinic assemblage, while muting others. Listening to the chicken student-puppet’s voice, the chicken student-puppet tells the teacher-puppet that his “problem” is that he is “scared” of the teacher. While a critical analysis of this puppet production may note the structures and practices that silence the children student-puppet, an analysis looking for student resistance may stress the chicken student-puppet’s agency in refusing to speak. While discursive analysis may examine discourses that constitute the student-puppet and teacher puppet as fearful/fearing subjects, a psychoanalytic analysis may wonder at the psychic processes, affects and transferences between bodies. Below, I consider the contributions of these various analytical approaches.

Critical approaches to the analysis of voices and schooling

Critical approaches to voices and schooling pay close attention to power, ideology, and the reproduction of class structures and social and economic inequalities through schooling. Influenced by Max Weber and Karl Marx, neo-Marxist scholars from the 1970s foregrounded analyses of power and conflict between and among social groups. Rather than taking differential experiences and outcomes of schooling as endemic to the social order, or taking for granted the socialising function of education in the service of the economy (cf. Parsons, 1959; Tyack & Cuban, 1995), these scholars analysed the reproduction of social privilege through the curriculum and schooling practices (e.g. Apple, 1979; Young, 1971, see Chapter 3). As an exemplar, Bowles
and Gintis argued in Schooling in Capitalist America (1976) that relationships between “administrators and teachers, teachers and students, students and students, and students and their work – replicate the hierarchical division of labor” (p. 131), socialising students into hierarchical structures mirroring corporations and thus reproducing capitalism’s social and economic inequalities. Bowles and Gintis’ (1976) theories of reproduction articulated the control of students’ voices with economic structures and forces to account for the intergenerational persistence of economic status.

Bourdieu extended this analysis of reproduction beyond economic structures and forces, arguing that the “cultural capital” (Bourdieu, 1977; Bourdieu & Passeron, 1977) transferred by cultural and social elites inter-generationally and through schooling also works to reproduce inequalities. As discussed in Chapter 3, Bernstein, in his language codes (1971), suggested that students’ (so-called) “restricted” language codes also marginalises them. For these theorists of economic and cultural reproduction, schooling inequalities are entwined with differential access to forms of knowledge and power and cultural and economic resources; those with power and privilege work to maintain their power and privilege, even if the mechanisms for this reproduction of inequality are contested (Smyth & Wrigley, 2013, p. 24).

While these critical analyses may diagnose the reasons for the chicken student-puppet’s fraught experiences in school, and provide a strong argument for the structural forces that constrain the chicken student-puppet’s speech, they are in danger of consigning the chicken student-puppet to silence and unintelligibility. How will the schooling system ever change, and how will the chicken-student puppet ever be intelligible? Bowles and Gintis (2002) later acknowledged that their “interpretation gave insufficient attention to the contradictory pressures operating on schools” and “avoided the question of what schools should be” (p. 15) – alternative(s) to an inevitable correspondence between economic background, students’ experiences of schooling and the reproduction of the social order.

Such critical interpretations may note, in the puppet production above, how classroom practices reinforce class relations and power structures. Perhaps, according to this mode of analysis, the curriculum makes the chicken student-puppet’s
knowledge unrecognisable; his language codes (Bernstein, 1971) are judged as lacking in relation to the modes of speaking valued in the classroom. While theories of economic and cultural reproduction may help to diagnose why some students succeed and others fail, social change becomes dependent on those with privilege to recognise the value of the capital and linguistic codes of disadvantaged groups, and to join in solidarity with disadvantaged groups, or for non-dominant groups to acquire these codes and capitals (maintaining the privileged place of these codes and capitals). These approaches may mute considerations of desire for the maintenance of power and privilege, and downplay the resistances of individuals and groups to social and cultural reproductions of inequalities.

Resistance in the analysis of voices and schooling

While these earlier critical analytical approaches notice the chicken student-puppet’s silences and articulate these with schooling and social structures and the reproduction of social and economic inequalities, analytical attention to student resistance may interpret the chicken student-puppet’s silence and speech as indications of his agency. Attending to moments of resistance inflects analysis of individual agency with analysis of complex social reproduction processes. The chicken student-puppet may be understood as boldly speaking and acting against classroom practices that are intolerable, even as he is intimately implicated in what happens in the classroom (and in his life).

Since Willis’ (1977) critical ethnography of working class “lads” in the U.K., Learning to Labor, critical ethnographers have explored how students dynamically shape their educational outcomes in interaction with their teachers and prevailing institutional norms through their resistance, compliance, or rejection of schooling practices. Responding to the determinism of earlier accounts of social reproduction (e.g. Bowles & Gintis, 1976), Willis (1977) attended to the “resistant dignity” (p. 39), the opportunities stolen to “have a laff” (p. 13), and the “everyday resistances” (Dolby & Dimitriadis, 2004a, p. 3) of the “lads” at Hammertown School. Willis (1977) argued that students struggled with, contested, and “partially penetrated” (p. 119) the social order of school, class and economic systems, individualism and meritocracy beyond optimistic rhetoric about education (p. 3). In attending to the lads’ agency,
Willis demonstrated that processes of social reproduction are “always shot through with fits, starts, and contradictions” (Weis, Jenkins, & Stich, 2009, p. 919). In a tradition of studies of resistance following Learning to Labour (see, for a nuanced review, Tuck & Yang, 2014b), the chicken’s speech and silence might be read as oppositional (even though it is ambiguous whether the chicken is a “lad” or an “earhole,” and whether his resistance is displayed through silences and/or speech). Like Willis’ lads, the chicken student-puppet’s silence also seems to have negative consequences that seal his fate as an unintelligible, unrecognisable student.

Willis’ introduction of human agency offered a “theoretical breakthrough” (Weis et al., 2009, p. 919) in analyses of schooling, students’ voices and the reproduction of inequalities, and has been powerfully influential in critical ethnographies (see Dolby & Dimitriadis, 2004b; Tuck & Yang, 2014b). However, Willis’ attention to agentic resistance has also been critiqued, for example, for his over-identification and romanticisation of the “lads’” masculinist resistance (Hammersley & Atkinson, 1996; McRobbie, 1980; Skeggs, 1992). Accounts of student resistance indebted to Willis have also been critiqued for only noticing conscious, oppositional power relations, producing “one-dimensional, cardboard-cutout representations of teachers” (Forsey, 2000, p. 214) and dichotomous representations of students as “either rebellious, resistant, feisty teenagers or […] compliant”, “required to reject their ethnicity in order to succeed in white society” (Devine, 1996, p. 237). Resistance, as a way to affirm agentic responses to difficult circumstances, may ascribe meanings that were never intended to social actions, and reduce complex relations of power and desire to singular accounts (Hynes, 2013).

Even as studies of resistance have eloquently described the complexities and paradoxes of social reproduction (Apple, 1982), like earlier critical approaches, they have been critiqued for diagnosing and describing cycles of reproduction without offering alternatives (Gore, 1993; Jenkins, 1982). While Willis’ (1977) lads display “resistant dignity” (p. 39), this resistance ironically leads them to embrace a future of unskilled labour, and they become complicit in the cycle of class relations (p. 174). Attending to resistances still focuses attention on students as the vectors for change, and risks simplistic accounts of students and teachers. Such analyses may not attend
to processes of subjectification, and may miss what circulates between students and teachers: how it is that students come to desire resistance.

**Discursive approaches to the analysis of voices and schooling**

Foucault’s and Butler’s discourse and power/knowledge relations enable another mode of analysis of schools and student/teacher relations and subjectivities beyond the dialectic of structure or agency. A discursive approach might situate the puppet production interaction in relation to broader discourses and shifting power/knowledge relations that constitute students and teachers as subjects. Such analyses produce accounts of how students are subjected within institutions through discourse, but leave underexplored classroom flows and assemblages of desire.

In Chapter 2, I introduced Foucault’s conception of power as productive, circulating within local, unstable relations and networks. For Foucault and Butler, the individual is made a subject and subjected to relations of productive power through discourse (Butler, 1990, 1997a; Foucault, 1976/1990). Discourses are “practices that systematically form the objects about which they speak” (Foucault, 1972, p. 49). Discourses are intimately entangled with institutions (e.g. the family, education, the law) and to disciplines that order, classify and produce knowledge about the conduct of bodies associated with these institutions (e.g. psychology, medicine, pedagogy, psychoanalysis) (Foucault, 1976/1990, 1977). Discourses authorise what can and cannot be said, and what subjects are recognisable and unrecognisable, intelligible and unintelligible. MacLure (2003) explains:

> [D]iscourses not only circumscribe what it is possible to say, know and do, but also establish what kind of person one is entitled/obliged to “be.” It is impossible, in other words, to speak without speaking as the kind of person who is invoked by one discourse or another. (p. 176, her emphasis)

Power, operating in and through discourse, incites, activates and shapes bodies into subjects (Butler, 1997b; Foucault, 1992). The chicken student-puppet who speaks in the classroom above, constrained by the discursive limits of this classroom, initially can only speak and be recognised as the ‘type’ of student who gets put on detention (cf. G. Thompson, 2011). A discursive analysis shifts examination from macro-level critiques of power (as in critical analyses) to the micropolitical; how the chicken
student-puppet is simultaneously subjected to and exercises power through discourse (Foucault, 1980, p. 98).

Discursive analyses open the possibility for a form of agency that is not a property of the resistant subject, and suggest the possibility of change; discourses are “constrained but not determined in advance” (Butler, 1997a, p. 139). While at times seemingly prevailing as truth, discourses are never total; they are “discontinuous activit[ies]” with “different manifestations” that come together at times, proliferating or merging, but also excluding, fragmenting and morphing at other times (Foucault, 1972, p. 229). Since discourses are contingent in formation, their instabilities, contradictions and slippages make them open to disruption, refusal and reshaping (cf. Butler, 1997a, 1997b; Foucault, 1976/1990). In moments of “discursive re-signification” and “discursive agency”, where subjects radically deploy discourse to take on new meanings (as in the re-signification of the term queer from a term of insult to a term of celebration), potential shifts in present discursive habits are glimpsed (Butler, 1997a; Youdell, 2006a).

Discursive analyses in educational research have insightfully examined “the institutionalised common sense” that naturalizes binary oppositions” and distributes inequalities (MacLure, 2003, p. 181). Mapping how subjectivities are differentially shaped according to binary oppositions: student/teacher, young/old, mature/immature, successful/failing, well-behaved/at-risk, these analyses highlight the historical and contextual contingencies of discourses, and the possibilities for destabilising and reconstituting discourses.

These modes of analysis indeed unthread discourses in circulation in schools, but only vaguely suggest alternatives, and do not enable analysis of non-linguistic components of educational assemblages. Discursive analyses focus on what is spoken and unspoken, and do not claim to deal with analyses of affect, desire, the sensory and the material (Barad, 2007; Koivunen, 2010; Massumi, 2002; Ringrose, 2011; Seigworth & Gregg, 2010; Terada, 2001). While the discourses that produce the chicken student-puppet’s silences may be analysed, discursive analyses do not claim to explore the psychic dimensions of the silences between the student-puppet and teacher-puppet. Foucault (1972) wrote that discourse is a “violence we do to things”,
“a practice we impose upon them” (p. 229). Movements of desire and affect that circulate between and exceed individual bodies slip through: what is excessive, inexplicable, unspeakable, uncanny and complex in schools that cannot be contained or captured within representational thinking or discourse (Blackman & Venn, 2010; Coleman, 2013). While discursive analyses can examine how the chicken student-puppet is constituted as a subject who lacks, desire that exceeds discourse is not analysed, nor, again, whether and how he comes to desire his own subjection. Psychoanalytical approaches, however, attempt such an investigation.

**Psychoanalytical approaches to the analysis of voices and schooling**

Psychoanalytical approaches to education have drawn attention to what cannot be explained cognitively or analysed discursively: libidinal investments, psychic processes, affects and transferences in pedagogical relations (Boler, 1997). Psychoanalytic approaches drawing on poststructural thought shift the research gaze from the student alone, to how subjects negotiate discursive positions in psychically complex ways (Holloway & Jefferson, 2000; Walkerdine, Lucey, & Melody, 2001). Deborah Britzman and Tamara Bibby are exemplary poststructural psychoanalytic scholars who explore teaching, as an impossible profession – the teacher tries to influence those with their own minds and resistances, natality, and psychical lives (Bibby, 2011; Britzman, 2009; cf. Freud, 1925/1968). I consider Britzman and Bibby’s important contributions before explaining why and how this study conceptualises desire differently.

Britzman and Bibby’s work has generated productive consideration of the psychic life of classrooms. Britzman interrogates the assumption that individuals are masters of their thought, and that cognition precedes affect (1998, p. 7), exploring the “stammers, conflicts” and “unaccountable affects” in classrooms (2009, p. 3), the conflicts between and within students and teacher and between “curriculum discourse and student discourse”, and “the struggle for voice” (1989, p. 150). In considering the chicken student-puppet’s stammers and silences, this approach attends to the psychic conflict represented in the chicken student-puppet’s boks and the student-puppets’ and teacher-puppet’s silences. Bibby (2009), in a resonant but different manner to Willis’
analysis of the lads’ unwitting desire for class reproduction, suggests that there is “something embedded in individual, professional and institutional psyches” that “is working hard to maintain the status quo and to avoid the difficulty” of pedagogical relationships (p. 54). In the case of the chicken student-puppet, this approach might analyse the chicken student-puppet and teacher-puppet’s unconscious libidinal investments in present classroom relations. The student-puppet and teacher-puppet could be understood as blocking out, denying or repressing “unbearable knowledge” (Bibby, 2009, pp. 52-53) to protect the psyche, withdrawing from the possibility of difficult encounters.

These psychoanalytical approaches enable analyses of affect in the classroom beyond individualised psychological approaches to emotion (see Chapter 3), and attend to the micropolitical vitalities of classroom life. However, there is a danger in some psychoanalytical approaches, particularly those informed by Lacan and Freud, that the desiring subject is again known in terms of what he or she lacks (Boler, 1999; Zembylas, 2007). Locating lack as a “condition in the psyche” inhibits “a critique of how lack is cultivated in the social as an economic and force relation” (Ringrose & Renold, 2011, p. 464). Considering important earlier critiques of deficit thinking in education reviewed in Chapter 3, psychoanalytical approaches that conceptualise desire in terms of lack may mirror and inadvertently reproduce similar logics of deficit. It is at this stage of the chapter, having considered a range of approaches to the analysis of voice, power/ knowledge, social reproduction, and change, that I turn to the analytical tools offered by Deleuze and Guattari.

**Desiring-production and social (re-)production**

Deleuze and Guattari re-orient analysis from the inevitable reproduction of the subject who lacks and the reproduction of social structures to the production of desire in social assemblages. Deleuze and Guattari work “outside the dialectic of agency and structure” (Ringrose & Renold, 2011, p. 463), analysing desiring-assemblages and social assemblages as inextricably entangled: “desire produces reality, or stated another way, desiring production is one and the same thing as social production” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1983, p. 30). They re-engineer and entwine psychoanalytic
libidinal economies of desire with Marxist theories of political economy, history and society (Buchanan, 2013; Ringrose, 2015). While given names at different times “schizoanalysis, micropolitics, pragmatics, diagrammatism, rhizomatics, cartography”, this approach studies the lines that produce individuals, groups, institutions and societies (Deleuze & Parnet, 2006/ 1977, p. 94).

Educational researchers have previously taken up Deleuze and Guattari’s concepts to analyse the affectual assemblages and desiring economies within and beyond classrooms (e.g. Albrecht-Crane & Slack, 2007; Cole, 2011; B. Davies & Gannon, 2009; de Freitas, 2012, 2013; de Freitas & Curinga, 2015; Gough, 2006, 2007; Hickey-Moody, 2007, 2013b; Jackson, 2010; Knight, 2013; Leafgren, 2009; MacLure, Holmes, MacRae, & Jones, 2010; Mulcahy, 2012; Olsson, 2009; Renold & Mellor, 2013; Renold & Ringrose, 2008; Ringrose & Renold, 2011; Roy, 2003; Sellar, 2014a; Semetsky, 2006, 2008; Semetsky & Masny, 2013; Sherbine & Boldt, 2013; Springgay, 2008; G. Thompson & Cook, 2012a, 2012b, 2013b; Wallin, 2010; Watkins, 2006, 2011; Webb, 2009, 2015; Youdell, 2011; Zembylas, 2007). I bring these scholars’ insights to questions of social reproduction in education and to the specific concept of voice in schools. I contribute to Deleuze and Guattari scholarship in education a strategic analytical orientation to listening, simultaneous destroying-generating, connecting and experimenting. Such an analytical arrangement has dramatic implications for ethnographic and participatory research that I elaborate in Chapter 5. This approach challenges a tendency in recent educational research using Deleuze and Guattari’s concepts to distance itself from analyses of the human voice (see de Freitas & Curinga, 2015 for a notable analysis of the materiality of the physical voice). Following Deleuze and Guattari’s discussion of Little Hans and Freud’s interpretosis, I argue the need to still listen and analyse, but to listen and analyse differently (cf. Mazzei, 2009). Desire is central to this analytic approach.

Desire as productive

Desire precedes the production of lack. In the traditional logic of psychoanalytic desire, the subject is defined by lack, and desire is born to attain what is missing. According to this logic, objects produce desire and the subject cannot feel satisfied
until the object is attained. In contrast, Deleuze and Guattari conceptualise desire as affirmiative and productive, seeking connections and relations in processes of desiring-production – production that is inextricable from social production. Desire is not only sexual, but is at work in “everyday social, political and cultural activity” (Webb, 2015, p. 438).

Desire, rather than separate from power, is interwoven with power as puissance: force, capacity or intensity (Surin, 2011, p. 25). However, unlike Foucault’s central concern with power, Deleuze takes desire as his primary point of analysis, viewing power to be “an affection of desire” (1994, note D) and a component in complex desiring-assemblages. Desire “creates relations through which power might operate” (Colebrook, 2012, p. 215). To clarify, I use the term desiring-assemblages to discuss the mechanisms and processes of desire at work (Deleuze, 1994, note D).

Desire precedes desiring subjects, as pre-personal and pre-individual fluxes of intensities connecting flows and generating differences (Deleuze & Guattari, 1983, pp. 1-8). Desiring-assemblages are not individual, and never exist in a free and unbounded state. Rather, desire “is always assembled” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1980/1987, p. 229), investing in social relations and concrete conditions. Just as students and teachers invest bodily energy to produce work, so too desire invests in social fields and is productive. While in some processes, desire transgresses fixed boundaries and has the potential to form relations between heterogeneous terms, changing the connections and social relations of society, other processes re-code desire in terms of lack (Goodchild, 1996).

Lack is “created, planned and organised in and through social production” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1983, p. 28). It is societal institutions that deprive “desire of its objective being” and produce lack (1983, p. 27). The French word manqué can mean “both lack and need in a psychological sense” as well as “want or privation or scarcity in an economic sense” (translator’s note, 1983, p. 28). Social production declares certain individuals to be lacking in comparison to others in particular skills, attributes, emotional competencies, outcomes, and/ or incomes (see Chapter 3). Desire is then twisted to become the “abject fear of lacking something” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1983,
p. 27), the “great fear of not having one’s needs satisfied” (p. 28). Wants and desires “teeter and fall victim” to a fear of not having/ being/ doing enough (Deleuze & Guattari, 1983, p. 28). The individual fears that he/ she lacks enough income, enough skills, enough time, or enough respect. Desire becomes an indicator of privation, rather than production.

In processes of social production (like schooling), desiring flows become codified, inscribed and recorded. Desire becomes “dammed up, channelled, regulated” (p. 33) because of its revolutionary, “explosive” potential (Deleuze & Guattari, 1983, p. 116). Implicit presuppositions and social obligations emerge, alongside codes and order words (Deleuze & Guattari, 1980/1987, p. 79), working to block and re-direct desire. Analysis of schooling, then, involves not only analysis of what is said and unsaid (discourse), but also “how desire moves in the social” (Ringrose, 2011, p. 600) within but also beyond schools, and the imbrication of desire in the formation of schooling’s order words. This analysis of schooling, then, interrogates how desire is made to desire its own repression: why students, teachers and schools continue to reproduce particular pedagogical patterns and outcomes, even as they resist them (Deleuze & Guattari, 1983, p. 29).

This analytical approach explores how *common sense*, taken-for-granted ways of apprehending and analysing students’ voices (see Chapter 3) are felt before and in dynamic relation to how they are then interpreted, and how these affective attunements and interpretations might be re-shaped. Below, I give an account of the trajectories of *desiring-analysis* that this study took. I do not suggest that my approach is a “correct” use of Deleuze and Guattari’s concepts, nor do I attempt to craft a “how to” guide to the appropriation of their concepts (Cumming, 2014). Instead, I craft an account of the experimental directions that Deleuze and Guattari open up for analysing the intersections of bodies, affects, desire, subjectivities, discourses, social fields and capitalism, and for the identification of possible escape routes from cycles of social (re-)production. Deleuze and Guattari’s analytic tools prompt four processes: *listening, destroying-generating, connecting* and *experimenting*. *Desiring-analysis* is a “creative combination” (Genosko, 2002, p. 49) generated through my reading, speaking, teaching and learning; in short, my “experimentation[s] in contact with the real” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1980/1987, p. 12).
Desiring-analysis

Listening

A desiring-analytical approach firstly attempts to listen when students speak. Returning to Freud’s case of Little Hans and the puppet production, Deleuze and Guattari warn against ignoring what children say or imposing a singular grid of interpretation on the utterance. When the chicken student-puppet says, “I’m [...] scared [...] of you”, these words are not to be dismissed or interpreted without engaging further with the chicken student-puppet and the collective assemblage of enunciation. Little Hans’ objections to Freud’s interpretation (“but a pee-maker doesn’t bite”) are to be listened to. In a conversation about the relationship between theory and praxis with Foucault in relation to their work in prisons, Deleuze asserts that “only those directly concerned can speak in a practical way on their own behalf” (Deleuze, in Deleuze & Foucault, 1977, p. 209). Foucault replies that the prisoners, when they began to speak, “possessed an individual theory of prisons, prison systems and justice” that is a “counter-discourse” and that “ultimately matter” (Foucault, in Deleuze & Foucault, 1977, p. 209).

At the same time, to position oneself as a researcher who listens or facilitates conditions for those “directly concerned” to speak is accompanied with its own dangers (see Alcoff, 1991; Bignall & Patton, 2010; Spivak, 1987). Foucault’s response to Deleuze’s vision (1977) of those “directly concerned” speaking on their “own behalf” helpfully cautions against the enthusiasms of the emancipatory researcher. Foucault observes: “there exists a system of power which blocks, prohibits and invalidates [students’] discourse and [their] knowledge” (in Deleuze & Foucault, 1977, p. 209). Foucault’s (1977) provocative question that he attributes as a central concern of Deleuze and Guattari’s Anti-Oedipus’ might helpfully be applied to researchers working with students’ voices: “How does one keep from being fascist, even (especially) when one believes oneself to be a revolutionary militant [or a researcher who listens to students]?” (p. viii). Researchers, too, may be caught up in desiring-assemblages through which power operates; power that blocks or redirects
desire, even amidst attempts to listen. I return to these concerns, and to the implications for research ethics, in the next chapter.

**Destroying-generating**

A *desiring-analytical* approach, secondly, engages in movements of simultaneously *destroying-generating* order words. Deleuze and Guattari’s approach seeks to “blow up binaries and classification hierarchies” that order desire and the social (Ringrose, 2015, p. 394): student/teacher, *age, ability*, psychological categories for *emotionality* and the ordering of *data* (see Chapter 1 and 3). I stretch Deleuze and Guattari’s target of the psychoanalytic Oedipal triangle to deficit interpretive grids that reduce how students are known and that produce accounts of students, teachers and schools in terms of what they *lack*.

This destruction is accompanied by simultaneous generations of other possibilities for interpretation, speaking, listening, becoming and living. To be clear, I do not read Deleuze and Guattari’s critique of Freud’s singular interpretive account of Little Hans’ subjectivity as a rejection of interpretation or subjectivity. Deleuze and Guattari’s critique of Freud is not a critique of interpretation *per se*, but rather a critique of a reductionistic form of interpretation that “stopped seeing difference in the productions of the unconscious, and instead saw only repetition, endless repetition” (Buchanan, 2013, p. 11). I am similarly sceptical of a sociological mode of interpretation that stops seeing difference in social fields and only sees *reproduction*, endless *reproduction*. In generating and proliferating interpretations of what is happening and what could happen, I also do not reject analytical explorations of subjectivity. Deleuze and Guattari’s ontological flattening of the social and psychical beyond hierarchies focuses attention on how subjectivity moves in the dance of desiring-production and social-production (Ringrose, 2015). I pursue what Buchanan (2013) has described as the “incomplete” task of figuring out “the new patterns of repetition” (p. 12) – contemporary patterns of *(re–)production* of affects, discourses, social relations and patterns of inequalities – in order to generate tactics for intervention.
Connecting

This mode of analysis, thirdly, makes connections between order words and “assemblages of enunciation of another scale” (Guattari, 1985/1996, p. 269). Rather than taking for granted that an autonomous independent individual authentically speaks for him/herself (as in phenomenological or liberal humanist approaches, see Chapter 2), nor dismissing knowledge that can come from listening to students (as in some poststructural approaches), voices and order words are connected to other assemblages, machines, forces and pressures beyond the site from which a voice speaks. This is to take into account the “subjectivity wars” at work in and beyond school (Guattari, 1985/1996, p. 270). Deleuze and Guattari thus “reclaim what was most important in Freud and Marx”:

… that subjective formations don’t, could not and should not coincide with an individual “profile”. Subjectivity establishes itself, at a minimum, in a complex relation to the other, mother, father, family, caste relations, class struggles, in short all levels of social interaction. (Guattari, 1985/1996, p. 269)

This mode of analysis complicates voices speaking for themselves, while also expanding the zone of analysis towards not only class, race, gender, but all zones where subjectivity is produced: a dynamic intersectionality that is constantly moving and changing (cf. Puar, 2007, 2012).

In particular, this study connects voices and subjectivities with the “chaotic multiplicities” (Hickey-Moody & Malins, 2006, p. 14) and contradictory, schizoid conditions of late capitalist modernity (Braidotti, 2006) – for example, in the interplay of neoliberal logics, human rights discourses, student voice rationales, consumer voice discourses, and desire. I am interested in examining moments of apparent contradiction and disjuncture in the schizoid movements of the concept of student voice in school reform processes (see Chapter 2). Such analysis probes the simultaneous pressures and potentials presently felt by students and teachers as they have a voice at school, and simultaneous liberations, resistances and repressions.
Experimenting

A desiring-analytical approach, finally, is oriented to noticing and enacting experimentation. Noticing apparent contradictions and simultaneity in a social field, the researcher experiments with the conditions that foster more affirmative modes of relating and living. Deleuze and Guattari’s interest in desiring-production and social-production is not (only) about describing the “structures and functions” and discourses that comprise “a social field”, but also explores the “particular movements that affect the Socius” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1994/ 2009, p. 67). Far from being neutral, the researcher works to interfere with, undo and revert the logic of lack and look for the pass words beneath the order words (see Chapter 3), the cracks and pathways out of the impasses of social reproduction, the “[a]ssemblages that can be subject to radical transformations” (Guattari, 1989/ 2013, p. 52), the “line which will make language flow between these dualisms” (Deleuze & Parnet, 2006/ 1977, p. 34). The analytic focus becomes the lines of modulation where something different happens – the utterances that slightly modify what happens, or proliferate and create new possibilities within a school, unexpectedly opening up “new degrees of freedom” (Guattari, 1985/ 1996, p. 273). Moments where something different happens indicate conditions that may foster, but not guarantee, “institutional creativity” and change (Guattari, 2015, p. 62). They potentialise pathways out of repetitious patterns of social reproduction.

Re-engineering analysis?

In this chapter, I reviewed analytical approaches to students’ voices and schooling’s inequalities, mapping critical, resistance, discursive and psychoanalytical approaches to power, subjectivity and social reproduction in schooling. These theoretical approaches will be revisited in relation to ethnographic encounters discussed in Chapters 6-9. While in this Chapter, I have outlined the potential of Deleuze and Guattari’s analytic approach to shift what is analysed in a school and how analysis is done, I have not explained what this looked like in this particular study. The reader may rightly question whether this approach risks interpreting the social field through a romanticised understanding of desire and affect, or marginalises students’ voices again through a proliferation of concepts and interpretations. Further discussion is
needed of my positionality in the field and of how students and teachers were enfolded in analyses and experiments with schooling’s social order.

The following chapter retrospectively maps where this experimental approach took this study, explaining my conception of the relationship between the field of subjectivity, the field of reality, and the field of representation. Rather than an account of how I fulfilled a pre-established methodological plan, this chapter constructs one possible map of the trajectories taken during this study (cf. Cumming, 2014). I explain how an orientation to experimentation generated “a thousand tiny methodologies” (Lather, 2013, p. 635). In a similar way to Deleuze and Guattari’s re-engineering of key psychoanalytic and Marxist concepts, the following chapter explains how I re-engineered central concepts in critical ethnographic and participatory forms of research: positionality, theory/praxis, and representation.
Chapter 5: Enfolding theory, unfolding participation

Unwinding fields

In previous chapters, I examined the concept of student voice: its perplexing movements in a school (Chapter 1), its historical rationales and controversies (Chapter 2), the murmurs around the concept of voice and the order words that form voices (Chapter 3), and previous approaches to analysing voices and schools (Chapter 4). In Chapter 4, I argued the need to consider what exceeds the linguistic, while still listening to students, connecting what students say to other assemblages, and experimenting with other ways of thinking, feeling, speaking, acting and relating. In a similar (but different) mode to Deleuze and Guattari’s re-engineering of key concepts in psychoanalysis and Marxism discussed in Chapter 4, this chapter re-works some of the key concepts employed in ethnographic and participatory research: positionality, ethics, co-theorising, and representation.

Deleuze and Guattari’s (1980/1987) rejection of the idea of a book as an image of the world has profound consequences for reconceptualising positionality, ethics, co-theorising and representation in ethnographic and participatory research:

There is no longer a tripartite division between a field of reality (the world) and a field of representation (the book) and a field of subjectivity (the author). Rather, an assemblage establishes connections between certain multiplicities drawn from each of these orders, so that a book has no sequel nor the world as its object nor one or several authors as its subject. (p. 23, my emphasis)

If we consider a thesis (or any ethnographic text) as a book, this statement speaks directly to longstanding concerns surrounding the ethnographer’s subjectivity (or positionality), and the relationship between theory/praxis in researching and representing the world (or a school). The world of the school is not divided from the subjectivity of the ethnographer nor the book (the thesis).

This chapter considers the consequences of Deleuze and Guattari’s unwound boundaries between the field of subjectivity, field of reality and field of
representation for ethnographic and participatory research. I structure this chapter according to these fields, engaging with previous debates in ethnography and participatory research, before exploring how Deleuze and Guattari’s concepts shift these debates’ focus. I review contrasting calls for researcher objectivity and participatory research alliances, in order to argue for the utility of Deleuze’s figuration of the fold (1988/1993, 1999/1986) in composing complicated accounts of research subjectivity. Introducing the relationship between theory and the world of praxis in educational ethnographies and participatory research, I explain how this study conceptualises concept creation. I explain what Deleuze and Guattari’s concepts enabled within particular research events with students previously and currently in the Steering Committee. Finally, considering ethnographic concerns surrounding representation, I describe Deleuze and Guattari’s approach to representation and the authorial I and summarise various ethnographic writing experiments. This chapter explores the potential, as well as the pressures and constraints, of listening to those “directly concerned” (Deleuze, in Deleuze & Foucault, 1977, p. 209) in research.

While this chapter constructs a methodological account, specific details about ethics, methods and data are elaborated in Appendices to this thesis. These Appendices include Participant Information Statements and Consent forms (Appendix B), Interview and Focus Group Procedures (Appendix C), a Summary of Scenarios Generated in Student Focus Groups (Appendix D), the PowerPoint Slides Used to Structure the Collaborative Analysis Days (Appendix E), a Summary of Collaborative Writing and Presenting Experiments with Students and Teachers (Appendix F), and Student Certificates and a Letter of Reference Given to Students to Acknowledge their Participation and Writing (Appendix G). At relevant points of the chapter, I direct the reader to these Appendices for further detail.

The field of subjectivity (the enfolded researcher)

Thinking with Deleuze and Guattari’s figuration of “the fold” (le pli) enables a different conceptualisation of researcher positionality as enfolded in ambivalent research relations. I situate my approach to positionality in the folds between ethnographic and participatory approaches.
The reflexive researcher?

One end of a spectrum of researcher positionality stresses the need for ethnographic “estrangement”, “alienation” and “detached and objective” observation (Yon, 2003, p. 413). Coffey (1999) argues that this “conventional wisdom” is premised on “a duality of observed and observer” (p. 20): that it is possible for the ethnographer to distance themselves, recognise and reflect on the world of the field, and then accurately represent the reality of this world. Earlier realist anthropologists defended the objectivity, scientific rigour and systematicity of their ethnographic stance and their “records” of reality. Material artefacts, written fieldnotes and visual photographs and drawings were understood to represent real objects, bodies and relations from the field (e.g. Becker, 1986; Collier, 1967; Collier & Collier, 1986; Mead, 1995/1975). A realist conception of ethnographic data understands visual images (photographs, drawings or video footage, for example) to mirror the objects, bodies or spaces that are photographed, drawn, or filmed, as representations of reality, and understands the ethnographer to be “separated and detached” from the artefact, photograph, or drawing (Hultman & Lenz Taguchi, 2010, p. 527).

The possibility of objective ethnographic representations reflective of reality has been undermined by a history of ethnographers’ attachments to and detachments from people, places and objects; turbulent power relations, manipulations and deceptions in ethnographic relations and representations; the ethnographer’s framing of the ethnographic world (what is included and excluded from the frame); and the ethnographer’s misunderstandings and misinterpretations of cultural practices, artefacts and relations (Coffey, 1999; J. Davies & Spencer, 2010; McLean & Leibing, 2007). The “crisis of representation” shattered the illusions of the ethnographer’s authority and objectivity and of the possibilities of discovering or presenting an account of a culture’s totality (Clifford & Marcus, 1986; Geertz, 1988; Said, 1989). The ethnographer, as the primary research instrument, is no “pure” vessel.

Anthropology’s reflexive turn curved the gaze back on the process and production of the ethnographic text, foregrounding the inseparability of the ethnographer’s subjectivities, participants’ subjectivities and the field from the
ethnographic text, and the impossibility of claiming ethnography as an objective social science (Hymes, 1974; Scholte, 1974). In refusing to ignore or erase the effects of the researcher’s presence, reflexive research practices were argued to enable the ethnographer to interrogate his/her political effects on data generation, theorising and ethnographic representations (Atkinson, 1990; Ball, 1993; Delamont & Atkinson, 1995; Hammersley & Atkinson, 1996; Siraj-Blatchford & Siraj-Blatchford, 1997). Subsequent movements in ethnography and participatory research embraced their own partiality and partisanship, with the caveat of the importance of reflexivity.

A participatory turn in research has subsequently moved away from the lone ethnographer representing a culture through her/his fieldnotes and records towards the formation of deliberate critical alliances and collaborative co-constructions of questions, methods, analysis and findings (e.g. Bhattacharya, 2008; Erickson, 2006; Hayes, 2011; Lassiter, 2005; Noblit, Flores, & Murillo, 2004). Participatory research with children and young people ranges from research that consults with children and young people (Tisdall, Davis, & Gallagher, 2009), to multi-generational critical Youth Participatory Action Research (YPAR), where young people are involved at every stage of the research (e.g. Cammarota & Fine, 2008; Fine, Torre, Burns, & Payne, 2007).

Texts created in such participatory research partnerships are argued to “collapse” the “dichotomy between observer and the observed”, moving towards “collaborative representation[s]” (Banks, 1995, n.p.). In particular, phenomenological arts-based and participatory research methods have been asserted to “access and valorise previously neglected knowledges” (Kesby, 2000, p. 423) by facilitating “communication in children’s [and young people’s] own terms” (White, Bushin, Carpena-Méndez, & Ní Laoire, 2010, p. 153). Researchers who couple the creation of visual texts by children and young people (for example, a photograph taken or a drawing sketched) with a conversation with the child about it argue that these conversations build bridges between the child or young person who created the artwork and the researcher or audience (e.g. Cappello, 2005).

These inclusive, participatory, reflexive positions, methods and representations, however, risk perpetuating an ontology that separates subjectivities and worlds from
methods and representations. Conceptions of visual methods as “visual voice” (e.g. Burke, 2007) and “[photo or visual] elicitation” (e.g. Harper, 2002) suggest that there is an authentic, inner voice waiting to be brought forth via the visual medium. James (2007) challenges the new “text positivism” that assumes visual research done with or by children is an “authentic (and hence unproblematic) representation of children’s voices” (p. 263). The assumption that drawings may be a “bridge” to child-adult understanding depends on a view of communication in which a subject can unproblematically transmit their knowledge and affective state to another (see Chapter 2). Visual, artistic and participatory methods risk displacing phenomenological assumptions about the linguistic voice to the visual voice. Voice, whether written or visual, remains a property to be unearthed, recognised as authentic, and reflexively represented. The expansion of research methods to encompass the visual, embodied and collaborative generation of data risks keeping intact the logics of representation that divides a field of subjectivity, a field of reality and a field of representation.

Furthermore, reflexivity has been critiqued for its implied conception of the researcher as rational and agentic, able to stand outside a situation and gaze back at oneself and the researched (Pillow, 2003; Silverman, 1997; Youdell, 2006b). For Haraway (1992) and Barad, the metaphor of reflexivity remains “caught up in geometries of sameness” (Barad, 2007, p. 72). In a similar way to the logics of the mirror in earlier realist ethnographies, that considered the photographic lens to stand apart from the world to be photographed, the mirror imagery of the reflexive researcher suggests that the researcher can stand aside and apart from the world he/she researches. Reflexivity retains the unified, rational, knowable Cartesian subject, potentially becoming a way of confessing one’s allegiances and partialities before proceeding as usual (Lenzo, 1995; Pillow, 2003; Tuck & Yang, 2014a). Alcoff (1991), cautions against “a desire for mastery and immunity” that seeks to step ‘outside,’ into a “privileged” analytical “position wherein one cannot be undermined or challenged” (p. 22). To be reflexive about one’s positionality does not neutralise power relations, validate one’s ethics and methods, nor legitimise the texts written from or about the ethnographic field. Indeed, it may even become a strategic ploy to intensify the researcher’s claim to epistemic privilege.
I have sought to re-think ethnographic subjectivity, the field and representation – not to perpetuate segmentations between the researcher, researched, bodies and matter, world and texts, but also not to suggest that I have discovered or created a methodological escape route from questions of power, ethics and representation. Using Deleuze’s figuration of the fold to write about positionality does not sidestep issues of power, ethics and representation, but rather enables a more honest account of my imbrication in the events that produced and are produced by this thesis text.

**Ethnographic folds**

I describe my ambivalent positionalities and the data associated with them in terms of Deleuze’s figuration of the fold (1988/1993, 1999/1986). Discussing Foucault’s “radical critique” of the phenomenological presumption of the interiority of the subject (1999/1986, p. 80), Deleuze undoes the assumption of a distinction between the inside and outside of subjectivity and relations, the self and the world, and between the world and texts written. For Deleuze, the “outside” is “a moving matter animated” by “folds and foldings that together make up an inside: they are not something other than the outside, but precisely the inside of the outside” (Deleuze, 1999/1986, p. 80). Folds of material selves (human and non-human bodies) wrinkle with folds of time (memory) and the folds of written text. Human bodies and matter of various speeds and intensities fold around, through and between each other, threading and unthreading new folds. The world folds into human bodies, shaping movements, stances, utterances and embodied identities, while bodies simultaneously, continually fold out into the world, symbiotically shaping, moving, morphing and transforming bodies, spaces, texts, and atmospheres. The figuration of the fold disrupts false dichotomies, as the outside is brought within (folding) and the inside brought without (unfolding).

To conceptualise the ethnographer as enfolded is to displace the objective ethnographic knower, as well as the phenomenological “vulnerable ethnographer” (e.g. Behar, 1996) who seeks out “true feeling” (Berlant, 2011, p. 65) in an ethnographic field. Knowledge is not obtained outside the world, but rather generated in enfolded engagement within it (cf. Barad, 2007). Apprehending the world as
formed of folds of matter and space wrinkled with bodies, time and texts unsettles a conception of the field as out there to be recognised and represented by the reflexive researcher. Ethically, the entanglements of the fold render it impossible to ever be unproblematically removed, like a “traditional” ethnographer (if earlier ethnographers ever were), nor unproblematically politically aligned with others (like a critical ethnographer). The researcher is part of that which she seeks to study (Barad, 2007). In making ethnographic decisions about research methods and instruments, when to start and stop the audio recorder, what data to include and exclude in writing, the researcher makes a fold to what she is enfolded within. Even these “decisions” and “intentions” are formed within entangled historical, social and material folds of human and nonhuman elements that exceed the individual researcher (Barad, 2007).

Photographs in this chapter

Throughout this chapter, I use photographs to punctuate my retrospective account of the folds of this research. A number of these photographs are from a particular art project organised by an art teacher in the school’s Support Unit for students diagnosed with Autism. This art project involved the literal enfolding of fabric, threads, balls, hoops, and strips of paper. These individual works of art were later combined and conjoined with work created by other students, teachers and community members for a public art exhibition at a regional art gallery (see Figure 2 and Appendix D: A Summary of […] student focus groups for further discussion).

Figure 2. A photograph taken by me of some of the works of art created by students and teachers – combined and displayed at a regional art gallery (Normal filter).
During this art project, students took photographs using my iPad’s Application Photobooth (with students selecting their own filters, and selecting what they wanted to photograph). In my engagements with students, teachers and the works of art during this art project, I was fascinated by the art project’s literal blurring of pedagogical boundaries (as students and teachers worked alongside each other), subject disciplinary boundaries (as the project spilled across the timetable into other designated subject times and spaces), and boundaries between speech, writing, and art creation. The photographs of these objects worked upon me, iridescent with their own intensities, seeming to gesture towards something that I was attempting to think, feel and write.

These photographs could be understood as needing to be interpreted: either by the researcher (who must somehow come to understand what the works of art represent, as in realist ethnographic approaches), or by the students (who should be asked to explain their compositional choices, as in phenomenological approaches that use arts-based or participatory methods). The researcher seeking to interpret what these art works represent may “misinterpret” their “meaning”; the researcher seeking an “authentic” phenomenological account from the student may be frustrated if the students cannot articulate in words what they “mean” – a particular challenge for some students.\(^4\)

My use of these photographs in this chapter gesture towards the liveliness of the folds of matter, bodies, texts, affects and space in research – as both including and exceeding the subject positions of participants and researcher in a field to be represented. I do not deny that works of art (objects, photographs, or drawings, for example) can be understood representationally, but agree with Coleman (2013) “that they do not only operate in this way” (p. 149, footnote 5). In their inaccessibility to phenomenological analysis (I do not know why particular students chose to photograph what they photographed, or to use the photographic filter that they used), these photographs become something other than a research record of the field to analyse and to represent. Each photograph is, rather, a shed skin of a moment in time.

\(^4\) See Appendix D (A summary of scenarios generated in student focus groups) for a summary of some of my communicative engagements with students involved in this art project.
that was visually netted (Knight, 2013); a block of sensation that memorialises affects from particular research conjunctions of bodies and materials (cf. Grosz, 2008; cf. Hickey-Moody, 2007).

These photographs are not only memorials of past research events, but each simultaneously has a continuing life of its own – affective intensities, speeds and slownesses – that unfold and move when brought into relation with the words on these folded pages. Affect is part of both their “force and form” (Seigworth & Gregg, 2010, p. 5). These affective by-products of research encounters form new assemblages. The question becomes, not (only) what the photographs are of (what they represent), but of what they do (Coleman, 2013, p. 2) in combination with the words on these pages and the assemblage of the reader’s reading (your own memories, your past research, the environment in which you read this thesis). These photographs potentially complement and amplify the affective intensities generated in these research accounts, since visuals can move the viewer bodily, “in inchoate ways that cannot be easily articulated or assimilated to conceptual thought” (Featherstone, 2010, p. 195). Amidst this chapter’s attempt to construct a metanarrative of the ethnography, the photographs potentialise other rhizomatic, intertextual readings (Moss, 2013). They are thus not static, fixed nouns: “artworks”, but verbs: “works of art” (Bolt, 2004, p. 5, cited by Konturri, 2013, p. 21) – working between the words typed, and between the reader and the text. Such works potentially move the reader more than a researcher’s written retrospective, representational account of people, places and things.

**Immanent ethics and the folds of ethnographic participation**

As discussed in Chapter 1, I was formerly a teacher at this school. In 2013, I returned to the outside of the inside of this school. I worked in a back room of the library, and conducted research interviews and focus groups predominantly in rooms in the library – on the inside of the outside of teaching spaces. Within these ethnographic folds, there were specific interactions that were formalised through processes of obtaining participants’ consent (see Appendix B: Participant Information Statements and Consent Forms). After a summary of the numbers of participants in various stages of the research, I explain how re-conceptualising researcher subjectivity, as always
enfolded, unable to stand outside the field of the research, the self or the text, necessitated an expanded orientation to ethics.

Figure 3. A work of art (Normal filter) – created by Adrian

To participate in formal research activities, students needed to return a consent form signed by their parent/caregiver, and to also sign their own consent form. Formally, 33 students previously in the Steering Committee (in 2010, 2011 or 2012) participated in 15 focus groups/interviews, and two students who were not in the Steering Committee also participated in these formal focus groups (total 35). Nineteen students from the 2013 Steering Committee students participated in 4 formal focus groups. A total of 54 students participated in 19 focus groups relating to the work of the past and present Steering Committee. In addition, two students who had not been part of formal focus groups brought back consent forms to participate in these collaborative analysis sessions only, while other students who had been part of the formal focus groups did not participate in the collaborative analysis days, or came for part of the day. Eight students from the school’s Support Unit for students diagnosed with Autism participated in four focus groups/interviews, after I modified Participant Information Statements and Consent forms to adjust language and include visuals (see Appendix B: Participant Information Statements and Consent Forms). A total of 62 students were involved in formal research activities where signed consent forms were needed. Students ranged in age from 12 to 18 years old.

Twenty-eight teachers (including five Executive and three Senior Executive teachers, and one pre-service teacher on professional experience working with Ms Frazzle), one School Learning Support Officer, and three Community Liaison Officers (total 32 adults) participated in 38 formal interviews requiring a signed
Informed consent and onto-relational dimensions of consent

Ethical codes of practices for research with children and young people and, specifically, principles of informed consent, foreground epistemological concerns. Children and young people are to be given information about the study’s content of the study: the aims, time and commitment required, the design of the study, who will know the results, whether there will be feedback, and whether confidentiality will be promised (Bessant, 2006; Hill, 2005). It is anticipated that the researcher will know in advance what will happen during the research, and will have pre-determined her/ his responses to pre-anticipated events (Bryant, 2011; Gallagher, 2009; Renold, Holland, Ross, & Hillman, 2008). Children and young people are positioned as autonomous individuals in control of their participation (Weithorn & Sherer, 1994). It is assumed that children and young people will be provided information by the researcher, understand this information, and make a rational choice about whether or not they want to participate (David, Edwards, & Alldred, 2001; Gallacher & Gallagher, 2008). Once this consent is gained, children and young people’s ongoing consent is to be re-negotiated throughout the research, with the researcher to remind participants that they can opt out or withdraw from participation at any time (Alderson, 1995; Alderson & Morrow, 2004; Groundwater-Smith, 2007). David et al (2001) have argued that “informed consent” privileges a transmission view of knowledge, foregrounding the researcher’s communication of key “information” about the research to students. I extend their reservations about informed consent to consider whether a focus on epistemological dimensions of consent sidelines its onto-relational dimensions. Indeed, institutional ethical requirements to plan this research in accordance with transcendent, normative codes of conduct did not prepare me for particular moments of ethical eruption. These “moment[s] of the ethical” (Bryant, 2011, p. 26) were events that impelled attention to the uneasy folds of normative ethics and immanent relations.
As a novice researcher anxious to receive ethics approval, I detailed research possibilities in the Participant Information Statements and student Consent Forms (see Appendix B: Participant Information Statements and Consent Forms). My initial “arm’s length” approach to students to avoid “real or perceived coercion” (Human Research Ethics Committee, University of Sydney, Question 3.3.b) was a student information meeting. At this meeting, I handed out the four-page long student Participant Information Statements to be read as a large group:

Students talk as they hand around the Participant Information Statements (PIS). Some of the students exclaim, “oooooof” as they flip through the four pages of the form. Other students groan and moan as they look through its dense text. I feel uncomfortable: this seems less like a Steering Committee meeting, and more like I am handing out an assignment. A student asks, “Miss, did you write this whole thing?” I say, “I did write this whole thing.” There is murmuring.

I invite volunteers to read different sections of the form, and invite questions between sections. Students raise their hand more frequently to volunteer to read aloud (like a good student) than to ask questions about the study. […] I hand out the separate, two page consent form. A student whistles, perhaps in disbelief at the number of forms. I explain that it’s important that they individually consent – not just their parents. […] I then give out the forms for their parents. I hear a student say, “it’s the same information.” I wonder whether I should also offer the Arabic translations of the parent/ caregiver consent form. I worry that I have lost their interest.

[Fieldnotes]

My detailing of research activities, intended to enhance the capacity for bodies to make informed decisions about how they would act, produced unanticipated responses.
This early meeting attuned me to the onto-relational dimensions of consent: the ambivalences of recruitment at a distance (Human Research Ethics Committee, University of Sydney) and the gaps between the information that normative ethical protocols presume that students need to know, and what students later asked for further information about. The information they later sought was less about research facts, and more about research relations. In the playground, Steering Committee meetings, the library, students asked me other questions: “Why are you doing this?” “Are you still getting paid?” “Do you miss being a teacher?” They asked each other questions: “Are you going to do it?” “What period do you want to do it in?” It was in these engagements (amidst jostling bodies, bouncing basketballs, the blazing sun and tired blades of grass, pizza wrappers, acoustic guitars, bodies moving in prayer) that students seemed to become informed about the study.

Yet, this was an informed consent that was something other than becoming informed with knowledge (information) about the topic that they were invited to talk about, giving time, support and resources while their views are in formation (Lundy & McEvoy, 2012). It seemed to me that students were becoming informed immanently and relationally, enfolding and re-folding their engagement with the research in engagement with each other and with me. Immanence – remaining within the specific folds of each encounter (B. Davies, 2014b) – compels moment-by-moment negotiations between bodies (St. Pierre, 1997). Students did not always bring back consent forms after these conversations. I attempted to observe, listen to, and respond when a student’s utterances (“I forgot the form”) or refusals sensed in body language, facial expressions, evaded glances, laughter, or silence, suggested that they did not
want to talk further or participate in the study’s formal dimensions. This form of consent is situated, dialogic, processual and political (Renold et al., 2008).

At the same time, as a former teacher at the school, on leave without pay, students may still have associated my invitation to participate with the compulsions of teachers’ “requests” for participation in school work and life. Our relationships, even if not as bound by a teacher-student role, and even if more open-ended in trajectory, were still always folded within educational spaces, and were likely to be understood and felt accordingly (David et al., 2001). Power and knowledge dynamically bend with folds of subjectivity: one’s relation to others and oneself is felt as “folded force” (Deleuze, 1999/1986, pp. 85, 93, 86). Spaces of folded force are not unifying or harmonious; in the fold there may be tears or compressions (see also Chapter 9).

Figure 6. A work of art (Thermal filter) – created by an unnamed student.

**Anonymity, confidentiality and acknowledgement**

Throughout 2013, I was enfolded in the Steering Committee’s work. The 2012 group were completing their research and presenting their findings to students on *The Learner I’d Like to be* in February-March 2013. The 2013 group’s research on *What I’d Like to Learn* was generated between March 2013 and February 2014. Early in the research, Ms Frazzle and I discussed how I could reciprocally support her facilitation (rather than adding extra work). Ms Frazzle welcomed my support as a sounding-board to plan and support the 2013 Steering Committee’s research, along with the academic partner (see Chapter 1). During meetings and research events related to the Steering Committee, I talked to students, took notes, and occasionally facilitated
group activities (for example, on the concept of the hidden curriculum). I also transcribed students’ interviews with teachers and wrote detailed fieldnotes of meetings, for students to use for their own research. I explained this study to students as “my research about your research” – although our research projects and voices overlapped and superposed.

The ethical principle of anonymity and confidentiality, intended to protect the identities of young people, was a point of contention with some students. Keeping students’ identities anonymous and data secure is premised on protecting young people from potential harm (Spriggs, 2007), particularly if they later change their views and regret the inclusion of their names (Gallagher, 2009). To use a participant’s real name may reveal the name of the school, with the potential for negative impact on the school and/or the student. While I designed this study in accordance with these principles, students frequently questioned them. In the information meeting when I introduced the research to former Steering Committee members, a Year 11 student read aloud from the PIS statement about research data being shredded and de-identified, looked up and said, “so we’re like ghosts.” In the 2013 Steering Committee, students expressed disappointment that their work and words would not be identifiable:

*John Dixon:* If we don’t really care if people use our names, why not just use them?

*Isaac:* We want people to know what we’ve been doing.

*Rodger:* It makes us feel special.

*Brooke:* I like being acknowledged and people knowing.

*Cristiano Suarez Ronaldo:* It’s a team effort.

*Dale:* People should have a choice whether to use a fake name or name.

[Transcribed spoken statements compiled from a range of Steering Committee contexts]
While I explained the issues with identifiability and the consequences for the school, I felt ambivalent. Not enabling students to use their own names seemed to capitulate to constructions of students as vulnerable and passive. At the same time, the consequences of using students’ names for the students and the school were too unpredictable.

As a way for students to be able to identify their contributions to this research, on the collaborative analysis days (see below), I invited students to choose their own pseudonyms, and to write on a post-it note how they would like me to describe them to a broader audience. These pseudonyms are used in this thesis text, and the full list of pseudonyms and student self-descriptions are listed in the preliminary pages of this thesis. I chose a pseudonym for students who did not want to choose their own pseudonym and for those who were not present on these collaborative analysis days. Transcribed audio quotations where I could not discern who was speaking are given the general pseudonym: Student.

Since I asked students to describe themselves (rather than, for example, giving them a demographic survey to fill in), I do not summarise students’ demographic data. Students were from a range of backgrounds, with countries of their parents’ origins including Lebanon, Samoa, Pakistan, India, Britain, Vietnam, Greece, Jordan, Denmark, the UK, and Australia (Indigenous). Students most frequently chose Anglicised pseudonyms, with a few exceptions. Some of the students chose names of sports celebrities or characters from television shows or electronic games. Their self-descriptions were at times earnest and “truthful” (with the description recognisable to me as who I knew this student to be), while at other times they seemed to be exaggerations, fantastical, humorous or ironic. In the fold (of a post-it note), the self is
“created on each occasion” in relation to the “the present-time stratum that serves as a limit: what can I see and what can I say today?” (Deleuze, 1999/1986, pp. 87, 98).

**Formal parent/caregiver and teacher interviews and focus groups**

To be a teacher and a researcher is not only to be “inside/outside” (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1993), with “insider” knowledge (Pole & Morrison, 2003) of teaching, learning, schools and communities. Interviewing parents of students who I previously taught, and colleagues and friends, is ethically fraught. I had Participant Information Statements and Consent forms translated into Arabic, the first language of many of the parents of families at the school, by a certified translation service (as required by the university Human Research Ethics Committee). Before commencing fieldwork, I asked a Community Support Liaison Officer at the school (employed to liaise between the school, students and parents and community members) to read and check the translation’s accuracy. This Community Liaison Officer (CLO) was concerned at the elevated register of the Arabic translation. Maintaining a commitment to inclusivity while simultaneously maintaining “arm’s length” meant that written literacies were privileged above verbal and oral literacies; translating these forms into Arabic did not necessarily render them comprehensible (cf. Hickey-Moody, 2013b). The school’s Arabic and Pacific Islander CLOs were invaluable supports, mediating between parents and I. They verbally explained the study to parents over the phone and in person, negotiating parents’ consent through their prior relationships and exemplary relational skills. My long-term collegial relationships with these CLOs were folded into their conversations with parents.

Parent interviews and focus groups were conducted on school grounds, with the exception of one parent interview conducted on the phone at the parent’s request. Topics for discussion included:

- The school;
- Your child’s experience of school;
- Students “having a say” in school;
- The process of getting a school to change (see Appendix C: Interview and Focus Group Procedures).
Due to the abundance of data generated in this ethnography, and parents’ overwhelming support for their children’s participation in student voice work, this thesis does not explicitly discuss the content of these focus groups and interviews. However, parents’ insights and support inform the arguments made in this thesis.

My “insider” status as a previous teacher meant that I had established professional and personal relationships to draw from in interviews with teachers and senior executive teachers (P. Collins & Gallinat, 2010; Petschler, 2012; Shokeid, 1997). Teachers were generous in speaking with me during free-period times or break-times, in their classrooms, staffrooms, in executive offices, in the library, or the staff common room. Prompt topics for discussion included:

- Teaching experiences;
- Student voice/participation – definitions;
- Your opinion of student voice/participation;
- This school’s context and student participation;
- The progress, benefits and challenges of student voice/participation at this school;
- National Partnerships for Low Socio-Economic Schools initiative and this school (see Appendix C: Interview and Focus Group Procedures).

Our shared experiences of the intensities of teaching and learning generated frank conversations (cf. Petschler, 2012); prompt topics shifted quickly into discussions of the immanent intensities surrounding teachers’ work.

Yet, my shifting movements inside and outside the folds of the school also had their own tensions. Colleagues and friends pointed out my comparative spatial and temporal liberties: “You’ve forgotten how busy we are”, “You get to have coffee like a normal person.” In our conversations, I was keenly aware of how the folds of my previous common sense understandings and teacher subjectivity were slowly unfolding and re-folding in relation to what I heard-saw-felt-spoke-read-wrote. Laws (2004; Laws & Davies, 2000) has written about her research as a principal exploring the discursive positioning of students classified with social and emotional disturbances. For Laws, it was risky to work “inside/ outside the dominant discourse”; it feels “dangerous” and “disloyal”; she feared that she would be “read in exactly the same ways as the students at the school are read – as disruptive, inappropriate and
needing control” (Laws, 2004, pp. 118, 119). I also was anxious as I wrote fieldnotes and these chapters, nervous that my writing “might trouble others” (Laws, 2004, p. 118), and might get students, teachers, and myself into trouble. I anticipated possible responses to this writing on a daily basis – enfolded inside even when outside the school, folds of the past iridescent in this present writing. Compressions and tears felt between the folds of past and present subjectivities were compounded by the folds of power/knowledge and friendship between the teachers (who were simultaneously my colleagues, friends and research participants) and I, and between senior executive teachers (who mediated my leave-without-pay from the Department of Education and Training) and I. Seeking to maintain these relationships, while also discuss controversial events and issues, was, at times, exhausting (cf. Hey, 2000).

Figure 8. A work of art (Twirl filter) – created by an unnamed student.

Having considered these folds of subjectivity and the field, the following section turns to the folds of theory and praxis in this study. In previous chapters, while I have discussed how Deleuze and Guattari’s concepts have enabled new ways of approaching affect, desire and power in student voice, I have not yet explained how I thought about, spoke about and enacted this theory with students in research encounters.

The field of reality (Theory/ praxis relays)

I do not conceptualise the praxis of fieldwork as separated from theorising. Rather, theory and praxis are dynamically related and continually emerging: “action-
theoretical action and practical action which serve as relays and form networks” in multiplicities that are both theoretical and practical (Deleuze, in Deleuze & Foucault, 1977, p. 206). Theory, for Deleuze, is “exactly like a box of tools. […] It must be useful. It must function. […] We don’t devise a theory but construct new ones” (Deleuze, in Deleuze & Foucault, 1977, p. 207). Concepts, for Deleuze and Guattari (1994/2009), are “not given” to then be analysed, but rather “created” and “to be created” (p. 11) to “relate to our problems, to our history, and, above all, to our becomings” (p. 27). “Praxis”, for Guattari (2000), is experimental rather than teleological in orientation (p. 33, and translator’s note 16, p. 76), involving the assembling of new relations of ideas, affects, bodies, texts, spaces and time as configurations of people “interpret their own positions” as “group-subjects” (Guattari, 2015, p. 71).

Experimenting with research assemblages and creating concepts occurred throughout the study. Theorising was simultaneously embedded in the research design and rhizomatic from research plans (cf. Nind, 2011) – an ongoing process and a discrete activity (cf. Holland et al., 2008). New concepts simultaneously emerged through long-term entangled relations, and irrupted in moments of wonder. Students and I collaboratively made sense of what was happening, even as the sense that was made was felt and articulated differently. Concept creation simultaneously worked with students’ forms of communication and lexicon – their theories (cf. Holland et al., 2008; Malone & Hartung, 2010) – while at times I also offered students philosophical concepts (like, for example, Deleuze and Guattari’s rhizome and Judith Butler’s discussion of Althusser’s interpellation). Creative methods used with students (including puppet productions, drawings, and diagramming) at times worked with real past events, while at other times generated fantastical productions of imagined futures.

This process of working with theories and creating concepts was constructed between students and I, and between this collaborative work and my reading of Deleuze and his collaborations. These processes were perhaps somewhere between the type of ethnographic work that can be accused of imposing a theoretical frame on a social field (see Dolby & Dimitriadis, 2004b; Lather, 1991), and participatory work that can be accused of not using theory at all (Stronach & MacLure, 1997). To work
explicitly with particular theoretical concepts with students risks reifying particular manifestations of *theory* valued in academic settings, foreclosing immanent theories, silencing diverse forms of expression, and necessitating that students speak within adult frames of reference (Ellsworth, 1989). Conversely, to reject discussing cultural theoretical concepts with students risks infantalising them, pre-defining their limitations and interests (Nind, 2011; F. Thomson, 2007). To work only with students “‘raw voices’” “‘speak[ing] for themselves’” (Mazzei & Jackson, 2012) risks perpetuating whatever dominant, *common sense* conceptions of students, teachers, schools and communities happen to be in circulation (Stronach & MacLure, 1997), but to eviscerate *voice* risks throwing out the proverbial baby with the bathwater (see Chapters 1, 2 and 4). I attempted to work simultaneously with what is described as *cultural theory* and with immanent *voiced* theories – to collaboratively interrogate common sense and, perhaps, generate something between *theory* and *praxis*.

**Student focus groups**

Student focus groups varied in size from two to six students, and were held at a time negotiated with the students during the school day. Focus groups generally took place over two school periods (1 ½ hours) and were held either in the school library, an outdoor table, or the executive meeting room. In focus groups, students and I discussed students’ conceptualisations of *student voice*, and memories and experiences of the Steering Committee and school. The following prompts loosely structured these discussions:

- Definitions of student voice
- Experiences of student voice
- Ways that students have a voice in the school
- Experiences of school
- Experiences of change in the school (see Appendix C: Interview and Focus Group Procedures).

However, discussions were non-linear, erupting in different directions and jumping tangentially from prompt topics.

Later in the focus group, students were given the option to respond to, and then to compose their own scenarios (see Appendix C: Interview and Focus Group Procedures).
Procedures). Before students created their own scenarios, I told students that the scenarios could be based on personal experiences, or that they could compose a fictionalised story, or explore an issue that they felt to be important surrounding student voice. I hoped to invite students to generate scenarios about what they felt was significant (Renold et al., 2008), and did not want to compel students to engage in a “forced telling” (Skeggs, 2002, p. 349) of their lives (that minoritised young people and children and young people at school are frequently compelled to give to adults in positions of institutional power). Scenarios could be composed in written, visual or audio-visual form (a narrative, a picture, a puppet production, a radio interview). I offered students seven puppets and one marionette (see Figure 9) as part of a repertoire of objects and materials, including coloured markers, paper, postcards, computers and an iPad. I asked students both before and after they created their scenario whether they consented to allowing their scenario to be read/ listened to/ viewed by another student focus group. After creating their scenario, the students and I discussed the scenario. At the end of this conversation, I invited students to write a brief written comment about the main points raised by their scenario, any thoughts about the process of creating a scenario and any other questions that they would have liked to have been asked. I view these research activities, rather than as eliciting students’ voices, as events where concepts and productions were created and analysed.

In response to the invitation to create a scenario about student voice, the majority of student groups created puppet productions: a surprising turn of the research (see Mayes, 2016). In discussing students’ scenarios below, my main points of reference are the puppet productions, although one drawing (see Manduri’s drawing in Chapter 1) and one embodied role play were also created (see Appendix D: Summary of Scenarios Generated in Student Focus Groups).
The scenarios produced by students in focus groups explored divergent concepts and temporalities. At times, students seemed to re-create memories of past events (like a puppet production discussed in Chapter 8 about a conflict between student-puppets and a teacher-puppet). At other times, they seemed to fictionalise, exaggerate, parody or satirise school life (like a puppet production where a teacher-puppet laments that her student-puppets are doing their homework). Other puppet productions seem to be imagined, even utopian, productions of possible futures (like a puppet production of a staffroom conversation where a teacher-puppet encourages a struggling teacher-puppet to “comfort” her students more).

Discussing these scenarios, students sometimes framed their compositional decisions in relation to representational modes of thought. For example, one student, preparing to film a puppet production about age and maturity (see Chapter 6), moved the marionette and spoke about its “symbolism”: “As you can see, it’s the immaturity controlling him – see the symbolism? [Moves his hand to move the strings of the marionette].” The puppet productions are, at their most real, fictionalised accounts that resonate with real life experiences: dramatisations of habitual ways of speaking, feeling, teaching and learning (for example, “You’re being disruptive”, see Chapter 6).
Thinking about the real and memory, I view memory not as something fixed to be re-presented and re-activated to be the same as the event from the past. The past does not lie latent, ready to be re-awoken (Bergson, 1908/2002), but rather, present circumstances and configurations enliven past sensations differently in each instance of “remembering” (Stagoll, 2010b). I view the productions created not (only) as representational memories of actual events, but as on a “virtual” plane: “the past that has never been present” (Boundas, 2010, p. 301); copies without originals. Even when students re-produced accounts of events from the past using the puppets (like a puppet production discussed in Chapter 8 that re-enacts a past conflict between students and a teacher), these productions do not reproduce the event. Rather, memories were worked with as “mo(ve)ments” (B. Davies & Gannon, 2006, p. 7) to experiment with; “re-eventalisation” that render the event open to reinvention and recalibration (M. Fraser, 2006, p. 130) (see Figure 10). Repeating words spoken in daily interactions, but transmuting, dislocating, and disembodying them onto hands and material objects, students disrupted, distorted, and laughed at dominant utterances, age codes, and schooled identities. Tweaking utterances and re-configuring events, new possibilities were formed for how school might be.

Figure 10. A screen shot captured by me from a video recording of a Year 10 puppet production.

The puppets seemed to soften the awkwardness and vulnerability of the research encounter, affording a distance from the intensity of the researchly gaze. A number of students gave an account of their feelings on post-it notes (see Figure 11) or articulated verbally their sense of the emotional dimensions of the focus group: as “fun”, “cathartic”, “enjoyable”, feeling “like a young kid playing with our toys again”
On the collaborative analysis days, I asked students why they gravitated towards the puppets in creating their scenarios. A number of students were emphatic that the puppets “protect our identity” (see Mayes, 2016):

Monique: You got to express yourself and the previous situations through puppets, so you didn’t really care how you looked or how you sounded, because you couldn’t really see your face. [...] It could be coming from the student that never gets in trouble or a student that always gets in trouble. You wouldn’t know. [Group discussion, first collaborative analysis day]

These material objects disembodied and transferred the voice, protecting the body of the student speaker from potential identification, judgment and censure. The puppets seemed to enable students to (momentarily and literally) escape dominant identity categories and segmentary relations. Added to a research configuration, puppets seemed to extend what students could say and do (cf. Lee, 2001; Prout, 2005).

Yet, the puppets also dramatise the inescapable ambivalences of working with voice. I bring these puppet productions into arrangement with other quotations, texts and concepts in this thesis text. These arrangements could be interpreted as voyeuristic appropriations of students’ voices. The puppet form literally dramatises the dangers of ventriloquy in research that includes voice data. Fine (1992) warns that voice research can be a “subtler form of ventriloquism” to the “‘obvious’” ventriloquy where the researcher “camouflages[s]” their privileges and interests (p. 214). In voice work that ventriloquises, according to Fine (1992), while “appear[ing] to let the
‘Other’ speak [...] we hide” (p. 215). Participatory research methods, including the use of puppets, simultaneously enable and constrain, extend and contract, unfold and entangle, like the threads of a marionette.

![Image](image.png)

Figure 12. Figure 10, cropped and zoomed in to focus attention on the marionette, its threads, and the work of the puppeteer.

**Collaborative analysis days**

Collaborative analysis was only not a separate stage of research, but occurred throughout the study in enfolded encounters. While this section accounts for the formal collaborative analysis days in late 2013, concepts were also explored, created and extended in other analytic encounters throughout the research: as students asked me about the progress of the research, as we discussed possible ways to theorise some of the complexities of student voice, and as we discussed fieldnotes, transcripts and draft presentations. As an example, Figure 13 captures a sketch diagram that I drew during an informal conversation with two Year 11 students, the academic partner and me. We discussed how we might construct a “political theory of voice”, whether or not there would be “overlaps” in differently positioned individuals’ “theories”, and whether or not there could be a central “big issue”:

_Eve: [...] And now we’re getting into a political theory of voice, that moves away from Habermas [...] Do we have consensus about what’s going on here –_  
_Academic partner: Well that’s the ideal._  
_Eve: Or is dissensus –_  
_Academic partner: [To Ayman and Ike] It’s alright, we have this argument [everyone laughs]._
Eve: About basically whether we’re trying to get everyone agreeing in one place or whether it’s okay to have different –

Ayman: That’s very hard. That’s the biggest issue in our modern day times.

Ike: That’s very – that’s a very big issue.

Eve: Or can we have difference and how do we deal with that?

Ike: That’s a very big question.

Ayman: That’s hard with so much options that everyone has – with religion-wise, culture-wise. That’s too big a question to have one answer. You can’t have one answer, to that question, sorry. (...) It’s impossible. [Informal analysis conversation]

![Figure 13. A photograph taken by me of a sketch diagram that I drew during an informal conversation with two Year 11 students, the academic partner and me.](image)

Below, I construct an account of two days of focused collaborative analysis according to Chapter 4’s description of desiring-analysis as oriented towards listening, destroying-generating, connecting and experimenting. While I call these analysis days collaborative, however, I foreground (like the discussion of the diagram above) that these collaborations did not necessarily produce “consensus” on the “big issue[s]”, nor did they ameliorate power relations.

**Listening**

Two formal days of collaborative data analysis were held towards the end of the year: one with students previously in the Steering Committee (October 2013), and one with students currently in the Steering Committee (November 2013) (see Appendix E: PowerPoint Slides Used to Structure the Collaborative Analysis Days).
On both collaborative analysis days, small groups of students analysed the scenarios produced in earlier focus groups. These scenarios were then discussed as a larger group. The first row on the A3 paper in Figure 14 displays the prompts given to initiate students’ discussions. Multiple interpretations of these scenarios were generated, as well as further questions, feelings and concepts: “local knowledge” related to local conditions (cf. Geertz, 1983).

![Figure 14. A photograph taken by me of an A3 paper from the first collaborative analysis day. Students wrote on this paper and on post-it notes as they analysed a puppet production created by another group of students.](image)

When the larger group re-convened, each analytical group shared their analysis with the broader group. One student from each group shared their group’s responses to the prompts (see Figure 14), and another student from the group wrote key points on the whiteboard. As each scenario was discussed, students discussed key ideas about student voice, and apparently tangential concepts. Connections were physically drawn on the whiteboard between affects and concepts in and between the scenarios. Writing in various colours, connecting lines, dot points, underlines, squares, circles, jagged lines, smiley-faces, and stick figures were layered; the whiteboard became a mess of connecting lines (see Figure 15).
As students drew connections between the scenarios, the emphasis was less on coding the scenarios’ themes, which would reduce each scenario’s singularity (Honan, 2007; MacLure, 2013a; Masny, 2013). I view these connecting lines, rather, as mapping productive associations between scenarios, and between scenarios and students’ experiences. These diagrams related the scenarios according to their variations, exploring how particular variables change or mutate particular concepts (Stagoll, 2010a). These discussions, whilst respectful, were agonistic. I encouraged divergent responses rather than an arrival at definitive interpretations (cf. Lather, 1993). One student said later on the second day that this process, “allowed for us to add on to our own ideas while also being able to compare the two [interpretations].”

**Destroying-generating**

Collaboratively analysing these scenarios, it seemed to me that the students and I explored habitual, common sense codes of speech that the puppets mimicked, parodied, and stuttered. Groups watched videos of puppet productions, where voices had been loosened from the subject of enunciation, lips physically distanced from the puppet’s mouth. As students wrote down “big ideas” on A3 papers (see Figure 14), I suggest that they were identifying the “dominant utterances” that signal the established order of schooling (Deleuze & Parnet, 2006/1977, p. 97): for example, maturity; emotion; power to control behaviour through rewards (see Figure 16).
Figure 16. A photograph of a sketch I drew in a field notebook of a diagram drawn on the whiteboard by students during the first collaborative analysis day.

Discussing these scenarios in groups, the micropolitics and microintensities of everyday schooling practices were made visible (cf. Renold & Ivinson, 2014): “It reminds me of my friend who is always rejected when asking questions” (see Figure 14). Writing these dominant utterances on the whiteboard (see Figure 15, above), it seemed to me that the students amplified these utterances, noting taken-for-granted modes of speaking-listening-teaching-learning-feeling in operation, and, perhaps, momentarily interrupting them (B. Davies & Gannon, 2006). This amplification was reminiscent to me of what students had done in their staff research presentations (when they created videos contrasting pedagogical approaches, see Appendix A and Appendix D for further context):

Rebecca: [The video we created] was so dramatised. Because the disrespect we wanted to convey was subtle and stuff, but we couldn’t make it in a subtle way because then people wouldn’t see it – so we had to dramatise it […] [Year 12 focus group].

Exploring what student-puppet bodies could say, do and feel in particular configurations, students simultaneously questioned how students’ and teachers’ voices, bodies and subjectivities are constituted:

Jarryd Hayne: All teachers are like that. They just talk.
Students suggested conditions that perpetuate established modes of relating:

Jim Stiman: What I dislike about the schooling system in general is teachers don’t have time to reset from different classes. Let’s just say the first class she has is really rowdy. She sends half the class out for whatever reason. Next class, she’ll take that stored anger out on them. And then it will just keep building up and up and up, until the last period, where she just keeps the whole class for three lunches. She has no time to reset whatsoever. [Group discussion on first collaborative analysis day]

To be clear, students dramatised and created concepts through their puppet productions and our conversations about them. I use the term dramatisation in my discussion of the puppet productions’ concept creation to draw connections to Deleuze and Guattari’s method of dramatisation. Dramatisation, as Lawlor and Wiame explain (2016), “aims at exploring the specification of Ideas prior to their being transformed into frozen concepts at a representative level” (p. 2). Dramatisation is a “special theatre” through which concepts are “incarnated or actualised” (Deleuze, 2004b, p. 94). In the case of the students’ puppet productions, as we discussed scenarios where schooling’s dominant utterances were exaggerated, and others where they morphed or shifted, these dominant utterances were rendered not inevitable; different discursive and affective habits might be formed with the slightest tweaking of circumstances. These “habitual voices of everyday life” were no longer “unquestionable and unchanging”, but became “unstable, arbitrary and open to infinite transformation” (Colebrook, 2002a, p. 120). The aim, in these dramatisations and their analyses, was not to judge (Deleuze, 1997b), but rather to create processes that “allow the emergence and development of minor paths in thinking, speaking and acting” (Lawlor & Wiame, 2016, p. 3). As Christian said, towards the end of the second collaborative analysis day: “what we’re doing is to get understanding of our
current reality, but use that information to prove - not create a forced reality, but a more preferred reality.”

Connecting

![Figure 17. A photograph of a work of art created at a NSW Commission for Children and Young People conference in 2013, by Isaac, Shaza, Ms Frazzle and me.]

On these collaborative analysis days, connections were made not only between the puppet productions, and between the puppet productions and students’ experiences, but also to other theories, concepts and fields beyond the school. During the second half of both collaborative analysis days, I shared with students how my theorising had been shaped through their words and the folds of our research. I hoped to position students as theorists (cf. P. Thomson & Gunter, 2007), and to discuss cultural theory and what I might write in this thesis text. Sharing my interpretations of scenarios after students had analysed them, and relating their interpretations to cultural theoretical concepts, was also a legitimacy test: to see if these concepts resonated with them. I hoped that these discussions, and the knowledge, concepts, skills and affects generated could be useful (cf. Hayes, 2011), enhancing students’ capacity to act – with, perhaps, “therapeutic outcomes” (Haug et al., 1987, cited in B. Davies & Gannon, 2006, p. 6). I hoped that the research process could reorient, focus and energise (cf. Lather, 1986) students in their own research and lives in a manner that might be described as pedagogical, or even empowering.
Towards the end of both collaborative analysis days, we discussed various conceptualisations of *student voice*. On the first collaborative analysis day, I introduced the rhizome (as a visual conceptualisation of *student voice*) using a photograph of ginger (alongside other visuals including waterfalls, volcanos and musical notes, see Appendix E: PowerPoint Slides Used to Structure the Collaborative Analysis Days). We discussed how these visual images and material phenomena and processes connected with their conceptualisations of student voice. Students responded with their own post-it note descriptions of student voice (see Figure 18 for an example).

![Figure 18. A photograph taken by me of J.T., Jeff Seid and Batata’s post-it note responses to a discussion of how student voice might be visually conceptualised.](image)

**Experimenting**

These collaborative analysis days experimented with what student voice might be and what collaborative data analysis might do. Towards the end of the second collaborative analysis day with the 2013 Steering Committee, in discussing
conceptualisations of student voice (see above), I added in a description of student voice that I had formed by merging words spoken by three Year 10 students (Mia Rose, Johnathan Stewart and Christian) during a focus group into one paragraph:

Regular classes, or more traditional forms of student voice [like Student Representative Councils], are kind of like a DJ’s repetitive music: always the same beat, and things pass by quickly without you understanding what’s happening. But the Steering Committee, for us, is more like slow jazz music that sinks in when you’re listening to it. It’s also like a song that changes the beat every 3 seconds. What we do is always changing somehow, somewhere – it’s unpredictable. The questions we had at the beginning are different to the questions we have now. We could also describe the Steering Committee as like a mix tape: it is never the same artist playing (or the same speaker speaking). Or it’s like the music of rap artist Busta Rhymes, whose style is not as common.

The broader group of students involved in this collaborative analysis day spoke enthusiastically about this description of student voice:

Brooke: That metaphor is really, really good – it relates a lot.
John Dixon: It is easy to understand – everyone knows music and we can all use it as a metaphor.
Johnathan Stewart: It’s true – in all the meetings, we’ve never had the same meeting. [Compiled from students’ spoken responses on the second collaborative analysis day]

I view these theorisations as “ethico-aesthetic experimentations” (Guattari, 2000) where “collective elaborations” (Rolnik, 2004/2008, p. 9) of student voice were produced.

However, the celebratory tone of this description of student voice and of my account of what happened on these collaborative analysis days may smooth over other anxieties and felt contradictions. As an example, after analysing the puppet productions together on the collaborative analysis day, I asked students to write responses on a post-it note to the following questions: “What’s missing from the scenarios and our discussions of them? What is difficult to talk about? Why isn’t it
spoken about?” (see Appendix E: PowerPoint Slides Used to Structure the Collaborative Analysis Days). One student wrote about the conditions of the data analysis session itself (see Figure 19).

![Figure 19. A photograph taken by me of James' post-it note.](image)

My attempts to “democratise” research by co-theorising with participants did not result in a stable state of interpersonal relations. Despite my attempts to encourage each student to “collaborate” in analysis, I had silenced this student, and the other students’ laughter had silenced him5. Together, we rendered him “speechless.” These imperceptible affective currents and blockages in research interactions, and the potential silencing from within and beyond a collective analysis session, disrupt any claim that participatory research necessarily generates analytical consensus or empowerment (cf. Boler, 2004b; Ellsworth, 1989; Li, 2004; Mayes, 2016; Mazzei, 2007).

**The field of representation (production of the book)**

Having rethought positionality and theory/praxis relations, this final section further explores Deleuze’s critique of representation, and other possibilities for ethnographic writing. For Deleuze, representation is “a site of transcendental illusion” (1968/1994, p. 265). The problem with representation is that it cannot acknowledge difference in

---

5 See also Adema’s written response to my questions in Appendix D: A Summary of Scenarios Generated in Student Focus Groups.
itself, but must always tame difference to the categories of what is recognisable (Deleuze, 1968/1994, p. 262). Deleuze’s anti-representational thought undermines the Platonic distinction between the original and the copy, judged as deficient in relation to the original (Marks, 2012). Rather than demarcating categorical differences, Deleuze’s thought opens out to difference, moving towards an “extremity of difference” where there is “[a] single and same voice for the whole-thousand voiced multiple, a single and same Ocean for all the drops, a single clamour of Being for all beings” (1968/1994, p. 304). This revolution to thought re-orientations the authorial voice and the place of affect in writing, even as it is not without its perturbations.

\[\text{Figure 20. A photograph taken by Harry of his “favourite” part of the Art Magic exhibition (Normal filter).}\]

\[\text{Figure 21. A photograph taken by me (with permission) of Harry’s work of art created in response to his “favourite” part of the Art Magic exhibition.}\]

\textit{The authorial voice and writing experiments}

In attempting to proliferate difference in writing, I attempted to think differently about the authorial voice, and to experiment with what writing collaboratively can do (see also Chapter 1). In sole-authored fieldnotes, conference papers, articles and, indeed, this thesis, my authorial voice is enfolded with the voices of others. Working with the figuration of the fold, the I of this thesis is laced through with the voices of the students, teachers and parents (and their many voices), Deleuze and Guattari’s voices, the voices of other student voice researchers, sociologists, anthropologists, post-qualitative researchers, philosophers and my own sense of an interior monologue. Beyond voices, what I write is tangled up with affects, matter, spaces, and bodies. The I who writes a text is not the writer’s voice alone: “To write is perhaps to bring this assemblage of the unconscious to the light of day, to select whispering voices, to gather the tribes and secret idioms from which I extract something I call my Self
In this sense, all writing is collaborative and participatory, enfolded with the voices of others (cf. St. Pierre, 2014).

Nevertheless, to write with an other - or multiple – voice(s), with their words, affects, bodies, in particular times and spaces, with particular materials, is to do something different to writing alone (even as I am never alone when I write). In writing with others, different relations and folds are created between voices, affects, bodies, time and matter – collaborative writing matters and creates something new. In Dialogues II, Deleuze describes his writing with Guattari as “assembled between us, neither union nor juxtaposition, but a broken line which shoots between two, proliferation, tentacles” (Deleuze & Parnet, 2006/ 1977, p. 14). The writing of Deleuze and Guattari (1983; 1980/ 1987; 1994/ 2009; 2006), the dialogues of Deleuze and Parnet (2006/ 1977; Boutang, 1996), and more recent collaborative writing work influenced by Deleuze (e.g. Gale, Pelias, Russell, Spry, & Wyatt, 2012; Sellers & Gough, 2010; Wyatt, Gale, Gannon, & Davies, 2011) trouble assumptions about the sovereign, autonomous, intentional humanist authorial I, and experiment with relations between writers, student and teacher roles in learning and teaching about writing, making transversal connections between subject positions. In this study’s collaborative writing, I considered the embodied capacities enabled and constrained in various collaborative writing assemblages.
Experiments with (and beyond) writing during this study included a conference paper and two journal articles. For the conference paper, two students, a teacher and I constructed a “re-eventalisation” (M. Fraser, 2006, p. 130) of a lesson observation event from the students’ research in 2011 (Mayes, 2013c). In a journal article for *English in Australia*, four volunteer students (three Year 10 students and one Year 9 student) discussed my fieldnotes from a previous Steering Committee meeting, and the “hidden curriculum”, power and emotion in student voice work (Mayes, 2013a). Another article, written for the practitioner journal *Connect* with two volunteer students from Year 7 and Year 9, was an account of the Steering Committee that assembled quotations from 2013 Steering Committee students (Mayes, Davis, et al., 2013). In other texts, students were not directly involved, but inextricably influential, like a conference paper formed between students from the Support Unit, their works of art, and my reading of Deleuze and Guattari (Mayes, 2014). These collaborative texts, and others, are summarised in Appendix F: Summary of Collaborative Writing and Presenting Experiments with Students and Teachers.

While such writing experiments have the potential to scramble conventional roles and hierarchies (Albrecht-Crane, 2005; Stivale, 2003), they are always micropolitical (Deleuze & Parnet, 2006/1977). I was the one to invite students to volunteer to write with me, rather than the students making this suggestion or seizing writing from me (cf. Trinh, 1991). I tried, through various means, to acknowledge their contributions while maintaining their confidentiality, even as I knew that I would
be credited, and they would not. I wrote certificates for each student on University of Sydney letterhead. On each certificate, I added words of thanks and appreciation to acknowledge each student’s particular contributions. I gave out these certificates individually to students during 2014 when visiting the school as a casual teacher. One student, who had contributed to a number of publications, requested a letter of reference detailing his work. I wrote this letter of reference on University letterhead (see Appendix G: Student Certificates and a Letter of Reference Given to Students to Acknowledge their Participation and Writing). I was, and am, always at risk of perpetuating “a colonial relationship” while at the same time “attempting to mask this power over the subject” (Pillow, 2003, p. 185). I do not assert that we escaped the structures or segmentary lines of teacher/ student/ researcher relations, but rather, that in half-glimpsed moments of intense engagement, we exceeded segmentary relations (cf. Albrecht-Crane, 2005), folded within, but simultaneously unfolding outwards.

**Assembling this thesis text**

To give an account of these writing experiments does not explain how this thesis text came to be arranged. Regardless of these writing experiments I invited students into, I still needed to fashion a coherent, sole-authored written thesis. Attempting to write about everything that had happened in this field and to work with the wealth of data generated, the “clamour” of competing voices “asking for their claims [...] to be heard” (Said, 1995, p. 219) was deafening. Transcribing the 67 interviews and focus groups over six months after the year of fieldwork, embodied, material voices metamorphosed to written format (Barthes, 1974; Holmes, 2014). These practices not only sliced off chaotic intensities and urgent desires, but simultaneously materialised other matter and meanings. Making cuts and folds to words and the world (that I was and am part of) made differences, and these differences affected others and myself (Barad, 2007).
Having sensed the significance of affect, I could not stop or pause affect for analysis (Hage, 2010); disentangling the collective “emotional knots” of a school was an “elusive task” (Thrift, 2008, p. 206). Reading through the hundreds of pages of fieldnotes, transcripts, artefacts and other data, attempting to make sense of what was happening, I was continually unsettled, but unsettled differently with each reading. Re-reading my accounts of particular events, these events or other events recalibrated and amplified in affective intensity. “[D]isconcerting sensations” (MacLure, 2011, p. 1003) invaded processes of analysis and writing: knots in the stomach, palpitations, goosebumps, nausea, unease, lightness, fascination. I attempted to work with these perturbations (Cumming, 2014) – and to note, too, when students and teachers seemed perturbed. Working with perturbations displaces logics of representation with logics of sensation – from the mirror to the fold. According to logics of sensation, what is felt changes what is thought; thoughts fold in with what is felt. There is no outside to what is felt or what is thought. Thoughts and senses, affects and the composition of written texts about affect, are mutually imbricated.

In these processes of analysis, I noted words that that seemed to unsettle students and teachers – words spoken in different keys, at different speeds, taking on different associations in different configurations. These repetitions were utterly different from each other (Deleuze, 1968/1994). These points of dissonance – where voices thought they were “speaking the same language” but where the reaction of the hearer indicated otherwise – became points in diagrams that I sketched in a series of
I continually returned to the words: *respect, understanding, responsibility* and *change*, that seemed to jolt and disconcert – used differently by differently positioned bodies. They seemed to be *dissonant refrains*: spoken to claim particular (physical and/or existential) territories, or to bring order from chaos. I considered not only how these refrains developed “into territorial motifs and landscapes” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1980/1987, p. 323), but also the alterations that were introduced as these refrains moved. Mapping these refrains’ movements, I analysed the lines at work in them: the segmentary, the molecular and lines of flight, and the lines of connection that could be made between them. Unthreading the lines of these (moving) refrains, I wondered “how we got to this point” (Guattari, 1985/1996, p. 275). Notwithstanding these embodied efforts to make sense of sensations, I still am not sure “how we got to this point” (Guattari, 1985/1996, p. 275); there were too many singularities, too many dissonances. What I write in this thesis remains a partial understanding – a necessary,
if tentative, nailing down of where I arrived at the temporal point when this thesis needed to be submitted.

The chapters that follow (Chapter 6-9) work with particular affects that circulated in this school, connected by imperceptible threads to affects beyond the school (Deleuze, 1992a). I worked not only with what produced “wonder” (MacLure, 2013c), but also with what produced uncertainty (see Chapter 6), fear (see Chapter 7), shame (see Chapter 8) and joy (see Chapter 9). Each of these chapters begins with a partial narrative – an extraction and juxtaposition of quotations where discursive refrains were used in divergent ways at particular times: respect (Chapter 6), understanding (Chapter 7), responsibility (Chapter 8) and change (Chapter 9). These narratives are partial in the sense of being incomplete fragments sliced from moving assemblages, but also are partisan – spoken from particular vantage points by particular bodies, brought into relation with each other by a partisan writer to make particular arguments. I transversally connect these partial narratives – uses of the words respect, understanding, responsibility and change – to the rationales for student voice reviewed in Chapter 2: respect to respect for students’ standpoint knowledge (see Chapter 6); understanding to the attempt to form mutual understandings between students and teachers (see Chapter 7); responsibility to the empowerment of students positioned as responsible (see Chapter 8); and change to the promise that a school can change through student voice (see Chapter 9). These partial narratives are also complicated in connection to particular order words of schooling: age (that younger students are to respect older teachers; see Chapter 6); ability (that students need to understand what adults have decided they need to understand; see Chapter 7); emotion (that students need to “express” their emotions in particular ways to be recognised as responsible; see Chapter 8); and data (that order what is recognisable as change; see Chapter 9).

Chapters 6-8 bring these partial narratives, a rationale for student voice, and an order word of schooling into relation with scenarios created by students. These scenarios repeatedly remind the reader that these data are (literally) dramatic productions, and that this thesis has been formed from an assembling of a multiplicity of voices. These scenarios are analysed in a similar way to how Deleuze and Guattari analyse the novellas and short stories of Virginia Woolf, Franz Kafka, F. Scott
Fitzgerald and others (Deleuze & Guattari, 1980/1987, 2006) – as narratives to be explored conceptually. I intersect discussion of these scenarios with other accounts and conversations with students and teachers, fields beyond the school, and other concepts. As I draw connections and thread together voices, productions and theory, I experiment with and beyond language – stuttering and stammering the language of schooling, student voice and theory (see Chapter 1).

**Ambivalences in these writing experiments**

These attempts to trouble representation and to write differently are not without their ambivalences. These writing experiments may or may not be e/affective, and themselves must be analysed for what e/affects they generate for the reader. To experiment with writing style – to stutter and stammer the dominant language of schooling and educational research – risks failure. Attempting to work against reading students’ scenarios as representations of interior emotions, at times I found myself interpreting them phenomenologically. At the same time as I tried to analyse affect before and beyond the humanist subject, I found myself writing representations attributing emotions to subjects. At the same time as I entangled students in issues of representation in collaborative writing engagements, questions of whether such research relations co-opt the representational thought of others niggled at me. At the same time as I attempted to move beyond metaphorical language, I found my writing to be laced through with metaphors. Braidotti (2002) writes that “[t]o attack linearity and binary thinking in a style that remains linear and binary would indeed be a contradiction in terms”, but it risks sounding “less than coherent at times” (p. 8).

Figure 26. A photograph taken by me of a bundle of yarn. This bundle of yarn was formed after the last Steering Committee meeting in December 2013, after the event captured in Figure 22.
Deleuze and Guattari’s (1980/ 1987) authorial struggles suggest that these contradictions are entangled in attempts to think and write otherwise. They write that they prefer to metamorphosis to metaphor, but constantly use figurations that are mistaken for metaphors (the rhizome, the fold…). They are frank about the limitations of language in their account of “[t]he problem of writing”: “We invoke one dualism only in order to challenge another. […] Each time, mental correctives are necessary to undo the dualisms we had no wish to construct but through which we pass” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1980/ 1987, p. 20). I invite you to consider, in moments where I reach a limit and fall into representing or over-coding a subject, person or event, how we might pass through such ways of thinking.

In this chapter, I have threaded together a discussion of the entangled theoretical and practical dimensions of this study’s methodological approaches. Beginning with Deleuze and Guattari’s unfolding of the distinctions between the field of subjectivity, the field of reality and the field of representation, I explained how I worked with the concept of the fold. While explaining the procedural ethical codes that I followed, I described the ethical perplexities that emerged, connecting these to Deleuze and Guattari’s immanent ethics, and outlining a notion of relational consent. I gave an account of processes of formal and informal research activities, enfolding discussion of Deleuze and Guattari’s theory/ praxis relays and concept creation. I defended my attempts to think about writing and representation differently, and discussed some of the ambivalences of these attempts.

Chapter 6, as the first of four chapters exploring what voices can do, is located in the classroom. I examine how students dramatise and give an account of how voices and bodies are customarily apprehended according to age, and the way in which micro-processes of communication in classrooms shape what students’ voices can do. This chapter entwines a discussion of standpoint knowledge (where students are to be respected for their standpoint knowledge), the ordering category of age (that orders relations of respect in schools), with the unsettling uses of the word respect at this school.
Chapter 6: Desiring respect, doubting certainty

I think [some teachers reacted negatively to the students’ research]

maybe because

of our age,

[Monique and Ike laugh and say “yeah”]

because we were maybe, what,

13 years old?

“We’ve got 13 year olds teaching us” […]?

- Bob, Year 11 focus group

This chapter is the first of four chapters to explore, with students, teachers, and Deleuze and Guattari, what voices can do in the social field of a school: the capacities of voices to affect and to be affected. Chapter 5 articulated a rationale for ethnographic writing that does not separate a field of subjectivity, field of reality and field of representation (Deleuze & Guattari, 1980/1987, p. 23), nor theory from praxis (Deleuze & Foucault, 1977), but rather connects and experiments in participatory ethnographic encounters with bodies, voices, texts, the world, and writing. This chapter takes up this mode of writing, intersecting earlier reviews of the standpoint epistemological rationale for student voice, the order word of age and the interpretive lens of developmental psychology with ethnographic accounts and productions of “what happened” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1980/1987, p. 192) in this school. In Chapter 2, I reviewed a standpoint epistemological rationale for student voice – that regards students as autonomous beings with knowledge and agency. The being child, according to this rationale, is to be respected for their experiential standpoint knowledge of schooling. In Chapter 3, I introduced the order word of age and the interpretive lenses of developmental psychology that demarcate and segment bodies in “binary fashion” – “adults-children”, and in a “linear fashion” – “You’re not at home anymore” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1980/1987, pp. 208, 209).

This chapter focuses on the image of thought of the school student in relation to this standpoint epistemological rationale for student voice, the order word of age
and the interpretive lenses of developmental psychology. The “dogmatic image of thought”, for Deleuze (1968/1994), categorises and individualises bodies in accordance with *common sense* and good sense, recognising what has previously been known (pp. 148, 266; see Chapter 1). The focus on *age* in this chapter emerges from earlier concerns in the literature on children and young people’s participation, but also from its use in this school as an order word to explain the challenges that accompanied student voice as a school reform strategy. Wyn (2007) argues that how adults see young people is the most significant barrier to young people’s active participation in institutional decision-making. At this school, students suggested that students’ voices may not have been listened to “because of [their] age” and because teachers, in some cases, “have been teaching for” longer than students had been at school (see above). And yet, students and teachers simultaneously adopted and disputed these *common sense* ways of interpreting past events and present relations.

I begin in the middle of the communicative act: what happens when students speak in school, how students give an account of what happened at this school, and students’ creative productions of what might happen. Listening to accounts of voice in classrooms, I question whether focussing attention on students’ standpoint knowledge necessarily grants students epistemic *respect*. I consider how lines that segment and order bodies according to *age* are inscribed and how barriers to young people’s active participation are erected. I argue that mundane daily communicative micro-processes form subjectivities in school that render it almost impossible for certain students to be recognised as legitimate speakers with legitimate knowledge. Thinking with Deleuze and Guattari, I map how intensities, doubts and desire exceed patterns of recognition of voices, and suggest that the physical, material force of voice might also be a vector for transformation of subjectivities and schooling. I argue that *what students’ voices can do* – their capacities to affect and to be affected – is contingent on how bodies (and voices) are viscerally apprehended and recognised, even as the affective force of the voice potentialises an unsettling of these segmentary lines.

What follows is a discussion of the term *recognition*, and a partial narrative of the ways in which the word *respect* was articulated by differently positioned bodies at this school. This narrative is *partial*: incomplete as well as partisan, a deliberate arrangement of extracted quotations that puzzled and perplexed me in their divergent
descriptions of past events. A puppet production, created by three Year 11 students, is then discussed in connection with students’ discussion of age, maturity and respect and Deleuze and Guattari’s discussion of the political and material force of voice. I consider some of the questions raised by students in relation to this puppet production. A second puppet production, generated in a focus group with three Year 9 students and one Year 8 student, is then threaded in with a discussion of the potentiality of uncertainty.

**Desiring respect: A partial narrative of student voice and age**

Contemporary conceptions of respect are partially indebted to the work of recognition theorists who analyse the lack of recognition afforded to marginalised groups in the public sphere. These scholars have called for the “norm of participatory parity” and reciprocal respect to be applied “through democratic processes of public debate” and shifts in institutional and social practices (N. Fraser, 2003, pp. 47, 43; Honneth, 2007; Charles Taylor, 1994). While these demands for subject recognition have been necessary political interventions, dynamic movements of subjects and bodies make it difficult to capture and account for the subject who is to be respected. This chapter, and thesis, works with the productive frictions between theories of recognition, Deleuze’s conception of recognition, and the shifting assemblages of late capitalism (Puar, 2012). To be clear, Deleuze (1968/1994) uses the term recognition differently to recognition theorists, associating recognition with a reconfirmation of common sense ways of thinking and the status quo – to recognise what one has always known (see McQueen, 2014 and below). In the remainder of this thesis, when I leave the word recognition unitalicised, I refer to the sense of the word as associated with recognition theory; when I italicise recognition, I work with Deleuze’s sense of this concept.

The sociologist Nick Lee has characterised the current era as an “age of uncertainty” (2001) – where previous certainties, stabilities and foundations have been dismantled and destabilised by economic, social and technological vicissitudes. The imperative to recognise one’s self, declare, and inhabit an “unambiguous ‘unitary’ subjectivity” (Ringrose, 2011, p. 599) in this age of uncertainty may produce
its own unsettling affects. In this chapter I explore lived patterns of recognition in an age of uncertainty: how school institutions and those within them “respect and disrespect through their practices of allocating (or withholding) value” (Hickey-Moody & Marshall, 2016, p. 6, my emphasis). I juxtapose dissonant conceptions and uses of the word respect as voice moves through shifting schooling assemblages.

The word respect was used and understood divergently in different territories at this school (Deleuze & Guattari, 1980/1987, p. 327). In an interview, a Head Teacher gave an account of the Steering Committee students’ use of the word respect when they first presented their research findings to teachers in 2010 (see Chapter 1 and Appendix A: Summary of Steering Committee research 2010-2013):

**Eve:** Do you think there were different definitions of what “respect” meant—what students meant, what teachers meant when were using some of those words—and how did that play out?

**Head Teacher [HT]:** Yes. [laughs] The students definitely saw it—that the teachers had to be respectful of them.

**Eve:** Yeah so how did that play out, particularly as it panned out later?

**HT:** Well when had—when we gave the feedback back at the staff meeting, the teachers were a bit annoyed with that—

**Eve:** That the students came up with that as a value?

**HT:** Yes—that the students felt they that should be—like you know um—not that they should be respected ., but that um they felt they weren’t being respected enough. [Interview]

However, for some teachers, the “point” of the students’ research was to give students “input,” which potentially could have shifted students’ feelings that “they were being disrespected”:

**Teacher:** [O]ne of the meetings when you were there and we had the kids like get up and talk to us and whatever. A teacher said something like, “uh how can they expect us to change when they don’t listen to us, and they’re disrespectful and this, that and the other.” And I’m thinking, you’re kind of missing the point. (. ) It’s not about behaviour, it’s not why we’re having this conversation. (. ) It’s about giving kids
input, and maybe if they had the input, (.) they wouldn’t be rude and disrespectful because they felt like they were being disrespected. [Interview]

For others, the “disrespect” shown by students to teachers needed to be addressed “first”, even as this “disrespect” was understood to be a characteristic of “this generation”:

**HT:** The students felt [that they weren’t being respected enough] so they vocalised that - which, for some teachers (.), was very annoying because they felt that well - they felt that overall, the students weren’t respecting them as teachers, and as an authority in the classroom (.) so how was it that they were – how were they going to show respect to the students when they felt that it wasn’t shown from the students. And they felt that the position, or the onus was on the students first to show respect to the teacher. And that’s where the process should begin, that’s where they thought it should be.

**Eve:** Yep.

**HT:** And we had a few discussions about this generation and their expectations and how they’re quite righteous and selfish and disrespectful generally. We had all those discussions. [Interview]

As the word *respect* was repeated across physical, intellectual, linguistic, and existential territories (Deleuze & Guattari, 1994/ 2009, p. 68), it shifted and changed.

*Respect* moved, and each time it moved, something escaped and departed and new connections were made – deterritorialising. Simultaneously, *respect* was reterritorialised – recombining with other concepts (of age, or standpoint, or development, or generation) – entering into new relations. Uttering the word *respect*, at times, drew lines of rigid segmentarity – of certain bodies who should *respect* other bodies: younger bodies who need to *respect* older bodies: “‘We’ve got 13 year olds teaching us’ […]?” Yet, other invocations to *mutual respect* shifted *respect* from familiar territory, tracing out the “little modifications” of the molecular line (Deleuze & Parnet, 2006/ 1977, p. 93). As the word *respect* dynamically deterritorialised and reterritorialised, what had happened was comprehended, understood, and affective equilibrium momentarily restored. *Common sense* accounts of the event temporarily
re-settled a sense of who students are, what the teacher/student relation is, and what happens and what should happen in classrooms.

In one particular focus group, three Year 11 students and I discussed what had happened at this school, and the relationship between voice, age and respect. During this focus group, these students created a puppet production that explored the relations between voice, age, maturity and respect. The following section turns attention to this puppet production as a point of entry to a discussion of the affects and effects of voice in schools. In this discussion, my authorial voice is composed of what the Year 11 students said about this puppet production, what other students said about this puppet production, and what other students said about age and voice in other configurations. These voices are threaded in with discussion of Deleuze and Guattari’s concepts of codes, order words and incorporeal and corporeal transformations (see also Chapter 3). There is no “pure” voice here. It is neither the case that I have decided to write about Deleuze and Guattari’s conception of voice and subjectification, and have found student “proof texts” to back up this description. It is also not the case that the students’ words and puppet productions made me aware of the force of voice, and that Deleuze and Guattari informed my subsequent analysis. I disentangle and re-thread segmentary lines (of adult/child, mature/immature, rational/irrational), molecular lines that slightly diverge from these segments, and lines of flight in order to analyse the arrangements of affects and subjectivities associated with age and student voice in schools (Deleuze & Parnet, 2006/1977, p. 94). This re-arrangement of these lines constitutes an analysis of the political force of voice.
Puppet production 3: “How does this benefit us in life?”

[The scene is set on a table in the library side room. Samantha’s right hand holds the puppet with orange hair: the Teacher-Puppet. On the table are set up a class of silent students (without hands animating them). The only student-puppet who moves is the marionette with the red and white striped bodysuit.]

Pythagoras (Narrator – off-screen): [Deep voice, as narrator] In the Year 8 maths classroom, a student has a question.

Samantha (Teacher-puppet): Good morning class. Now, you should all know who Pythagoras is. We will be learning about him today and how he -

Johnathan (Year 8 student-puppet): [Voice is higher pitched. Student-puppet rises to his feet] Miss, how does this even help us in [pitch suddenly rises] life?

Samantha (Teacher-puppet): Shh! [Nods head vigorously] You’re being disruptive! [Year 8 student-marionette jumps on the spot] Please, there’s no time for your questions!

Johnathan (Year 8 student-puppet): [Student-puppet bops on spot] But it’s a good question, Miss.
Samantha (Teacher-puppet): No it’s not. I’ll decide if it’s a good question or not. [Year 8 student-puppet sits back down again, then lies back on table. The student actors start laughing – muffled.]

Pythagoras (Narrator): Fast forward to year 11. The same question is asked.

Samantha (Teacher-puppet): Good morning everybody. Um, as you all know, um, Pythagoras was visited in the younger years in order to –

Johnathan (Year 11 student-marionette): [Tone of voice is deeper in pitch and calm in tone. Remains seated] Excuse me miss, um, I’d like to ask a question. How does this benefit us in life?

Samantha (Teacher): Oah! I’m happy you asked that question and I’ll be happy to explain it to you. Um, you may not feel that Pythagoras is important, but it is because um, you’ll um, it’ll be, um, it will appear in all your exams. Blah blah blah blah.

Habits of communicating and relating dramatised in this puppet production do not emerge from nowhere, but are formed, patterned, repeated and reinscribed each day. Chaotic, ambivalent affective intensities surge through schools and are apprehended by human bodies – movements of arms, legs, pencils, fans, eyelids;
speeds and slownesses in the playground, the exam hall, the classroom; sudden surges of bodies when a bell rings; a rush of blood when a student speaks out of turn. “[The student-puppet rises to his feet.]” When comparable intensities repeat, and join with similar experiences in other situations, they become interrupted and codified:

_Leila_: I realise that over the years the teachers began to show you that – I don’t know – convey that we were mature or something – wouldn’t be as mean or anything in class. I think it’s just something (1) maybe from the bad kids in the class, they will ruin it for everyone or something – I don’t know if that’s it but – but they’ll have an expectation that by Year 12, ‘that’s it, they going to be mature and I’ll treat them like an adult’ - you know they don’t really expect that from Year 8 - there are some really mature kids in Year 8 – […] but they treat us differently as we get older. [Year 12 focus group]

The Year 8 students-puppet’s body is associated with “disruptive” questions; the Year 11 student-puppet’s body is associated with questions that make the teacher-puppet “happy.”

Those who resist or attempt to redefine or deterritorialise the order of schooling are interpreted according to established codes: “You’re being disruptive!” The order word issues and forms lines of rigid segmentarity: those who question, and those who decide whether or not “it’s a good question or not” [teacher-puppet] – those to be respected and those who respect. Classificatory, hierarchical, binary lines between teacher/student, young/old, knowledgeable/ignorant, are organised in language and effected bodily through order words, introducing “new configurations of bodies” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1980/1987, p. 83).

An “incorporeal transformation” is the “pure instantaneous act” that occurs when a person utters a statement concerning another person’s status, engendering a psychical shift (Deleuze & Guattari, 1980/1987, pp. 80-81). Deleuze and Guattari (1980/1987) use the example of age to explain how order words effect incorporeal transformations:

Bodies have an age, they mature and grow old; but majority, retirement, any given age category, are incorporeal transformations that are immediately attributed to
bodies in particular societies: “You are no longer a child”; this statement concerns an incorporeal transformation, even if it applies to bodies and inserts itself into their actions and passions. (p. 81)

The biological domain of age, statements of age categories and perceptions of maturity are correlated through these incorporeal transformations. Deleuze and Guattari use the example of a judge’s sentence (“Guilty”) that incorporeally transforms the accused into a convict, even before his body has been chained (Deleuze & Guattari, 1980/1987, pp. 80-81). The judge’s statement accomplishes the act of transforming the accused into a convict because it is empowered by and connected to the whole juridicial collective assemblage of enunciation: texts, acts, spaces and utterances that collectively meet in the form of the judge (Grisham, 1991). “You’re being disruptive!”

Each time a student and/or a teacher speaks, corporeal and political changes are inaugurated, effected or reinscribed, loosening and reforming lines of subjectivity, effecting incorporeal transformations that affect the physical body. These “segmentations penetrate our being” so that they “appear and even feel bodily”, even while they may be “socially orchestrated captures of the body – gender, class, [type of student]” (Buchanan, 2007, p. 2). In the Year 11 puppet production, the teacher-puppet’s response to the Year 8 student-puppet effects an instantaneous incorporeal and corporeal transformation, as the student is marked as “disruptive.” The puppet body that has stood up to ask the question of the teacher, and had “bopped on the spot” to defend the question, finally “sits back down again, then lies back on table.” Language does not carry information but, rather, pulses with force (Roy, 2004). The student-puppet is moved by the force of the teacher’s statement, physically and psychically moving back into the subject position of compliant student (sitting down), and, perhaps, disengaged or discouraged student (lying down).

The incorporeal transformation is recognizable by its instantaneousness, its immediacy, by the simultaneity of the statement expressing the transformation and the effect the transformation produces; that is why order-words are precisely dated, to the hour, minute, and second, and take effect the moment they are dated. (Deleuze & Guattari, 1980/1987, p. 81)

These types of incorporeal transformations are accomplished daily, hourly, moment-by-moment in classrooms, as students are sentenced as bad students, or positioned as
good students. Speech thus serves an “existentialising function” in the production of subjectivity (Guattari, 1995, p. 22).

The order word articulated by a body directly impacts and intervenes in other bodies and shifts the atmosphere, slows down or speeds up affective transformations, and alters the field of relations. Order words propel bodies to adopt particular postures: ways of thinking-speaking-feeling-acting-moving. A student knows the postures that he or she is to adopt if she is to be recognised as in line with the social order: “There are times when you don’t act mature and then the teacher still treats you as if you are mature, because the teacher actually knows that you are mature” [Shaniqua, Year 10, Collaborative analysis]. The statement inserts itself into the student’s actions and passions – they may choose to act mature now they are treated accordingly, or return to acting mature because the teacher “knows” them to be mature: controlling their bodies, sitting still, picking up a pen and focusing on the paper. The order word effects divisions between teacher and student, young and old which, in turn, transform how the student and teacher understand themselves and hold their faces. A sound or sign “melds with our physico-affective matrix” (Roy, 2008, p. 167). Bodies are affected by the speech of others – the force of the order word forms and constitutes who bodies think they are and what they can do.

This puppet production dramatises how certain bodies are thus recognised as legitimate speakers of order words, while other bodies’ voices and articulations are unrecognisable, illegitimate, unspeakable (cf. Butler, 1997a); dismissed because they are too immature, too emotional, too inexperienced. Deleuze and Guattari (1980/1987) note the contingency of the response to a declaration of war: “I declare a general mobilisation” (p. 82) – a statement that might be compared to the student researchers’ call to teachers to “respect students” at the first staff presentation in 2010 (see Appendix A: Summary of Steering Committee research 2010-2013). If there is not the “effectuated variable” that gives “that person the right to make such a statement”, such a statement will be regarded as “an act of puerility or insanity, not an act of enunciation” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1980/1987, p. 82).

*Bob:* I think [some teachers reacted negatively to the students’ research] maybe because of our age, [Monique and Ike laugh and say “yeah”] because we were
maybe, what, 13 years old? “We’ve got 13 year olds teaching us” [...]?

[Year 11 focus group]

To recognise a speaker as legitimate is to reinforce established codes that structure the communicative order of the institution. When a subject is recognised, for Deleuze and Guattari:

… our knowledges, beliefs and values and reconfirmed. We, and the worlds we inhabit, are reconfirmed as that which we already understood our worlds and ourselves to be. An object of recognition is precisely a representation of something always already in place. (O'Sullivan, 2006, p. 1)

When other ways of thinking or relating creep in, these may be resisted or rejected because they do not fit with the established code of who is recognisable as a speaker.

_Faisal:_ Some teachers said [about the students’ research], “this is ridiculous” – I think that’s because they’re so used to teaching for like a long time and now suddenly some students, like 15-year-olds are telling them what to do, telling them that they should be teaching in other ways. I can understand why they’d be not wanting to change. [Year 12 focus group]

Even if a student asserts that an experience, like student voice, has caused them to mature and change, a dominant image of thought shapes how these claims will be recognised:

_Senior Executive teacher:_ [Two particular students] talk about how great that [the Steering Committee] was for them, um but I think they would have been the same anyway. [...] I think they would have come out leaders anyway whether they were part of student voice or not. [...] I've been teaching for almost 30 years, it's a long time to see how kids progress and change as they get into the senior years anyway. Because what happens, they don't just change, but our relationship with them changes because we change. Our attitude changes with them. So the way we talk to them changes. [...] Because we think they are older and they can understand; we don't talk down to them. We don't treat them like little kids anymore. We have higher expectations of them. So the whole environment of the classroom changes when we walk into a senior class. And the kids feel it. Going from [Year] 10 to 11 there's a change. There's a change with the majority of the kids. [Interview]
The problem with recognition, for Deleuze and Guattari, is that it is a non-encounter, and does not allow for the possibility of things being otherwise. Over time, those who initially questioned this order may come to recognise their place in it, its inevitability, and laugh at their earlier desire:

**Monique:** I think we just expected teachers to like – this whole school to like – to change a lot - but it changed, but not dramatically, do you know what I mean? [...] We were just young and we just expected –

**Ike:** I think we expected “oh yeah teachers are going to change from the get-go” –

**Bob:** That’s it.

**Monique:** They’re going to walk into class and everything’s going to be like how we picture it in our head, like you know –

**Ike:** Kick back. [...] 

**Eve:** “We were younger” – are you saying you were idealistic or had high -

**Ike:** I think we didn’t have a sense of reality at the time – we just thought, “oh this is going to happen, this is going to happen” –

**Monique:** Yeah.

**Bob:** “Everything’s going to change.” [Year 11 focus group]

Retrospectively naming themselves as “just young”, this group of students, in this research configuration, account for what happened in the school in terms of their excessive “expect[ations]” of change: that they “didn’t have a sense of reality at the time.” Listening to how students narrate accounts of these interactions suggests the habitual ways in which communicative interactions in schools are ordered and understood. Such statements may be suggestive of the lines ordered around desire that slowly muffle the young body over time – that arrest affect, block desire, whereby the young body comes to desire his/ her own repression and to understand this as “reality.”

**Desiring questions**

In the Year 11 focus group where the above puppet production was created, these students simultaneously questioned and reified this ordering of age and voice in
schools. In our discussion after they created the puppet production, they explained the significance of their puppet production’s exploration of the “issue of maturity”:

Eve: [...] Why did you choose this issue of maturity to talk about? (3)
Samantha: Cause it could be the, uh, the factor that is influencing the (.) – how they are treated – how the students are treated, and how other relationships are.
Pythagoras: And that’s what’s going to affect the student’s overall view on school (.) and whether or not they want to go. It’s like um, how they are with their teachers. (.)

Yet, at another stage of this focus group, these students gave an account of how their own relationships with teachers had improved over time, moving, again, to a more familiar territory of developmental growth over time, where respect is to be demonstrated by students, and then reciprocated by teachers:

Pythagoras: The things we were worried about in Year 9 and stuff – the teachers – now it’s just nothing.
Eve: And why has it changed – when you get to be a senior?
Pythagoras: I think –
Johnathan: We mature. We become –
Pythagoras: The conversations we have with teachers they are more intellectual – it’s more relevant to what you’re doing. All the conversations.
Johnathan: And because of that, we have more respect [...] and we gain respect as well.

These students simultaneously questioned why students were only treated as “mature” when they are older:

Samantha: But, then I think (.) um, why should you have to wait till Year 11 (.) to get that [being treated “like a mature person”] –
Pythagoras: Yep.
Samantha: Why – why can’t it be from (.) the start?

This puppet production prompted (and still prompts) questions. At the end of this focus group, I invited the students to write down the main points from the focus
group discussion (see Chapter 5). Pythagoras wrote on a post-it note: “Were we right to say what was said?” (see Figure 27).

Collecting the post-it notes, I asked Pythagoras:

**Eve:** What do you mean, “were we right to say what was said?”

**Pythagoras:** Like, looking back, if we had an issue with a teacher or something, were we the ones thinking irrationally, or were we actually right?

On the collaborative analysis day, a group of students analysed this particular puppet production. This puppet production, for them, had prompted another question:

**Chatterbox:** Some questions [we have] – do teachers have theories about younger students? [...] Like how do they perceive the younger students? [Group discussion on first collaborative analysis day]

Having explored the age codes of the classroom and the order words that repeat and reinstate these codes daily, the reader may question the extent to which this order is fixed. Are order words uni-directional, so that only teachers can effect incorporeal transformations on student bodies? If there are patterns of recognition, where certain students are viewed in certain ways, what can be done? Can students’ voices affect age codes and order words within the gridded space of a school where
particular order words structure relations and communicative codes? These questions are important because they are questions of social reproduction – whether communicative codes, habits of recognition and the order of schooling inevitably repeat (see Chapter 4).

Possibilities for relations to be otherwise may be glimpsed in moments where codes are de-coded, the order is jumbled and words become “components of passage” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1980/1987, p. 110). As discussed in Chapter 3, order words, relations between them and their effects are in “constant variation” and are “constantly subject to transformations” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1980/1987, p. 82). Massumi suggests: “[e]ven in the most controlled political situation, there’s a surplus of unacted-out potential that is collectively felt. If cued into, it can remodulate the situation” (in Massumi & McKim, 2009, p. 7). Order words do not just erect lines that segment and that shape the way a face is held in moments of incorporeal and corporeal transformations. Because there is always an affective remainder (Massumi, 2002), there are also possibilities of insurgent murmurs that exceed age codes and order words. Imperceptible, “partially articulated” feelings may be quickly “absorbed” or reterritorialised by other, more dominant modes of making sense (Renold & Ivinson, 2014, p. 371). Escape routes from these communicative habits become possible through examination of these moments of ontological jarring, where cracks are made to common sense certainties. Another puppet production, generated by a group of Year 8 and 9 students, suggests the transformative potential of such ontological jarrings: for students to not only be affected, but also to affect, through uncertain affects.

**Doubt and uncertain transformations**

Three Year 9 students and one student in Year 8 created this puppet production. Chapter 3 discussed the first half of this puppet production, as an entry point to a discussion of the order words that create, arrange and reinforce arrangements of students’ bodies and voices in schools. To remind the reader, in the first half of the puppet production, a student-puppet who has been “sent out” from another classroom tells the teacher-puppet that her class is “boring” and that the teacher-puppet should
“improve on your teaching and the way your classroom looks.” The student-puppet’s words and actions in the first half of the puppet production could be coded with a focus on the student-puppet’s deficits in maturity, linguistic competence and social skills (see Chapter 3). In this section, I consider the second half of the puppet production: an imagined scenario created by Year 8 and 9 students that enacts what might happen after the student-puppet leaves the room. I consider the possibility of uncertainty as generative, potentialising possibilities to unsettle and reconfigure dominant codes, order words and relations.

Puppet production 1B: “Hmm. Maybe I could change things a little bit”

[…]
Hussein (teacher-puppet): [Moves towards student-puppet] Yes?
Rodger (student-puppet with yellow cap): You know – your lessons are (.) let’s say, boring (.) because, you know, the way you speak and things like that and your room is so [looks up and around] not vibrant, so dull. Your students were really talking about something else so not on, so not from the topic. I mean, you should really improve on your teaching and the way your classroom looks. You never know: your students might be more engaged and more (.) more uh, more respectful.

Hussein (teacher-puppet): (.) Um (.) don’t tell me what to do. I’ve been teaching for more than 10 years.
Rodger (student-puppet with yellow cap): [Louder, exasperated] Ugh, whatever, I’m going. [Student-puppet nods, turns around quickly and walks away.]
Hussein (teacher-puppet): [Moves away, walking by himself. Camera zooms in. There is a long silence.] (2) Hmm. Maybe I could change things a little bit. (.) Cause I was a bit harsh on him. [Sits down, flicks legs forward.] (.) And the class was pretty boring too. [Head downwards, walks away.]

James (narrator): One day later.
James (as student-puppet): Ooooh. Class again.
Alisha (student-puppet with yellow hair): [Exasperated] Oh my god. (.) [Student-puppet head tilts backwards, looks up at the roof and in a circle. Mouth is open wide.]
James (as student): [Whispering, exasperated] I learned that stuff in primary.
Alisha (student-puppet with yellow hair): [Change in tone – louder, excited] Oh my god! It’s so bright in here.
Hussein (teacher-puppet): [Teacher-puppet walks towards the students] Hello. Good morning. Hello Alex and Ashley. How are you?
James (as student): Very good, sir.

Hussein (teacher-puppet): Today, we’re revising yesterday’s unit. But today we will be using the computers.
Students: Yay!
Rodger (student-puppet with orange hair): Oh my god, this class is so amazing sir.
Hussein (teacher-puppet): Thank you. I decided just for you.
Like the Year 11 age puppet production above, habitual codes and order words are dramatised in the first half of this puppet production: “No, we have to finish this subject first – this unit. [...] Don’t speak to him. [...] [D]on’t tell me what to do” (see Chapter 3). The segmentary, linear progression of units of work is enforced; segmentary lines of subjectivity that divide teacher from student, good student from bad student are reiterated. The teacher’s statements “Don’t talk to him. [...] [D]on’t tell me what to do” effect incorporeal transformations, abjecting the student-puppet who is “sent out” to this classroom, spatially segregating him from the other student-puppets. This utterance reinforces the “code-territory complex (do not approach my territory, it is I who give the orders here...)” (Deleuze & Parnet, 2006/ 1977, p. 96).

In this gridded space, the student-puppet who is sent out is unrecognisable as a legitimate or valued speaker, in comparison to the teacher-puppet: “I’ve been teaching for more than 10 years.” In discussing the puppet production, the students who created the puppet production spoke about the student-puppet in terms that highlight dominant codes and order words: “Why should he [the teacher-puppet] listen to him [the student-puppet]? Cause he’s been misbehaving” (James).

At the same time, for these students, the student-puppet’s behaviour does not invalidate his “voice” and the potential for his voice to affect others: “Even if someone gets sent out, everyone still has a voice – is valid” (Rodger). In the second half of the puppet production, the students create, dramatically, a possibility that other affects and thoughts are at work; that students’ voices might affect teachers. After the bad student-puppet leaves, the teacher-puppet, animated by a hand, shuffles back and forth across the desk, nods its head, pauses between phrases. The teacher-puppet says
to himself: “Hmm. Maybe I could change things a little bit. (.) Cause I was a bit harsh on him.”

The teacher-puppet then changes the physical environment of the classroom (“It’s so bright in here”), the pedagogical assemblages that the student-puppets are invited to enter into (“today we will be using the computers”), and his terms of address for the students (from “Hello class”, to “Hello Alex and Ashley”). The students who created this puppet production were explicit about the reasons for their composition choices: that the teachers’ and students’ habits of relating were “also about the room” (Rodger) and that the teacher using the students’ names shows that “He doesn’t ignore them like he was doing before” (Hussein), and communicates a message: “The students know that the teacher actually has knowledge of them” (James). The teacher-puppet’s shifts in the classroom environment, pedagogical assemblages and interactive positioning effect a different response from the student-puppets: “Oh my god, this class is so amazing sir.”

However, for these students, this puppet production scenario was not necessarily a realistic portrayal of what happens in classrooms. They questioned the extent to which teachers are affected by students’ words:

_Eve_: Do you think that teachers would actually go away and think like that?
_James_: Honestly (.) no.
_Rodger_: We haven’t seen it with our own eyes (.) but there’s a possibility – a possibility that they actually do […]
_Alisha_: But it’s like thanking the bad guy.

This group vacillated between denying the possibility of teachers’ capacities to be affected (“Honestly, no […] We haven’t seen it with our own eyes […] But it’s like thanking the bad guy”), and the “possibility” that teachers “actually” are affected.

Thinking with Deleuze and Guattari, there are moments of unactualised potential that this puppet production dramatises. I interpret the second half of the puppet production not as a performance of a fantasy, as in psychoanalytic understandings of fantasy as “internalised, repressive ‘waking dreams’ where the
working-class subject fantasises about escaping their lack” (Ringrose & Renold, 2011, p. 464). Rather, in Deleuze and Guattari’s conceptualisation of “group fantasy”, “revolutionary desire is plugged into the existing social field”, “making it possible to disinvest the current social field, to ‘deinstitutionalise’ it” (1983, pp. 30, 31). I argue that this puppet production dramatically experiments with other possible conditions of teaching and learning. These “fantastic” dramatisations of desiring-production were plugged into the existing social field of the focus group and plug into present conditions of student-teacher relations. This puppet production, rather than only representing current classroom conditions, becomes an opportunity to interrogate the common sense image of thought of students as lacking and not affecting classroom processes. Students, in this puppet production, create another image of thought.

A moment of “possibility” is glimpsed when the student-puppet says to the teacher-puppet, “You never know: your students might be more engaged and more (.) more uh, more respectful.” The student-puppet questions the order – that the teacher-puppet should not be told “what to do.” Affects circulate that seem to make the student-puppet and teacher-puppet simultaneously desire and resist the repressions and constraints of these habitual codes. The teacher-puppet performs the expected response to the student-puppet’s words: “don’t tell me what to do.” The student-puppet resists age and role codes but also performs the expected role of rude student: “Ugh, whatever, I’m going.” Yet, there are also little cracks in the certainties of these institutional hierarchies and modes of communicating – lines of flight that escape from fixed habits.

The student-puppet’s resistance to the order produces a slight shudder – an ontological jarring that opens up a “silent, imperceptible crack” to the rigid surface of professional subjectivity (Deleuze, 2013/1990, p. 177). “Hmm. Maybe I could change things a little bit” (Teacher-puppet). Deleuze and Parnet write that, while a “profession is a rigid segment”, what is worthy of attention is “what happens beneath [the rigid segment], the connections, the attractions and repulsions, which do not coincide with the segments” (2006/1977, p. 93) – tiny cracks, jarrings, shudders, shocks, schizzes. Excessive, impervious affects tug gently at lines of rigid segmentarity. There is an imperative to role, to identity, to certainty – the teacher-puppet does not articulate his doubts to the student-puppet. The teacher-puppet must
not show the student-puppet that he has been affected by the student-puppet’s voice. “I’ve been teaching for more than 10 years.” Yet, even as the statement normatively orders and reinforces habitual hierarchical relations, it simultaneously triggers turbulences in habitual subjectivities. The teacher-puppet is “forced to thought” (O’Sullivan, 2006, p. 1). “Cause I was a bit harsh on him.” The crack in rigid subjectivity marks “a threshold […] you can no longer stand what you put up with before, even yesterday” (Deleuze & Parnet, 2006/1977, p. 126).

Something is happening affectively that exceeds the teacher-puppet’s response to the student-puppet – something ambivalent, murky, disjunctive, and emergent. In imperceptible ruptures, something between the binary roles of teacher and student may be forged and new connections of multiplicity made (Deleuze & Parnet, 2006/1977, p. 99). But these possibilities remain unactualised.

Doubting what voices can do

This chapter has suggested that what student voices can do is constrained by a dominant image of thought that apprehends the voice and body of the young speaker as “immature”, “irrational” and “bad”. A common sense image of thought constrains classroom relations; students are understood and their words apprehended according to their age, generation, and, potentially, other categories of identity. While this chapter focused on the particular category of age, the communicative act is also entangled with other categories applied to particular bodies, including gender, race/ethnicity, class, religion, sexuality and (dis)ability. For the students in this study, it was perhaps easier to speak about how students are treated differently than others because of age (a category through which bodies pass) than to speak about race/ethnicity, gender, class, religion, sexuality or (dis)ability.

Lines of rigid segmentarity construct and reinforce particular subjectivities in schools. Even while students acknowledge that “[e]ven if someone gets sent out, everyone still has a voice – is valid,” for a teacher to heed these students’ words would be, according to James, “like thanking the bad guy.” A dominant image of thought organises the field of possibilities for what can be seen, heard, done, and the
modes of being that are available in school. When voices speak, bodies are changed, incorporeally transformed into what they are named to be.

At the same time as students articulated and dramatised what voices do – how bodies affect and are affected by the force of language – these interactions were fraught with doubts and uncertainties that emerged alongside order words. “Were we right to say what was said?” – Pythagoras wrote on a post-it note after speaking confidently in a focus group. “Maybe I could change things a little bit” – a teacher-puppet says after ordering the student-puppet, “don’t tell me what to do.” Common sense conceptions of schooling’s subject positions momentarily hang in suspension – but segmentary lines and certainties are then restated – “Honestly (.) no.”

A standpoint epistemological rationale for student voice, that regards children and young people as beings, may offer a view of the child that is more agentic than the developmentally becoming child, but may disallow these vacillations and uncertainties. In this chapter, shifts in utterances and assertions of the capacity to act suggest that both younger and older bodies are variously positioned in different spaces, relations and circumstances as agentic and lacking agency, confident and uncertain, knowledgeable and ignorant, mature and immature, rational and irrational, respectful and disrespectful (cf. Gallacher & Gallagher, 2008; Lee, 2001; Prout, 2005). Ways of thinking, living, teaching and learning “in uncertainty” are needed (Law, 2004, p. 15), that re-think student voice, the subject positions of student and teacher, and the institution of schooling, and that do not disallow these vacillations and doubts, or urge a swift return to certainty. In Chapter 10, I will connect these schizophrenic conditions (Arnot, 2006; Ball, 2003; Braidotti, 2006) of doubt and the imperative to certainty to what happened in this school, and to student voice.

Moments of uncertainty hang in suspension at the end of this chapter. “Were we right to say what was said?” “Maybe I could change things a little bit.” The reader may well question what might happen if we lingered longer in suspension above or between these lines of rigid segmentarity. While this chapter has focused on the lines of rigid segmentarity, and dominant codes and order words that structure habitual modes of relations between students and teachers in classrooms, the radical potential of these moments of uncertainty remains under-explored. The following
chapter explores what happens in student voice configurations, as dramatised by students: whether unsettling fixed segments and roles in dialogue opens communicative spaces where bodies and voices affect and are affected. I trace the movements of molecular lines – lines that slightly diverge from the segmentary, making “detours” (Deleuze & Parnet, 2006/ 1977, p. 93). I argue that troubling the codes of schooling is not so easily effected; reconfiguring student and teacher roles and encouraging dialogue does not necessarily transform conceptualisations and dramatisations of pedagogical relations. While students may give accounts and dramatise moments where new *understandings* form, these moments are fleeting and constrained, occurring behind the backs of the speakers, retrospectively articulated differently by those who engaged in brief relational encounters.
Chapter 7: Desiring understanding, fearing dialogue

Shaza: The chicken has been like that throughout – the whole time it’s been at school, but only recently has it had the courage, through the use of the focus group, to (.) -

James: Express his concerns – Shaza: Express his concerns, and speak in a way that the teacher can understand.

- Second collaborative analysis day group discussion, analysing a puppet production

The previous chapter explored a dominant image of thought that constrains what students’ voices can do, recognising students according to age categories and relations. A young body is more likely to be recognised as “disruptive” and “disrespectful” than an older body, even though “there are some really mature kids in Year 8.” Order words inscribe segmentary lines dividing the student from the teacher, the mature from the immature, but simultaneously potentialise shudders to habitual relations. An utterance might lodge and produce a shock to thought: “Maybe I could change things a little bit.” The chapter concluded by questioning the potentiality of uncertainty in pedagogical relations. I wondered how, in dialogical events associated with student voice, students’ voices affect and are affected.

In this chapter, I turn to the dialogical event, where student and teacher bodies are reconfigured, students and teachers speak face-to-face, and traditional student/teacher roles are jumbled. The purpose of this chapter is to explore accounts and productions of these student voice events and the ambivalent affects surrounding dialogue and understanding. I consider whether, as Shaza said (above), student voice interactions enable students to “speak in a way that the teacher can understand.”
Student voice advocates argue that student voice events provide opportunities for students and teachers to bridge positions and perspectives (see Chapter 2), “reaching an understanding” (Habermas, 1984, p. 44, my emphasis). Yet the order word of ability, introduced in Chapter 3, orders students’ bodies according to their performances of understanding of valued speech and emotional codes: whether or not they speak according to valued linguistic codes, and whether or not they listen and “express” emotion according to codes for emotional deportment. This chapter forms a web entangling ethnographic uses of the refrain understanding, the student voice dialogical rationale, and order words about students’ ability to understand. I question whether divergent understandings are harmonised and consensus formed through the dialogical encounter. In particular, I map the movements of the molecular line in the dialogical event. This supple line may modify, detour and resist lines of rigid segmentarity, even as fear constrains it from moving too far from the safety and security of the segment (Deleuze & Parnet, 2006/ 1977).

In the following section, I produce a partial narrative of the movements and mutations – deterritorialisations and reterritorialisations - of the discursive refrain understanding in students’ and teachers’ accounts of the Steering Committee’s work. Raising questions about dialogue, I then turn to a puppet production created by four Year 9 students towards the end of the year of their involvement in the Steering Committee. This puppet production was used in Chapter 4 to introduce diverse analytical approaches to students’ voices, emotions, bodies and schools. In this chapter, I connect this puppet production and students’ interpretations of it to this refrain of understanding. I question the politics of who is permitted to interpret what has happened in the dialogical event: what needs to be understood and who has understood. In the final section of the chapter, these accounts and productions are transversally intersected with broader socio-political forces and pressures associated with fear and silence. This fear is not necessarily the property of the phenomenological subject (Massumi, 1993c), and these silences are not necessarily the opposite of speech (Foucault, 1976/ 1990; Mazzei, 2007). Rather, fear saturates social spaces, entwined in processes of subjectification in and though even dialogical student voice events (Massumi, 1993b).
Desiring understanding: A partial narrative of student voice and dialogue

Understanding is a dominant refrain in public discourse, mobilised amidst other affects in global circulation. Understanding is not only celebrated in the student voice literature, but is also a “capability” declared to be a cross-curriculum priority in the Australian Curriculum (Australian Curriculum Assessment and Reporting Authority [ACARA], 2013a). “Intercultural understanding”, according to an ACARA elaboration, “involves students in learning about and engaging with diverse cultures in ways that recognise commonalities and differences, create connections with others and cultivate mutual respect” (2013b, para. 1). While “intercultural understanding” is an important cross-curriculum priority, I agree with Watkins and Noble (2016) that this declaration of its value “skirts around […] unpacking what intercultural understanding might mean, theoretically and in educational practice” (p. 43). In this chapter, students and teachers’ accounts of their dialogical understandings were made in the context of these national curriculum changes, as they engaged in dialogue about the new Australian Curriculum for History (see Appendix A: Summary of Steering Committee research 2010-2013). While teachers and students did not speak about the specific cross-curriculum priority of “intercultural understanding,” uses of the term understanding suggest some of the conditions and “politics of recognition” (Watkins & Noble, 2016, p. 44) which shape experiences of dialogical understanding in student voice work. I will return later to conceptualisations of understanding, in intersection with contexts of uncertainty, regimes of performativity, and conditions of surveillance. Indeed, dialogical understanding may be undercut by an immanent material matrix of fear.

To be upfront, I have previously optimistically described the Steering Committee as challenging rigid segments and striations: in its composition of students from across class groupings and, in 2013, across age groupings; in its institutional territory off the timetable; in its spatial territory outside of classrooms (sometimes the executive meeting room, other times the library, other times outside of school). I have argued that the Steering Committee’s research activities jumbled segments, roles and positions; unsettled relations of who understands and who needs to understand; who asks questions and who answers; who collects data on whom (Mayes, 2013c; Mayes, Davis, et al., 2013; Mayes & Groundwater-Smith, 2010, 2011, 2013). These accounts
of the potentiality of dialogue in student voice events deterritorialise – lift and move – hierarchical and classificatory segmentary lines where certain bodies understand and others do not – to a “hybrid space” (Bahou, 2012, p. 246) between bodies (see Chapter 2).

At certain times and in certain configurations, students and teachers gave similar accounts of how students’ dialogical engagements with teachers enabled understanding to be reached between teachers and students. One teacher, who was interviewed by students in the 2013 Steering Committee about her feelings about the changes to the Australian Curriculum for History, later gave an account of this experience:

**Head Teacher:** It’s very rare that we get to relate to them (.) as we are. (.) As people. Just as people in general, not just as teachers or as students – just as people. And I think that um (.) it was a positive experience for both students and teachers in the sense that we got to a level of understanding, in that yeah, “we sometimes don’t feel like what we’re doing with you. But we have to. We are guided and instructed. We have to conform just like you do.” And I think that was an understanding that we came to. [Interview]

Another teacher described to me her purposes when students interviewed her in 2013: “I was trying to get them to understand that sometimes we feel just as restricted as they feel bored” [HSIE teacher interview]. In these dialogical configurations, suspending habitual modes of relating associated with institutional roles, different conversations became possible (cf. Mayes, 2013c). A Year 9 Steering Committee student spoke about affective shifts that these configurations potentialised:

**Isaac:** In class it’s not as comfortable to talk to the teacher, and there are lots of other people around. The interview was more personal. The teachers all were a little bit nervous, but it was also much more comfortable – in class they might be more stressed or frustrated with students. A teacher is a different person in class, because there’s a different amount of students. An interview is a good opportunity for them to meet us, for us to understand each other. [Year 9 focus group]
Similarly, a Year 11 student spoke about the different understanding afforded through observing a teacher’s lesson as a researcher two years earlier (see Mayes, 2013c):

_Onetwothree:_ You look at the students and you see from the teacher’s perspective. You see - you know what, she was doing this to us, and you know we were going to follow […] - But then we realised what she does – cause we’re not in the class when we’re in the class, we’re supposed to do our work and pay attention. Now we can pay attention to the whole room [spreads arms wide]. We can see what Miss is doing and then - then we understand. […] how it might feel. How she feels in the class. [Year 11 focus group]

Michael Johnson, another Year 11 student, described this student/teacher interview situation as, “more direct – we were talking about things that we wanted to know. You wouldn’t ask those questions [normally]” [Year 11 focus group]. On a molecular line, as positions in classroom territories were reconfigured, these students and teachers articulated a sense of understanding – shifts in existential territory. But not everyone felt “more comfortable”:

_Zein:_ It was very unusual. Everyone felt weird. You have that really weird feeling. […] Cause you don’t have that kind of bond together, and you’re basically apart, and you don’t talk much [Year 11 focus group].

Student voice was also associated with fostering student understanding of something pre-determined – understanding reterritorialised on pre-established ground. A member of the Senior Executive spoke in an interview about the importance of giving students “opportunities to feel and understand and actually experience what we want them to feel” through dialogical events like the ones described above. Another member of the Senior Executive spoke about the 2013 Steering Committee focus (What I’d Like to Learn) as fostering student understanding of the curriculum:

_Eve:_ [W]hat is your hope with [the Steering Committee research inquiry focus on the Australian Curriculum]? For the students as they = go through that process?

_Senior Executive:_ = What I hope is that students can see (. ) what it takes you know, to deliver for them what they get in the classroom. So it’s kind of like taking them behind the scenes in a factory. Do you know what I mean? And see how chocolate’s
made and how ice cream’s made and then you can kind of pick the flavours maybe…]. You can help churn the chocolate or you can pick some flavours or whatever – but, to understand […] where this stuff came from. [Interview]

The Steering Committee research focus is framed, here, as a visit to a territory of curriculum formation where students understand something that they will bring back to the classroom’s striated space. Describing other opportunities when Steering Committee students asked questions of the Senior Executive (about, for example, why the school banned mobile phones), a member of the Senior Executive explained the value of these opportunities as helping students to “understand” the rationale for the rules (rather than necessarily modifying them). Understanding, as a verb, differs here from a sense of understanding formed between bodies (as a noun). The molecular line, while supple and diverging from segmentary lines, still remains close to them. Understanding is reterritorialised – taking on another form, brought back into regime of striated space, albeit differently.

Yet, students did not always “feel and understand” what teachers “wanted them to feel” and understand. In the following section, I turn to drawings produced by a group of students from the 2013 Steering Committee on the second collaborative analysis day that explores the student/teacher interview situation. As I discussed in Chapter 5, I did not assume that these drawings were representations of past events, but rather encounter them as artefacts formed in collaboration between the past and the present, the visual and the linguistic, pens, butcher’s paper, environments, students, me, refracted memories of past events, circulating affects in the present and hopes-in-formation for future events (Knight, 2013). I then plug in affects monumentalised in these drawings with other accounts of dialogical events. The divergent understandings of differently positioned bodies suggest dialogue’s ambivalences. I explore these drawings and other accounts of past events in relation to Deleuze and Parnet’s (2006/1977) discussion of the interview, to unsettle my own assumptions and to produce other ways of thinking and feeling about student voice.
There are always “many politics” (Deleuze & Parnet, 2006/ 1977) in a dialogical event – diverging understandings of who has understood whom and what has been understood. On the second collaborative analysis day, after the students and I analysed the puppet productions of other groups and discussed the process of collaborative analysis, I invited them to create a drawing of an interview situation – thinking about, for example, when they were interviewed for the Steering Committee (by an older student), when they had interviewed a teacher that year, or another interview (see Appendix A: Summary of Steering Committee research 2010-2013). One group of three students from Years 7 and 9 created the drawings below (see Figures 28, 29 and 30):
The students explained the drawings to the other students and to me:

**Dale:** [Referring to drawing] This is the um interview [...] The teacher is thinking that she can’t handle this. This is like (1) -

**xPeke:** In her mind, this is her. [Points to the drawing captured in Figure 30] In his [the student’s] mind, that’s who he’s looking at [Points to the drawing captured in Figure 29]. She’s trapped in this paranoia state.

**Dale:** There’s no camera, so you can’t –

**Christian:** That’s cool. [Students spontaneously clap]

**xPeke:** The point of the observation – the normal view [inaudible].

**Eve:** Ah, this is like the imaginary world on the other side, and the person’s -

**xPeke:** Reality, and the imagination.

**Christian:** Nicely played, my brother.
The students represented the interview situation as a site of fear in these drawings. There is a gap between the actual words spoken in the dialogical event and the virtual encounter (in the stick-figure teacher’s “mind”). The stick-figure-teacher sees the stick-figure-student virtually as a skull with knives saying: “You will die!”

Deleuze and Parnet reject the logics of the “conventional” interview or dialogue – logics that may also be tracked in student research events (e.g. students’ interviews with teachers). In a conversation, interview or dialogue, one is asked to “explain oneself” by the other who asks questions (Deleuze & Parnet, 2006/1977, p. 1). When you are asked a question that you have not invented, the aim becomes “to get out” of the conversation (Deleuze & Parnet, 2006/1977, p. 1). “It’s like my brain is on fire. I hate being out of my element. I’m trapped.” Deleuze and Parnet (2006/1977) disparage the interview as flattening engagement and perpetuating established ways of thinking. In this mode of engagement, one party has already defined the problem, and asks the other party a question, “speaking on one’s own” and, not escaping “a ‘Master’s or colonist’s discourse’, an established discourse” (Deleuze, 1995, p. 125). In the interview sketched in these drawings, interview segments (interview/interviewee) remain in place.

When there are multiple bodies involved in an event, who is permitted to say authoritatively what has happened: whether or not students and teachers have understood the other, or have felt a moment of mutual understanding? Whose understanding is validated and valued? Who is assessed to have not understood the situation? These questions of who is considered to legitimately speak and account for the affective intensities of the event are always political.

The 2013 Steering Committee students disagreed with each other throughout the year about what was at work in their dialogical encounters with teachers, and how they could understand what was happening. In Steering Committee meetings, students repeatedly debated the extent to which teachers would “tell the truth” or “act normal” with students in dialogical research events. One student said that he thought teachers “appreciated” the opportunity to be interviewed: “We know they appreciated it; they wanted to do it. I don’t think they were holding too much info back; they answered nearly every question” (Bella, Year 10, second collaborative analysis day).
But others were not so sure. One student said, in a Steering Committee meeting after students had observed a group of teachers discussing their ideas and plans for the Australian History curriculum (see Appendix A: Summary of Steering Committee research 2010-2013):

**Dale:** I don’t really think that they [teachers] acted how they really would. They were nervous, didn’t say stuff that they really would say – they wouldn’t talk as formal in the staffroom. You need to put a camera in their staffroom – maybe when you do their actual meetings, they get frustrated and swear. [*Year 7 focus group*]

Another student spoke about what he had learned about interviewing:

**Isaac:** We’ve learned how to think about how a student or teacher might feel and how we can get everything out of them: by making them feel comfortable, assured that nothing will be taken to anyone higher than them, all the information will be confidential, allowing them to express how they feel. When we’ve done observations, we’ve seen how they’ve reacted to the questions – facial expressions, getting agitated sometimes – like moving a cup, or their voice changing. [*Year 9 focus group*]

Over the year, students questioned what research methods might help them to somehow “capture” or “access” teachers’ feelings. The possibility (and ethics) of using a “secret camera” came up on multiple occasions. Students wondered how they might grasp what seemed to escape or exceed their understanding of what teachers were thinking and feeling.

These contested understandings of what happens in the dialogical encounter collided in a particular event that did not (necessarily) generate the understanding that students, nor teachers, had anticipated. During this meeting, the Steering Committee students observed a group of six HSIE teachers discussing a proposed Year 7 History unit of work for the Australian Curriculum. My fieldnotes produce a partial narrative of this event:

Ms Frazzle has clustered six desks in the middle of a classroom for the teachers to sit at to meet, and has arranged desks in an arc around these desks for the Steering Committee students to sit at. There is paper on the desks for students to take notes on as they watch the teachers’ meeting. Ms Frazzle says to the students, “I feel nervous
I know how you feel in class,” as she moves to sit down at the clustered desks in the centre of the room. As the Head Teacher walks into the room, she says, “I’m scared,” hunches up her shoulders towards her ears and laughs. A Year 9 student calls out that the formation of desks is a “ring of fire.”

During this meeting, the newest member of staff, a younger male teacher, sits quietly as the other teachers talk about the Year 7 unit of work. At one stage, he says something to the other teachers as part of the conversation. A Year 9 student sitting at a desk in the outer circle behind the male teacher points his left arm and forefinger towards the male teacher, smiles, and mouths “he’s talking!” at another student. There is some whispering among students. Otherwise, the students are silent during the observation of the meeting, occasionally making faces and mouthing words to each other across the room. At the end of the meeting, the Head Teacher turns around from her desk and says, “thank you guys for your lovely behaviour.”

This absence of the male teacher’s speech is the first thing that the students comment on as soon as the teachers leave the room. A Year 9 student speculates, “It’s like he’s too shy or something. It might be out of respect – he was a bit reluctant to put his ideas out there,” but adds that one of the other teachers “could have asked him if he had an opinion or something.” Another student says to Ms Frazzle, “you guys never asked him what he thought about the topic.” A Year 7 student speculates that he might have felt “outnumbered by his gender.”

The male teacher approaches Ms Frazzle and I at lunchtime to apologise for his silence during the meeting. He says, “I got stage fright – I couldn’t speak – I sat back.” He repeats the word “stage fright” and identifies himself as an “Early Career Teacher” a number of times. [Fieldnotes]

When students’ interpretations of this event and of the teacher’s silence were later shared with the HSIE teachers, there were mixed reactions. A HSIE teacher, in a later interview with me, said:

[In the student/teacher research events] they got to see our perspectives on things. And sometimes they still misread us – there’s going to be an “us versus them” thing. [...] They hate us, they don’t see us as human beings. They assume we’re doing the wrong thing. They’re talking about us in a deficit way. [...] That actually irritated me, ‘why aren’t you letting [the male teacher] speak? Why are you overpowering him?’ [Interview]

Divergently, the Head Teacher of the faculty gave another account of this research event, and what was happening in the silences:
For those brief moments when [the students] were watching us, it created connections between teachers and students. You are still aware of them, conscious of their thoughts as you talk: their own thoughts, your actions and how you think in terms of what we were dealing with that day, planning for the programs. I felt that connection was really positive. You couldn’t really absolutely ignore that they were there, and you didn’t really want to: a connection came in. We were moving away from that student/teacher relationship – there was a collegiality between teacher and student – I’ve never experienced it before. We only touched on it but it was nice.

[Interview]

Silence, interpreted by some of the students as fear, and attributed by one teacher to “stage fright,” was divergently apprehended, understood and accounted for by differently positioned bodies. Some said that they felt “fright”; others said that they felt “collegiality” and “a connection.”

Assembling these fragments of accounts of dialogical events, it seemed that how students and teachers understood these events and each other did not necessarily move towards a consensus about what had been understood. In an interview, bodies are “never in the same rhythm”; “always out of step”; what happens is not “grasped” “at all in the same way” (Deleuze & Parnet, 2006/1977, p. 13). Students and teachers had rather different hopes and understandings of what was happening, and articulated the affects at work differently. To question What does student voice do? is to consider how the dialogical event works: to explore the potentiality of moments in suspension that are later coded in language.

**Troubling silences: Misunderstanding voices**

In this section, I turn to a puppet production created by four Year 9 students from the 2013 Steering Committee that explores the ambivalent affects of the student voice dialogical event. These students were part of the events and conversations about interviews and fear in dialogical research events discussed earlier in this chapter. In Chapter 4, I considered how the speech and silence of the chicken student-puppet in this puppet production might be interpreted from various analytic approaches: as generated by schooling structures and practices, as agentic resistance, as constituted
through discursive norms, and as shot through with psychic conflict. Below, thinking with Deleuze and Guattari, I explore the multiplicities of (mis-)understandings, voices, silences and fear, and the work of desiring-production in these apparently intractable moments of silence. I consider voice and silence and the “communication of desire” within a “richly expressive situation in which a whole series of semiotic components are involved” (Guattari, 1997, p. 16).

Before proceeding, it is worth noting previous warnings surrounding the analysis of silence in qualitative research. Mazzei (2007) warns qualitative researchers not to romanticise silent voices or project onto silences the researcher’s own longings or interpretations of a situation (p. 60). Instead of attempting to identify what particular instances of silences mean, I am more interested in what these silences do and what is produced in and through them. Simultaneous ambivalent affects are at work in student voice configurations, shutting down the possibilities of encounter and holding out potential escape routes from habitual relations. These silences, and divergent possible interpretations of them, suggest the need for other ways of thinking about the dialogical event associated with student voice.

**Puppet production 2: “Bok”**

[The scene is set at the table in the school’s Executive meeting room. On the left side of the frame, the teacher-puppet (with brown hair and purple dress) is standing, facing the student-puppets. Four student-puppets are behind one side of the table: a student-puppet wearing a blue cap, the chicken student-puppet, the sheep student-puppet and a student-puppet with orange hair. Adjacent, on the other edge of the table, is the student-puppet wearing a yellow cap. The teacher is starting a lesson.]
Isaac (teacher-puppet): Okay class, we’ve been learning about travel. Does anybody have any questions? [All students are upright at side of table. Chicken student-puppet is closely flanked by the student-puppet with a blue cap and the sheep student-puppet.]

xPeke (chicken student-puppet): [Quietly] Bok.

Isaac (teacher-puppet): Yes, chicken?

xPeke (chicken student-puppet): [Loudly] Braaaaaaeek. [Raises open beak to the ceiling]

Isaac (teacher-puppet): I’m sorry. Can you please repeat that?

xPeke (chicken student-puppet): [Loudly] Braaaaaeek. [Opens beak to ceiling]

Isaac (brown hair teacher-puppet): Um. I don’t understand you.

xPeke (chicken student-puppet): [Loudly] Bok bok, braaaaaaeek.

Isaac (teacher-puppet): Okay chicken, stay with me after class.

xPeke (chicken student-puppet): [Plaintively] Breara [Chicken student-puppet slowly collapses forward on table, beak down]
Umprikash (student-puppet wearing yellow cap): [Hands wide. Puppet body shakes as he speaks] It seems we have a communication error.
Isaac (teacher-puppet): Okay.
Umprikash (student-puppet wearing yellow cap): Why don’t we conduct a focus group to solve this issue?
[Student-puppet with orange hair nods vigorously and then puts head face down in lap.]

Isaac (teacher-puppet): Sure thing. [Teacher-puppet moves closer, and all puppets move closer to each other.]
Umprikash (student-puppet wearing yellow cap): Why did you put the chicken on detention?
Isaac (teacher-puppet): I didn’t understand what he was saying in class.
[Chicken student-puppet taps beady eyes on table three times.]

xPeke (chicken student-puppet): [Lifts head from table quickly and quietly says] Mmrrrrra. [Replaces head on table, face down. Taps table with beady eyes twice.] (1)
Shaza (student-puppet with orange hair): Maybe you’re just misinterpreting what the chicken’s trying to say.
Isaac (teacher-puppet): I will try now.
Shaza (student-puppet with orange hair): Go ahead. [Turning body towards chicken student-puppet and teacher-puppet.]
Isaac (teacher-puppet): What’s your problem, chicken?

xPeke (chicken student-puppet):
[Slowly, lifting head from table. Puppet arms are on side of beak, in protection. The human voice of the puppeteer still has the cadences of a chicken’s squawk]
Bbb, bbb, (.) I’m (.) –

Isaac (teacher-puppet): Yes?

xPeke (chicken student-puppet): - scared (.) –

Isaac (teacher-puppet): Yes?

xPeke (chicken student-puppet): - of you. (.) Broooaaak.

Isaac (teacher-puppet): Are you scared of me? (1) [Student-puppet with orange hair slumps head forward in lap.]

xPeke (chicken student): Yes. [Student-puppet with yellow cap nods head emphatically.] (.)

Isaac (teacher-puppet): Why?

xPeke (chicken student-puppet):
Mmmm. [Taps beady eyes on table twice] Bruuuk. (1)

The puppet-lesson opens with a typical classroom interaction – the teacher-puppet re-states the topic of study and asks if there are any questions. The chicken student-puppet responds to this invitation, but in a “chicken” mode of “speech” that is
unintelligible to the teacher-puppet. As discussed in Chapter 3, the chicken student-puppet’s linguistic codes and cultural capital are not recognised by the teacher-puppet. The teacher-puppet asks the chicken student-puppet to “please repeat that?” before saying, “Um, I don’t understand you.” This misunderstanding, according to one of the students who created this puppet production, could be due to generational differences: “sometimes, teachers might not understand ways that students express themselves because of their age. Age generations are different” (Isaac, Year 9, collaborative analysis; see Chapter 6).

Having not understood, the teacher-puppet tells the chicken student-puppet to “stay with me after class.” When I spoke with the broader group of students on the collaborative analysis day about this puppet production, one student drew attention to this statement:

-Eve: What were the big ideas or themes?
-John Dixon: That teachers don’t really see what’s happening. Like the student was scared of the teacher. The teacher didn’t really see that - she didn’t – just said, “stay with me after class” straight away.
-Isaac: They don’t read between the lines. The teachers. […]
-Student: Miscommunication between teachers and students.
-Eve: Yep. ()
-Christian: They observe, without a focus on gaining an understanding of [inaudible].

But this imperative to “stay with me after class” is ambiguous. It could invite the chicken student-puppet to speak one-on-one to avoid shaming him for incomprehensibility, or it could indicate punishment for speaking strangely in class. It could invite a voyage on a molecular line to a slightly different mode of relating, one-on-one, after class, or it could propel a return to segmentary lines of detention. The chicken student-puppet slowly collapses forward, beak down. Understanding is not reached; the chicken student-puppet's fear is misinterpreted, and there is “[m]iscommunication” between teacher and student.

At this stage of the puppet production, the usual logics of classroom interactions are interrupted – another student-puppet speaks without being called on
by the teacher-puppet. The student-puppet says: “It seems we have a communication error.” A crack is made to the segmentary line. A student-puppet suggests, “Why don’t we conduct a focus group to solve this issue?” On the collaborative analysis day, the students discussed the significance of a student initiating a focus group:

-Eve: Is it significant that a student suggested a focus group, rather than another teacher?
-John Dixon: Student suggested it – the teacher could reject it –
-Eve: If a student suggested it?
-John Dixon: Because sometimes teachers don’t really care.
-Brooke: [quietly] It’s interesting.
-Student: - bother listening to –
-Eve: A student? So is it unrealistic, in a way? Or you [to Brooke] said interesting,
-Brooke: I found it interesting that the student actually [inaudible] – [overlapping voices]
-Student: There needs to be a Steering Committee.
-Student: Just encouraged them.
-Eve: And so is it significant then, that the student suggested the focus group?
-Isaac: [inaudible]
-Eve: And so then, what sort of situation does the focus group create?
-Christian: [Inaudible] It’s just my impression - with the student putting the focus group topic out there, it’s saying it doesn’t always have to be, you know, older, or the teacher that can make the change. You can do it if you have a concern.

Students articulated surprise at the teacher-puppet’s response to the question, “Why don’t we conduct a focus group to solve this issue?” The teacher-puppet physically moves closer to the student-puppets, who re-configure their puppet-bodies into a semi-circle. Towards the end of the collaborative analysis of this puppet production, Christian noted, “the teacher could have actually not agreed to a focus group, but the teacher was open to that situation.” This new configuration is contingent on the teacher-puppet’s “open[ness].”

As the teacher-puppet says, “Sure thing” and moves her puppet body towards the students, it is as if “[a] threshold is crossed, which does not necessarily coincide with a segment of more visible lines” (Deleuze & Parnet, 2006/ 1997, p. 93, emphasis
their). This crack is felt as “something that will perhaps matter” unfolding amidst regular modes of being (Berlant, 2011, p. 5). On the molecular line, there might be a “molecular crossing of strata” where processes intersect and produce “a new capital of potentiality” (Guattari & Rolnik, 1982/2008, pp. 467, 470). The teacher-puppet attempts to understand what the chicken student-puppet is saying: “I didn’t understand what he was saying [...]. I’ll try now.”

In a new configuration, the teacher-puppet asks, “What’s your problem, chicken?” Segmentary and molecular lines entangle in this question. This question could reproduce classificatory segments – divisions between your problem and my solution. The question could individualise or pathologise the chicken student-puppet, putting the responsibility to communicate clearly – according to schooling’s codes – back onto him. But the chicken student-puppet responds by haltingly speaking in a language that the teacher-puppet can understand. Something has shifted, so that the chicken student-puppet is momentarily intelligible. Amidst the questions that the chicken student-puppet “turn[s] in circles among”, there may be “becomings which are silently at work, which are almost imperceptible” (Deleuze & Parnet, 2006/1977, p. 1). The students spoke during the collaborative analysis day about this moment:

**Shaza:** The chicken has been like that throughout – the whole time it’s been at school, but only recently has it had the courage, through the use of the focus group, to (.) -

**James:** Express his concerns –

**Shaza:** Express his concerns, and speak in a way that the teacher can understand.

In the teacher-puppet’s repeated, coaxing, “yes?”, there is perhaps interest, engagement, desire in motion. Suspended between the teacher-puppet’s encouraging “yes” and the chicken student-puppet’s faltering speech is the possibility of becoming-otherwise. And yet, this moment hinges on the chicken student-puppet making himself intelligible – impelled to speak in the language of the party with greater institutional power (cf. Said, 1989; Spivak, 1987).
There is a silence after the chicken student-puppet slowly articulates a particular emotional intensity, finally comprehensible: “I’m [...] scared [...] of you.” A “frightened [student-puppet] face” ruptures the classroom’s surface:

There is, at some moment, a calm and restful world. Suddenly a frightened face looms up that looks at something out of the field. The other person appears here as neither subject nor object but as something that is very different: a possible world, the possibility of a frightening world. (Deleuze & Guattari, 1994/2009, p. 19)

The “frightened [puppet] face” startles the teacher-puppet out of comfort and habitual modes of being, alerting her to something not previously apprehended. Things are not as they have seemed to be. Perhaps the teacher-puppet felt this classroom to be an open space; perhaps her subjectivity is constructed on an understanding of herself as a progressive educator who listens to students and allows student-puppets to initiate focus groups. What does this statement, “I’m [...] scared [...] of you” do?

There is another silence after the teacher-puppet repeats the utterance as a question: “Are you scared of me?” The student-puppet with orange hair slumps forward in the space of this silence. The teacher-puppet asks, “Why?” Even when the chicken student-puppet momentarily speaks in the dominant, valued language of the institution, he is not understood (cf. McIntyre et al., 2005). The “spotlight” (Gordon, 1981, p. 132; Madhuri sketch drawing, Chapter 1) falls on the chicken student-puppet, and he must give a further account of himself (Butler, 2005).

This is no ideal speech situation (Habermas, 1984). The chicken student-puppet hesitates, unable to explain himself and the affects in circulation:

[T]he slightest hesitation in response to [a demand to explain yourself] pushes you into a kind of hole, forcing you to wonder: “After all, who am I? Am I just a piece of shit?” It is as if your right to exist were to collapse. And so you think that the best thing to do is to shut up and internalise those values. But who says so? It is not necessarily the teacher […], it may be something that is part of us, inside us, something that we ourselves reproduce. (Guattari & Rolnik, 1982/2008, pp. 55-56)

De Miranda (2013) describes the molecular line as an “airlock of hesitation” that might be “explored upwards and downwards” (p. 117): upwards towards a stretching of constraints, or downwards, towards the segmentary line or a line of abolition. Perhaps in his silence, the chicken student-puppet knows more than he can bring
himself to express (Alerby, 2012) – his tacit standpoint knowledge has reached its limits for articulation (Polanyi, 1958, 1969). Perhaps the chicken student-puppet exposes himself to a risk of judgment and rejection, but fails to feel understood (Burbules, 2004). Perhaps the chicken student-puppet fears articulating his dissent – and so spirals into silence (Noelle-Neumann, 1974). Perhaps the chicken student-puppet does not want to be classified as psychologically vulnerable and placed under psycho-therapeutic monitoring (Coppock, 2014; Coppock & McGovern, 2014).

Words “cannot say enough – or hide enough” (Mazzei, 2007, p. 35). Perhaps in these silences, the chicken student-puppet senses the impossibility of accounting for – in words – who he is, what he meant to say, or why things are the way they are.

The chicken student-puppet is silent. The chicken student-puppet bashes its eyes on the desk. The chicken student-puppet returns to chicken noises, “Bruuuk.”

At the end of this puppet production, the viewer/reader does not know if the chicken student-puppet’s response is a retreat to segmentary lines, or the molecular crossing of a threshold. The molecular line may dry up or set free; may hesitate and fall in paralysis, or persevere and escape (de Miranda, 2013). Segmentary lines seem to be re-introduced, in a manner that resonates with some of the interactions described by students and teachers earlier in the chapter: the teacher speaks, and the onus is on the student to understand. In this classroom, with its history, in this event, it is not so simple as for the teacher-puppet to open a crack in her subjectivity, welcome the conditions of a focus group, and become-otherwise, nor for the student-puppet to initiate a focus group where the teacher-puppet and the chicken student-puppet re-see each other, nor for the teacher-puppet to understand the chicken student-puppet’s feelings, nor for the chicken student-puppet to understand the teacher-puppet’s feelings. It is, perhaps, safer for the teacher-puppet to recognise the chicken student-puppet according to what the teacher-puppet has known the student-puppet to be: immature, irrational and irresponsible (see Chapters 3 and 6). The chicken student-puppet, in turn, withdraws to a habitual mode of being. The chicken student-puppet and the teacher-puppet are both trapped within grids of schooled subjectivities that limit their possible responses (G. Thompson & Bell, 2011). The lines of connection that reached out appear to flee back to a line of rigid segmentarity – that divides teacher from student, intelligibility from unintelligibility (Deleuze & Guattari, 1980/
1987, p. 227). While the molecular line resists the segmentary line, it may fear the consequences of flight, and retreat to the segmentary line:

We are afraid of losing. Our security, the great molar organisation that sustains us, the arborescences we cling to, to binary machines that give us a well-defined status, the resonances we enter into, the system of overcoding that dominates us – we desire all that. […] We flee from flight, rigidify our segments, give ourselves over to binary logic; the harder they have been to us on one segment, the harder we will be on another; we reterritorialise on anything available […]. The more rigid the segmentarity, the more reassuring it is for us. That it what fear is, and how it makes us retreat into the first line. (Deleuze & Guattari, 1980/ 1987, p. 227)

New lines of subjectivity in formation are fragile – molecular lines and lines of flight vulnerable to retreat to the segmentary line, or to diversion to a black hole (Deleuze & Guattari, 1980/ 1987).

To analyse the chicken student-puppet’s silences and what students and teachers said about past dialogical events may miss something that exceeds individuals and that circulates between bodies. The “frightened face” looms up “looks at something out of the field” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1994/ 2009, p. 19) – and this “out of the field” is plugged into the ethnographic field. The fears and silences that I have discussed in this chapter must be related “directly to what’s Outside” (Deleuze, 1995, pp. 7-8) – institutional, national and transnational fears – since classrooms and what is beyond them continually fold, unfold and refold.

The accounts and productions assembled in this chapter share a “central nervousness”, even as this nervousness took “many forms”, varying in translation from body to body (Massumi, 2005, p. 32). I argue that this nervousness or fear is something other than the nervousness and fear previously discussed in the student voice literature as a property of the individual teacher, who is anxious that his/ her authority will be undermined through student voice (e.g. Flutter, 2007; Robinson, 2014; Shor, 1996). Bragg (2007b) considers analyses of student voice that foreground teachers’ “fear” to be overly “psychologising” (p. 344), and locates teachers’ responses within a broader educational context of performativity. Extending Bragg’s analysis, I situate fear in the context of its “saturation of social space” in late capitalism; fear that is not the possession of a subject but “part of the very process of subject formation” (Massumi, 1993b, p. ix). Massumi, after Deleuze and Guattari,
recasts the psychological framing of fear as an individualised emotion. Fear, rather, is political: “the inherence in the body of the ungraspable multicausal matrix of the syndrome recognizable as late capitalist human existence (its affect)” (Massumi, 1993a, p. 12). Amidst the “terrors of performativity” (Ball, 2003), a securitisation connected to a fear of terror[ism], and an erosion of civil liberties, insecurity has become “the new normal” (Massumi, 2005, p. 31). Like Marx’s superstructural forces, and Foucault’s microphysics of power, these affects are “known principally through their effects”, but “remain none the less real or analytically valid as a result” (Hynes, 2013, p. 561). These fears, anxieties, tensions, suspicions and paranoias are sensed (Aly & Green, 2010; Coppock & McGovern, 2014); even if the multicausal matrix that gives rise to them is beyond the teacher-puppet and the chicken student-puppet’s understanding.

In each of these accounts and dramatisations of understanding, fear and silence were uttered and dramatised from a collective assemblage of bodies, texts, affects, gazes, materials, environments, memories – that teem with associations murmuring around the statement (see Chapter 3). To be observed and listened to was, at times, associated with being monitored – for both the self-confessed “Early Career Teacher” with “stage fright” in the HSIE teacher meeting, and for the chicken student-puppet closely listened to by the teacher-puppet (“Why?”). Student voice, in a climate of performativity and surveillance, may seem to be another mode of performance review for some teachers, and another mode of surveillance for some students. To interview a teacher may be associated with the need for hidden cameras (“There’s no camera, so you can’t –“), the need to analyse micro-movements, and the need to cultivate psychotherapeutic methods to “get everything out of them.” Collective traces of this climate of surveillance engender an equation of hidden cameras with capturing “truth.” Fear is calibrated and modulated in objects, texts and relations that activate the body: measures of performance, security cameras, large metal gates, school policies, modes of speaking, listening, relating and being (Massumi, 2005). This fear circulates, sticks to, soaks in and eats up.

Even as fear may collectively attune and even shock a multiplicity of bodies, reactions of bodies vary according to each body’s “lived past” and each body’s angle of participation in the event (Massumi, in Massumi & McKim, 2009, p. 2). In these
student/teacher dialogical events, there were moments of engagement and encounter, alongside moments of misinterpretation and misunderstanding. In exploring dialogue’s ambivalent affects, I do not wish to nullify what happens and what might happen through student voice. Indeed, so much was happening that exceeded my grasp and understanding. Some of these fragments of encounters suggest that student voice intended to promote understanding may inadvertently further place the spotlight on students, and make some teachers feel “trapped.” Yet, often within the same event, student voice did seem to generate new attunements and relations. Dialogical events might be simultaneously subversive and affirmative, simultaneously limited by the codes and order words of the classroom and rare moments of interactional creativity. Rather than eviscerate voice and dialogue, I suggest that we need new ways of thinking about (and feeling within) the intensities surrounding dialogue. These intensities are at least as unsettling as they are harmonising. In Chapter 10, I further explore the possibility of more agonistic, dissensual, difference-oriented approaches to voice, dialogue and “intercultural understanding” in schools.

In this chapter, I have analysed accounts and productions of student voice dialogical events, and the ambivalent movements of affect entangled in voice and silences. I worked with, and simultaneously interrogated, the movements of the term understanding as it was deterritorialised and reterritorialised, and fears and silences surrounding dialogue. Previous discussions and analyses of Steering Committee research events were brought into relation with a puppet production created by four Year 9 students, in order to explore the intersections of segmentary and molecular lines in configurations intended to engender understanding.

This chapter included quotations from some teachers and senior executive teachers who hoped that students’ dialogical experiences would engender new understandings that they would bring back with them to classrooms. In the following chapter, I ethnographically explore what happened in classroom spaces during and after students’ participation in the Steering Committee. Having explored the dialogical events associated with student voice, I question whether the understandings accounted for in this chapter were confined to Steering Committee research activities. Did students then have a voice in other spaces and configurations in the school? What do their empowered voices then do? I take up a third discursive refrain: responsibility.
Advocates for student voice argue that students should be positioned as responsible, given rights, as a way to empower their voices (see Chapter 2). I intersect this rationale with the order word of emotion – and encouragements for students to take responsibility for their expressions of emotions (see Chapter 3). In a focus group discussion with four Year 11 students, a line of flight irrupts as they create a puppet production that re-eventalises a past classroom conflict. In transcribing my own stuttered response to their puppet production, I unfold my participation and implication in patterns of subjectification effected in and through student voice. While this present chapter explored the perils and misunderstandings in the students’ research work, the following chapter unfurls my own responsibilities and shame in this study’s participatory research events. While Chapter 6 traced the segmentary lines of age and the possibilities of uncertainty, and this chapter (7) followed molecular lines and the ubiquity of fear, Chapter 8 is impelled by the line of flight and the affect of shame.
Chapter 8: Desiring responsibility, shaming change

We are
trying
to
change.
- Student-puppet, Year 11 puppet production

The previous chapter explored the movements of understanding in and through the field of the school as student voice was enacted as a school reform strategy. In the dialogical event associated with student voice, understanding was, at times, something for students to gain through listening to teachers, while, at other times, it was something formed between students and teachers. I mapped the ambivalent potential of the molecular line in the dialogical encounter; the possibility that something different might happen through reconfiguring students’ and teachers’ bodies in student voice events. Yet, students’ accounts and dramatisations of these events unsettled an account of student voice as necessarily producing mutual understandings and understanding of the experience of the other. Fear was laced through these accounts and dramatisations of dialogical events – fear that is not necessarily a property of a phenomenological subject, but ubiquitous, circulating and shaping subjectivities.

This chapter works with the movements of voice as it makes its way back into classrooms, in a temporality that follows the dialogical event associated with student voice, questioning what students’ voices can do in the striated spaces of classrooms after their involvement in student voice work. I intersect my earlier discussion of the critical pedagogic rationale for student voice, critiques of the responsibilising function of student voice, and the order word of emotion, with accounts and productions of events that followed students’ participation in the Steering Committee. In Chapter 2, I discussed the imperative to “change” the world rather than only “interpret” it (Marx, 1978, p. 145) and to read the “word” in order to read and change “the world” (Freire & Macedo, 1987). Student voice researchers have pointed towards the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child’s declaration of children and young people’s
“right to express” their “views freely in all matters affecting” them (United Nations, 1989) to buttress arguments that students should be positioned and recognised as responsible and capable of advising, recommending and initiating changes to schools. But, as I discussed in Chapter 3, alongside the movement to recognise children and young people’s rights, governance practices have also shifted, re-positioning school leaders to be more autonomous and responsible for their own “output control” (Krejlsler, 2007, p. 473), and re-positioning students, teachers and schools as “entrepreneur[s]” (Foucault, 2010, p. 226) of projects of the self in institutional reform. In recent years, school reform strategies focusing on emotion and behaviour have been developed and enacted in schools; reform strategies that encourage students to become responsible for understanding and regulating their own emotions, and to understand and manage the emotions of others. Student voice work may amplify this imperative to self-regulate and become more responsible (Fielding 2001; Arnot, 2006).

Examining the lines that entangle rights and responsibilities, this chapter explores what happens when students are given and use their right to have a voice – the “immanent modes of existence of people provided with rights” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1994/2009, p. 107). What happens when students bring newfound understandings, and a desire “to change” (as the student-puppet says above) back to the territory of their classrooms? Who is understood to need to become more responsible? Who claims responsibility – or is held responsible – for changes that happen? What changes are recognisable, and what happens when bodies have different understandings of whom or what is supposed to change?

I proceed with a partial narrative of the responsibilities that became enmeshed with students’ rights in the Steering Committee. Noting a Senior Executive teacher’s account of the “turning point” of the student voice reform, I trace how responsibility was “put back on” students involved in the Steering Committee for “their behaviours.” Wondering “[w]hatever could have happened for things to have come to this?” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1980/1987, p. 194, their emphasis), I turn to a puppet production created by four Year 11 students, that dramatises a classroom conflict between student-puppets and a teacher-puppet. In the interviewer’s stuttering response to the students’ discussion of this classroom conflict, the authorial voice of
this chapter breaks down. Multiple footnotes are used at this stage of the chapter to
dramatise doubts (cf. Chapter 6), fear (cf. Chapter 7), and shame surrounding the
accounts I assemble. These footnotes are experiments – ruptures that break with the
segmentary lines that form autonomous responsible subjects and a coherent
ethnographic account. I work the limits of what an authorial voice can do, moving
with the vacillations and cracks in the I.

In this chapter, I use the word shame as a discursive marker of ambivalent
affective intensities associated with these events. This word was not necessarily used
by students and teachers, and indeed, may seem like an extreme word choice. The
term shame is used after Deleuze and Guattari (1994/2009), Tomkins (2008) and
Probyn (2004). I acknowledge that there are differences between Tomkins’ and
Deleuze and Guattari’s approach to affect (see Blackman & Venn, 2010; Clough,
2007; Coleman, 2013; Gregg & Seigworth, 2010). Affect theorising influenced by
Tomkins’ work has been described as starting with bodily drives, working from the
“inside-out” (Coleman, 2013, p. 31). Affect theorising influenced by Deleuze, after
Spinoza, analyses affect “in the midst of things and relations (in immanence)” (Gregg
& Seigworth, 2010, p. 6). While acknowledging the differences between these
approaches, the present analysis experiments with the relations between these two
vectors of affect theorising, in a methodology of the fold that undoes distinctions
between inside and outside.

Deleuze and Guattari’s interest in shame is articulated in the context of a
critique of the capitalist democratic state and of human rights – a context that
becomes relevant in relation to the twin order words of rights and responsibilities. For
Deleuze and Guattari, “the shame of being human” is experienced “not only in […]
extreme situations”, but also “in insignificant conditions”:

… before the meanness and vulgarity of existence that haunts democracies, before the
propagation of these modes of existence and of thought-for-the-market, and before
the values, ideals, and opinions of our time. The ignominy of the possibilities of life
that we are offered appears from within. We do not feel ourselves outside of our time
but continue to undergo shameful compromises with it. (pp. 107-108)

Shame, for Deleuze and Guattari, is a “‘composite’ feeling”: a “shame that [humans]
could do this, shame that we have been unable to prevent it, shame at having
survived, and shame at having been demeaned or diminished” (footnote 17, 1994/2009, p. 225).

For Probyn, after Tomkins, shame is entwined with interest. Interest is neutral, able to be directed down multiple paths in concrete assemblages. According to Probyn, interest involves “a desire for connection” (2004, p. x). Holding out one’s interest entails vulnerability, a laying bare that puts oneself at risk. The “conditional if” hedges the potentiality of interest (Probyn, 2004, p. xi):

If you enjoy communicating your experiences and ideas and aspirations and I enjoy being informed about the experiences, ideas and aspirations of others, we can enjoy each other. (Tomkins, 2008, p. 227)

In the moment where interest is held out (you think someone you admire is smiling at you and you smile back), there are seeds for communion, for engagement, for friendship. But the conditional if “contains the seeds for shame” (Probyn, 2004, p. xi) – if the interest, the vulnerability is not reciprocated, one may feel undone, unwound, and raw: ashamed. The person you thought was smiling at you was smiling at the person behind you (Tomkins, 1995, p. 135). Probyn (2004) argues that shame is an “ambiguous state of feeling, emotion, and affect”; a “fine line or border between moving forward into more interest or falling back into humiliation” (p. xii). Dry mouth. Stutter. Blush. In its physical manifestation, shame makes “visible” what we care about (Probyn, 2004, p. xii); it “alerts us to things, people, and ideas that we didn’t even realise we wanted” to engage with (p. 14). Response sensations suggest what we feel responsible for, and the responses that our body is capable of. Shame might be “hidden away”, “corrected” or “denied” (p. xiii), but may also be “positive in its self-evaluative role” (Probyn, 2004, p. xii). Interest may flow in ambivalent affective directions, depending on the response to its display. This chapter examines some of these flows of interest and shame in concrete configurations where bodies affect and are affected by their rights and responsibilities.

Desiring responsibility: A partial narrative of student voice and change

The neoliberal subject’s rights and responsibilities form along lines of rigid segmentarity: those legally recognised to possess rights, and the hierarchies of responsibilities in families, institutions and communities. Rights and responsibilities
belong to autonomous, independent individuals. Ascription of rights to children and young people are intended to recognise, empower and enable voice. For the child, to become responsible is to become self-reliant, and to disavow one’s own dependency to others. Lines of responsibility and accountability affix culpability, and establish lines of causality: those who are responsible for a deleterious event (and are blamed), and those who claim responsibility for a happy event (and are credited). Attribution of responsibilities and accountabilities are intended to control, anticipate, plan and improve outcomes. To be vulnerable to others is embarrassing, if not shameful; the responsible adult endeavours to appear self-sufficient and emotionally stable.

Yet, these rights and responsibilities may be troubled in immanent responses to concrete conditions, particularly in social conditions “where fear is constantly stoked, yet vulnerability is deemed shameful” (Layton, 2009, p. 109). Teachers spoke of the imperative to be responsible and in control, even in a milieu where they felt, at times, out of control, propelled by adrenaline, and eroded by pressure. One teacher spoke of the strains of the imperative to be in control:

**Teacher:** [W]hen you’re working with other people, you don’t actually have that much control over (.) over them and what they’re doing and what they’re thinking. But as a teacher you’re kind of told that you should have this level of control (.) and so when you don’t, there’s frustration, there’s disappointment, there’s um (.) a sense of failure, and then all of those negative emotions feed into your future behaviours. [...] And I’m sure the kids can pick up on your emotions. [Interview]

It is difficult to control other bodies, with their energies, movements of speeds and slownesses, thoughts, affects, and entanglements. Teachers are affected by the uninvited affective intrusions of others (Brennan, 2004):

**Teacher:** [W]hen you are in the classroom, your adrenaline rush – it’s like you’re performing on stage in a way.

**Eve:** Totally.

**Teacher:** And it’s like, that’s very draining as well. [...] You could go home and (.) like one student (.) could do something to you -

**Eve:** Mmm.
**Teacher:** And send you home feeling toxic (.) for a few days. Do you know what I mean?

**Eve:** Absolutely.

**Teacher:** And then one thing could happen and you could go home feeling (.) so maternal and sweet. [Eve laughs] You know? It’s very – it’s a very – that’s probably the most difficult part of the job.

**Eve:** Absolutely.

**Teacher:** The way it affects your biochemistry -

**Eve:** Yeah.

**Teacher:** You have to understand it or you won’t survive. [...] But (.) at the end of the day I love the kids and their madness. I love their honesty (.) and the wackiness of it all. Like, they just bring you back to life. And, there will be times when they send you home toxic (.) absolutely. Especially when they are going through something toxic at home (.)

**Eve:** Yeah.

**Teacher:** Like sometimes they come, they spit it out on you without - no one knows why. [Interview]

What happens in the classroom can be beyond words – something “sp[a]t”, something “toxic” – beyond the linguistic. There is desire to go home “feeling (.) so maternal and sweet”, and to connect with students, in their “honesty” and “wackiness”; to be brought “back to life” in the pedagogical encounter. But words also matter and wound: “Sometimes those harsh words [...] the actions of the students can penetrate and leave scars” [Head Teacher interview]. Interest, held out by the teacher, may be met with “toxic[ity]”, “draining” the teacher’s body.

Amidst the “toxic”, the “words” that “penetrate and leave scars”, the “frustration”, “disappointment” and “sense of failure”, teachers’ bodies are also impacted by the demands of their responsibilities and accountabilities:

[A member of the Senior Executive] says we’re in a state of “erosion” – “we’re chipping away at the kids” to get them interested in learning, but on the other hand “we’re being chipped away” – by tiredness, increasing demands [Fieldnotes].

The teacher feels “chipped away” by responsibilities, and is encouraged to feel responsible to “get [students] interested in learning”, and to take on further “demands.”
It was in these milieus where teachers felt, at times, out of “control”, “toxic”, “scar[red]”, in a state of “erosion”, that students in the Steering Committee had a voice.

Some students changed during and after their involvement in the Steering Committee: they described themselves, and were recognised by teachers, as becoming more responsible. It happened (Deleuze & Guattari, 1980/ 1987). Some students from the Steering Committee became Prefects and School Captains and Vice Captains.6 Some students did not become Prefects or School Captains or Vice Captains, but nevertheless described changes in themselves:

_Onetwothree:_ I remember I was very, very, very like bad, and I used to stick to my word. I used to stick to something – like I’m angry, I’m angry, that’s it, don’t bother me. Now, yeah, I get over it. [...] Now I realise – not all teachers are the same, maybe I should control it, do you know what I mean? [...] Some will – they’re more like flexible and you can work with them and some you can’t [...] It made me go, the teacher’s putting up with the class, the rest of the class. I feel slack for them. Like, if they can do that, at least I can control myself. [Year 11 focus group]

For some students, differing relations with other students and teachers seemed to be afforded in and through the Steering Committee: new connections that enabled different modes of being a student.

Other students were apprehended as inconsistent in their performance of student subjectivity between schooling configurations. It happened (Deleuze & Guattari, 1980/ 1987). They were called “flip-floppers”: students who behaved one way in one configuration, and another way in another configuration.7

---

6 What would it do if I wrote out the numbers and proportions of students from the Steering Committee who became Prefects, School Captains and Vice Captains? Would it make you think that the group had always been an elite group, for students who would have “come out leaders anyway” (see Chapter 6)? Or would it make you think that the Steering Committee changed students? Who is authorised to say what and who changes a student’s trajectory? Who gives an account of the affects, relations, experiences, and texts that make a student who s/he perceives him/herself to be in the present?

7 How did it come to be that the focus was on the “flip-flopper” and not the conditions producing the “flip flopp[ing]”?
**Teacher:** But, I’ve actually seen one of the kids: [student’s name]. I saw a massive change in him (.) over the last sort of term. And I spoke to [name of another teacher who also teaches him], and she said, “oh, it’s the Steering Committee.” And I said, “what do you mean?” I said, “he’s just done a 360 – you know whatever, a 180?” She said, “yeah yeah yeah. He saw what we go through and he’s got this new-found respect for teachers.” And I was just like, “wow!” I go, “is that what it is?” Yeah, and he’s always, and I can’t – but then there’s others like [name of another student who was previously in the Steering Committee] (.) just, “sorry miss yeah yeah yeah.” And then, you know, a second later, he’s doing the same thing. So, I’ve seen some kids just really have a respect for what we’re doing. But then others just – and they’re likable kids, don’t get me wrong, wouldn’t hurt a fly – but just making it so hard. [Interview]

One teacher spoke to me about a Steering Committee student who had “unexplained absences” from her class and “doesn’t do any work.” She said to me, “I’m just warning you: he comes across as good, but he doesn’t come out with the goods.”

There were events where there was conflict between students from the Steering Committee and teachers; events where students brought particular words from their research (like respect) into other classroom spaces. It happened (Deleuze & Guattari, 1980/1987).

**Eve:** [...] I’ve heard other people talk about the resentment that some teachers felt when the students presented to staff and past experiences –

**Teacher:** I certainly felt that [...] because the kids were actually – at the time – sorry⁹ -

**Eve:** It’s okay.

**Teacher:** They were actually bullying me in a way, with those statements.

**Eve:** Right.

---

⁸ What would it do if I gave an account here of all the work that this student did in and for the Steering Committee? Would it suggest that I am trying to defend this student? Would it place a wedge between the type of teacher who this student worked well with, and the type of teacher who this student did not work well with? But is it just about the teacher? This student, this teacher (and I) are arranged and are re-arranged in a kaleidoscope of shifting configurations, discourses, affects, bodies, texts that shape this student and this teacher’s capacity to act, to speak, to write, to read, and to be between classrooms, and the immanent relations that are possible between us all.

⁹ This teacher and I are friends. We had shared moments of camaraderie. I was facilitator of the Steering Committee. There was conflict between her and students from the Steering Committee. It is difficult for us to speak (and for me to write) about these times. My friend, I was not in your classroom then. I do not understand what happened. I am sorry too.
Teacher: [Loudly] “Respect. We want respect.”
Eve: When they come back here [the classroom]?
Teacher: Yeah, and the thing is like, and I’m thinking like, “I have never seen respect from you.” In my mind I’m thinking, “these kids who have – who don’t know what respect looks like.” They are now like throwing, throwing it around like a weapon. Like, “we’ve got a weapon, we are throwing it at you.” (.)
Eve: Yep.
Teacher: But they don’t even know what, really it is.
Eve: Yep.
Teacher: Yeah. (.)
Eve: How would they know what it really is, do you think? What would be (.) -
Teacher: I think um, there should have been a definition of (.) like (.) what is respect.
Eve: Yep.
Teacher: “Respect is when you don’t talk back to someone.” (.)
Eve: Yep.
Teacher: “Respect is when you don’t use a tone of voice.” Um, you know (.) it really should have been a really complete definition\(^\text{10}\). I think the kids would have found it – if they were treating the teachers with that, they would never have been in trouble.
Eve: Yeah.
Teacher: The teachers would have celebrated it. They would never have had to say that. Alright? But that was what was hurtful I think.
Eve: Mmm.
Teacher: We were never getting respect (.) and then they came in and accused us of not giving them what we were dying for.
Eve: Mmm.
Teacher: I guess that’s what it was. [Interview]

A teacher was “dying” for respect – perhaps, for the right to teach or to carry out her pedagogical responsibilities – and felt that the word respect was “throw[n]” back at her “like a weapon.” She was interested, but then hurt. Desiring to connect, she was hit with the physical force of voice. We might ask, who is responsible?

\(^\text{10}\) Could there be a definition of respect complete enough to pre-empt all the possibilities of how the term might be deployed? To pre-teach how to speak, feel, act in contingent future interactions? To know, in advance of the utterance, how it will make the other feel? And would this definition, inevitably, be deterritorialised, and reterritorialised, and deterritorialised, and reterritorialised?
A Senior Executive teacher pinpointed a “turning point” in the student voice reform strategy as when the “rights of kids” were “attached” to “responsibility”:

**Senior Executive**: This [Steering Committee] has also been good for the kids because it’s put back the responsibility on them about their behaviours.

**Eve**: Mmm.

**Senior Executive**: And I think it’s only then that the teachers (.) started to have – that was the turning point.

**Eve**: And when was that do you think – that that happened?

**Senior Executive** [...] The initial stuff was hard (.) and then it was only when they [teachers] got to the discussions about – “yes, that’s fine, I hear what you’re saying, but what about the kids?” When the teachers felt they had this opportunity [...] To (.) um (.) say to the kid, “well, what’s your responsibility?” Cause we always talk about the rights of people and the rights of kids – But then attached to that is some responsibility as well. [Interview]

This affectively “hard” reform strategy – which had deterritorialised the refrain respect and forced a rupture in the skin of school life – met a “turning point” when it was interwoven with “responsibility as well.”

Towards the end of 2010, the Senior Executive invited the Steering Committee to be part of a Positive Behaviour Interventions and Supports (PBIS) process of negotiating the school’s values that a teacher committee had already been working on. I was on this teacher committee in 2010 and 2011. The 2010 Steering Committee facilitated focus groups with students, and facilitated separate focus groups with parents. In these small groups, students and parents selected six “core values” from a list of 16 values, and ranked these values in their order of importance to the group11. Teachers facilitated the teacher focus groups. The PBIS teacher committee analysed and pooled the results from the student, parent and teacher groups, and counted the instances where particular values were ranked. The new

---

11 But who selected the words included in the original list? What power relations circulated through each small group discussion? Could there be a consensus about each group’s values? Could a consensus be achieved across these multiple groups of students, teachers and parents? Is there a possibility of a common language gained through consensus, or does consensus flatten differences and uncomfortable affects (cf. Massumi & McKim, 2009)?
school values, decided on through this democratic process of consensus, were instantiated in the acronym **RESP**:  

- Respect  
- Equity  
- Safety and  
- Positivity\(^1\)².

In the 2010 Annual School Report, *responsibility* for promoting these school values was narrated as shared: “Parents, staff and students see it as their responsibility to encourage and reinforce these values across the school.” These school values were launched in 2012. The 2012 Annual School Report account of the launch foregrounded the role and *responsibility* of the students for the launch’s success:

> The leadership required of the student committee to utilise their voice managed to mobilise the support and active participation of the entire student community in order to make the PBIS launch a success. […] While the launch was a celebration, it was achieved through months of student-led research, focus groups, interviews, presentations and results analysis. […] These values were eventually refined from initial research completed in 2010-11 about teacher/student relationships and effective learning environments.

RESP became materially encoded across the school, in signage and colourful tokens (see Chapter 9). Students, in this account, were positioned as *responsible* for making this launch a “success”.

Students spoke of being encouraged to behave differently as a result of their involvement in the Steering Committee. The 2012 Steering Committee’s focus: *The Learner I’d Like to Be*, generated student analysis of the “qualities” of “effective learners.” The students compiled the following list of qualities through their research: cooperative, confident, committed, respectful, good attitude, appropriate behaviour, mature, and focused (see Appendix A: Summary of Steering Committee research 2010-2013). In their research presentation to staff, the students said: “*We noticed that all these qualities can be linked to at least one RESP value*” [Student PowerPoint presentation to staff artefact]. At the same time, throughout 2012 and 2013, a number

\(^1\)² But how does one define respect (or equity, or safety, or positivity)? What did the parent mean when she chose the value respect? What was the student thinking of when she chose the value respect? What event was the teacher recalling when he chose the value respect?
of students used the phrase “mixed learner” to describe themselves. Students involved in this year of research spoke about what happened to them when they would “get in trouble”:

_Batata:_ When you get in trouble they always mention it.
_Eve:_ Do they?
_Batata:_ Yeah. [Deepens pitch] “You’re in Steering Committee.”
_Jeff Seid:_ Cause they expect you to understand the rules […] Teachers probably think that we should understand them and show some more respect [Year 10 focus group].

Some students responded by changing their behaviour when reminded of their involvement in the Steering Committee when they were “in trouble”. Others did not. One Year 11 student spoke about not wanting to be a hypocrite: “If you’re telling everyone, ‘you should do this,’ but then, you’re going around and doing the complete opposite, you’re a hypocrite” (John Citizen Smith). Another Year 11 student recounted how, when suspended in Year 9 for a behaviour incident, he was told that he would not be able to remain in the Steering Committee as a consequence. This student composed a written apology and verbally spoke an apology for his behaviour. He was permitted to re-join the Steering Committee. But another student who was “stood down” from the Steering Committee at a similar time did not choose to compose an apology letter. She told me that she refused to write an apology letter because, “I did nothing wrong” [Year 11 focus group]. It happened (Deleuze & Guattari, 1980/ 1987).

There were students from the Steering Committee who were asked to leave the school and who chose to leave the school13. It happened (Deleuze & Guattari, 1980/ 1987). There were students and teachers whose Year 9 conflicts with teachers seemed to be reconciled by the time that these students left school14. All these events happened15.

---

13 Would they have left anyway? How could we ever know?
14 Were these earlier conflicts, as some teachers said, just “Year 9’ issues” – typical “adolescent” behaviour, teething issues on the pathway to responsible adulthood? Were these reconciliations inevitable, or actively sought out? By whom?
15 … in “a relation with something unknowable and imperceptible” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1980/ 1987, p. 193).
What happened?

Hearing these multiple accounts of connections, conflicts, reconciliations, and silences surrounding the Steering Committee, I have questioned “[w]hat happened” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1980/1987, p. 192). Interest – a desire for connection – seemed to have been held out, by students and by teachers – at different moments (Probyn, 2004). At times, this interest seemed to be met with engagement, connection, even communion. At other times, there seemed to be withdrawals, detachments, even “shaming assaults” when bodies did not act in accordance with the expectations of the other (Layton, 2009, p. 112). Respect and understanding shifted and moved, deterritorialised and reterritorialised, kaleidoscopically, dizzingly – teachers’ accounts of students saying, “‘We want respect’”; students surmising that teachers thought students should “understand them and show some more respect” out of a greater “understand[ing]” of “the rules”. Lines of flight seemed to exceed the well-formed plans of the Steering Committee, the plans of the Senior Executive, and the plans of this ethnography. Lines of flight seemed to shoot off from the Steering Committee and surge back into classrooms; these lines, simultaneously, refocused attention back onto the student subject, as an autonomous, rigid segment. Lines of flight seemed to be recaptured, rigidifying back to segmentarity, like the stereotypical depiction of an unhappy marriage: “A man comes home and says, ‘Is the grub ready?’, and the wife answers, ‘What a scowl! Are you in a bad mood?’: two rigid segments in confrontation” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1980/1987, p. 227). These accounts of past interactions suggest a focus of responsibility and change on particular subjects: the student who changes or does not change. There seemed to be an expectation that students would transfer a newfound sense of responsibility and respect back into their regular classroom settings.

Is there any escape from such modes of relating? Does student voice “harden striations of social space and social hierarchies” (Ringrose, 2011, p. 602), reinforcing divisions between student and teacher, between regular classes and the Steering Committee, between teachers who are supportive and unsupportive of students’ voices? Do diverging senses of how a situation may be changed or improved impel
inevitable confrontation? Is there an escape route from apprehending students as “flip-flopers” in speech, emotions and behaviour?

In the next section, I transcribe a puppet production where student-puppets attempt to bring their respect and understanding to another classroom configuration. Four Year 11 students created this puppet production. I consider what happens when words and concepts from one configuration (for example, rights, mutual respect, understanding, changing pedagogical relations and changing the school) are deterritorialised and taken up in another territory. What happens when a student tries to change a classroom? Is the student puppet apprehended as responsible? In the midst of an interaction about this puppet production, a rupture is effected, that might potentialise an escape route from these logics surrounding responsibility.

Puppet production 4: “We are trying to change”

Ayman (Chicken teacher-puppet): Alright guys, we’re going to go on with the [the work from the previous lesson].

Student-puppets: [Collectively] Aaaaaawh.
Ayman (Chicken teacher-puppet): Hands up who hasn’t done it.
Hagrid (Yellow cap student-puppet): It’s been two periods.
Ayman (Chicken teacher-puppet): Well
we’re doing it again.

John Citizen Smith (Sheep student-puppet):
Miss? Well, we’ve spent two periods on it. Some of us have already finished. Instead of wasting time, I think we could go on – those who are finished, we could go on with the [next, practical component of the class work] and the others =

Hagrid (Yellow cap student-puppet): =
That’s not a bad idea.

John Citizen Smith (Sheep student-puppet):
- go on with writing –

Ayman (Chicken teacher-puppet): No, we’re not doing that. This is what the Steering Committee has done to you guys. You think you can do whatever you like and you think that you can change the classroom rules. Well, that’s not on.

John Citizen Smith (Sheep student-puppet):
Well, we’ll just [inaudible].
Savannah Smith (Red and white striped marionette student-puppet): Miss, we don’t like being attacked like that. We are trying to change.

Ayman (Chicken teacher-puppet): Well this is what the Steering Committee – this is what you think you can do and that’s not happening. (.)

Hagrid (Yellow cap student-puppet): We’re not attacking you, Miss. (.)

This puppet production dramatises familiar segments and habitual speech acts discussed in previous chapters: the order word, the attention to particular bodies who speak, incorporeal transformations, and ambivalent interminglings of segmentary, molecular and lines of flight. The teacher-puppet (the chicken) introduces her plan for the lesson as an order word: “we’re going to go on with the [the work from the previous lesson].” The student-puppets groan, and the teacher-puppet reiterates the order: “we’re doing it again.”

In a sudden rupture, a student-puppet makes a suggestion: “Instead of wasting time, I think we could go on – those who are finished, we could go on with the [next, practical component of the class work].” A molecular line diverges from the segmentary line of the lesson plan. The teacher-puppet focuses attention to these particular bodies and draws a line of connection between their words and the Steering Committee: “No, we’re not doing that. This is what the Steering Committee has done to you guys. You think you can do whatever you like and you think that you can change the classroom rules. Well, that’s not on.” The movement of voice to this new classroom space is overcoded as an overexertion of agency and resistance to authority. Desire is subjected to signifying chains – the student-puppet’s suggestion signifies resistance, and resistance is connected to student voice. It is the de-personalised force of “the Steering Committee” that is attributed as the cause of the student-puppets’ attempts to shape the classroom order (not interest or desire). The order of the classroom is re-established: “that’s not happening.” The teacher-puppet attempts to stop the “lines of flight, and to this end to trap and stabilise the mutation
machine” that would change the lesson plan (Deleuze & Guattari, 1980/1987, p. 229).

This teacher-puppet may be differentially attuned to the line of flight:

\[O\]ne group or individual’s line of flight may not work to benefit that of another group or individual; it may on the contrary block it, plug it, throw it even deeper into rigid segmentarity. It can happen in love that one person’s creative line is the other’s imprisonment. (Deleuze & Guattari, 1980/ 1987, p. 205)

The danger of this move – to trap and stabilise movements of mutation – is that it can create a “void” (1980/1987, p. 229).

The student-puppets speak again, disputing and simultaneously reinforcing a binary conception of power at work in the classroom: “we’re not attacking you”; “we don’t like being attacked like that”. A binary understanding of voice and power lingers, even as they dispute it: “attacking” or “being attacked”. Refusing to be recognised as “attacking” the teacher-puppet, the student-puppets resist the coding of his/ her words as thinking “you can do whatever you like”. But this re-interpretation of their words engenders further conflict. The student-puppets’ heightened emotionality is taken as further signifying their opposition to the teacher: “that’s not happening”. This interaction seems to reinforce divisions between student and teacher, and between regular classes and the Steering Committee.

A small group of students analysed this puppet production on the first collaborative analysis day, naming “power” and “arrogance” as concerns of this puppet production. Reporting back to the bigger group on the key concepts in the puppet production, two students from the group explained:

**Hagrid:** [The puppet production] showed how arrogance – arrogance is brought by giving people (.).

**Eve:** The teacher’s arrogance or the students’ arrogance?

**Hagrid:** Both. [Laughs] [...]

**Jim Stiman:** Arrogance is brought by giving people power. Teachers believe students given power will become arrogant.

Later on in the discussion, Jim Stiman further explained their use of the word “arrogant”: 
Jim Stiman: By arrogance – both a belief, and a way someone acts. If someone’s arrogant with their power, they use it against people in a way that is either unethical or should not, um, or affects someone in a way that it leaves a mark. [Group discussion, first collaborative analysis day]

To entwine these words with earlier quotations and with Deleuze and Guattari’s concepts, words can leave “a mark”, “penetrate and leave scars”, stick to you as “toxic”, effecting transformations to one’s body and sense of self (incorporeal transformations). But Hagrid laughs when I asked who is demonstrating “arrogance”. He replies, in this configuration, that “both” parties are “arrogant.”

Order words that inscribe segmentary lines “continually intermingle” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1980/1987, p. 198) with molecular lines (of speaking as if one were in a student voice configuration) and lines of flight (of creativity or destruction) in these configurations. Molecular lines and lines of flight entwine, inextricably, with segmentary lines: a “mutual immanence of the lines” that is “not easy to sort” out (Deleuze & Guattari, 1980/1987, p. 205, their emphasis). The two accompanying dangers of the molecular line (that slightly diverges from the segmentary line) are clarity and power. According to Deleuze and Guattari, the molecular reveals:

… spaces and voices, like holes in the molar [segmentary] structure […] Now there are indistinct fringes, encroachments, overlappings […]. Everything has the clarity of the microscope. We think we have understood everything, and draw conclusions. We are the new knights; we even have a mission. (1980/1987, p. 228, my emphasis)

In this state of clarity, the molecular line is in danger of “reproducing in miniature the affections, the affectations, of the rigid [line]”; “microfascisms lay down the law” (1980/1987, p. 228). “‘We want respect.’” Were certain utterances prompted by clarity – of students feeling that they had “understood everything” about teaching, or teachers feeling that they “understood everything” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1980/1987, p. 228, my emphasis) about students’ words and actions? Were students riding molecular lines where they became “the new knights”, endowed with rights, drawing conclusions from their new knowledge (1980/1987, p. 228)? Were teachers reterritorialising on segmentary lines, mistaking their affective attachments in rigid forms of teacher/student identities and relations for universal obligations (cf.
Stengers, 2005)? Such “contagious affective charges” and “collective existential mutations” at work in groups “don’t necessarily develop in the direction of emancipation” (Guattari, 1995, p. 2).

Are there simultaneously other “lines” of interest that seek “entanglement, and reciprocity” (Probyn, 2004, p. x)? Who, or what, is the student-puppet “trying to change”?

_Eve:_ What was your point in [the statement, “We are trying to change”]?

_Savannah Smith:_ Um (.) you’re just, when you get, when you’re trying to do something and then someone –

_Hagrid:_ Cuts you down.

_Savannah Smith:_ - yeah, you feel (.) hopeless (.) useless, like you’re trying your best but then there’s that someone telling you that you’re not good enough. It gets to you.

_Hagrid:_ Aah [breathing out heavily]. Amen to that.

_John Citizen Smith:_ It just makes you give up because you think, “oh well like what’s the point? Stuff it.”

_Ayman:_ Sometimes you don’t have the energy to keep on going. Sometimes there is no next time. […] There’s no more.

_John Citizen Smith:_ You can’t go back. Once you leave you’re out. You’re not into it.

[Year 11 focus group]

To return to Probyn’s discussion of interest and shame, the moment where desire for connection is held out is precarious. When met with a blank stare, or with censure, the “little moment of disappointment – ‘oh, but I was interested’” may be “amplified” (Probyn, 2004, p. 13). You feel “hopeless (.) useless. […] It gets to you. […] You don’t have the energy to keep on going.” The capacity of your body to act is “diminished or blocked; your body is separated from its capacity to act” (Deleuze, 1988, p. 27). You withdraw. “Breuuk” (Chapter 7). “Sometimes there is no next time.” Probyn (2004) wonders whether shaming practices may not work where there is diminished interest in reintegration into a community (p. xvi). As Pythagoras said, “how the students are treated, and how other relationships are [may] affect the student’s overall view on school (.) and whether or not they want to go” (see Chapter 6). New lines in formation are fragile – lines of flight vulnerable to diverting to a black hole (Deleuze & Guattari, 1980/ 1987). Fragile lines in formation may be
broken, flows of desire interrupted, obstructed or redirected. When we dismiss the voices that seem “too strident, too offensive or too irresponsible we may often miss things of importance and of a deeper seriousness than our first impressions allow” (Fielding, 2004b, p. 303; my emphasis).

Responsibility

But who is responsible for this breakdown? Is it the student-puppet – who has stepped beyond the segmentary relation and onto the molecular line, or been carried away on a line of flight? Is it the teacher-puppet – who has responded dismissively to the student-puppet’s suggestion, missing the interest in the student-puppet’s words? With this group of students, my language broke down in the attempt to work through these logics of change. Our focus group conversation turned to an actual (rather than a virtual) example connected to this puppet production:

*Ayman*: [...] [In a particular class] Every single lesson if there’s anything like talkativeness or whatever, [the teacher] always goes back to the Steering Committee. She goes, “this is what I get from my Steering Committee kids.” I mean – everything that happens, if we’re talking whatever, it’s, “this is what Steering Committee has done to you guys” or if (. .) if we say, “Miss, I think we should be doing this or we should do” – “this is what the Steering Committee has made you into.” [...] *Hagrid*: Oah. What?

*John Citizen Smith*: So they blame everything on the Steering Committee. Even if you’re trying to give advice =

*Hagrid*: = Wow.

*John Citizen Smith*: - on how you could do something so that everyone can enjoy it –


*John Citizen Smith*: = - it’s like – “Oh no Steering Committee has made you –”

*Ayman*: = Yeah.

*John Citizen Smith*: = “- not better or worse but some kind of [inaudible]” –

*Ayman*: “They made you, they made you question –”

*John Citizen Smith*: = Think.

*Ayman*: = - question (_) how to learn or question how to – or try to do things different ways or something; “Oh that’s what the Steering Committee’s done to you guys. They’ve given you a big ego.”
John Citizen Smith: = Yeah.
Ayman: Or stuff like that.
John Citizen Smith: [Next three utterances overlap] = A big ego.
Eve: = Right? “A big ego.”
Hagrid: = Is that – [whispering] whaaaat?
John Citizen Smith: Also, some teachers, if you try to give them advice about how we can do something, they think that you’re trying to teach them how to do their job.
Ayman: All the time.
Eve: Yep.
John Citizen Smith: And they get really defensive.
Eve: () Have you tho– like have you – like then – have you – an, an – has tha tha – has (). Let me start again. Has that made you reflect on how you might () talk to people? () Or has that just made you ju - feel like () upset that () yeah. How do you how do you –
Hagrid: [Quietly] If that happened to me, I would be upset () and I’d probably be suspended () or expelled. () I would argue. [Eve laughs. No one else laughs] I would argue. But uh, I need to come to school. [Eve laughs]
Ayman: I do that. I do that when she does it to me now. I’m not just going to say that I sit there and take it. No – I say, “no that’s not true. That’s not fair.”
Eve: Yeah. So it does lead sometimes to a bit of a () –
Ayman: Confrontation sort of thing.

I stutter. Stop myself. Falter – disagree [with whom?]. But agree [with whom?]. Hesitate, start again.

The researcher is caught in micro-perceptible moments of paralysis.

The eventual question asked is whether or not this group of students “reflect[ed]” on how “you might talk to people”. She, perhaps, discursively positions the students as responsible for the events that have taken place, and as responsible to “reflect” and change how they “might talk to people”. This question is spoken in the common sense terms that the researcher is quietly questioning. She (re-)produces what she has heard that others have said to the students. “Well what’s your responsibility?” “[A]ll manner of voices in a voice, murmurings, speaking in tongues” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1980/1987, pp. 76-77) whisper around her question.
“Has that made you reflect on how you might (. . .) talk to people?” In this question, perhaps she suggests that it should be the students who reflect on their words and attempt to express themselves more diplomatically. That, perhaps, students should apologise. That students should be silent rather than suggest how things could be better. She laughs at Hagrid’s quiet response that he would be “upset” and would “probably be suspended (. . .) or expelled”. He, months later, laughs that “both” student-puppets and teacher-puppet are “arrogant.” She is forcefully attuned to her enmeshed implication in these desiring-assemblages, unable to step outside them.

The shame of colleagues that they entrusted in gentle moments of vulnerability rushes forth: “something toxic hits you.” The wounds of students that they collectively shared in focus groups in quiet rooms in the library are re-opened.

The shame of being a teacher.
The shame of being a student.
The shame of being a researcher listening to it all.
The shame of saying too much.
Or saying too little.
The shame of not doing enough – or doing too much.

Affecting and being affected, enfolded, implicated.
Responsible?

A rupture

Have you thought – When you’re working with other people, you don’t really have that much control over (. . .) over them and what they’re doing and what they’re thinking. [Whose words are these? The teacher’s? The researcher’s?]

16 The analytical task is not to investigate what this stuttering means. But rather, the analytic task is to enter into the cracks between half-formed words. The line of flight. To amplify order words and common sense logics. To write in the dominant language; disrupt it from within. To construct a minor literature (Deleuze & Guattari, 2006).
like have you – But as a teacher [a researcher?] you’re kind of told that you should have this level of control. [Who tells her? Who tells me?]

like then – [T]hey [Teachers?] came in and accused us [Students?] of not giving them what we were dying for.

have you – ‘What’s your responsibility?’ [Teacher? Researcher? Student? Reader?] 

an, an – [Students?] probably think that we [Teachers? Researchers] should understand them and show some more respect.

has tha tha – Sometimes those harsh words penetrate and leave scars.

has (.). [These words] affect someone in a way that leaves a mark.

Let me start again. They were actually bullying me in a way, with those statements. Has that made you reflect on how you might (.)

talk to people? (. ) Cuts you down.

Or has that just I [The teacher? The student? The researcher?] went home made you ju - feeling toxic.

feel like (. ) “Oh well, what’s the point? Stuff it.”

upset that (. ) [T]hey just bring you back to life.

yeah. How do you Has that made you reflect on how you might (. ) how do you— talk to people?
This rupture breaks into the gaps of a transcribed stutter, between the infinitesimal pauses between syllables. This rupture, where quotations from multiple transcripts are brought into relation, is not intended to be a performance of sympathy or pity for students and/or teachers. Bringing these words into relation is not to substitute places – as if to suggest that the researcher had grasped the standpoint of another, or stepped into their shoes. It is also not imitational, taking up students’ and teachers’ words. This rupture is not a moment of mutual understanding between the students and the researcher, or the teachers and the researcher, or teachers and student. This rupture is not a moment where the researcher empowers the voices of others by letting their raw voices speak for themselves.

Rhizomatically connecting transcribed stutters with other utterances from students and teachers is a production of a “zone of exchange between [students, teachers, the researcher] in which something of one passes into the other” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1994/2009, p. 109). A crack. A zigzag.

This is not a feeling of pity [...]. It is a composition of speeds and affects involving entirely different individuals, a symbiosis; it makes the [student] become a thought, a feverish though in the [teacher/researcher], at the same time as the [teacher/researcher] becomes a [student] [...]. The [student] and the [teacher/researcher] are in no way the same thing, but Being expresses them both in a single meaning in a language that is no longer that of words, in a matter that is no longer that of forms, in an affectability that is no longer that of subjects. Unnatural participation. (Deleuze & Guattari, 1980/1987, p. 258, their emphasis and my emphasis)

This is a “participation” in the collective shame of our time: the “the shame of being human” experienced “before the values, ideals, and opinions of our time” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1994/2009, pp. 107-108). From “within”, the researcher “do[es] not feel [herself] outside of our time but continue[s] to undergo shameful compromises with it” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1994/2009, pp. 107-108). We all – students, teachers, executive, researcher, reader – were desperate to connect, to affect and to be affected, to be recognised as responsible for making a difference, to change things. We were all interested. We all made ourselves vulnerable. We all participated. We are all implicated.

This chapter has explored the logics of change at work surrounding the refrains of responsibility and change in this school. I assembled quotations from
students and teachers that dramatised a particular logic of change: that students, given the right to have a voice, should become more responsible, transferring their newfound respect and understanding back to other classroom configurations. I constructed a partial narrative of these logics, and resistances to these logics. I interrupted my own authorial voice in footnotes, uncertain about whether this partial narrative could do justice to the overlapping, intersecting movements of desiring-assemblages. Turning to a puppet production created by four Year 11 students that dramatised these logics of change, the chapter attempted to stutter the logics of responsibility.

In Chapter 10, I will return to the logics of responsibility, and gesture towards another mode of response-ability. Before discussing how things might be otherwise, we might question how a school, and indeed, a researcher, might evaluate everything that happened and did not happen here. At the same time as student voice might sharpen a subjectificating gaze on students and on teachers, was student voice simultaneously doing other things? Is it possible that student voice might compound the capacity to affect and to be affected, and form escape routes from habitual modes of speaking, listening, learning and teaching? The following chapter takes up these questions to explore what else was happening, in the midst of the ambivalent shift from student voice to positive behaviour. Taking up a particular object associated with these logics of change – a RESP token – Chapter 9 constructs a cartography of the movements of the token through the territory of the school. Displacing human agents who ostensibly are or are not responsible to change (in) the school, I consider what the RESP token opens up and closes down – and how this student voice work might be evaluated differently – beyond the human subject. I argue that mapping movements of simultaneous empowerment and repression, voicing and silencing, are, perhaps, “not contradictions, but escapes” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1980/ 1987, p. 220).
Chapter 9: Partially evaluating, desiring joy

We wanted people in the school to learn.

- Rebecca, Year 12 focus group

The previous chapter explored what students’ voices could do in their classrooms, during and after their involvement in the Steering Committee. I suggested that the interest held out by students and teachers – desire for connection – is precarious – vulnerable to blockage or diversion. Interest was at times met with a sharpened gaze on particular individuals, who were exhorted to become more respectful and responsible, as a demonstration of understanding gained through the Steering Committee. While for some students and teachers, dialogical encounters seemed to enable new modes of being and relations to become possible, other students and teachers seemed to withdraw from engagement with the other.

Following the events partially narrated in previous chapters, this chapter considers how these ambivalent affective intensities surrounding what happened might be evaluated. In the final reform evaluation document, the Steering Committee, also known as the Students as Researchers (SaRs) initiative, was assessed to have made “little or no progress” towards the target: “Decrease in student incident interviews by 10%.”

Schools in receipt of National Partnerships funding were required to report the outcomes of the reform strategies in an A4 table towards the end of the funding period. In the final evaluation of National Partnerships, specific “targets” from the school’s Annual School Plan were to be aligned with a particular reform strategy, “outcomes” aligned to correspond with the “targets”, and an assessment made of whether the progress towards the target was “limited (little or no progress)”, “sound (target achieved)”, or “high (target exceeded)”. This was in accordance with logics of change described in the National Partnerships Implementation Plan:
The success of the Partnership will rely on the ability of schools to put in place clear strategies that will have a direct impact on student outcomes. While schools will have the flexibility and the resources to develop innovative strategies, clear accountabilities will be used to establish whether these strategies are making a difference. (Australian Government, NSW Government, Association of Independent Schools NSW, & NSW Catholic Education Commission, Oct 2010, p. 84)

The lines of connection to be drawn in schools’ evaluation documents between targets, strategies and outcomes were to accord with the future of each reform strategy beyond the funding period. Strategies demonstrated to be successful were to be sustained; strategies where “little or no progress” was made were to be discontinued. Schools’ intentions for the future of each reform strategy were to be elaborated in a later section of the report: “Sustainability.” This evaluation document was submitted to the institutional body overseeing the National Partnerships initiative as an accountability mechanism. This form of evaluation, in Deleuze’s terms, is majoritarian: entwined with dominant systems of power and control, with particular modes of recognition and modes of representing change (Patton, 2008).

Evaluated against the target: “Decrease in student incident interviews by 10%”, the work of the Steering Committee was coded in terms of what was lacking: the Steering Committee had not decreased the number of students who were interviewed by Senior Executive teachers for behaviour incidents. The Positive Behaviour Interventions and Supports (PBIS) strategy was aligned with another target: “Decrease in student suspensions by 5%.” This target had been met (“sound”), and the PBIS strategy was to be maintained. In the later “Sustainability” section of the report on sustainability, the SaRs initiative was celebrated, but its continuation left open-ended:

The SaRs initiative is a program that was brought to life through NP funding. Its value has been important in relation to its impact on the culture and pedagogy of our school. It has afforded opportunities for students to participate in dialogue with teachers and primary decision makers, such as the principal and the school’s executive, to create a more collaborative learning environment where student perspective about their learning is valued. Unfortunately, the specific design of this initiative necessitates funding in order that a time allocation can be physically assigned to a coordinating body. Therefore, with the cessation of NP funding, even though the value of the program is unquestionable, no monitory [sic] commitment can be made as yet in relation to the continuation of the program.
The Steering Committee was discontinued at the end of 2013. The values, rewards and consequences system developed through Positive Behaviour Interventions and Supports remained.

How might this final evaluation of student voice in a school’s process of reform be interpreted? How might I, a researcher enfolded in the life of this school, analyse this institutional evaluation? In Chapters 2, 3 and 4, I outlined previous analyses of student voice work and school reform: analyses that celebrate students’ achievements in the work of school reform, critical and discursive analyses that suggest that students’ voices may be further governed through reforms that invoke *voice* and positive behaviour, and a psychoanalytic interpretation that “unbearable knowledge” (Bibby, 2009, pp. 52-53) may be denied or blocked by teachers and schools. However, as I discussed in Chapter 4, these interpretations may disallow what exceeds this reform evaluation: desire (and joy and interest) still in motion even when “little or no progress” was declared.

The conceptual resources of Deleuze and Guattari’s *desire*, introduced in Chapter 4, enable attention to complex assemblages, concrete conditions, simultaneous affects, and the glimmering potentiality of joy. I made folds and cuts to data from within the folds and cuts of the world, including and excluding particular elements in and from this analysis and this chapter, attempting to materialise joyful affects. Thinking with Deleuze and Guattari’s conception of desire as productive, I turn from the majoritarian evaluation typed on A4 pieces of paper to a smaller piece of paper: a RESP token (Figure 31).

![Figure 31. A photograph taken by a School Learning Support Officer (SLSO) of a RESP token (for Respect).](image)

As introduced in Chapter 8, the RESP token emerged out of Steering Committee work done in 2010, 2011 and 2012, enfolded with the work of a Positive
behaviour interventions and support (PBIS) teacher team. in this chapter, I map the movement of this reform remnant, and the desiring-assemblages formed with it, attempting to “stick as closely as possible to the event[s]” associated with this token and to the verbal and non-verbal “expression of the masses” (Deleuze, 2004a, p. 217) about it. Working with the RESP token takes the focus off individual agency or structural governance, laughter and disappointment, to intertwined lines of regulation and lines of liberation that shift and change. These desiring-assemblages provoke another mode of thought surrounding the intersections of student voice, schools in disadvantaged communities, and school reform – a way of thinking and feeling that exceeds both a celebratory optimism (cf. Mockler & Groundwater-Smith, 2015b) and a suspicious pessimism (cf. Stern, 2012). An attention to desire extends and elaborates the insights gained by analysing what might be celebrated and critiqued about student voice. I argue that the RESP token is a material monument of the deterritorialisations, reterritorialisations and metamorphoses of the concept of student voice. These desiring-assemblages at times confirm earlier partial narratives told in this thesis, and at other times suggest alternative narratives.

The chapter proceeds by revisiting Deleuze and Guattari’s conception of desire as productive, before discussing two possible interpretations of the RESP token that recognise it according to what it represents. I then argue that the RESP token can also be encountered as a more open-ended partial object – not a sign that represents, but a vector and a bloc effusing and producing particular affects in particular desiring-assemblages. I construct a series of partial narratives of this partial object, and suggest that students and teachers were engaging in immanent minoritarian evaluations of the token in desiring-assemblages. The minor is significant in its relation to the normative major standard that seeks to define and delimit (Honan & Bright, 2016; see Chapter 1). Writers of minor literatures, for Deleuze, function to “invent a minor use of the major language within which they express themselves entirely”, making “the language take flight […] ceaselessly placing it in a state of disequilibrium, making it bifurcate and vary in each of its terms” (1997a, p. 109, his emphasis). Minoritarian evaluations, I suggest, are evaluations that exceed or escape from the “targets” or criteria for “success” set by a dominant party (for example, a school). I move towards an alternative evaluation of the movement of student voice in school reform – an
evaluation that attempts to listen to minoritarian experimentations with what a RESP token – and what student voice – can do.

**Desiring-production and social-production**

*Desire*, as I discussed in Chapter 4, is affirmative and productive – force and capacity in search of connection. It is not that an object (a car, or a diamond, or a token) produces desire and the individual does not feel satisfied until the lacking object is attained. The student does not intrinsically lack, for example, a sense of engagement in school, or confidence in learning, or the ability to empathise. The student does not intrinsically lack what a behavioural token represents, and then seek out the token to fill this gap. Desire, rather, “is always assembled” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1980/1987, p. 229): a RESP token infiltrates desiring-assemblages, and potentialises flows between bodies, which may shift and turn in various directions. “Desire always remains in close touch with the conditions of objective existence; it embraces them and follows them, shifts when they shift, and does not outlive them” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1983, p. 27). Desire moves in and through the dialectic of structure and agency, of macroanalyses of schools and systems and microanalyses of power and resistance. Desire is not to be separated from the ostensible rationality of institutions, nor the apparent objectivity of processes of evaluation, but rather, forms “part of the infrastructure itself” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1983, p. 63). Desire attaches itself to objects (a RESP token, a mobile phone, a puppet), insinuates itself into bodies, exceeds capture and control, and metamorphoses those it is assembled with. But desire exceeds consciousness – the individual may not consciously perceive or feel a transition in bodily potential, nor be able to articulate precisely what it was that suddenly made her feel more alive, or powerful, or joyful. While at times imperceptible, desire is revolutionary; “capable of calling into question the established order of society”, “no matter how small” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1983, p. 116). The virtual force of desire leaves a “politically significant remainder” (Hynes, 2013, p. 566), even when it is muted, blocked or re-directed.

To analyse desire is to map these almost imperceptible moments where flight fleetingly evades fixity, where regulation randomly ruptures a social field. New
arrangements of bodies, objects, sensations and intensities potentialise breaks from segmentary formations, providing alternatives to patterns of social reproduction. The analyst looks for such “transversal flashes” of desire (cf. Guattari, 1995, p. 93; Renold & Ivinson, 2014, p. 364); suggestions of something different happening in a concrete social configuration, even if these moments are quickly re-regulated and re-integrated (reterritorialised) to a dominant order (Ringrose, 2015).

In the midst of the apparent blocking and co-option of student voice, a RESP token moves.

**The RESP token**

To review what happened at this school, after Steering Committee students’ earlier disruptions to dominant understandings (determinitorialisations) of respect in 2010 and 2011, new school values were launched in 2012. The definitions of Respect, Equity, Safety and Positivity were re-articulated and reterritorialised, materially encoded across the school in signage affixed to walls of classrooms, corridors and the school foyer. These signs articulated what these values should look and sound like in particular territories of the school: classrooms, corridors, office areas, the playground (see Figure 32).

![Figure 32. A photograph taken by me of a RESP sign affixed to a corridor wall. (Note: Photograph is modified to preserve the anonymity of the school).](image)

Teachers were to identify and recognise moments where students demonstrated Respect, Equity, Safety or Positivity, write the student’s names on a colour-coded
token, authenticate the token with their signature, and give the token to the student (see Figure 31). Students were to collect these tokens and deposit them in the RESP buckets in the school foyer (see Figure 33).

Every week, at school assemblies, a Head Teacher transferred these deposited tokens from the RESP buckets to colour-coded paper bags. During the assembly, a Deputy Principal drew a number of tokens out of these bags and read out the names of students written on them. Students whose names were drawn out walked to the front of the assembly, shook a Deputy Principal’s hand, were given an iceblock that recess as a reward, and invited to a barbeque with the Principal during class time at the end of the school term.

The logic of token economies is developmental and teleological, aiming to produce recognisable targeted behaviour. According to the PBIS model, students are “rewarded through an ongoing recognition system” (Horner & Sugai, 2000, p. 231) that reinforces pre-established “identified target behaviour” (Yeung, Barker, Tracey, & Mooney, 2013, p. 2). “[P]erformance criteria” for what each value should look and sound like are to be devised by a school, and students are to be explicitly taught these criteria and provided with “systematic positive reinforcement for meeting and exceeding” these criteria (Luiselli et al., 2005, p. 184). The token is an object for student development towards an established standard for student speech, emotional
expression and behaviour. Tokens are reminiscent of Melanie Klein’s partial objects (the mother’s breast as a separate part of the mother’s body, or the child’s “blankie” as a developmental attachment tool). For Klein, according to Deleuze and Guattari (1983), partial objects are objects of consumption, part of the child’s evolution. According to the logic of the token, the student will desire the reward and control her/his body according to pre-determined behavioural expectations in order to earn the reward. According to the logic of the token, the student will gradually internalise the behaviours needed to gain the reward. The token, in turn, is intended to remind the teacher to praise the student, to become more positive in pedagogical speech.

**Interpretations of the RESP token**

The school’s introduction of the RESP token and the RESP system could be interpreted in a number of ways: as a positive sign of the fulfilment of the rationales for student voice, and/or a sign of the co-option of student voice. Both interpretations apprehend the RESP token object according to what it represents: victory or governance. These two interpretations can also be connected to the ways in which student voice in school reform can be evaluated – as an institutional strategy to celebrate, or a technology for student governance. After I introduce these two positions, I map the movements of the RESP token, suggesting the overlaps and entanglements of affirmation and governance in its immanent uses.

The RESP token could be interpreted as a “visible victory” (M. W. McLaughlin, 1993; Mitra, 2009, p. 322) for the Steering Committee – a sign that their work had made a material difference to the structures and rules of the school. The RESP values could be interpreted as forming a shared language and consensus surrounding terms that had previously been contested (like respect). It could be interpreted as having empowered students – who made a change to their school and led the launch of the values. It could be interpreted as a sign of the school’s improvement – a re-branding and re-culturing of the school along more positive, democratic lines (see Chapter 2). Quotations from the school’s evaluation of the students as researchers (SaRs) initiative (above) could sit among such an interpretation: student voice, here, is said to have had “unquestionable value”, having
impacted on the school’s “culture and pedagogy”, encouraged “dialogue” and created “a more collaborative learning environment.”

A group of Year 11 students spoke about the installation of the RESP signs as an indication that the school had “completely changed”. These students had been directly involved in the launch of the RESP values, where their work had been publicly acknowledged. In a focus group, when I asked them about their definition of student voice, they articulated the significance of the RESP signs:

Pythagoras: And seeing the school put up all those RESP sign things – cause you could tell the school were serious about it. [...] It’s like, “we started that.” [...] Usually when we do this type of thing – like teachers ask what do you want to change – nothing really happens –

Johnathan: They forget about it.

Pythagoras: But now it’s like the whole school is completely changed because of it. [...] RESP changed everything for me. It proved to me that you can do it.

Samantha: How long do you think – do you think it will last?

Pythagoras: RESP? They got the boards up - they’re not going to take it down. I think it’s going to stay.

Jonathan: They’re printed in colour. [They laugh]

Eve: Is the boards – what’s significant about it?

Pythagoras: That’s what – yeah to me that’s what it was - it’s permanent. [Year 11 focus group]

For these students, the materiality of the RESP signs signified that the school was “serious about it”: the signs were “printed in colour” and are “permanent.” Financial resources had been invested in producing colourful, durable signs, engendering affective investments in the value of student voice: social-production entwined with desiring-production. Students’ questioning of majoritarian terms like respect (deterritorialisations) – had achieved something: “We started that.” The work of students had territorialised walls of the school.

Alternatively, the RESP token could be interpreted as a sign of the co-option of student voice, becoming a technology for students’ self-governance and responsibilisation. Critics of student voice have argued that voice work domesticates and accommodates students’ voices, reinscribing pedagogic control through apparent voice (see Chapter 2). These analyses foreground a tendency for schools to modulate
uncomfortable or dissenting views towards the school’s agenda, to better govern students. This interpretation focuses on the re-framing (reterritorialisation) of respect through RESP. The RESP token becomes a symbol of a majoritarian understanding of respect as shown to teachers by students, and recognised and awarded by teachers.

Analyses of Positive Behaviour approaches introduced in Chapter 3 could be applied here to the taming of the emotions through the RESP system. Similar projects that work with Positive Behaviour approaches, emotional literacy and/or emotional intelligence have been critiqued for de-politicising and silencing particular emotions, so that there becomes “no pedagogically acceptable language” to contest school practices (Gillies, 2011, pp. 193-194). The school’s process of negotiating the RESP values might be interpreted as flattening dissenting definitions of respect through apparent consensus (cf. Massumi & McKim, 2009) – firmly defining what respect is supposed to look and sound like. In demarcating the boundaries of respect, the RESP initiative could be argued to have further curtailed speech, and rendered abject those refusing to accord with its emotional and communicative codes. School values then became order words that organised and reinforced political arrangements.

Another student focus group discussion of RESP accords with this second interpretation. Four Year 12 students, involved in the original process of negotiating the RESP values, spoke about the RESP process:

**Faisal:** [T]eachers took credit for it and they sort of changed it to be RESP for students instead of about, teachers and students. [...] So now they are rewarding us in class for, “their behaviour’s being good and respectful and safe and positive,” but they’re not really putting it to themselves. **Rebecca:** Yeah. Because that is what they liked. [...] It’s not really student voice any more. It was about student voice, students having a say, but it was changed around [...] **Faisal:** As soon as voice - it changes over time. **Abdul:** Now it’s more about mediocrity, you know like, “this student was equitable today,” or “this student was safe today” [...] You’re getting rewarded for not doing what you’re not supposed to do rather than doing what you should be doing. **Rebecca:** We wanted it to be about student voice and us making a change in the school that would benefit the students. And maybe this RESP thing is good and it does
benefit the students and it gives them the incentive to, you know, be better but our focus was not on the students –

Faisal: Our focus was on more so education and students actually wanting to come to school and learn rather than being rewarded for behaviour. It was more about learning than just simple behaviour. I mean, I could sit there quietly and not learn anything. You know? It’s more about – I actually sat there one day just daydreaming and I got a RESP award, just being quiet.

Abdul: The thing about encouraging mediocrity is that like, it makes people passive. It makes students passive and they won’t like think forward and try and add to what is being taught and try and state their opinion. They will just sit there and be, mediocre, be average.

Faisal: I’d rather no Merit system and teachers just teaching and the student actually interested in that. That’s really what I was hoping for from the start –

Rebecca: That’s what we kind of aimed for. As [Faisal] said, we were aiming for improved education. We wanted people in the school to learn. Let’s face it: this school kind of has a reputation of people not doing very well at school. And we wanted to change that reputation. [Year 12 focus group]

For these students, it was not that the school had “completely changed” (as the previous group had suggested), but rather that “students having a say […] was changed around” “over time.” To these students, the reform process had morphed to re-focus on student behaviour, and fostered “mediocrity” and “passivity”. Student voice in school reform, in this account, had been reterritorialised to become “what they liked”. Potentially disruptive affects, voices and actions were re-ordered and defused in force.

The RESP token as a partial object

I am interested not only in what students said about student voice, the RESP tokens and the school reform process, but also in what was done and not done with the RESP tokens: these material remainders of a school reform process. Intersecting what students and teachers said about these little pieces of paper, and what I observed happen, suggests that a RESP token does, and can do, many other things in excess of both celebration and governance. Rather than the logic of either/ or, that interprets the
RESP token as a sign either of achievement or co-option, the RESP token moved and was used in many different contexts for many different purposes.

Below I analyse the RESP token as a partial object, according to Deleuze and Guattari’s critique and re-tooling of Klein’s concept of *partial objects*. Deleuze and Guattari credit Klein for the “marvellous discovery of partial objects”, but lament that she “failed to grasp the logic of these objects” (1983, p. 44) – their potential to subvert the Oedipal complex in their connections, conjunctions, syntheses and disjunctions with desiring-machines. In this chapter, the partial object of the RESP token is examined for its potential to subvert order words that recognise students according to their *age, ability, respectful emotional expression, and data* produced about them (see Chapter 3). A partial object like a RESP token, for Deleuze and Guattari, is not a tool for achieving pre-established structural stages of development (Surin, 2010), nor for modifying students’ voices, emotions, or behaviour. Rather, partial objects are “political options for problems, they are entryways and exits, impasses the child [and adult] lives out politically, in other words, with all the force of his or her desire” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1980/1987, p. 13). A RESP token inserts another element into desiring-assemblages.

Moving with the trajectory of the RESP token through the terrain of the school, with the desiring-assemblages that it forms and is formed within, affective constellations are glimpsed. The RESP token affects and is affected by the hands that grasp it, discard it, tear it, fold it into their diary, thread it into an artwork, and speak about it. The question is not (only) what the RESP token meant or represented in this school, but rather what new possibilities the RESP token offered for desiring, speaking and acting that had not previously been available (Guattari, 1985/1996). The RESP token simultaneously compounded and constrained capacities to act in different configurations. Bodies experimented with minoritarian uses of RESP tokens, immanently evaluating what a RESP token could do. In the following section, I compose and connect nine fragmented partial narratives that include the partial object of a RESP token as part of desiring-assemblages. I then evaluate these desiring-assemblages.
Partial narratives of a partial object

Partial narrative 1:

On the whiteboard, “RESP awards” is written, with a ☺, and a solid line underneath the heading. Students’ names are listed underneath.

Partial narrative 2:

Through the narrow hole in the top of the padlocked RESP bins where RESP tokens are supposed to be deposited, I glimpse a chip packet wrapper, and an empty juice box, strategically twisted to fit through the narrow hole.

Partial narrative 3:

In the classroom, a teacher has written names of students onto RESP tokens, and given the tokens to two students to distribute. These students walk around the room, individually placing the token on the recipient’s desk. The students who have received tokens pick the tokens up, unzip their bags, take out their school diaries, slip the tokens under the plastic flap, and return their diaries to their bags.

Partial narrative 4:

The Head Teacher who organises RESP walks to the front of the assembly. She is carrying four brightly coloured small paper bags with rope handles. Each bag is colour-coded with the RESP colours. She stands, microphone in hand. Students sit on the concrete. She announces that she is going to draw the latest RESP prizes, and says that following our RESP values “makes for a nicer place.” There are some “oooohs.” It is hard to know if the tone of these “oooohs” is affirmative or sarcastic.

She reaches in the red paper Respect bag to pull out a token with a student name. The first token that the Head Teacher pulls out from the red Respect bag is the name of a Year 12 student, Samir.

Samir jumps up and runs to the front of the assembly. The Year 12 students erupt in laughter and cheering. The Head Teacher reaches her hand into the bag again. The second token she pulls out from the same bag also has [Samir’s] name on it, and then the third one as well. Students are clapping and laughing.

The Head Teacher says, somewhat conspiratorially, that Samir emptied all his tokens from his diary into the bins at the one time. Samir and the Head Teacher laugh. The cheering of the assembly takes a few moments to subside.
Partial narrative 5:

A small stack of RESP tokens sit in the locked desk drawer, unsigned. The teacher says to me, “They’re literally token.”

Partial narrative 6:

The Year 11 students tell me, grinning, “[name of teacher] gets us to write her RESP tokens.”

Partial narrative 7:

At the RESP barbeque, a Senior Executive teacher sits at a picnic tables alongside students. She asks a Year 8 boy, “are you a little bit naughty? You look like you could be a little bit naughty.” The students and the Senior Executive teacher smile.

Partial narrative 8:

Passing classrooms, I hear voices say: “You’re not being very RESP right now” and, sarcastically, “Gee, you’re really displaying our RESP values.”

Partial narrative 9:

In a classroom in the school’s Support Unit for students diagnosed with autism, students and teachers sit next to each other. Students’ and teachers’ hands wind woollen threads and fold pieces of fabric around balls, hula hoops and metal nests. They are crafting individual art works that will be combined with the art of other students, teachers, and other community groups into a bigger art work and exhibited at a regional art gallery [See Chapter 5].

A teacher holds up a RESP token to the group of students. She says that they might like to twist or fold a RESP token into their artwork. She demonstrates folding up a token, winding woollen thread around it, and then hiding the wrapped token within the folds of a small piece of fabric. A student laughs. The RESP token has become imperceptible.

Mapping the movements of the RESP token

Mapping the movements of the RESP token, there are impasses, strange detours, and breakthroughs, as well as paths that the token was designed to pass through (Deleuze, 2004). RESP tokens are supposed to be given by teachers, accumulated by students,
deposited in RESP bins, and drawn and acknowledged at school assemblies. In its uses, however, the RESP token is moved away (deterritorialised) from its intended purposes, with something escaping or departing, fixed relations broken up, and new organisations made possible (Deleuze & Guattari, 1980/1987). Processes of reappropriation (reterritorialisation) of the RESP token also take place – movements that do not return the RESP token to its original intentions and territories, but rather recombine elements that have escaped into new relations. Deterritorialisations and reterritorialisations are “mixed up” in their movements (Deleuze & Guattari, 1994/2009, p. 68). The RESP token unfurls the knots of the social field, and simultaneously is used to form other knots, in particular places and times.

The intended movements and trajectories of the RESP token can be noted in some of these partial narratives. The RESP token, developed to foster more positive student behaviour and more positive student/teacher interactions, at times appears to achieve these purposes. In Partial Narrative 1, RESP facilitates a teacher writing a ☺ and a list of students’ names who will receive RESP tokens. The RESP token potentially replaces, or supplements, a disciplinary habit where the names of students who display negative behaviours are written on the board. The RESP token may enable positive behaviours that were previously unnoticed and unacknowledged to be recognised and verbally affirmed. In Partial Narrative 3, new configurations of bodies in school classrooms are enabled through the RESP token: students hand out tokens to other students written by the teacher. In Partial Narrative 7, at the RESP barbeque, a new configuration is formed: a Senior Executive teacher and students sit side-by-side at a picnic table.

Coinciding with these intended trajectories of the RESP token, the RESP token shifts and moves away from its intended trajectories – put to minoritarian uses – deterritorialised and reterritorialised. In Partial Narrative 2, the RESP token bin is rendered a territory for rubbish – where students might, as Willis’ (1977) lads might say, ‘have a laff’ at what a piece of rubbish can do in a RESP token bin. This reengineering of the RESP bin is perhaps resistant, subversive of the purpose of the RESP bins and tokens. In Partial Narrative 4, a Year 12 student, Samir, pushes the normative, regulative logic of the token to its limit – hoarding RESP tokens, depositing them all at once in the bins, and multiplying the number of recognitions
that his respectful behaviour can receive. His actions amplify the “incentive regulation” (Foucault, 2007, p. 354) of students through RESP, who have been positioned as in charge of accruing tokens as a sign of their value as students. Samir’s actions exaggerate the sign (receiving a token = good student) to the point of laughter. Students’ laughter accompanies expected assembly behaviour (clapping). In teachers’ and students’ shared laughter at his use of the token, Samir is simultaneously recognisable as a good student and encountered as something otherwise – subversive, cheeky, clever.

The RESP token is simultaneously nudged back towards (but not returning to) previous relations (reterritorialised). The RESP token is brought back towards its purpose and territory (reterritorialised) as teachers experiment with what a RESP token might do: in Partial Narrative 6, a teacher experiments with what might happen if students give her tokens, jumbling the order of who is supposed to identify examples of Respect, Equity, Safety and Positivity. In Partial Narrative 7, a senior executive teacher is moved from the territory of her office (detrerritorialised) to a picnic bench, sitting next to a Year 8 student, eating sausages. In this moment, she reminds him and bystanders of the function of the RESP token, refocusing (reterritorialising) the conversation back to behaviour: “‘are you a little bit naughty? You look like you could be a little bit naughty.’” Encouraged to use the language of RESP in the classroom, in Partial Narrative 8, teachers take the language of RESP back towards (but not identical to) previous classroom interactional habits: “‘You’re not being very RESP right now’”. In Partial Narrative 5, a teacher refuses to accord with the encouragement for teachers to distribute RESP tokens, keeping the stack of tokens securely locked in the territory of a desk drawer. In Partial Narrative 9, another teacher takes the RESP token into a different territory – the RESP token becomes an element in a work of art formed between students and teachers. The partial object of the RESP token, intended to form the responsible, self-controlled individual, becomes part of a work of art. The RESP token, and the students’ names written on tokens, become folded over by soft wrinkles of wool and fabric. The name of the student, which is supposed to be publicly read out and applauded at assembly, is rendered imperceptible.
There were many politics, many lines, many affects felt in the movements of the RESP token. To interpret the affects, words and actions surrounding the RESP tokens only through lenses of celebration, governance – or even resistance – diminishes the potentiality of the token (Hynes & Sharpe, 2010). The RESP token was a sign that memorialised part of the students’ work in the Steering Committee: a remnant and material remainder of the reform strategy. But it was not only that. The RESP sign-boards affixed to walls and the paper tokens were used to mould students’ words, emotional expression and behaviour to become more respectful. But they were not only used to do that. Students and teachers, at times, suggested resistance in their uses, misuses, and refusals of the tokens. But to suggest that these minoritarian uses of RESP tokens were always resistant is also not true. Resistance, and its traditional analytical use discussed in Chapter 4, suggests a conscious, oppositional intent of an individual or group, and looks for words and actions that are recognisable as conscious and oppositional. Resistance, too, following Willis (1977), has been previously analysed as ultimately self-defeating; the lads’ “resistant dignity” (p. 39) consigns them to working class futures. But many of these uses made of the RESP token in these partial narratives are affirmative and productive. Humour and laughter, in some of these narratives, is not necessarily resistant or subversive, but affirmative and experimental, generative of different modes of being. The RESP token, as an additional element in complex school assemblages, enabled students and teachers to test out different subjectivities and relations. What the RESP token did, and what was done with the RESP token, was sometimes humorous, sometimes shocking, sometimes joyful, sometimes poignant, sometimes clever, sometimes rude, sometimes beautiful – sometimes many of these things simultaneously. The RESP token, a partial object in these desiring-assemblages, has a “flexible and plastic quality which makes [it] inherently political” (Surin, 2010, p. 203).

**Joy and minoritarian evaluations**

Reading these partial narratives, then, how is one to evaluate the effects and affects of the RESP token and, more broadly, student voice in school reform? The logics of majoritarian evaluations seek to establish criteria for success – “targets” to map against “outcomes” – with reform strategies evaluated as making “limited” or
“sound” progress towards the target, or “exceed[ing]” the target. In a similar logic, reform strategies like PBIS seek to establish criteria for behaviour, and evaluate the efficacy of the reform against the extent to which students approximate and perform against pre-established behaviour criteria. Majoritarian modes of evaluation decide in advance what they would like to see.

An alternative mode of evaluation, after Deleuze, evaluates what is said, thought and done according to the immanent mode of existence that it implies: what is enabled and constrained from happening. Forces and relations are distinguished according to their effects and affects – whether they are affirmative or negative at the level of life itself: whether a relation compounds or diminishes a body’s capacity to act. Joy accompanies encounters that affirm life and enhance potentiality. According to Deleuze, when a body encounters “a body that agrees with [its] nature, one whose relation compounds with ours, we may say that its power is added to ours; the passions that affect us are those of joy, and our power of acting is increased or enhanced” (1988, pp. 27-28). Joy brings “us near to action, and to the bliss of action” (p. 28). This mode of evaluation does not pre-determine in advance of the encounter what will augment or diminish the body’s capacity to act. The capacities of a body, and what will enhance or decrease its capacities to act are only known in immanent desiring-assemblages. What produces joy and augments a body’s capacity to act on one day will not do so the next day. Augmentations and decompositions of capacities felt in the encounter are fleeting, rising and falling in transition. Teachers know this: the pedagogical activity, text or explanation that generates joy, engagement and learning with one student or one class cannot be guaranteed to work in the same way with another student or another class. The RESP token, that fostered engagement and connectedness in one assemblage, may be met with bored stares in the next. The research activity, that elicited authentic voices in one research focus group, may generate little data with another group. Relations are not judged according to pre-determined standards or targets, but rather evaluated as they emerge, with the evaluator remaining within the relation. “[J]oys and sadnesses, increases and decreases, brightenings and darkenings are often ambiguous, partial, changing, intermixed with each other” (Deleuze, 1997a, p. 145). The evaluator seeks to notice, listen and attend to the differential attunements of bodies to a partial object, or a configuration, a text, or strategy. As bodies are tuned to particular affective keys,
desire shifts and moves, variously affirmative, subversive, composing and decomposing relations.

My discussion of this dynamic enfolding, unfolding and refolding of multiplicitous affects in desiring-assemblages is not intended to be relativistic, as if to suggest that reform strategies and their outcomes are all a matter of one’s perspective. Such relativism would lead a student, teacher or researcher to detach themselves from others, hope for the best, and abandon responsibility for how others feel and respond. Forces at work in any assemblage are to be distinguished, rather, moment-by-moment, according to whether they are affirming or denying of life (Deleuze, 1992b, pp. 102, 218). Rather than diminishing a student, teacher, school leader or researcher’s responsibility, the multiplicity of possible affects and effects that could actualise in any relation heightens responsibility. It becomes even more urgent to attend to what is happening in any pedagogical or school or research event – to ask, “What is happening in this moment?” (Mayes, 2016, p. 118). To interrogate what affects are produced in an immanent relation, and by the partial objects enfolded in it. To question whether what is happening enhances or diminishes the capacities of bodies to act: to engage, to feel good about school and life, to feel connected, to feel knowledgable and able, to feel in control, to feel a sense of belonging, to feel that they have a voice (cf. Munns & Sawyer, 2013). To experiment with objects and supplements, seeing what extends and bolsters agency and change (Lee, 2001; Prout, 2005). To ask what might be done through these alliances and augmentations, and what we might “become in relation to others” (Mayes, 2016, p. 119).

Such an attention to movements of desire is important because of the profound consequences of affects felt at school:

*Ayman:* Sometimes you don’t have the energy to keep on going. Sometimes there is no next time. [...] There’s no more.

*John Citizen Smith:* You can’t go back. Once you leave you’re out. You’re not into it.

[Year 11 focus group, see Chapter 8]

Conversely, joy, engendered in haptic desiring-assemblages, may change the trajectory of a body’s life, augmenting her/ his capacity to feel, to speak and to act; to
feel that “‘we started that’” and “you can do it” (see above). Desire potentially expands a sense of possibility, impels a body towards action – towards making a difference in the world.

**Eve:** So did your feelings about the Steering Committee change from the beginning, middle, end, for now [...] –

**B.J.:** Well at first I thought it was going to be hard and then I got so interested and it went easy and then, I just felt (.) mad for every little thing.

**Eve:** Mmm. What were the things that were interesting for you?

**B.J.:** Like the research, you have to write good work, talking about it, and stuff.

[Year 10 focus group]

Desire can transform a group of bodies – create “group-subjects” from atomised individuals who “interpret their own positions” (Guattari, 2015, p. 71).

**Abu George:** We got more people to think and to put it together and it means something bigger than one person thinking. [...]  

**Onetwothree:** We all worked together as one - like we didn’t work: “he’s better, he’s better, this one’s low - he doesn’t know nothing.” We all worked together and we had respect. [Year 11 focus group]

Desire, entwined with students’ voices and partial objects, can potentialise change in a school. But the trajectory of the change depends on the response that desire meets.

Considering these movements of desire and their consequences, we might ask, what can students’ voices do in a school reform process? The RESP token, in my uses of it in this chapter, dramatises the metamorphoses of the concept of student voice – its deterritorialisations and reterritorialisations. Students’ voices simultaneously did nothing within and after the majoritarian evaluation document, while also doing many other things before, during, after, and in excess of the official evaluation document. The concept of student voice, like the uses of the RESP token, were taken up in various assemblages – deterritorialised and reterritorialised – with differing effects and affects. Students’ and teachers’ minoritarian uses of the RESP token immanently evaluated the reform strategies through experimentation, exploring what a RESP token could do here, now, in this configuration. Minoritarian evaluations are
constructed within a major evaluation – at their borders – and have the potential to forge “another possible community” and “another consciousness and another sensibility” (Deleuze & Guattari, 2006, p. 17). Throughout the student voice in school reform initiative, students also experimented with what student voice, as a concept and as a material force, could do. What happened was beyond celebration or co-option, or “limited” progress towards a target. Indeed, the target was “exceeded”, because the target did not know in advance what voices and RESP tokens could do. Mapping the movement of the RESP token, dynamic trajectories are glimpsed, and perhaps even lines of escape from habitual patterns of relating.

In this chapter, I have examined the ways in which the ambivalent affects surrounding student voice in school reform were normatively evaluated (making “little or no progress”), and the felt fluctuations of immanent, minoritarian modes of evaluation. My attention to the minoritarian modes of evaluation formed by students and teachers was prompted by a refusal to compose a damage-centred study (Tuck & Yang, 2014a), while simultaneously not wanting to project a utopianism of what student voices can do (Mockler & Groundwater-Smith, 2015b). In examining the forces at work in the majoritarian reform evaluation document, and in the minoritarian uses of the RESP token, I have sought not to suggest that desire can overthrow other forces. Indeed, processes of social production dam, channel and regulate desiring flows even as they escape (Deleuze & Guattari, 1983). I have also sought to avoid suggesting that compounded capacities to act are always conscious, resistant, or necessarily unequivocally affirmative (Hynes, 2013).

Instead, this chapter has attempted to produce an account of the movements of desire in evaluation as “something not too serious”, sticking “as closely as possible to the event and the expression of the masses” (Deleuze, 2004a, p. 217). The students (and, perhaps, my own) humour is not (only) an attempt to mask over the difficulties of these events, but instead invites you towards a line of escape. Student voice, school and research might become more open-ended and experimental in trajectory, enacting praxis without a predetermined telos (Guattari, 2000), responsive to the effects and affects of this praxis. These partial narratives of a RESP token – a partial object that remained when the Steering Committee ended – could be vectors of “becoming that turns the most negligible of trajectories, or even a fixed immobility, into a voyage”
(Deleuze, 2004, p. 65). The following chapter extends and works with the ontology of *becoming* that I have gestured towards at the end of this chapter; *becoming* that is always minoritarian.
Chapter 10: Becoming

(Student voice is) like a song that changes the beat every 3 seconds.
What we do is always changing somehow, somewhere – it’s unpredictable.
The questions we had at the beginning are different to the questions we have now.

- Student quotations (Mia Rose, Johnathan Stewart, Christian) from Year 10 focus group, compiled together for second student collaborative analysis day

Throughout this thesis, I have explored what happened at this school and what students’ voices can do. My questions have been simultaneously ethnographic and conceptual, philosophical and empirical, relaying between praxis and theory. In experimenting with folds of positionality, the real world of school, and writing, I have attempted to think and feel differently about voice, and specifically, student voice. As I have mapped the dimensions of the concept of student voice, its intersections with other order words (age, ability, emotion), interpretive frames for analysing voice in schools (critical theory, resistance theory, discourse, psychoanalysis), and the repeated refrains of respect, understanding and responsibility as voice was enacted, these dimensions grew – “directions in motion” that had “neither beginning not end”, growing and overspilling (Deleuze & Guattari, 1980/1987, p. 21). Folded, unfolded, refolded, it was “not always easy to see things in the middle” – “everything changes” as I moved and as students, teachers, affects, objects, texts, refrains, concepts and territories moved (Deleuze & Guattari, 1980/1987, p. 23). Student voice, perhaps, is more rhizome than tree – “always changing somehow, somewhere – it’s unpredictable” (student quotation above), even as its roots and growths were, at
times, entwined with those of the linear, classificatory, hierarchical tree. Mapping the movements of student voice, and making transversal connections with these order words, interpretive frames and refrains in the school, student voice grew in dimensions and directions, metamorphosing.

In this chapter, I return and move between the questions: What happened? and What can students’ voices do? Like Chapter 2, this chapter is ordered in four sections, that are related to the four rationales for student voice: standpoint, dialogue, empowerment and school improvement, and the order words of age, ability, emotionality and the ordering function of data discussed in Chapter 3. Like Chapter 2, I open each section with data – this time, a photograph from the study, juxtaposed with a quotation from Deleuze and Guattari. Each section explores what happened ethnographically, alongside the concepts formed between students, teachers, other researchers, other theorists, and I. Reviewing the contingent conditions that constrain and enable what student voice can do, I then explore the possibilities of an ontology of becoming for feeling-thinking-listening-speaking-living otherwise. I argue that thinking and feeling with an ontology of radical relationality has much to offer student voice as an educational movement that hopes to trouble the binary relation of student/ teacher, even as an ontology of becoming challenges liberal humanist assumptions. The events explored in this study and the concepts intersected with them have implications for the student/ teacher relation, for engagement in school, for research with children and young people, and for modes of evaluation of what happens in and beyond schools.
The child [does] not become; it is becoming itself that is a child.

- Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari

A Thousand Plateaus

Student voice has been premised on a standpoint epistemological rationale that positions students as beings – social agents with standpoint knowledge and rights. At this school, there were lines of segmentarity that order age relations and responses to voice, even as they intersected, threaded and diverged in relation to molecular lines and lines of flight. What students’ voices could do depended on the image of thought held about the student: common sense developmental conceptualisations of children, adolescence, generational relations and codes for behaviour and speech. The concept of student voice shifted and moved in relation to the order words of age, and with other territorial refrains: respect, understanding, responsibility and change. Yet, lived immanent doubts and vacillations of both young people and adults suggest the need for other ways of conceptualising student, teacher and the relation between them. Below, I give an account of these movements, and suggest the potentiality of becoming for reconceptualising relation between fixed points of subjectification.
In Chapter 2, I introduced the standpoint epistemological and human rights rationales for student voice, that frame children and young people as beings, repudiates the “ideology of immaturity” (Grace, 1995, p. 202) of developmental psychology, and argues that children and young people should be recognised as responsible within school. Children and young people are “given”, in the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child, “the right to express [their] views freely in all matters affecting the child, the views of the child being given due weight in accordance with the age and maturity of the child” (United Nations, 1989). In this study, in some configurations, students were recognisable as beings with rights – subjects who were responsible, competent, rational, and actively making meaning of their world. However, the question of the “maturity” of the child and the “weight” that was to be consequently “given” to their “views” was contested, entangled with the order word of age and the territorial refrain of responsibility.

The order word of age forms lines of rigid segmentarity according to processes of chronological and biological progression through time. The arrangement of accounts and productions in Chapter 6 suggested that what student voices can do is constrained by an image of thought of younger students as “immatu
irrational.” If a student’s body and voice is interpreted through the lens of the becoming child of developmental psychology, then it is far more difficult for a younger student to be encountered as a legitimate speaker. The student-puppet in Chapter 6 who asks why they are studying Pythagoras theorem is not understood to be asking a legitimate question because of the status of his body and subjectivity. Popular culture rhetoric about “generation” may be entwined with adults’ responses to students’ views and research; students may be understood as more “disrespectful” and “selfish” than previous generations (Chapter 6). If student subjectivity is understood in terms of particular codes for behaviour and speech, the student-puppet who suggests to the teacher-puppet that she change her pedagogy and classroom environment can only be recognised as disrespectful because of his status as the type of student who gets “sent out.” Even while the students acknowledged that “[e]ven if someone gets sent out, everyone still has a voice – is valid”, for a teacher to acknowledge what these types of students say would be “like thanking the bad guy” (Chapter 6). Segmentary lines construct and reinforce particular subjectivities – particular students are recognised as good/ bad, smart/ dumb, high/ low. These order
words organise the field of possibilities for what can be seen-heard-done, and the modes of being that are available in school.

As explored in Chapter 8, conceptualising students as beings and more importantly, as responsible, rendered unrecognisable those students who were deemed inconsistent (“flip-floppers”) in their performance of a responsible disposition. Student voice, entwined with the concept of rights, became caught up in the territorial call for responsibility: to claim rights, students must also demonstrate responsibility. Marshall’s “complete” adult citizen, who enjoys “rights and responsibilities” (1950, p. 14), is the standard for evaluation of the student’s participation at school (Moosa-Mitha, 2005). Rather than changing the world (of the school) over “interpret[ing]” it (Marx, 1978, p. 145), the onus for change was placed back on students’ shoulders – to change themselves in order to change the school. Students were encouraged to move towards an idea of the “effective learner” that the 2012 group had created in their own research: cooperative, confident, committed, respectful, good attitude, appropriate behaviour, maturity, focus (see Appendix A: Summary of Steering Committee research 2010-2013 and Chapter 8). Students were to monitor themselves and to accept being monitored as a result of their involvement of the group; to become responsible for their own “output control” (Krejsler, 2007, p. 473). This creative combination of democratic rhetoric and the language of individual responsibility is perhaps not “inconsistent” (Robinson, 2014, p. 9) or “contradict[ory]” (Rudduck & Fielding, 2006, p. 223), but rather an outworking of neoliberal reform logics: a moving arrangement of the language of democratic education with performativity, accountability and surveillance.

Yet, in this school, the capacity to demonstrate respect, understanding, responsibility and control over outcomes varied between configurations for both students and their teachers. The doubts and vacillations uttered and performed in Chapter 6 potently evoke this uncertainty. Pythagoras questioned: “Were we right to say what was said?” – doubting his maturity, rationality and authority. The teacher-puppet towards the end of Chapter 6 hesitates: “Maybe I could change things a little bit”; uncertain about prior pedagogical certainties. A teacher confessed, in Chapter 8: “when you’re working with other people, you don’t actually have that much control over (.) over them and what they’re doing and what they’re thinking. But as a teacher
you’re kind of told that you should have this level of control.” After the period of fieldwork in this study, Isaac wrote in an email to me about his understanding of both students’ and teachers’ shifting capacities and agencies to speak, to act and to effect change:

During the beginning of Steering Committee I held the perspective that everyone had to pick a side (teachers or student), as both sides could not be “right” in the sense, that they were given an opportunity to speak out and invoke change. But, towards the end I began to see a mutual perspective, which underlined the fact that both sides are neglected in creating change and making executive decisions involving the national curriculum, school funding, student assignment (to classes) [Email to me, April 2015].

Isaac gave an account of both teachers’ and students’ mutual incapacity to effect change in particular educational arrangements. Positioned and repositioned in shifting assemblages, both adults and young people may feel ontological jarrings in certainties and capacities: agentic and powerless, efficacious and constrained from acting, knowledgeable and ignorant, mature and immature, rational and irrational. “We are guided and instructed. We have to conform just like you do’” (Teacher, Chapter 7). Subjectivity is “in circulation in social complexes of varying sizes”, the “ways in which individuals experience this subjectivity oscillates between two extremes: a relation of alienation and oppression”, and “a relation of expression and creation” (Guattari & Rolnik, 1982/ 2008, p. 46). A body’s capacity to speak and to act shifts and moves.

The being conceptualisation of childhood/ adolescence produces an impasse: students unable to adequately and consistently perform the responsible being child, and teachers unable to recognise students as responsible. Conceptions of the adult as “full” and the child as characterised by lack (Tarulli & Skott-Myhre, 2006, pp. 193, 198) may also elide the perpetual incompleteness of both younger and older people. Both ontological conceptualisations of the child – as developmentally becoming and as agentic being – focus attention on recognising the child as a certain type of subject, in dualistic relation to the adult. The being child, while less paternalistic than the developmental psychology becoming child, is still a modernist, humanist subject in
possession of agency and knowledge, evaluated in comparison to the adult’s competencies, agency and responsibilities (Lee, 2001; Prout, 2005). Both the developmental becoming child and the agentic being child cannot escape the gaze of the adult. Either way, the child is studied as a subject: either a becoming subject (studied with research on them, or expected to develop normatively over time), or a being subject (given “child-friendly” methods and positioned as an agent, expected to speak authentically from their standpoint knowledge). A being conception of students may only focus attention on the child’s ontological status, inadvertently heightening students’ subjectification, while sidelining examination of adults’ doubts, uncertainties and contingent capacities to speak and to act. We all can be immature, irresponsible, impotent and uncertain, depending on the configuration in which we find ourselves. Other ways of thinking about students and teachers are needed that that attend to the dynamics of the student/teacher relation and the contingent assemblages of teaching and learning environments.

_Becoming_-minor and, specifically _becoming_-child, offer another way of thinking about relationality that moves away from binary forms of subjectification. _Becoming_ is not a product or a trajectory for a subject, but “a verb with a consistency all of its own” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1980/1987, p. 239). As movement and verb, Deleuze and Guattari’s _becoming_ is radically ontologically different to the nouns used to conceptualise the child of developmental psychology and the child of human rights, that keep the gaze of the adult on the student as an atomised subject.

In contrast to a dominant image of thought of the developmentally _becoming_ child – the modernist, humanist subject who incrementally progresses towards a standard of maturity, rationality, responsibility and independence – _becoming_ is a process of increasing relationality without a predetermined _telos_ (Deleuze & Guattari, 1980/1987). Rather than the young student progressively becoming an adult, the logics of _becoming_ instead move the adult teacher (as well as the student) towards a becoming-child. All _becomings_ are minoritarian, exceeding and escaping from the confines of normative identity categories (_student, teacher, child, adult, human, non-human_). _Becoming_-child does not resemble or imitate the distinct segmentary entities of child and adult (or _woman/ man or animal/human_), but “pass[es] between” dualisms (Deleuze & Guattari, 1980/1987, pp. 275, 277). Not an “evolution” towards
a clear telos (adult), becomings concern alliances and symbioses: creative
“‘involutions’” between “heterogenous terms” that “form a block that runs its own
line ‘between’ the terms in play and beneath assignable relations” (Deleuze &
Guattari, 1980/1987, pp. 238-239). Becomings are movements away from
subjectification, de-individualisations, towards alliances and interminglings with other
human and non-human entities.

The significance of minoritarian becomings for this study is becoming-child’s
creative force for transformation. Becoming-child is the intensity and power
associated with the child: the vital, “irreducible site of forces” of the baby that
“shatters paving stones” (Deleuze, 1997a, p. 167); it is the “protests” and “questions”
of “kindergarten” students that might explode “the entire education system” (Deleuze,
in Deleuze & Foucault, 1977, p. 209). Little Hans (see Chapter 4) is “taken up” in an
assemblage, becoming-otherwise, affects circulating and transforming in
experimentation (Deleuze & Guattari, 1980/1987, p. 257). This philosophical
invocation of the child is not a romanticisation of childhood, but rather a rupture to
segmentary, linear subjectivities.

Becoming-child offers a profoundly different ontology to the standpoint,
rights-based rationale of much student voice work that frames students as agentic
beings: an ontology of difference. This radical relationality displaces the becoming
body developmentally progressing towards rationality and responsibility, working on
a reflexive project of the self. Becoming also displaces the liberal humanist agent who
possesses universal rights and needs to be recognised and respected as a subject by a
listener who stands apart from the speaker. To think and work with a becoming-child
ontology is to shift focus from what the student lacks: maturity, understanding,
responsibility, change, or even, lack of recognition of standpoint knowledge,
opportunities for dialogue, empowerment, or opportunities to participate in school
decision-making.

Rather than defining children and adults in terms of who they are, what they
lack, and who they need to become, the focus shifts to the collective assemblages of
enunciation from which the body speaks and the conditions that compound and
diminish a body’s capacities to speak, listen, feel, respond, and act. Beyond student
and teacher, there are libidinal forces, social forces, political forces, economic forces (Deleuze & Guattari, 1983): bodies that jostle and call into flight; desiring-assemblages that distract and allure; power relations in and between groups of friends and colleagues; family, community, national and international attachments, conflicts and complications; material resources that enable or hinder teaching and learning; partial objects (like a token, a puppet, a post-it note) that extend and contract possibilities. These affective and material conditions form, re-form and de-form a body’s performance of maturity, understanding, responsibility and change. In a becoming ontology, what becomes more significant than recognising the universal and abstract liberal humanist subject possessing a standpoint and rights is a profound interdependence and responsiveness in and to the encounter (B. Davies, 2014a). The adult does not listen to the child, as if the child is set apart from the adult, but the capacities of the child are indissolubly enmeshed with the capacities of the adult, and the material assemblages of speaking, listening and acting (cf. Bragg & Manchester, 2012; Cockburn, 1998; Fielding, 2004b; Mannion, 2007). Rather than viewing children and adults as at ends of a developmental continuum, both groups can be viewed as “always in the middle” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1980/1987, p. 21), building networks in all directions, with human and non-human elements.

However, caution is vital in processes of becoming. Deleuze and Parnet warn readers of the need for prudence in manipulating a segmentary line, which I extend here to considerations of suspending segmentary lines between students and teachers. They argue that “precautions” need to be taken “to soften” the segmentary line, to “suspend it”, because undermining a line is not merely aimed against the State and existing hierarchies, but “directly at ourselves”, since segmentary lines are “so much a part of [our] conditions of life” (Deleuze & Parnet, 2006/1977, p. 103). It is confronting and unsettling to unweave a thread that you had understood to be part of your self (teacher or student or researcher). And it is potentially unsettling to see another body, who you thought you had understood, speak differently in different assemblages. A crack in segmentary lines may become a crack-up; a breakthrough may teeter close to a breakdown (Deleuze & Guattari, 1980/1987). In order to launch processes of becoming-otherwise in schools, it may be necessary to maintain some segmentary lines, find some certainties, secure a plot of land to stand on – to carefully plan and vigilantly attend to affects and effects at work in pedagogical experiments.
What might it do to turn attention from the individual student or teacher to relations of becoming? To work with doubt and uncertainties, and to be open to movements of becoming, might impel care to how we (as teachers and students) affect and are affected by each other; how we work with our shared uncertainties and doubts in our capacities to act. Pedagogically, holding more loosely to the imperative to certainty and coherent identity might prompt engagement in more open-ended epistemological and ontological questions about the things we do not know or understand, and our relationships to each other and to the world. The teacher might not only explore students’ doubts with them or imply that limitations, ambiguities and incompleteness are unique to growing up, but might share his/ her own doubts, articulate how s/he is affected by students; tell students how what they have said has unsettled her/ his certainties. Doubts, uncertainties and vacillations might not, in these relations, induce fear and shame that needs to be concealed or diluted, but have the potential to produce something else.

**Double becomings**
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*Movement always happens behind the thinker’s back, or in the moment when he*
Becoming-otherwise, though, may not necessarily be engendered in the dialogical event associated with student voice. What students’ voices can do depends on how the relation between students and teachers is felt and what is expected of the relational encounter: who is expected to understand, and how understanding is understood. In this section, I review what happened here – the misunderstandings and limits of dialogue – before exploring how becoming offers other ways of thinking about the dialogical event associated with student voice.

Voice is not only a concept, but is also a felt force, affectively and materially transforming bodies and subjectivities. This study aimed to not only explore what the concept of student voice could do, but also what the materiality of spoken voices do to bodies, relations and worlds. Words participate in shaping our understandings and ordering the world, and potentialise disturbances and reconfigurations of subjectivities, understandings, and the world. The segmentary lines of age, class, gender, culture/race, (dis)ability, sexuality are effected in order words; incorporeal transformations that alter how the body holds itself and the person sees herself.

“You're being disruptive!” (Chapter 6). “If you’re telling everyone, ‘you should do this,’ but then, you’re going around and doing the complete opposite, you’re a hypocrite” (Chapter 8). But simultaneously, molecular lines and lines of flight in dialogical events subtly diverge from lines of rigid segmentarity, potentialising crossings of thresholds between classifying strata. “We were moving away from that student/teacher relationship – there was a collegiality between teacher and student – I’ve never experienced it before. We only touched on it but it was nice” (Head Teacher interview, Chapter 7). The molecular line may enable the subject to be momentarily intelligible to another: “I’m [...] scared [...] of you” (Chapter 7).

But the dialogical event, here, did not always “feel empowering” (Ellsworth, 1989, my emphasis) and, at times, impelled retreat to secure categories – reterritorialisations on lines of rigid segmentarity. Interest, fear, shame and withdrawal knotted and unknotted in dialogical events and accounts of these events.
There was interest – a desire to connect: “This should be interesting” (Student-stick-figure thought bubble, Chapter 7). There was fear – desire to escape: “It’s like my brain is on fire. I hate being out of my element. I’m trapped” (teacher-stick-figure thought bubble, Chapter 7). Students felt shame: “They’ve given you a big ego” (Chapter 8). Teachers “certainly felt” “resentment” (Chapter 8). Teachers tried to be open: “Why?” (Teacher-puppet, Chapter 7). Teachers spoke back: “You think you can do whatever you like and you think that you can change the classroom rules. Well, that’s not on” (Teacher-puppet, Chapter 8). Some students spoke back: “I’m not just going to say that I sit there and take it. No - I say, ‘no that’s not true. That’s not fair’” (Chapter 8). Other students retreated from encounters: sat back in their seats, closed their mouths: “oh well like what’s the point? Stuff it” (Chapter 8). “Breuuk” (Chapter 7). Dialogue did not necessarily generate mutual understandings, nor were students simply silenced or marginalised from dialogue; nor did teachers feel in control of dialogical events.

The political question is whose understandings – of an event, or of the way things should be – is privileged. Speaking face-to-face heightens the potential for a relational encounter that might shift and transform relations, but simultaneously heightens the potential for incorporeal transformations that damage and break relations and place the student and teacher at risk of censure and judgment. In many cases, the teacher – the person who assesses and evaluates the performance of the student – was the one to judge if the student had understood their emotions, the emotions of others, and the realities of teaching and learning. But some teachers also felt “bull[ied]” “in a way”, “misread”, talked about “in a deficit way” by students (Chapters 8 and 7). Students and teachers were not necessarily rendered “comprehensible to others in a new sphere” (Cook-Sather, 2009, p. 219) through the dialogical event. The capacity for the student and the teacher to be comprehensible to others was constituted and constrained by the order words and codes of the social order: common sense modes of understanding. To return to the sociological terms discussed in Chapter 4, students, at times, were evaluated to lack the necessary elaborated codes of speaking that accord with majoritarian classed, raced and gendered values. Dialogue was a zone of possible exposure to judgment and rejection for both students and teachers (cf. Burbules, 2004, pp. xvii-xviii).
The consequences of what happened here are significant, and compel a rethinking of what happens in the dialogical event. Student voice work is oriented towards teaching and learning how democracy works. Schools, more broadly, focus on educating students about how to appropriately and lawfully express oneself in the *polis*, and monitor who resists these norms, who fails to behave ‘appropriately’, and the negative consequences for these individuals. However, attention might also shift to the political lessons that students learn when desire is blocked or interpreted as resistance or misbehavior, in small classroom moments as well as in significant ‘behaviour’ incidents. Young people learn about the “boundaries of the political community” (Yuval-Davis, 2011, p. 20) through “how we run our schools” (Holdsworth, 2000, p. 356) – through schooling structures, situated processes and embodied relations. The “lived experiences of exclusion” that result from stretching the codes and order words of schooling may be apprehended as meaning that one’s “personal concerns or interests do not count as being of public significance” (Moosa-Mitha, 2005, pp. 384-385). These “politics of belonging” inform students’ sense of the limits of who they might be and what they might do (Yuval-Davis, 2011).

Further work is needed on the complex movements of desire in and through the open system of schools; the capacities to feel that one can make a difference that are daily blocked and opened up. Desire is blocked or redirected in social relations that may become internalised in psychic repressions: a student’s repression or redirection of his/ her speech and energies is firstly a social and affective relation before it is a conscious decision. Desire comes to desire its own repression (Deleuze & Guattari, 1983). These accounts and productions of student and teacher interest, shame and withdrawal are significant in a time when young people are framed, at times, as politically apathetic (e.g. Putnam, 2000) or alternatively, as holding onto cultural, religious or political attachments that are considered to be risky or extreme (see Coppock, 2014). Other ways of thinking about the hazardousness of dialogical events, and the political conditions of *voice* and reform in schools are needed.

* Becoming does not negate the possibility of dialogical encounter, but complicates a comfortable sense of the possibility of *understanding*. *Becoming* is not listening to the standpoint of an individual or group (where the listener stands separately to the speaker) in an attempt to come to a point of mutual *understanding*. 
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Becoming is not a harmonisation, unification, exchange or assimilation of the views of two parties. Becoming is a relation between multiplicities that potentialises the creation of the new, deterritorialising both student and teacher as separate segments. In processes of becoming, habitual stable identities may be troubled and destructured, forming “blocks of becoming” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1980/1987). Blocks of becoming form between bodies in active engagement, affected by what comes from the participating bodies but exceeding both.

The differential accounts of what happens in a block of becoming are exemplified in the relation between the wasp and the orchid. When a wasp lands on an orchid, “heterogeneous elements” converge, forming “a becoming-wasp of the orchid and a becoming-orchid of the wasp” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1980/1987, p. 10). Something changes for each of them, and something is formed between them. A part of the wasp is left with the orchid, deterritorialising the wasp. The orchid’s pollen is left with the wasp, and the pollen is transported and reterritorialised elsewhere. The orchid does not imitate or resemble the wasp, but, rather, the two “interlink and form relays in a circulation of intensities” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1980/1987, p. 10). A multiplicity is produced between the wasp and orchid that grows in dimensions; the becoming is not attributable to either of them. Both are immersed in the relation and qualitatively change.

Something changes for the student. Something changes for the teacher. Something is formed between them in the encounter. There is no set apart individual who respects, understands, and changes an other. Rather, respect, understanding and change are constituted in the encounter – built together and between points of subjectification, in specific moments and assemblages that shift and change. But each may give different accounts of the multiplicity formed between them – of what lingers with them from their brief encounter. “For those brief moments when [the students] were watching us, it created connections between teachers and students” (Head Teacher, Chapter 7). One may say that the encounter was “beautiful”; the other may say that it was “weird” or that they were “scared” (Chapter 7). As the philosopher Isabelle Stengers (2005) has noted about the wasp and orchid, relating Deleuze and Guattari’s becoming to political diplomatic relations, the wasp and the orchid come into the relation with different risks and challenges, and feel the effects of their
encounter differently. Both are irrevocably changed, utterly differently. There is “no wasp-orchid unity. Wasps and orchids each give quite different meanings to the relation that was produced between them”, and each party “will indeed keep its own version of the agreement” (Stengers, 2005, p. 194). These types of double becomings do not produce a joint understanding, but are dissensual.

The temporality of becoming, too, also may not always coincide; becoming may not happen during the dialogical event. Becoming, rather, is untimely; arriving in a temporality that does not align with the conclusion of the encounter, in a time-frame that is not foreseeable or able to be planned. Beneath questions and answers, away from the event, quiet becomings may be at work. Evolutions are non-parallel. Movements happen behind the back of the interviewer, “in the moment when he blinks” (Deleuze & Parnet, 2006/1977, p. 1). There are movements at work for the teacher-puppet at the end of Chapter 6, who censures the student-puppet, but later asks himself whether changing his pedagogical practices might lead to a shift in his relationships: “Maybe I could change things a little bit.” There are movements at work in Pythagoras’ question written on a post-it note: “Were we right to have said what was said?” (Chapter 6). These movements, the majority of the time, are not reported, and may not even be perceptible to the individual, let alone to their interlocutor. It is not necessarily in the dialogical interaction (the interview/ the focus group/ the classroom observation) that becoming occurs; becoming may not happen in the time of chronos (chronology).

There are implications of re-thinking the dialogical event for lived democratic education in schools. The unsettling affects surrounding the student voice dialogical event suggest that student voice produces subjectifications in schools. Advocates of voice in schools might take care with whether and how we compel students and teachers to give an account of themselves (Butler, 2005), how we interpret what is happening in the dialogical event, and our expectations of changes that should emerge from student voice. These compulsions, interpretations and expectations may, inadvertently, smooth dissenting views and block flows of interest – desire for connection (Probyn, 2004).
The double relation of becoming has relevance for theorising and experimenting with agonistic forms of dialogue and democratic education in schools. Student voice might become something other than an exercise in understanding the perspective of another or of forming a consensus that risks flattening affect and blocking desire. The political philosopher William Connelly (2005), influenced by Deleuze, Spinoza and others, has argued for the cultivation of a pluralist, dissensual, difference-oriented “agonistic respect” (p. 25) in ourselves and in society. Below, I extend his theorisation of agonistic respect, threading in insights from Stenger’s (2005, 2011) discussions of diplomatic relations, and Butler’s (2005) Giving an Account of Oneself, to consider the implications for schools. This conception of agonistic respect is, perhaps, a further deterritorialisation of the territorial refrain of respect.

Cultivating agonistic respect begins first with understanding that we do not really understand ourselves and our own affective investments, attachments, beliefs, and expectations, the effects of these investments, and how these attachments may be incomprehensible to others. We each have entrenched affective investments in our safe segmentary lines: gender, class, race, sexuality, abilities, roles, and our expectations of the roles of others. But we may not always apprehend how these attachments shape how we speak, listen, feel and respond, and may “confuse” our “attachments with universal obligations” (Stengers, 2005, p. 191): our sense of how a student, a teacher or a researcher should speak, listen, feel, act and respond. We do not necessarily understand how, in particular assemblages, desire can “find itself caught, like a boat, under this particular wind” (Deleuze & Parnet, 2006/1977, p. 100) – how what we feel, say and do is shaped by forces beyond ourselves.

Cultivating agonistic respect begins with this apprehension of what we “cannot have fully known”, constituted as we are in “partial opacity” even to ourselves (Butler, 2005, p. 42).

Apprehending the murkiness of our own investments, attachments and the effects of our actions, even to ourselves, we may begin to sense how what is dear to us may be incomprehensible to others. In such exercises on the self, we may “come to terms positively” with how who we are – our particular arrangements of segmentary lines of identities, beliefs, differences – “feels strange” (Connolly, 2005, p. 32) to
others. In ethnographic terms, this movement is not only to make the familiar strange, or to compose a thick description of the strangeness of another, but to apprehend how one’s commitments and one’s self are strange to others: to encounter one’s own difference-in-itself. Since segmentary, molecular and lines of flight are in constant movements of rearrangement, not fixed and unmoveable, we may become open to cracks in our habitual subjectivities.

Agonistic respect, secondly, involves cultivating awareness of our own uncertainties, fears and failures to understand others. Encountering the differences of others’ interpretations of particular experiences (like a student’s or a teacher’s accounts of a dialogical event), we note the void between these various accounts, and are struck by our doubts, fears, or desire to retreat. We plug in our doubts and fears to broader social, political and economic forces, and interrogate how these have been constituted and arranged. As a student, I consider how I am simultaneously barraged by a multiplicity of competing affects, desires and demands, and asked to give an account of who I am and to perform a particular identity. As a teacher, I juxtapose the imperative to be in control of my classroom, my students’ outcomes, and my professional development with the uncertainties, anxieties and misreadings that I sense. As a researcher, I interrogate how attempting to anticipate the ethical dilemmas that will arise in a research project do not necessarily prepare me for the shock of misunderstanding and difference, and the effects that come to matter in the research cuts that I make (Barad, 2007). These affects formed and are formed by discourses, affects, materials and spaces beyond the field of the school: the imperative to control, the circulation of risk, the social-production of certain groups as fear-inducing or vulnerable. What we feel is coded and given a language by order words in circulation, and we seek out words to code and categorise our sensory experiences.

Sensing these uncertainties, fears and failures to understand, encountering differences between and the simultaneity of competing affects, desires, discourses and demands, we might re-modulate affect, cultivate receptiveness, surrendering the claim to know what the other is experiencing, or what they need or want (cf. B. Davies, 2014a; Ellsworth, 1997; Miller, 2005; Orner, Miller, & Ellsworth, 1996; Springgay, 2008; Zembylas, 2007). These limits of knowing and attention to feeling might foster felt relations of humility and generosity, as Butler (2005) has put so eloquently:
I will need to be forgiven for what I cannot have fully known, and I will be under a similar obligation to offer forgiveness to others, who are also constituted in partial opacity to themselves. […] As we ask to know the other, or ask that the other say, finally or definitively, who he or she is, it will be important not to expect an answer that will ever satisfy. By not pursuing satisfaction and by letting the question remain open, even enduring, we let the other live, since life might be understood as precisely that which exceeds any account we may try to give of it. (pp. 42-43)

Apprehending our own misunderstanding of our affects and desires, the affects of others, and the intensities in the room opens up the possibilities of alternative ways of understanding, feeling and relating.

Finally, cultivating agonistic respect involves an awareness of its own limitations; agonistic respect is beyond reach because we can never step outside the fold. There is no harmonisation of differences or consensus; “old flames of anathematisation will periodically flare up again”, and “new and unexpected movements” of others “will arise to pose the issue all over again in surprising terms” (Connolly, 2005, p. 33). Even as we attempt to “to work tactically on [ourselves] and others to overcome existential resentment[s]” (Connolly, 2005, pp. 32-33), micropolitics are at work – subtle movements of segmentary and molecular lines and lines of flight and blockages, redirections and ruptures of desire. But the impossibility of reaching a point of complete respect does not have to be paralysing (cf. Lather, 2001). Rather, it may be compelling, gripping – impelling further engagement, to work with impasses – not to overcome them, but to produce something new. The aim becomes, then not to resolve tensions, but rather to “modulate” them “into a symbiosis: a cross-fertilisation” of capacities that “live out to the fullest the intensity of the event of their coming together” (Massumi, in Massumi & McKim, 2009, p. 12).

For student voice and for schools, this is to generate something between fixed points of student and teacher. Becoming, and agonistic respect, may be the zone where “new understandings of what it is to be a student, what it is to be a teacher” form, “in ways which blur boundaries and invite a different set of relationships and modes of working” (Fielding, 2006, p. 311), even as each party might give differing accounts of what a student and a teacher are. Different ways of relating and understanding might be possible as we misunderstand, are shocked to thought by our affective investments, apprehend the interdependency of teachers and students, and
shift attention towards alternative modes of feeling, speaking, listening and relating in and beyond school. Further ethnographic work is needed to map examples of what this might look like in schools – how to forge engagement across differences that cohabitate “the same strip of territory” (Connolly, 2005, p. 34) (for example, a school), without flattening differences, universalising and ignoring singularities, nor accepting the destructive.

Response-abilities before others

This study has worked between ethnography and participatory research: modes of research concerned with “the problem of speaking for others” (Alcoff, 1991) and with researching “with” others (e.g. Cahill, 2007). In Chapter 1, I explained that the question “What can voice(s) do?” is not only concerned with the movements of voice as a concept, nor only with the work of voice as a felt force, but is also methodological: What can our voices do together? Entwined with this question were concerns surrounding positionality and ethics: the ethical responsibilities, perplexities, disjunctures and ambivalences of working in the folds of ethnographic and participatory research. I have also explored the constitution and murmurs around the
authorial I who composes this thesis – what is this I that speaks and writes about these events, and what is it that she does and is doing?

In this study, I attended to the voices of others – listening to them, worrying about them, analysing them, critiquing them. I heard lingering developmental conceptions of childhood, was worried that student voice could amplify processes of subjectification in schools, analysed students’ expectations of the dialogical event, and critiqued processes that seemed to have morphed voice into positive behaviour. Even as I worked with the figuration of the fold, at times I thought myself outside of these logics and events. At times, it seemed that students and I spoke with each other, forming accounts, productions and theories about student voice (Chapter 5). The molecular line of my theorising and writing with students revealed:

… spaces and voices, like holes in the molar [segmentary] structure […] [N]ow there are indistinct fringes, encroachments, overlappings […]. Everything has the clarity of the microscope. We think we have understood everything, and draw conclusions. We are the new knights; we even have a mission. (Deleuze & Guattari, 1980/1987, p. 228)

At times, I was clear in purpose, thought I had understood everything, and drew conclusions.

But there were also moments of “folded force” (Deleuze, 1999/1986, p. 86), where I was shocked into attunement to my own implication in these logics and events; not speaking for, not speaking with, not responsible for or responsible to others – but thoroughly enmeshed, folded and compressed. In a moment where, thinking that students and I had co-theorised the conditions of the puppets productions, a Year 8 student notified me via a post-it note that he had been rendered “speechless” by other students and by me (Chapter 5). It is not that the researcher has a “desire for power” or “desire to oppress or to be oppressed”, but power, oppression and desire are “the actual component lines of a given assemblage” (Deleuze & Parnet, 2006/1977, p. 100). In other assemblages of enunciation, my questions were threaded through with the voices of teachers and students, murmuring, indistinguishable, forming and reforming my voice. “[M]y interior monologue is never my own” (Lawlor, 2008, p. 183). When a group of Year 11 students hesitantly dramatised a past classroom event shot through with hurt, disappointment and shame, I asked them:
“Has that made you reflect on how you might (. ) talk to people?” (Chapter 8). I was immediately flooded with uncomfortable affects, and sensed that this question positioned students as responsible. “If you’re telling everyone, ‘you should do this,’ but then, you’re going around and doing the complete opposite, you’re a hypocrite” (Chapter 8). I wondered if what I had said had shamed them, and I was ashamed.

It has not been straightforward to answer: what can our voices do together? What the students’ (and teachers’) and my voices could do together depended on the desiring-assemblages at work in research configurations (see Mayes, 2013a; Mayes, 2016). As assemblages shifted and moved, relations of power and desire compounded or decomposed relations between bodies and augmented or diminished bodies’ capacities to act. Segmentary lines, molecular lines, lines of interest, lines of desire and lines of flight were entangled. As Deleuze and Guattari said, “It’s too easy to be antifascist on the molar [segmentary] level, and not even see the fascist inside you, the fascist you yourself sustain and nourish and cherish with molecules both personal and collective” (1980/ 1987, p. 215). I am, and have been, at times, a fascist.

_Becoming_ and speaking _before_ offer conceptual resources to considerations of ethical responsibilities in ethnographic and participatory research, to work against professional fascisms. Remaining “on the shore”, positioned outside of what is happening to others, becoming “the professionals who give talks on [student voice]” is ridiculous (Deleuze, 2013/ 1990, p. 179). “[S]peaking for others” (Alcoff, 1991) while standing apart from them, and stepping back and letting “the subaltern speak” (Spivak, 1987) are both impossible. I cannot step “outside of [this] time” but continue “to undergo shameful compromises with it” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1994/ 2009, pp. 107-108). Enfolded within, unfolding and re-folded, there are, however, zones of exchange, zones of response-ability _before_ – zones of _becoming_. Shame might even be productive.

Discussing the shame of being human in the context of the holocaust and human rights abuses, Deleuze and Guattari (1994/ 2009) write: “We are not responsible for [pour] the [others] but responsible before [devant] them” (p. 108). To be responsible _before_ is not to be responsible “‘for their benefit,’ or yet ‘in their place’”, but is, as Deleuze and Guattari explain, “a question of becoming” (1994/
To be before (devant) is not to be outside the fold of subject positions, but to be something other than student, teacher or researcher – “in proximity” with students, teachers, words and the world: “among the others and they are in me” (Lawlor, 2008, p. 178). Among “a swarm of differences” (Deleuze, 1968/1994, p. 55). Participation.

Speaking before others, rather than for or with others shifts conceptions of responsibility in student voice, not acting for others or acting as if one were the other in a manner that would presume that one is set apart from the other as an autonomous and discrete subject. One is “responsible before others, facing them, and in relation to them” (Gilson, 2011, p. 79). To speak before is to break with relations that judge and remediate the other’s (student or teacher) lack. Bodies affect and are affected in the zone of exchange, enfolded and co-implicated in the constitution of doubt, fear, shame and joy in schools and in research. This responsibility is not the liberal democratic responsibility of the rights-bearing student as he/she participates in school reform processes. Nor is it the responsibility of the accountable teacher who must remain in control of his classroom and its outcomes. Nor is it the responsibility of the conscientious researcher who must give an account to an ethics committee of how she will ethically deport herself when the unforeseen event happens. This is not the responsibility of the atomised individual.

Responsibility becomes a response-ability to the “zone of exchange” between bodies (Deleuze & Guattari, 1994/2009, p. 109); response-ability between interdependent, interrelated bodies who affect and are affected by each other (cf. Barad, 2007; Ellsworth, 1997; Heimans, Singh, & Glasswell, 2015). Response-ability is a capacity to respond, moment-by-moment, immanently, suspended in the zone of exchange between two points of subjectification. In this zone there is “an affectability that is no longer that of subjects. Unnatural participation” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1980/1987, p. 258, their emphasis and my emphasis). Re-thinking participation produces new thought and praxis for participatory ethnographic research: a double becoming of positionality as a concept and the felt experience of research relations. What is felt in research relations changes what is thought about positionality. What is thought about positionality activates changes in what is felt in research encounters.
Conceptualising *response*-ability *before* has implications for research with students in schools, and children and young people beyond schools. Working in the fold, *response*-able, speaking *before* others necessitates an attention to segmentary lines even in ostensibly democratic research relations, and the interplay between power and affect in participatory research (Mayes, 2016). *Response*-ability re-figures ethics towards the immanent and relational – from the rights and responsibilities of the autonomous individual subject, to *response*-abilities compounded between bodies, who are not set apart, but whose lives inextricably depend on each other. Such a *response*-ability might impel a more hesitant approach to giving an account of what actually happened: a different mode of evaluation.

**Becoming and (re-)forming**

![Figure 37. (Figure 25. Reprise)](image)

*Figures – they are the thing which is the most imperceptible,*  
*they are acts which can only be contained in a life*  
*and expressed in a style. […]*  
*A style is managing to stammer in one’s own language. […]*  
*Constructing a line of flight. […]*  
*Things never pass where you think,*  
*nor along the paths you think.*

- Gilles Deleuze’s Preface to the English language edition, *Dialogues II*
The final dimension of the research question impelling this study, was “What can [authorial] voice(s) do? In this section I consider what not only the authorial voice of a thesis text can do, but also what can be done in school reform evaluation documents.

When a school (and a doctoral student) is asked to give an account of a school reform process, it is not necessarily possible to tell a complicated story about how a process of student voice produced excessive affects, unsettled teachers’ subjectivities and troubled habitual interactions. The authorial voice of a school evaluation document (and a thesis), even after conducting collaborative evaluation (and research) processes, must construct a coherent and singular account, drawing conclusions, effecting cuts and folds to the world, making some things come to matter and others to not. Majoritarian school reform evaluations (and guides for writing doctoral theses) value “contract, clarity and closure” (Fielding, 2006, p. 310): the identification of targets, the devising of an intervention and the measurement of outcomes correlated to represent the value of an intervention (see Chapters 3 and 9). This school, like other schools in low socio-economic contexts in an accountability and market-driven environment, experienced external pressure to evidence improvement and to discontinue reform strategies with more ambivalent outcomes (cf. Lupton & Hempel-Jorgensen, 2012). I, too, as a teacher and researcher committed to student voice, sensed that I should give a positive account of school improvement and disregard more ambivalent data, as a way to advocate for the adoption of student voice as a reform strategy.

Yet, school reform evaluation accounts (and my research accounts) were unable to contain or explain the ambivalent affects between teachers and students. I have not been able to account for “what exactly happened” here (Deleuze & Guattari, 1980/1987, p. 199). Indeed, what I have done in this research made (and makes) other things happen. What happened and happens suggest the need for a more open-ended approach to the teloi (goals) of school reform.

Becoming reorients logics of change and how we conceptualise outcomes and accountability. Becoming does not have a predetermined telos, and the orientation of becoming is not towards a pre-identified outcome of the relation. To ask “‘What are you becoming?’” may be “particularly stupid”, according to Deleuze and Parnet
(2006/1977), since as someone becomes, and gives an account of himself, “what he is becoming changes as much as he does himself” (p. 2). Theories of change in current accountability processes seek correspondence (or the construction of correspondence) between pre-determined targets, a reform strategy and a specific outcome. But, after Marx, via Deleuze and Guattari (1983), we “cannot tell from the mere taste of wheat who grew it; the product gives us no hint as to the system and the relations of production” (p. 24). The products of this reform period: students who became school leaders, teachers who made changes to pedagogical practices, RESP signs and tokens, suspension data – give us little hints as to the multiplicitous voices, bodies, discourses, affects and relations that produced them, the multicausal dimensions of the assemblages within which these products were formed, and what the reform account itself produces. Becoming does not “reduce to, or lead back to, ‘appearing,’ ‘being,’ ‘equaling’ or ‘producing’”, and “produces nothing other than itself” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1980/1987, pp. 239, 238). The fleeting block of becoming is more “real” than the “the supposedly fixed terms through which the becoming passes” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1980/1987, p. 238). Becomings are always minoritarian, moving away from repetition of the same and towards the production of alliances, symbioses and difference.

Minoritarian evaluations of reform strategies (like student voice and PBIS) were constituted between bodies at this school at the same time as majoritarian evaluations were composed. What a voice, or a RESP token, could do was not only a question for the summative evaluation, but a lived experiment created with other voices, bodies and partial objects in desiring-assemblages – “what can [we] see and what can [we] say [and do] today?” (Deleuze, 1999/1986, p. 98). Sometimes the capacity to speak, to act and to be encountered differently were augmented through a partial object (like a RESP token or a puppet) that shifted an assemblage – extending what could be taught and learned, said and done (Lee, 2001; Prout, 2005). Moments of augmented power were sometimes fleeting, sometimes sustained. These immanent experiments were sometimes resistant, sometimes regulative, sometimes predictable, and sometimes creative. Minoritarian evaluations happened in the midst of the relation – evaluating the affirmations and negations of the relation at the level of life itself. Immanent modes of evaluation do not move towards an anticipated target or goal, but rather towards affirmative, productive difference. I mapped these movements rather
than construct a definitive conclusion of what happened. This map was not the same as the territory.

There are possibilities in becoming and immanent minoritarian evaluations for teachers, school leaders, systems and researchers. Below I offer two concepts for working with becomings and minoritarian modes of evaluations in school reform processes: teleodynamism and transversal accountabilities.

Connelly (2013) has written about the possibilities of biological processes of teleodynamism for political philosophy: processes that also offer much to educational evaluations. Rather than pre-determining a telos to be reached through a reform strategy, teleodynamic processes are open-ended pursuits that adapt to unclear, changing environments. Humans in a new environment seek to make sense of and find a habitable territory and ways to live without knowing in advance what this territory and these modes of living might look like. The exchanges between humans navigating this new territory, and the exchanges of drives within the individual adjusting this setting are teleodynamic, as new ideas, strategies, thoughts are brought forth. So too, teleodynamic processes in schools might involve experiments with pedagogical practices and configurations without being so certain of what might happen. In the teleodynamic pursuit, “the result of that search is not always implicit in the beginning; it often involves a creative element that emerges from these movements back and forth” in a way not reducible to precedents (Connolly, 2013, pp. 85-86). Teleodynamism involves dynamic transversal experimentations in contact with physical, intellectual, linguistic, and existential territories, rather than repetitions of what has happened before.

Teleodynamic processes do not abandon outcomes or accountability. Indeed, what is produced during a reform strategy is of central concern. In teleodynamic processes, students, teachers, school leaders and researchers pay attention to the unanticipated, the perplexing, the curious, rather than setting targets that recognise what was anticipated. Noting these moments where we are affected, we explore the conditions under which something different happens, and what our accounts produce. The conditions under which novelty is sensed are explored for their potentiality – as affective sites where different capacities and social relations might form. Attending to
moments of unactualised potential – where something might have happened, but did not, the conditions that block or divert desire elsewhere are explored. *Becoming* is “the thing which is the most imperceptible” (Deleuze & Parnet, 2006/1977, p. 2). Rather than a re-formation (that repeats what has been formed before) or a re-production (that produces what has been produced before) of habitual relations and social inequalities, there might be, in these moments, co-creation and social-production. Exploring these sites of potentiality, the evaluator remains within the relation, wary of the dangers of trying to capture or replicate what is happening, vigilant to fascistic tendencies to think that it has all been understood.

Evaluations formed teleodynamically are more like a sketch map than the tracing of a pre-determined path. Reform evaluations, too, might become more like sketch maps. Sketch maps, after Ingold (2007), are formed for and in relation to others – to explain where you have been or to supplement an account of where you hope to go; open products generating conversations as participants take turns to add lines to the drawing. Sketch maps are formed as you and I walk together, or as we retrospectively construct an artefact that reminds us of where we have been. Sketch maps are not the *real* territory, but rather partial objects that extend and supplement conversations about the territory. Sketch maps are always open to contestation.

Teledynamic evaluations are shared in vertical, horizontal and transversal directions, in what Sellar (2014b) has described as “multilateral forms of accountability” (n.p.). Teledynamic processes, accompanied by sketch map-like evaluations, are formed and collectively evaluated between multiple parties. Student voice, in multilateral forms of accountability, is not only a reform strategy, but also a mode of evaluating reforms that potentially produces something different to what has happened before. This mode of accountability is not only vertical – accounts formed for those positioned hierarchically above. Nor is it only horizontal and democratic, shared with students, parents and communities. Sellar (2014) describes “multilateral” accountabilities as involving divergently positioned stakeholders who debate the values and purposes of schooling. These debates and experiments about what matters and why we are doing what we do in schools might be transversally constructed, pursued and evaluated. This is accountability “working in multiple directions” (P. Thomson, Lingard, & Wrigley, 2012, p. 3), shooting between points of
subjectification, forming connections previously unnoticed, agonistically respecting
the assets of different modes of seeing, interpreting and responding. Divergent
accounts, and different modes of evaluating what happens in schools (quantitative and
qualitative, spoken and written, linguistic, artistic, material, corporeal) are juxtaposed,
attending to the differences between rather than the points of consensus.

The challenge in these processes, as was glimpsed in this study, is not to
flatten differences or evaluate in “the language of just one of the parties” (Stengers,
2011, pp. 56, 57). The challenge is not to harmonise, but to enable disagreement,
negotiation and contestation, and keep the intensity in what happens next (cf.
Massumi, in Massumi & McKim, 2009). Enfolded with these teleodynamic processes
and their evaluation is response-ability: “Who is, or will be, affected, and how”
(Stengers, 2011, p. 62) by this evaluation?

The imperative to reform one’s school, one’s teachers, one’s students, and
one’s very self, does not necessarily increase the capacity of bodies to act. Reform can
“ero[de]” bodies (Chapter 8) and compound tensions between bodies. Ceaselessly
driven towards teleological targets by “supposedly necessary reforms” and “perpetual
training” (Deleuze, 1992c, pp. 4, 5), bodies in and beyond schools can become
exhausted. The demand to be certain, to understand what has happened, to be
responsible and change may putrefy relations and life. The imperative for students,
and teachers, and schools to reform themselves, and to produce accounts of how they,
or their students, or their teachers, or their schools have reformed along segmentary
lines (of identity categories, or class groupings, or teacher accreditation steps, or
arrangements of numerical data on A4 word evaluation tables) may cut off or mute
what is excessive or unspeakable, and produce unforeseen effects and affects.

But, entwined with and diverging from these segmentary lines of reform are
processes of becoming – reforming, perhaps. These reformings are (re)-formations
created between bodies, forming beneath spoken and written reform evaluation
accounts, exceeding and escaping from linguistic modes of expression, shooting off
from targets. These reformings may not be completely actualised and may be
imperceptible, but glimmer with potentiality. Processes of reforming happen in
moments of response-iveness before others, blocks of becoming forming between
parties, in movements of encounter and transformation into something other than we have previously been.

If the protests of children were heard
   in kindergarten,
if their questions were
   attended to,
it would be enough to

explode

the entire
educational
system.

- Gilles Deleuze, in dialogue with Michel Foucault

Intellectuals and Power
Afterword(s): But what actually happened?

But what exactly happened?

In truth,
nothing assignable
or perceptible:
molecular changes,
redistributions of desire such that
when something occurs,
the self that awaited it is already dead,
or the one that would await it has not yet arrived.

This time, there are outbursts
and crackings
in the immanence of a rhizome,
rather than great movements and breaks
determined by the transcendence of a tree.

- Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari
A Thousand Plateaus

It is difficult to conclude what happened at this school. Many things happened. Student voice did many things. There were many words, many affects and “many politics” (Deleuze & Parnet, 2006/1977). Desire flowed, was blocked and was redirected. These flows and changes were not necessarily perceptible, or there was too much to perceive. There were molecular changes, redistributions of desire, new compositions and fresh decompositions of relations, new selves and group subjects. There were cracks in subjectivities, ruptures in ways of knowing and feeling. But it was difficult to draw lines of connection between events and their causes. I do not understand what happened, nor why. To understand and come to a definitive conclusion was not the intention of this study (cf. Webb, 2009); such an endeavor would require another ontology and methodology.
In this study, I attempted to listen to students’ and teachers’ voices, and the affects in circulation beyond the linguistic voice and human subject, to destroy order words in order to generate other ways of feeling about voice and school, to connect what was happening to what was happening beyond it, and to experiment with the collaborative creation of accounts and theories of student voice and schooling. I proliferated what Lather (2013) calls, after Deleuze, a “thousand tiny methodologies” (p. 635), shunting transversally between proliferating verbs associated with different modes of research: understanding, interpreting, emancipating, deconstructing (cf. Lather, 2006; Lather, 2015). I also sought to connect, experiment and create. I mapped and moved with the concept of student voice, the order words of schooling, in processes of desiring-analysis and folds of research relations. Exploring what voices can do, the can was provisional, dependent on shifting assemblages. Theorising and enacting these contingencies, I created accounts with students of what had happened when student voice was enacted as a school reform strategy in one school, and dramatisations of what could happen. I attempted to think, feel and write differently about what voice can do, as a concept, as a felt force that folds and unfolds subjectivities, as a tool in the formation of group subjects, and in the formation of lines of writing. Segmentary, molecular and lines of flight forming and un-forming subjectivities, forming lines of writing, lines creased in folds, were entangled, unthreaded and re-threaded.

This study has been uneasily assembled between student voice – an educational movement associated with the phenomenon of embodied voices – and educational scholarship that mobilises the concepts of Deleuze and Guattari. I have listened to the temporally refracted accounts of students and teachers about what happened in a school, among other murmuring voices. These accounts are significant because they suggest what lingers and folds into bodies, subjectivities and schools over time, even as I have simultaneously complicated phenomenological assumptions about voice, subjectivity, memory and research. Students’ accounts from this school complement and extend previous research that has evaluated participatory work with students at the end of a voice project or initiative (e.g. Hampshire et al., 2012; Hill, 2006; Morgan, 2009; Rudduck & McIntyre, 2007). The uneasy affects performed and produced in and through these accounts and productions contribute to suggesting why
it may be that “student voice work explicitly committed to work with those who are most disadvantaged within schools […] has yet to emerge with any significance” (Fielding & McGregor, 2005, p. 13). I argued, working with the students’ and teachers’ accounts, that there is a dominant image of thought, order words, and territorial refrains that block and redirect desire to have a voice – and that makes voice desire its own repression or mutation.

This study also suggested some of the contingent conditions under which this dominant image of thought may be troubled; the passwords beneath the order words; the deterritorialisations of territorial refrains that happen each day. I foregrounded the significance of affect – pre-personal feeling – and desire – force seeking connections – in the formation of voice and subjectivities in schools. The material force of language – what happens when a voice is spoken from a collective assemblage of enunciation – makes a difference. These empirical and philosophical experiments with what voice can do suggest the need for a double becoming in research in and about schools – a zigzag exchange where senses and thought shift in relation to each other; what is felt changes what is thought, and what is thought changes what is felt. Working with voice enlivens and enables, even while simultaneously, students, teachers and researchers might be less sure about what is being enlivened and enabled. This less certain affective knowing and thought in ambivalent affect activates different futures.

There are many limitations to what I have done in this study that accompany these many words, many affects and many politics. As suggested in Chapter 5, my attempt to eschew binaries and representational practices did not always succeed, and may have produced unforeseen e/affects. Moving between the folds of my professional subjectivity and research entanglements, trying to understand students and teachers while failing to understand, at times I replicated the binaries that I sought to escape. The methodological decisions that I made foregrounded certain aspects of the field and marginalised others. My research practices made some things come to matter and de-activated others, even as I was enfolded within these practices, unable to necessarily notice what had come to make a difference. In particular, I am concerned about the effects of this study for students and teachers – who might be held responsible for the folds and cuts that I made, and for what this research does.
This is a question of what the voice of a research text can do: what a research text brings into being, and what it disables; it is a question of who a research text benefits, and the benefits of doing research.

The creation of a work is central to the process of becoming. I have written this thesis in an attempt to think, feel, teach, learn and live differently. The “only aim of writing is life, through the combinations which it draws” (Deleuze & Parnet, 2006/1977, p. 4). I am not sure if this work will be generative of life, if it will compound the capacities of others to speak and to act and produce joy. I hope that it will. I have written this text because becoming is only possible “if writing results. Without the tangible result of a creation, becoming fails and becomes a bare repetitious circle of the same behavior” (Lawlor, 2008, p. 170). This study has attempted to create works that might unsettle repetitious patterns of speaking and listening in schools. I can only hope that this work is worthy of the events that it narrates and the events to come.

We got more people to think and to put it together and it means something bigger than one person thinking.

- Abu George, Year 11 focus group

Figure 38. [Figure 6. Reprise]
Research isn’t only confined to reality –
but to our dreams,
to what we believe is right,
or our vivid imaginations.
We are changing reality.

- James, second collaborative analysis day
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Appendix A: A Summary of the Steering Committee’s work and research findings: 2010-2013

2010: The School I’d Like

The focus of research in first year of the Steering Committee was *The School I’d Like*, inspired by a question asked to UK students by *The Observer* newspaper in 1967 and 1996, and *The Guardian* newspaper in 2001 (Burke & Grosvenor, 2015). Over 2010, students in this school’s Steering Committee explored questions of their school’s identity, learning environments, student/teacher relationships, classroom interactions and learning activities. The primary research experience designed and facilitated by the students was a research day with all Year 9 students, with methods that included creating podcasts, categorising and ‘tagging’ photographs of learning environments, focus groups and responding to a video created by students (see Mayes & Groundwater-Smith, 2010).

After analysing these data, students presented their research findings to the whole staff at an after school staff meeting, with a multimodal presentation including a simulated performance of a classroom (where the students played the role of teachers, and the teachers were positioned as students), a digital animation, a video, Powerpoint presentation, speeches, and paper handout. These findings: “*The School [that Year 9 students would] Like*” and the Steering Committee’s key recommendations were summarised by the acronym KERF:

- **K**now your students
- **E**ncourage your students
- **R**espect your students and
- **M**ake learning **F**un (see Mayes & Groundwater-Smith, 2010; Mockler & Groundwater-Smith, 2015, pp. 57-58).

Immediately following the students’ presentations, students and teachers broke into groups to discuss the research findings, with each small group facilitated by two Steering Committee students.

In the weeks following the staff presentation in 2010, it was suggested by Senior Executive members that the Steering Committee become involved in the Positive Behaviour Interventions and Support (PBIS) process. Working with a team of teachers who had been working on reformulating the school’s values, the 2010 Steering Committee students ran...
focus groups with students and parents to determine the ‘core values’ shared by ‘key stakeholders’ in the school community. This PBIS process of reformulating the school’s values continued in 2011, and these values were formally launched in 2012 with the acronym RESP:

- Respect
- Equity
- Safety
- Positivity.

The relationship between ‘student voice’ and this PBIS process that developed the RESP values are discussed in Chapters 8 and 9.

2011: The Teachers I’d like

In 2011, the Steering Committee’s collaborative inquiry centred on teaching: The Teachers I’d Like. A new representative group of Year 9 students was formed, and initially trained by the previous 2010 Steering Committee in a ‘handover’ process. After designing, conducting and analysing a student survey with Year 9 students about teaching and learning, Steering Committee students conducted lesson observations of ‘effective’ teachers from across all faculties: teachers in classrooms where students felt that they were learning, and where they felt that their results and capabilities were improving. Students had seen Head Teachers observe their teachers’ lessons as part of the Teacher Annual Review Schedule (TARS) process and were excited to be positioned as ‘researchers’ investigating the practices of effective teachers. The aim of these observations was to formulate more specific pedagogical strategies for recommendations to teachers (see Mockler & Groundwater-Smith, 2015, pp. 59-60).

In small groups (of 4-5), students formulated a research question and pre-determined the data that they would collect in the classroom, the focus group questions that they would ask a select group of students from the class after the lesson, and interview questions that they would ask the teacher after the lesson. Students then compared their research findings through lesson observations at two schools in different demographic contexts: a coeducational systemic Catholic high school in a disadvantaged community outside of the city, and a coeducational public primary school in an affluent part of the city (see Mayes and Groundwater-Smith, 2011). Students generated the acronym TEACHER to summarise their research findings about effective teaching, and their key recommendations:

- T – Teach Positively
- E – Educate at the students’ level
As in 2010, the 2011 Steering Committee developed a research presentation, which they presented to the past (2010) Steering Committee for feedback, before presenting their findings to staff, in a similar multimodal format to the 2010 presentation.

In mid-October 2011, after this presentation, I moved overseas (at the beginning of my doctoral studies) and Ms Frazzle began facilitating the group. Ms Frazzle had been one of the ‘effective’ teachers observed and interviewed by a Steering Committee research group during 2011. Following the recommendations of staff and the Senior Executive that the students’ presentation of their research was also shared with students, the group reprised their presentation for students in year meetings. The students also photocopied and laminated visual aid versions of the ‘TEACHER’ acronym and recommendations, which they individually gave to teachers, for teachers to display in their classrooms at the teacher’s discretion.

2012: The Learner I’d Like to Be

The 2012 inquiry, ‘The learner I’d like to be,’ shifted the focus away from the school and teachers, towards students themselves. After surveying Year 9 about the qualities and contingencies of ‘effective learners’, students conducted lesson observations within and beyond the school, focusing on qualities of effective learners in junior and senior years. These observations were followed by focus groups with students from the lesson and an interview with the teacher, as in 2011. The students also visited two other school sites as part of their research: a public primary school in an affluent suburb of the city and a comprehensive public secondary school in the outer western suburbs of the city. A list of qualities of effective learners was articulated in their research findings, with examples from their qualitative data:

- Cooperative
- Confident
- Committed
- Respectful
- Good attitude
- Appropriate behavior
- Maturity and
In exploring these findings, students composed a video dramatising two students’ navigations of a ‘bad’ day. This video raised questions about the extent to which the embodiment of an effective learner persona is a “choice” or is up to “chance,” dependent on a range of contingent conditions and factors within and beyond the school. Students debated the extent to which a student must perform these qualities consistently to be “effective” as a learner, with students asserting the potential of being “mixed” learners. These findings were presented to the staff, and then separately presented to the senior executive (who were unable to attend the first presentation) towards the end of 2012. Students then presented their research findings to students in year meetings at the beginning of 2013. Students remained in the group until the end of Term 1 2013. The beginning of my ethnographic fieldwork overlapped with the end of their research.

2013: What I’d Like to Learn

The 2013 Steering Committee, a cross-age group of students from Years 7-11, inquired into the nature of the curriculum itself. In the context of a new Australian Curriculum for History, due to be implemented in 2014, the students explored the relationship between the explicit and hidden curriculum (see Chapter 3) and investigated how curriculum documents are constructed, including a group interview with the principal and an analysis of the previous and new NSW curricula for history. In small groups, students then interviewed teachers from the Human Society and its Environment (HSIE) faculty about their views on the introduction of the Australian Curriculum. They observed a faculty meeting planning a new unit of work, and developed questions for a focus group conversation between Steering Committee students and teachers from the HSIE faculty. They also visited an independent Catholic girls school, observing history lessons, interviewing HSIE teachers, and facilitating focus groups with students about the new curriculum. The students disseminated their work and findings in a presentation at the school that they visited, at a NSW Deputy Principals’ Conference, and through a publication (see Mayes et al., 2013). Throughout the project, they considered and debated whether students should be involved in curriculum design, and strategies for including students at the levels of the classroom, faculty, school, and curriculum bodies. The students’ research, and their internal debates, is explored in Chapter 7.
Appendix B: Participant Information Statements and Consent forms

Final versions of Participant Information Statements and Consent forms are included in this Appendix.

NOTE: The name of the school has been replaced with [NAME OF SCHOOL], in both the English and Arabic versions of the Participant Information Statements and Consent forms. All forms were produced on The University of Sydney Letterhead with the following details on the first page:
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DEB HAYES
Associate Professor
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The University of Sydney
NSW 2006 AUSTRALIA
Telephone: +61 2 9351 6389
Facsimile: +61 2 9351 4580
Email: deb.hayes@sydney.edu.au
Web: http://www.sydney.edu.au/

Or in Arabic:
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ABN 15 211 513 464
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غرفة 916
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تلفون: +61 2 6389 9351
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بريد إلكتروني: deb.hayes@sydney.edu.au
موقع إترنت: http://www.sydney.edu.au/
1. Students previously or currently in the Steering Committee – Student PIS

Students’ constructions of student participation
PARTICIPANT INFORMATION STATEMENT –
Students previously or currently in [NAME OF SCHOOL’S] Steering Committee
(CHILDREN UNDER 18 YEARS)

(1) What is the study about?

You are invited to participate in a study of ‘student participation’ (a term that
describes the involvement of students in school decision-making).

You were asked if you would like to be a participant in this study because
currently are or you used to be in [NAME OF SCHOOL’S] ‘Steering Committee’.
In this student voice group, you are/ were involved in thinking about teaching and
learning changes at [NAME OF SCHOOL]. The study is trying to find out about
the experiences of students who have been involved in school decision-making.
Finding out these things will help adults in schools, researchers and other young
people think more about how to work together in school decision-making and
research.

(2) Who is doing the study?

The study is being conducted by Eve Mayes. It is part of her Doctor of
Philosophy (PhD) at The University of Sydney under the supervision of
Associate Professor Deb Hayes. The results from this study will be shared in the
PhD thesis of Eve Mayes, as well as in a short report to the Department of
Education and Communities and the school.

(3) What do I have to do?

The study involves a number of different research activities. You may choose to
be involved or to leave the study at any stage. All activities may be recorded as
audio- or video-files, depending on whether you, your parent/ caregiver and the
other students that you complete the activity with agree for you to be recorded.
Focus group and larger group research activities will only be recorded if all
student participants and their parents/ caregivers consent. All research activities
will be held in the library during class time or at other times negotiated between
you and the researcher. If you do not wish to participate, you will remain in your
scheduled class.

a) Focus group responses to a scenario – You will choose a group of 3-4
students and negotiate a time for the focus group with the researcher.
Your group will respond to scenarios that are based on the issues
surrounding student voice, discussing how the scenarios relate to your
own experiences. Each participating student will be involved in one focus
group that will take approximately 30 minutes.

b) Creating a scenario in a group– You will then be given the option to
compose your own scenario as a group based on your group’s
experiences of student voice. After your group has composed a scenario,
you will talk about your scenario with the researcher. Each participating
student will be involved in one focus group that will take approximately 1
hour.

c) Group interpretation another group’s scenario – After all groups have
composed their scenarios, you will be invited to respond to another
student group’s scenario. You will discuss the main ideas that you think
are raised by the other group’s scenario. Each participating student will
be involved in one focus group that will take approximately 30 minutes.
d) Larger group analysis of all scenarios - After all groups have analysed another group’s scenarios, all student research participants will be invited to discuss the main points from all the scenarios as a larger group. There will be one joint data analysis session with all participating students. This session will take approximately 1 hour.

(4) How much time will it take?

The researcher will negotiate with you the times when research activities will occur, so your school day is minimally disrupted. If you do not wish to participate, you will remain in your scheduled class. The focus group response to a scenario will take about 30 minutes. The group construction of scenarios will take about 1 hour. The group interpretation of another group’s scenario will take about 30 minutes (half a school period). The larger group analysis of scenarios will take about 1 hour.

(5) Do I have to do the study?

You do not have to take part in this research. It’s up to you. Participation is completely voluntary. Your parent/caregiver also needs to consent to you taking part in this research.

Even if you choose to take part at the beginning, you can change your mind and choose not to take part later on. All you need to do is tell the researcher that you don’t want to take part in the research any more. There will be a Participant Liaison staff member at the school who you can also speak to if you want to leave the study. You can also decide not to answer any questions you don’t want to.

If you decide to not take part or to stop being involved in the study, it will not affect your school results or progress or your future relations with The University of Sydney or [Name of school].

If you take part in a focus group and wish to leave, as this is a group discussion it will not be possible to delete your individual comments once the session has started.

(6) What if the research makes me feel upset?

If anything that you talk about during the research makes you feel upset, you can tell the researcher and the research activity will be stopped. The researcher will give you the name of the school counsellor to talk to, if you wish to speak to someone further.

(7) Will anyone else know?

Only the other students in your focus group will know what you talk about. In any research report that is published, no one will know what information you gave the researchers.

The only times that the researcher will have to tell someone is if you tell them that someone has physically or sexually abused or neglected you or that there is a risk that you will be hurt in the future. The researcher would also have to tell someone if you said you might hurt yourself or someone else. If these things happened they would tell the school principal.

(8) What will happen to the information I tell you?

The information that you tell the researchers will only be used by them to help them write about student voice. All aspects of the study, including results, will be strictly confidential and only the researchers will have access to information on
participants. Data (including any texts produced by students and any audio- or video-recordings) included in publications on the study will be anonymised. No one will know what information you gave the researchers and no one else apart from the researchers will be allowed to use the information.

During the study, the information you tell the researchers will be stored securely on a password-protected electronic device, and physical copies of anything that you create will be stored in a locked filing cabinet in the office of Eve Mayes at the University of Sydney. After the study is completed, all audio/visual/ text/ physical data will be stored in a locked filing cabinet in the Chief Investigator’s office. It will be stored for 7 years and then shredded/ erased.

The information could be used with information from other participants in reports or papers about the research. You will not be able to be identified in these reports or papers.

(9) **Do I get anything for being part of the study?**

We cannot and do not guarantee or promise that you will receive any direct benefits from the study. However, you may find that talking about student voice with other students and the researcher will help you to reflect on your past experiences of student voice, as well as develop your skills and understanding of research processes. The research is also intended to inform [NAME OF SCHOOL'S] student consultation and participation processes and improve communication between teachers and students, benefitting the student body and staff.

(10) **Can I tell other people about the study?**

Yes.

(11) **What if I have any questions?**

When you have read this information, Eve Mayes is available to discuss it with you further and answer any questions you may have. Eve Mayes can also be contacted via email: evde8182@uni.sydney.edu.au. If you have any questions about the research project or you want to talk about it, you can also contact Associate Professor Deb Hayes, (02) 9351 6389, email: deb.hayes@sydney.edu.au.

(12) **What if I am not happy with the study?**

If you have any concerns or complaints about the conduct of a research study can contact The Manager, Human Ethics Administration, University of Sydney on +61 2 8627 8176 (Telephone); +61 2 8627 8177 (Facsimile) or ro.humanethics@sydney.edu.au (Email).

This information sheet is for you to keep
2. Students previously or currently in the Steering Committee – Student Consent forms

STUDENT CONSENT FORM – Students previously or currently in [NAME OF SCHOOL’S] Steering Committee

I, ..........................................................................................................................[PRINT NAME], give consent to my participation in the research project

TITLE: Students’ constructions of student participation

My parent/ caregiver has agreed for me to take part in the research. I understand that the research is trying to find out about the experiences of students who have been involved in school decision-making.

In giving my consent I acknowledge that:

1. The research activities and the time that they will take have been explained to me, and I have been able to ask and get answers to any questions I have about the project.

2. I have read the Information Statement and have had a chance to discuss the information and my involvement in the project my parents/ caregivers and with the researcher/s.

3. I understand that I can choose not to participate in the research at any time, including at the end of the research. If I change my mind I will let the researcher know. I can also speak to the Participant Liaison staff member at the school if I don’t want to be involved in the project anymore. I understand that I don’t have to answer the questions that are asked if I don’t want to. I understand that I won’t get into trouble if I choose not to answer a question or if I stop taking part in the research.

4. I understand that the research will take place in the form of focus groups responding to a scenario, creating a scenario and responding to another group’s scenario. I understand that all participants who were in the Steering Committee at any stage during 2010-2013 will also get a chance to discuss all the scenarios and their main ideas as a larger group. I understand that all these activities are about students participating in school decision-making.

5. I understand that if anything I talk about during the research makes me feel upset I will let the researcher know and the research will be stopped. I will be given the name of the school counsellor who I can talk to about what is making me upset, if that is what I want to do.

6. I understand that my involvement is strictly confidential. Nothing that can identify me, like my name or my address, will be used in research. That means that no one will know where the information came from and no one will be able to connect it to me. If I consent to texts that I produce being published, I understand that I will not be able to be identified in these texts. I understand that research data gathered from the results of the study may be published however no information about me will be able to be identified.
7. I understand that the only times the researchers would have to tell someone is if I told them that someone has physically or sexually abused me or neglected me or that there is a risk I will be harmed in the future. The researchers would also have to tell someone if I said I might hurt someone else or myself. If any of those things happen they would have to tell the school principal.

8. I understand that I can withdraw from the study at any time without affecting my relationship with the researcher/s or the University of Sydney or [NAME OF SCHOOL] now or in the future.

9. I understand that I can withdraw from being in the focus group at any time if I do not wish to be in the discussions anymore. However, as it is a group discussion it will not be possible to delete what I have said up until that point.

10. I understand that the information I provide will be stored securely during the study on a password-protected electronic device, and physical copies of anything that I create will be stored in a locked filing cabinet in the office of Eve Mayes at the University of Sydney. I understand that, after the study is completed, all audio/ visual/ text/ physical data will be stored in a locked filing cabinet in the Chief Investigator’s office. It will be stored for 7 years and then shredded/ erased.

11. I understand that I will not receive any compensation for being involved in the project, apart from further opportunities to develop my skills and understanding of research processes. I understand that the research is intended to inform [NAME OF SCHOOL’S] student consultation and participation processes and improve communication between teachers and students, benefitting the student body and staff.

12. I consent to:

   • Audio-recording  YES □  NO □
   • Video-recording  YES □  NO □
   • Recording/ photocopying of visuals/ texts produced as scenarios  YES □  NO □
   • Our group’s scenario being read/ viewed by another student group  YES □  NO □
   • Publishing of visuals/ photos/ texts produced by me (The photographs will only be of my work, not of me)  YES □  NO □
   • Receiving Feedback  YES □  NO □

If you answered YES to the “Receiving Feedback” question, please provide your details i.e. mailing address, email address.
Feedback Option

Address: __________________________________________
_________________________________________________

Email: ____________________________________________

13. I will be given a copy of this consent form. If I have any questions about the research, I can contact Associate Professor Deb Hayes, (02) 9351 6389, email: deb.hayes@sydney.edu.au. If I have any concerns or complaints about the conduct of the research study, I can contact The Manager, Human Ethics Administration, University of Sydney on +61 2 8627 8176 (Telephone); +61 2 8627 8177 (Facsimile) or ro.humanethics@sydney.edu.au (Email)

..............................................................
Signature of young person

..............................................................
Please PRINT name

..............................................................
Date
3. Parents of student participants previously or currently in the Steering Committee – PIS

Students’ constructions of student participation

PARENTAL (OR CAREGIVER) INFORMATION STATEMENT – Students previously or currently in [NAME OF SCHOOL’s] Steering Committee

(1) What is the study about?

You are invited to permit your child to participate in a study of ‘student participation’ (a term that describes the involvement of students in school decision-making).

Your child was selected as a possible participant in this study because of their current or previous involvement in [NAME OF SCHOOL’s] ‘Steering Committee’. Students in this student voice group were trained and involved in research investigating teaching and learning reforms at the school. The study is investigating their experiences of participation in school decision-making and research.

(2) Who is carrying out the study?

The study is being conducted by Eve Mayes. It is part of her Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) at The University of Sydney under the supervision of Associate Professor Deb Hayes. The results from this study will be shared in the PhD thesis of Eve Mayes, as well as in a short report to the Department of Education and Communities and the school.

(3) What does the study involve?

The study involves a number of different research activities. You and your child may choose for your child to be involved or to leave the study at any stage. All activities may be recorded as audio- or video-files, depending on whether you, your child and the other students that your child completes the activity with agree for them to be recorded. Focus group and larger group research activities will only be recorded if all student participants and their parents/caregivers consent. All research activities will be held in the library during class time or at other times negotiated with students. Students who do not wish to participate will remain in their scheduled classes.

a) Focus group responses to a scenario – Your child will choose a group of 3-4 students and negotiate a time for the focus group with the researcher. Your child’s group will respond to scenarios that are based on the issues surrounding student voice, discussing how the scenarios relate to their own experiences. Each participating student will be involved in one focus group that will take approximately 30 minutes.

b) Creating a scenario in a group – Your child will then be given the option to compose their own scenario as a group based on their group’s experiences of student voice. After their group has composed a scenario, they will talk about their scenario with the researcher. Each participating student will be involved in one focus group that will take approximately 1 hour.

c) Group interpretation another group’s scenario – After all groups have composed their scenarios, they will be invited to respond to another student group’s scenario. They will discuss the main ideas that they think are raised by the other group’s scenario. Each participating student will be involved in one focus group that will take approximately 30 minutes.
d) Larger group analysis of all scenarios - After all groups have analysed another group’s scenarios, all student research participants will be invited to discuss the main points from all the scenarios as a larger group. There will be one joint data analysis session with all participating students. This session will take approximately 1 hour.

(4) How much time will the study take?

The researcher will negotiate with your child the times when research activities will occur, so your child’s school day is minimally disrupted. Students who do not wish to participate will remain in their scheduled classes. The focus group response to a scenario will take about 30 minutes. The group construction of scenarios will take about 1 hour. The group interpretation of another group’s scenario will take about 30 minutes (half a school period) and will occur around Term 1 Week 6. The larger group analysis of scenarios will take about 1 hour and will occur around Term 1 Week 8.

(5) Can my child withdraw from the study?

Being in this study is completely voluntary. You are not under any obligation to consent to your child’s participation. Your child can withdraw any time prior to or during the research study.

Your decision whether or not to permit your child to participate will not affect your child’s school results or progress or prejudice you or your child’s future relations with The University of Sydney. If you decide to permit your child to participate, you are free to withdraw your consent and to discontinue your child’s participation at any time without affecting your relationship with the University of Sydney or with [NAME OF SCHOOL]. There will be a Participant Liaison staff member at the school who you can also speak to if you want to withdraw your child from the study.

If your child takes part in a focus group and wishes to withdraw, as this is a group discussion it will not be possible to exclude individual data once the session has commenced.

(6) What if my child becomes upset during the research activities?

Your child will be advised to tell the researcher if anything that your child talks about during the research makes him/her feel upset, and the research activity will be stopped. Your child will be given the name of the school counsellor to talk to, if they wish to speak to someone further.

(7) Will anyone hear about what my child says to the researchers?

No, no one will know what information your child gives the researchers. All information is strictly confidential.

If a child discloses physical or sexual abuse, or risk of harm, the researchers will inform the school principal.

(8) What will happen to the information that my child gives?

The information that your child gives will only be used by the researchers in this project to inform their study of student participation. All aspects of the study, including results, will be strictly confidential and only the researchers will have access to information on participants. Data (including any texts produced by students and any audio- or video-recordings) included in publications on the study will be anonymised. No one will know what information your child gave the
researchers and no one else apart from the researchers will be allowed to use the information.

During the study, the information your child gives will be stored securely on a password-protected electronic device, and physical copies of anything that your child creates will be stored in a locked filing cabinet in the office of Eve Mayes at the University of Sydney. After the study is completed, all audio/visual/text/physical data will be stored in a locked filing cabinet in the Chief Investigator’s office. It will be stored for 7 years and then shredded/erased.

(9) Will anyone else know the results?

All aspects of the study, including results, will be strictly confidential and only the researchers will have access to information on participants.

A report of the study may be submitted for publication, but individual participants will not be identifiable in such a report.

(10) Will the study benefit me?

We cannot and do not guarantee or promise that you or your child will receive any direct benefits from the study. However, your child may find that talking about student voice with other students and the researcher will help them to reflect on their past experiences of student voice, as well as develop their skills and understanding of research processes. The research is also intended to inform [NAME OF SCHOOL's] student consultation and participation processes and improve communication between teachers and students, benefitting the student body and staff.

(11) Can I tell other people about the study?

Yes.

(12) What if I require further information about the study or my child's involvement?

When you have read this information, Eve Mayes is available to discuss it with you further and answer any questions you may have. Eve Mayes can also be contacted via email: evde8182@uni.sydney.edu.au. If you have any questions about the research project or you want to talk about it, you can also contact Associate Professor Deb Hayes, (02) 9351 6389, email: deb.hayes@sydney.edu.au.

(13) What if I have a complaint or any concerns?

Any person with concerns or complaints about the conduct of a research study can contact The Manager, Human Ethics Administration, University of Sydney on +61 2 8627 8176 (Telephone); +61 2 8627 8177 (Facsimile) or ro.humanethics@sydney.edu.au (Email).

This information sheet is for you to keep
4. Parents of student participants previously or currently in the Steering Committee – Consent forms

PARENTAL (OR CAREGIVER) CONSENT FORM – Students previously or currently in [NAME OF SCHOOL’S] student Steering Committee

I, ............................................................................ [PRINT NAME], agree to permit ................................................................................................................................................................................................. [PRINT CHILD’S NAME], who is aged ........ years, to participate in the research project

TITLE Students’ constructions of student participation

In giving my consent I acknowledge that:

1. The procedures required for the project and the time involved for my child’s participation in the project have been explained to me, and any questions I have about the project have been answered to my satisfaction.

2. I have read the Information Statement and have been given the opportunity to discuss the information and my child’s involvement in the project with the researcher/s.

3. I understand that being in this study is completely voluntary – I am not under any obligation to consent to my child’s participation.

4. I understand that the research will take place in the form of focus groups responding to a scenario, creating a scenario and responding to another group’s scenario. I understand that all participants who were involved in the Steering Committee during the period of 2010-2013 will also get a chance to discuss all the scenarios and their main ideas as a larger group. I understand that all these activities are about student participation in school decision-making.

5. I understand that if my child becomes distressed during the research, the research activity will be stopped. My child will be given the name of the school counsellor.

6. I understand that my child’s involvement is strictly confidential. I understand that research data gathered from the results of the study may be published however no information about my child nor I will be used in any way that is identifiable.

7. I understand that if a child discloses physical or sexual abuse, or risk of harm, the researchers will inform the school principal.

8. I understand that I can withdraw my child from the study at any time without prejudice to my or my child’s relationship with the researcher/s or the University of Sydney or [NAME OF SCHOOL] now or in the future.
9. I understand that my child can withdraw from participation in the focus group at any time if my child or I do not wish for discussions to continue. However, as it is a group discussion it will not be possible to exclude individual data to that point.

10. I understand that the information that my child provides will be stored securely during the study on a password-protected electronic device, and physical copies of anything that they create will be stored in a locked filing cabinet in the office of Eve Mayes at the University of Sydney. I understand that, after the study is completed, all audio/visual/text/physical data will be stored in a locked filing cabinet in the Chief Investigator's office. It will be stored for 7 years and then shredded/erased.

11. I understand that my child will not receive any compensation for being involved in the project, apart from further opportunities to develop his/her skills and understanding of research processes. I understand that the research is intended to inform [NAME OF SCHOOL’S] student consultation and participation processes and improve communication between teachers and students, benefitting the student body and staff.

12. I understand that my child also has to consent to take part in the research study.

13. I consent to:

   • Audio-recording YES ☐ NO ☐

   • Video-recording YES ☐ NO ☐

   • Recording/photocopying of visuals/texts produced as scenarios YES ☐ NO ☐

   • Publishing of visuals/photos/texts produced by my child (The photographs will only be of your child’s work, not of your child) YES ☐ NO ☐

   • My child’s group’s scenario being read/viewed by another student group YES ☐ NO ☐

   • Receiving Feedback YES ☐ NO ☐

If you answered YES to the “Receiving Feedback” question, please provide your details i.e. mailing address, email address.

**Feedback Option**
Address: ____________________________________________

_______________________________________________

Email: ____________________________________________

.................................................................
Signature of Parent/Caregiver

.................................................................
Please PRINT name

.................................................................
Date
5. Parents of student participants previously or currently in the Steering Committee – PIS (Arabic translation)

مبدئي الطلاب لمشاركة الطلاب
بيان معلومات الآباء (أو القائمين بالرعاية) - الطلاب في السنوات العاشرة أو الحادية عشر أو الثانية عشر

(1) عُمّ تدور هذه الدراسة؟

أثناء مسح للطفل بالمجموعة في دراسة “مشاركة الطلاب” (مصدر: مسح مشاركة الطلاب في صناعة
المدرسة المدرسية).

(2) من الذي يقوم بإداررة الدراسة؟

أتم إجراء هذه الدراسة من قبل إيف ماس. وهي جزء من درجة دكتوراة الفلسفة الخاصة بها بجامعة سيدني تحت
إشراف الأستاذ الدكتور ديب هايس. سيتم مشتركه النتائج من هذه الدراسة في رسالة دكتوراه الفلسفة الخاصة برف
واس، بالإضافة إلى أنه سيتم مشتركتها في تقرير قصير للدراسة والمجتمعات والمدرسة.

(3) ما الذي تطور عليه هذه الدراسة؟

تتطلب الدراسة على عدد من الأنشطة البحثية المختلفة. يمكن أن يكون استخبارات إذا كانت
تؤدي مشاركة طفل او نزلة الدراسة عدد أو مرحلة. قد يتم تسجيل كل الأنشطة على شكل
ملفات صوتية أو ملفات فيديو حسب ما يعتبره كتب وطفل الطفل الطلاب الذين
تستجوبن شكل النشاط معهم - على أن يتم تسجيلهم أم لا. سيتم تسجيل الأنشطة البحثية
المجموعة المركز والمجموعة الأخرى فقط في حالة مواجهة كل الطالب المشارك،
أو إذا أرادوا أن يتم التفاعل أو المشاركة في المجموعة. تم تجنيد الطلاب من ذوي الحساب في
المجموعة سيعتبر في صفوف الدراسة المحددة.

(4) كم من الوقت تستغرق الدراسة؟

إيجابيات مجموعة الترخيص vue لأحد السيناريوهات – سيختبر طفل مجموعه من 3-4 طالب وستفاضون
مع الاجابة للتحديد مجموعه لمجموعة الترخيص. ستستجيب مجموعة طفل لجميع السيناريوهات المقدمة على المسائل
المحورية بصور الطلاب ونساطش الكيفية التي ترتبط بها هذه السيناريوهات بتجربتهم الخاصة. ستخطط
كل طفل شارك في مجموعة ترخيص واحدة تستغرق حوالي 30 دقيقة.

إنشاء سيناريو في مجموعة - سيعرض طفل المشارك بعدم إنشاء السيناريو الخاص به كمجموعة نادراً
على تجارب مجموعة مع صوت الطلاب. بعد قيام مجموعة بإنشاء سيناريو، ستتحاول على
السيناريو الخاص بهم بالباحث. سيتعرض كل طفل شارك في مجموعة ترخيص واحدة تستغرق حوالي
ساعة.

تسدير مجموعة السيناريو مجموعه أخرى - بعد قيام جميع المجموعات بإنشاء السيناريوهات الخاصة بهم،
سيأتي النتائج الإجابة السيناريوهات قامت مجموعه أخرى بإجابة. يقومون بأداية الأشكال الرئيسية
التي يعكون أنهم قاموا إجابة أخرى من خلال سيناريو المجموعة الأخرى. سيتعرض كل طفل شارك في
مجموعة ترخيص واحدة تستغرق حوالي 30 دقيقة.

التحليل الجماعي الأكبر لجميع السيناريوهات - بعد قيام جميع المجموعات بإنهاء السيناريوهات، سيقوم
أخرى، سيتم دعوة كل المشارك في الجماعة الطلابي كي يقوموا بإيصال النتائج الرئيسية من كل
السيناريوهات ك مجموعة أكبر. سيكون هناك جلسة تحليل بيانات مشتركة واحدة مع كل الطلاب
المشاركين. تستغرق هذه الجلسة حوالي ساعة.
ستفاوض الباحث مع طلابه حول الأوقات التي ستعض فيها الأنشطة البحثية حيث يتم تقليل تعب الباحث في استخدام الطالب إلى أقل حد ممكن، الطالبين الذين ليهؤلون في المشاركة سيعطون في صورتهم الدراسية المرجوة تستغرق اجتماع مجمّعة التفكير الجماعي لأي سايرة يبحثون حول 30 دقيقة. تستغرق الدراسة الجماعية للسياقين حوالي ساعة. تستغرق التغيير الجماعي لسيرة مجموع أخرى حوالي 30 دقيقة (تفصيل حصة دراسية) وسياق في غضون الأسبوع السادس من الفصل الدراسي الأول. تستغرق التحليج الجماعي الأكبر للسياقين حوالي ساعة وسبع في خضم الأسبوع التامن من الفصل الدراسي الأول.

هل يستطيع طللب الانسحاب من الدراسة؟

إن المشاركة في هذه الدراسة طوعا تماما. إنها ليست مجزأة على حال من الأحوال بالموافقة على مشاركة طلبت.

إن قرارك - سواء بالسماح لطلبت بالمشاركة أو الرفض - لن يؤثر على نتائج طلبت المدرسية أو تقدمه المدرس أو يضر بعلاقتك أو علاقات طلبت المتستقبلية بجامعة سيني. إذا قررتTA الصلاح لطلبت بالمشاركة، فإن تلك الحفيدة في مجتمع مفاقمة طلبت ورفقاء طلبت في أي وقت دون أن يؤثر ذلك على علاقتك بجامعة سيني أو بمدرسة هوORD. سيكون هناك موظف-r بمساءة أبابا المشاركون في المدرسة يمكن أيضاً التحدث إليه إذا اهتم طلبت من الدراسة.

إذا شارك طلبت في مجموعة تزيين أو اراد الانسحاب، فيما إن هذه مناقشة جماعية تلائم يمكنه استعداد

البيانات الفردية بعد الجلسة.

ماذا لو شعر طلبت بالضغط أثناء الأنشطة البحثية؟

سيأسف طلبت بخبر الباحث أبدا إذا كان هناك أي شيء تحدث عنه طلبت أثناء البحث يشعر بالضغط تقدم

إياف الأنشطة البحثية. سيعد طلبت اسم الأخصائي الاجتماعي للدراسة تحدث إليه إذا كان يود التحدث إلى شخص

ما بشكل أكبر.

هل سيسمع أي شخص مايقوله طللب للباحثين؟

لا، لن يعرف أي شخص معلومات التي يعطبها طلبت للباحثين. جميع المعلومات سرية للغاية.

إذا تعرض طلبت لأي بدني أو جسمي أو احتمالية ضرر فيقوم الباحثين بالإعلام مدرة.

ما الذي يحدث للمعلومات التي يقدماها طلبت؟

سيتم استخدام المعلومات التي تقدماها طلبت فقط من قبل الباحثين في هذا المشروع من أجل الإعلام عن قائمهم برادة مشاركة الطلاب. جميع جوانب الدراسة بما في ذلك النتائج، ستكون سرية تماما وسيكون بإمكان الباحثين فقط الوصول إلى معلومات من الباحثين، سيتم إيصالات هوية البيانات (بما في ذلك أي نصوص تم إنتاجها من قبل الطلاب والباحثين) من المستندات المادية للدراسة. إن يرغب أي شخص معلومات الباكيمانتة التي أطلبه طلبت للباحثين وأن يصبح لأي شخص آخر عاود الباحثين أن يقوم باستخدام المعلومات.

أثناء الدراسة، سيتم تخزين المعلومات التي يقدماها طلبت بشكل مام على جهاز الكمبيوتر بمحمية كلمة مرور وسيتم تخزين النسخ المادية لأي شيء يقوم طلبت بناءه في خزانة إيداع مفتوحة في مكتب أقدم بجامعة سيني. بعد إتمام الدراسة، سيتم تخزين كل البيانات المادية المجمعة التحضيرية/التصريفة في خزانة إيداع مفتوحة في مكتب أكبر الباحثين. سيتم تخزينها لمدة سنة ست ثم يتم تزويدها أو تسليمه.

هل سيعرف أي شخص آخر النتائج؟

جميع جوانب الدراسة، بما في ذلك النتائج، ستكون سرية تماما وسيكون بإمكان الباحثين فقط الوصول إلى معلومات عن الباحثين.

قد يتم تقديم تقرير عن الدراسة من أجل النشر لكن لن يكون بالإمكان التعرف على الباحثين الأفراد في مثل هذا التقرير.

هل ستكون هذه الدراسة؟

324
لا يستطيع أن نمضآن ولانضمن أو نعلم أن تحصل أنت أو طالب على أي فوائد مباشرة من الدراسة. ومع ذلك، فقد بجد طالب أن أحدث عن صوت الطلاب أن يلاحظ وينبغي أن يتاح في تجربتهم السابقة مع صوت الطلاب بالإضافة إلى تجربة مهاراتهم وفهمهم للعمليات البحثية. إن الغرض أيضًا من هذا البحث هو الإعاث عن العمليات الاستشارية وعمليات المشاركة بالطالب بدراسة [NAME OF SCHOOL] وتحسين التواصل بين المدرسين والطلاب وإعادة الطلاب والموظفين.

(11) هل يمكنني إخبار الآخرين عن الدراسة؟

نعم.

(12) لماذا أود الحصول على المزيد من المعلومات عن الدراسة أو مشاركة طلبي؟

عند قراءتك لهذه المعلومات، ستكون إيف ماس متاحة لمناقشة إ_office@uni.sydney.edu.au تلقائيًا. يمكن أيضًا الاتصال بإيف ماس عبر البريد الإلكتروني: إيف ماس، 8176 8627 261 فاکس: 8177 8627 261 إلكتروني: ro.humanethics@sydney.edu.au هايم، 9358 6389 (02) بريد إلكتروني: evde8182@uni.sydney.edu.au إيف ماس، 8176 8627 261 فاکس: 8177 8627 261 إلكتروني: ro.humanethics@sydney.edu.au

(13) ماذا لو كان لدى أي شكاوى أو مخاوف؟

يمتلك أي شخص لديه مخاوف أو شكاوى بشأن اجراء الدراسة البحثية أن يتصل بالمدير، إدارة الأخلاءات البشرية، جامعتي سيدني على هاتف 768177 8627 261 فاکس 8177 8627 261 إلكتروني: ro.humanethics@sydney.edu.au

ورقة المعلومات هذه مخصصة للذين يعفون بها.
6. Parents of student participants previously or currently in the Steering Committee – Consent form (Arabic translation)

أوافق أنا ... [عدد الوصاية] على السماح لـ [أَكْتَب إِسْمِ الطَّالِب]، والبالغ من العمر ... سنة، بالمشاركة في مشروع البحث.

1. أنني قد قمت بقراءة بيان المعلومات وتم إعطائي الفرصة لمناقشة المعلومات ومشاركة طفل في المشروع مع الباحث/باحثين.

2. أنني أتفهم أن المشاركة في هذه الدراسة اختيارية تماماً - أنني ليست تحت أي إجبار للمواافقة على المشاركة طفلي.

3. أنني أتفهم أن البحث سيتم على هيئة مجموعات تكزيع تستخدم إلى سيباريو وتقوم بإنشاء سيباريو وتستجيب لسيباريو مجموع أخرى. أنني أتفهم أن كل المشتركين في الأعوام 10-12 سيحصلون أيضاً على رخصة لمناقشة جميع السيناريوهات وأفكارهم الرئيسية كمجموعة أكبر. أنني أتفهم أن كل تلك الأنشطة/مشاركة الطفل في اتخاذ القرار المدرسي.

4. أنني أتفهم أن البحث سيتم على هيئة جماعات تكزيع سرية تماماً. أنني أتفهم أن المعلومات التي يجمعها من نتائج الدراسة قد يتم نشرها إلا أنني لن أتمكن من إستماع المعلومات عن طفل أو على أي طريقة يمكن التعرف عليها.

5. أنني أتفهم أنه إذا شعر طفل بشعور خاص أثناء البحث، سيتم إيقاف النشاط البحثي. سيتم إعطاء اسم الأطفال.

6. أنني أتفهم أن المشاركة طهيرية تماماً. أنني أتفهم أن المعلومات التي يجمعها من نتائج الدراسة قد يتم نشرها إلا أنني لن أتمكن من إستماع المعلومات عن طفل أو على أي طريقة يمكن التعرف عليها.

7. أنني أتفهم أن حالة تعرض طفل لأي بندي أو جسدي أو احتمالية ضرر سيقوم الباحثين بإعلام مدير المدرسة.

8. أنني أتفهم أن بالكاني سحب طفل من الدراسة في أي وقت دون حدوث ضرر على الطفل في نقاط الت المدرسة [NAME OF SCHOOL] أو جامعة سيدي أو مدرسة [NAME OF SCHOOL].

9. أنني أتفهم أن بالكاني سحب الطفل من المشاركة في مجموعة التكزيع في أي وقت إذا لم يكن يرغب الطفل أو لم أرغب أنا في استمرار المناقشات. ومع ذلك، وحيث إن هذه المناقشات جماعية فإن يكون من الممكن إستبعاد البيانات الفردية عن هذه المرحلة.

10. أنني أتفهم أن المعلومات التي يقوم طفل بتقديمها سيتم تخزينها بشكل آمن أثناء الدراسة على جهاز الكمبيوتر المحض بكمية محدودة. أنني أتفهم أن سيتم تخزين النسخ المائية لأي شيء يقومون بإنشاؤه في خزانة إيداع مفقودة في مكتب أي ملف بحثي متعلق بجامعة سيدي. أنني أتفهم أنه بعد إتمام الدراسة، سيتم تخزين كل البيانات المالية السمعية/البصرية/النصية في خزانة إيداع مفقودة في مكتب كبير الباحثين. سيتم تخزينها لمدة سبع سنوات ثم سيتم تعريفها أو طمسها.
أنتم أن طفلك لن يحظى على أي تعويض مقابل مشاركته في المشروع عدا عن المزيد من الفرص لتنمية مهاراته وفهم العمليات البحثية. أنتم أن هذا الغرض من هذا البحث هو الإعلام عن العمليات الاستشارية وعمليات المشاركة للطالب.

11. أنتم أن على طفلك أيضاً أن يوافق على المشاركة في الدراسة البحثية.

- لا
- نعم

- لا
- نعم

- لا
- نعم

12. التسجيل الصوتي

- لا
- نعم

- تسجيل الفيديو

- لا
- نعم

13. أن يتم قراءة سيناريو مجموعة طفلك أو الإلقاء عليه من قبل مجموعة طلاب أخرى.

- لا
- نعم

- لا
- نعم

- لا
- نعم

أوافق على:

- تسجيل الصوتي
- تسجيل الفيديو
- التسجيل/التصوير الصوتي للمواد البصرية/العكوس الملتقطة كسيناريوهات

إذا كان رداً هو نعم على سؤال "الثقة تعني استجابة"، فضلًا قم بتزويج بيانتك مثل عنوان المراسلات وعنوان البريد الإلكتروني.

خيار المشاركة الاستجابة

العنوان: ______________________________

البريد الإلكتروني: ______________________________

توقيع الأب/القائم بالرعاية

فضلاً، بمجرد الإسم بحروف واضحة

التاريخ
7. Student participants (beyond Steering Committee students) – PIS

Students’ constructions of student participation
PARTICIPANT INFORMATION STATEMENT
(CHILDREN UNDER 18 YEARS)

This is an information sheet to help you decide whether you want to take part in a research study about student participation.

(1) **What is the study about?**

You are invited to participate in a study of ‘student participation’ (a term that describes the involvement of students in school decision-making).

You were selected as a possible participant in this study because you are a student at [NAME OF SCHOOL] who has an interest in student participation. The study is trying to find out about what students think about participating in school decision-making. Finding out these things will help adults in schools, researchers and other young people think more about how to work together in school decision-making.

(2) **Who is carrying out the study?**

The study is being conducted by Eve Mayes. It is part of her Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) at The University of Sydney under the supervision of Associate Professor Deb Hayes. The results from this study will be shared in the PhD thesis of Eve Mayes, as well as in a short report to the Department of Education and Communities and the school.

(3) **What does the study involve?**

As part of this research study, Eve Mayes is observing the opportunities for student voice and the ways in which students, teachers and parents think about student voice in the wider school community. As part of these observations of the school community, students may be invited to be involved in a number of different research activities. You may choose to be involved or to leave the study at any stage. All activities may be recorded as audio- or video-files, depending on whether you and your parents agree for you to be recorded. All research activities will be held in the library. Interviews or focus groups may be conducted during class time or during breaks, in consultation with participants. If you do not wish to participate, you will remain in your scheduled classes or will continue your regular activities.

1. **Individual or group interview/ discussion** – You may be asked to be interviewed, and you will choose whether you would prefer to be interviewed individually, or with a friend, or in a group of 3-6 students. Topics for discussion may include what you think student voice means, your experiences of student voice and school, and how to change a school. You might also be asked to choose one scenario (written by the researcher) about student voice to read/ listen to/ view. You will discuss the scenario with your group and how the scenario relates to your own experiences of student voice. You will decide as a group whether you agree to be recorded (on an audio- or video-file). Participants will be interviewed or participate in an interview once. These interviews will take approximately 45 minutes.

2. **Creating a visual/ photograph/ text scenario in a group** – You may be invited to draw a picture, take photographs of your own work, or write a text with others in a group based on your group’s experiences of school. After your
group has composed your texts, the researcher may ask you some questions about what you have made/written. Participants will participate in this text creation focus group once. This focus group will take approximately 45 minutes.

(4) How much time will the study take?

The researcher will negotiate with you the times when research activities will occur, so your school day is minimally disrupted. Interviews or focus groups may be conducted during class time or during breaks, in consultation with participants. Participants who do not wish to participate will remain in their scheduled classes or will continue their regular activities. These interviews/focus groups will take approximately 45 minutes.

(5) Do I have to take part in the research? Can I withdraw from the study?

You do not have to take part in this research. It's up to you. Participation is completely voluntary. You don't have to say yes.

Even if you choose to take part at the beginning, you can change your mind and choose not to take part later on. All you need to do is tell the researcher that you don't want to take part in the research any more. There will be a Participant Liaison staff member at the school who you can also speak to if you want to leave the study. You can also decide not to answer any questions you don't want to. If you decide to not take part or to stop being involved in the study, it will not affect your school results or progress or your future relations with The University of Sydney or [NAME OF SCHOOL].

If you take part in a group discussion and wish to leave, as this is a group discussion it will not be possible to delete your individual comments once the session has started.

(6) What if the research makes me feel upset?

If anything that you talk about during the research makes you feel upset, you can tell the researcher and the research activity will be stopped. The researcher will give you the name of the school counsellor to talk to, if you wish to speak to someone further.

(7) Will anyone hear about what I tell you?

In any research report that is published, no one will know what information you gave the researchers. If you take part in a group discussion, the other participants in the group will know what you talk about.

The only times that the researcher will have to tell someone is if you tell them that someone has physically or sexually abused or neglected you or that there is a risk that you will be hurt in the future. The researcher would also have to tell someone if you said you might hurt yourself or someone else. If these things happened they would tell the school principal.

(8) What will happen to the information I tell you?

The information that you tell the researchers will only be used by them to help them write about student voice. All aspects of the study, including results, will be strictly confidential and only the researchers will have access to information on participants. No one will know what information you gave the researcher and no one else apart from the researcher will be allowed to use the information.
During the study, the information you tell the researchers will be stored securely on a password-protected electronic device, and physical copies of anything that you create will be stored in a locked filing cabinet in the office of Eve Mayes at the University of Sydney. After the study is completed, all audio/visual/ text/ physical data will be stored in a locked filing cabinet in the Chief Investigator’s office. It will be stored for 7 years and then shredded/ erased.

(9) Will anyone else know the results?

The information could be used with information from other young people in reports or papers about the research. You will not be able to be identified in these reports or papers.

(10) Will the study benefit me?

We cannot and do not guarantee or promise that you will receive any benefits from the study. However, you may find that talking about student voice with other students and the researcher will help you to reflect on your past experiences of school, as well as develop your skills and understanding of research processes. The research is also intended to inform [NAME OF SCHOOL’S] student consultation and participation processes and improve communication between teachers and students, benefitting the student body and staff.

(11) Can I tell other people about the study?

Yes.

(12) What if I want to know more about the study?

When you have read this information, Eve Mayes is available to discuss it with you further and answer any questions you may have. Eve Mayes can also be contacted via email: evde8182@uni.sydney.edu.au. If you have any questions about the research project or you want to talk about it, you can also contact Associate Professor Deb Hayes, (02) 9351 6389, email: deb.hayes@sydney.edu.au.

(13) What if I have a complaint or any concerns?

Any person with concerns or complaints about the conduct of a research study can contact The Manager, Human Ethics Administration, University of Sydney on +61 2 8627 8176 (Telephone); +61 2 8627 8177 (Facsimile) or ro.humanethics@sydney.edu.au (Email).

This information sheet is for you to keep
8. Student participants (beyond Steering Committee students) – Consent form

STUDENT CONSENT FORM

I,........................................................................[PRINT NAME], agree to be involved in the research project

TITLE: Students’ constructions of student participation.

My parent/ caregiver has agreed for me to take part in the research. I understand that the research is trying to find out about what students think about being involved in school decision-making.

In giving my consent I acknowledge that:

1. The procedures required for the project and the time involved for my participation in the project have been explained to me, and any questions I have about the project have been answered to my satisfaction.

2. I have read the Information Statement and have been given the opportunity to discuss the information and my involvement in the project with the researcher/s.

3. I understand that being in this study is completely voluntary – I am not under any obligation to consent to my participation.

4. I understand that the research will take place in the form of informal interviews, and/ or group discussions responding to and/ or composing visuals/ photos/ texts. I understand that all these activities are about student participation in school decision-making.

5. I understand that if anything I talk about during the research makes me feel upset I will let the researcher know and the research will be stopped. I will be given the name of the school counsellor who I can talk to about what is making me upset, if that is what I want to do.

6. I understand that my involvement is strictly confidential. I understand that research data gathered from the results of the study may be published however no information about me or my family will be used in any way that is identifiable.

7. I understand that if I disclose physical or sexual abuse, or risk of harm, the researchers will inform the school principal.

8. I understand that I can withdraw from the study at any time without prejudice to my relationship with the researcher/s or the University of Sydney or [NAME OF SCHOOL] now or in the future.

9. I understand that, if I am interviewed, I can stop the interview at any time if I do not wish to continue. The audio recording will be erased and the information provided will not be included in the study.
10. I understand that I can stop my participation in the group discussion at any time if I do not wish to continue; however as it is a group discussion it will not be possible to exclude individual data to that point.

11. I understand that the information that I provide will be stored securely during the study on a password-protected electronic device, and physical copies of anything that I create will be stored in a locked filing cabinet in the office of Eve Mayes at the University of Sydney. I understand that, after the study is completed, all audio/visual/ text/ physical data will be stored in a locked filing cabinet in the Chief Investigator’s office. It will be stored for 7 years and then shredded/ erased.

12. I understand that I will not receive any compensation for being involved in the project, apart from further opportunities to develop my skills and understanding of research processes. I understand that the research is intended to inform [NAME OF SCHOOL’S] student consultation and participation processes and improve communication between teachers and students, benefitting the student body and staff.

13. I understand that my parent/ caregiver also has to consent for me to take part in the research study.

14. I consent to:

- Audio-recording □ YES □ NO □
- Video-recording □ YES □ NO □
- Recording/ photocopying of visuals/ texts produced during the interview/ focus group □ YES □ NO □
- Publishing of visuals/ photos/ texts produced by me (The photographs will only be of my work, not of me) □ YES □ NO □
- Receiving Feedback □ YES □ NO □

If you answered YES to the “Receiving Feedback” question, please provide your details i.e. mailing address, email address.

**Feedback Option**

**Address:** ______________________________________________________

____________________________________________________

**Email:** ______________________________________________________
Signature of young person

Please PRINT name

Date
9. Student participants (beyond Steering Committee students) – PIS
Modified to support the inclusion of students from the school’s Support Unit

Students’ constructions of student participation
PARTICIPANT INFORMATION STATEMENT
(CHILDMREN UNDER 18 YEARS)

This is an information sheet to help you decide whether you want to take part in a research study about students talking to teachers about what they like and don’t like.

(1) What is the study about?

You are invited to participate in a study that is about students talking to teachers about what they like and don’t like about school.

You were asked if you want to be part of this study because you are a student at [NAME OF SCHOOL].

If you are interested in this research, you might want to ask someone to help you read the form.

(2) Who is carrying out the study?

Eve Mayes is doing this research. It is part of her Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) at The University of Sydney. Associate Professor Deb Hayes is her supervisor.

(3) What does the study involve?

Eve Mayes is asking students from [NAME OF SCHOOL] about what they think about school, and how students can talk to teachers about any changes that they would like to make at school.

Eve Mayes might ask you if you want to be involved in a group interview/discussion. You can choose if you want to be interviewed with a friend or in a group of 3-6 students. Topics for discussion may include what you think about
school, how students can talk to teachers about what they like to learn, and how to change a school.

You can choose when you want to have the discussion: in class time or during recess or lunch. If you don’t want to be involved, you can just stay in class. Group discussions will be in the library.

You will decide whether you agree to be recorded (on an audio- or video-file).

You may be invited to draw a picture, take photographs of your own work, or write a text with others in a group based on your group’s experiences of school. Eve Mayes might ask you some questions about your work.

(4)  Do I have to take part in the research? Can I withdraw from the study?

You can say yes or no. It is up to you whether you take part.

You can ask for the interview to stop at any time or to leave the discussion. It will take no longer than 45 minutes.
If you decide to not take part or to stop being involved in the study, it will not affect your school results or progress or your future relations with The University of Sydney or [NAME OF SCHOOL].

(5) What if the research makes me feel upset?

If anything that you talk about during the research makes you feel upset, you can tell the researcher and the research activity will be stopped.

(6) Will anyone hear about what I tell you?

The discussion would be private. Eve Mayes will not tell your teachers or your family what you say.

If you say that anyone has hurt you, Eve Mayes will need to tell the school principal to help you.

(7) What will happen to the information I tell you? Will anyone else know the results?

The information that you tell the researchers will only be used by them to help them write about what students think about talking about school. Your name will not be used in any report that Eve Mayes writes.

The information could be used with information from other students in reports about the research. People will not know if Eve Mayes talking about what you said when they read these reports.

(8) Will the study benefit me?

You will not receive any benefits from the study. But, you might like talking about school with other students and the researcher. Eve Mayes also hopes to help [NAME OF SCHOOL] and other schools from this research.
(9) Can I tell other people about the study?

Yes.

(10) What if I want to know more about the study?

When you have read this information, Eve Mayes is available to discuss it with you further and answer any questions you may have. If you would like to know more about the project, you can speak to either Eve Mayes or Deb Hayes at The University of Sydney.

Eve Mayes can also be contacted via email: evde8182@uni.sydney.edu.au. You can contact Associate Professor Deb Hayes on (02) 9351 6389, email: deb.hayes@sydney.edu.au.

(11) What if I have a complaint or any concerns?

Any person with concerns or complaints about the conduct of a research study can contact The Manager, Human Ethics Administration, University of Sydney on +61 2 8627 8176 (Telephone); +61 2 8627 8177 (Facsimile) or ro.humanethics@sydney.edu.au (Email).

Thank you for taking the time to read this letter and for your help. If you would like to be part of this research, please sign the attached form and return it to school.

This information sheet is for you to keep
10. Student participants (beyond Steering Committee students) – Consent form Modified to support the inclusion of students from the school’s Support Unit

STUDENT CONSENT FORM

I, ..................................................................................[PRINT NAME], agree to be involved in the research project

TITLE: Students’ constructions of student participation.

Please read and check if you agree with the following statements.

1. I understand that the research is about students talking to teachers about what they like and don’t like about school. The research has been explained to me, and I have been able to ask any questions that I might have about the activities or the time.

2. I understand that I do not have to be part of this research. It is up to me whether I take part.

3. I understand that the research will take place in the form of group discussions and making visuals/photos/texts about students talking to teachers about school.

4. I understand that if anything I talk about during the research makes me feel upset I will let the researcher know and the research will be stopped.
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5. I understand that the discussion would be **private**. Eve Mayes will not tell my teachers or my family what I say. *My name won’t be used* in any reports.

6. I understand that if I say that anyone has *hurt* me, Eve Mayes will need to tell the school principal to help me.

7. I understand that I can stop being part of the research at any time and *it won’t affect my relationship* with Eve Mayes, Associate Professor Deb Hayes or The University of Sydney.

8. I understand that *I can stop the discussion* and leave at any time if I do not wish to continue. If I am in a group discussion, I can leave and the discussion will continue.

9. I understand that Eve Mayes will look after information from the research for 7 years. She will keep it **private and safe**.

10. I understand that *I will not get anything* for being involved in the project.

11. I understand that my parent/ caregiver also has to consent for me to take part in the research study.

12. I consent to:
• Eve Mayes recording our group discussion on an audio-recorder. She will be the only person who listens to this recording

   YES ☐ NO ☐

• Eve Mayes recording our group discussion on a video camera. She will be the only person who watches this video

   YES ☐ NO ☐

• Eve Mayes recording/ photocopying any visuals/ photos/ texts that I create during our group discussion

   YES ☐ NO ☐

• Eve Mayes publishing visuals/ photos/ texts produced by me (The published photographs/ texts will only be of my work, not of me)

   YES ☐ NO ☐

• Receiving feedback: I would like to get a copy of the short report that Eve Mayes writes

   YES ☐ NO ☐

If you answered YES to the “Receiving Feedback” question, please provide your details i.e. mailing address, email address.

**Feedback Option**

**Address:** ____________________________________________
___________________________________________
Email: ____________________________________________

--------------------------------------------------------
Signature of young person

--------------------------------------------------------
Please PRINT name

--------------------------------------------------------
Date
11. Parents of student participants (beyond Steering Committee students) –

PIS for student participation

Students’ constructions of student participation
PARENTAL (OR CAREGIVER) INFORMATION STATEMENT

(1) What is the study about?

You are invited to permit your child to participate in a study of ‘student participation’ (a term that describes the involvement of students in school decision-making).

Your child was selected as a possible participant in this study because they are a student at [NAME OF SCHOOL] who has an interest in student participation. The study is investigating their experiences of participation in school decision-making and research.

(2) Who is carrying out the study?

The study is being conducted by Eve Mayes. It is part of her Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) at The University of Sydney under the supervision of Associate Professor Deb Hayes. The results from this study will be shared in the PhD thesis of Eve Mayes, as well as in a short report to the Department of Education and Communities and the school.

(3) What does the study involve?

As part of this research study, Eve Mayes is observing the opportunities for student voice and the ways in which students, teachers and parents/caregivers think about student voice in the wider school community. As part of these observations of the school community, students may be invited to be involved in a number of different research activities. Your child may choose to be involved or to leave the study at any stage. All activities may be recorded as audio- or video-files, depending on whether you and your child agree that they can be recorded. Focus group and larger group research activities will only be recorded if all student participants and their parents/caregivers consent. All research activities will be held in the library. Interviews or focus groups may be conducted during class time or during breaks, in consultation with participants. Participants who do not wish to participate will remain in their scheduled classes or will continue their regular activities.

1. Individual or group interview/discussion – Your child may be asked to be interviewed, and they will choose whether they would prefer to be interviewed individually, or with a friend, or in a group of 3-6 students. Topics for discussion may include what they think student voice means, experiences of student voice and school, and how to change a school. They might also be asked to choose one scenario (written by the researcher) about student voice to read/listen to/view. They may discuss the scenario with their group and how the scenario relates to their own experiences of student voice. They will decide as a group whether they agree to be recorded (on an audio- or video-file). Participants will be interviewed or participate in an interview once. These interviews/will take approximately 45 minutes.

2. Creating a visual/photograph/text in a group – Your child may be asked as part of a group to draw a picture, take photographs of your own work, or write a text with others in a group based on their experiences of school. After your child’s group has composed their text, the researcher may ask them
some questions about what they have written. Participants will participate in this text creation focus group once. This focus group will take approximately 45 minutes.

(4) **How much time will the study take?**

The researcher will negotiate with your child the times when research activities will occur, so your child’s school day is minimally disrupted. Interviews or focus groups may be conducted during class time or during breaks, in consultation with participants. Participants who do not wish to participate will remain in their scheduled classes or will continue their regular activities. Interviews/ focus groups will take approximately 45 minutes each.

(5) **Can my child withdraw from the study?**

Being in this study is completely voluntary. You are not under any obligation to consent to your child’s participation. Your child can withdraw any time prior to or during the research study.

Your decision whether or not to permit your child to participate will not affect your child’s school results or progress or prejudice you or your child’s future relations with The University of Sydney. If you decide to permit your child to participate, you are free to withdraw your consent and to discontinue your child’s participation at any time without affecting your relationship with the University of Sydney or with [NAME OF SCHOOL]. There will be a Participant Liaison staff member at the school who you can also speak to if you want to withdraw your child from the study.

If your child takes part in a focus group and wishes to withdraw, as this is a group discussion it will not be possible to exclude individual data once the session has commenced.

(6) **What if my child becomes upset during the research activities?**

Your child will be advised to tell the researcher if anything that your child talks about during the research makes him/ her feel upset, and the research activity will be stopped. Your child will be given the name of the school counsellor to talk to, if they wish to speak to someone further.

(7) **Will anyone hear about what my child says to the researchers?**

No, no one will know what information your child gives the researchers. All information is strictly confidential.

If a child discloses physical or sexual abuse, or risk of harm, the researchers will inform the school principal.

(8) **What will happen to the information that my child gives?**

The information that your child gives the researchers will only be used by them to inform their study of student participation. All aspects of the study, including results, will be strictly confidential and only the researchers will have access to information on participants. Data (including any texts produced by students and any audio- or video-recordings) included in publications on the study will be anonymised. No one will know what information your child gave the researchers and no one else apart from the researchers will be allowed to use the information.

During the study, the information your child gives will be stored securely on a password-protected electronic device, and physical copies of anything that your
child creates will be stored in a locked filing cabinet in the office of Eve Mayes at the University of Sydney. After the study is completed, all audio/visual/ text/ physical data will be stored in a locked filing cabinet in the Chief Investigator’s office. It will be stored for 7 years and then shredded/ erased.

(9) **Will anyone else know the results?**

All aspects of the study, including results, will be strictly confidential and only the researchers will have access to information on participants.

A report of the study may be submitted for publication, but individual participants will not be identifiable in such a report.

(10) **Will the study benefit me?**

We cannot and do not guarantee or promise that you or your child will receive any benefits from the study. However, your child may find that talking about student voice with other students and the researcher will help them to reflect on their past experiences of student voice, as well as develop their skills and understanding of research processes. The research is also intended to inform [NAME OF SCHOOL’S] student consultation and participation processes and improve communication between teachers and students, benefitting the student body and staff.

(11) **Can I tell other people about the study?**

Yes.

(12) **What if I require further information about the study or my child’s involvement?**

When you have read this information, Eve Mayes is available to discuss it with you further and answer any questions you may have. Eve Mayes can also be contacted via email: evde8182@uni.sydney.edu.au. If you have any questions about the research project or you want to talk about it, you can also contact Associate Professor Deb Hayes, (02) 9351 6389, email: deb.hayes@sydney.edu.au.

(13) **What if I have a complaint or any concerns?**

Any person with concerns or complaints about the conduct of a research study can contact The Manager, Human Ethics Administration, University of Sydney on +61 2 8627 8176 (Telephone); +61 2 8627 8177 (Facsimile) or ro.humanethics@sydney.edu.au (Email).

This information sheet is for you to keep
12. Parents of student participants (beyond Steering Committee students) – Parent consent for student participation

PARENTAL (OR CAREGIVER) CONSENT FORM

I, ....................................................................................................................................[PRINT NAME], agree to permit
....................................................................................................................................[PRINT CHILD’S NAME], who is aged ...........
years, to participate in the research project

TITLE Students’ constructions of student participation

In giving my consent I acknowledge that:

1. The procedures required for the project and the time involved for my child’s participation in the project have been explained to me, and any questions I have about the project have been answered to my satisfaction.

2. I have read the Information Statement and have been given the opportunity to discuss the information and my child’s involvement in the project with the researcher/s.

3. I understand that being in this study is completely voluntary – I am not under any obligation to consent to my child’s participation.

4. I understand that the research will take place in the form of informal interviews, and/ or group discussions responding to and/ or composing visuals/ photos/ texts. I understand that all these activities are about student participation in school decision-making.

5. I understand that if my child becomes distressed during the research, the research activity will be stopped. My child will be given the name of the school counsellor.

6. I understand that my child’s involvement is strictly confidential. I understand that research data gathered from the results of the study may be published however no information about my child nor I will be used in any way that is identifiable.

7. I understand that if a child discloses physical or sexual abuse, or risk of harm, the researchers will inform the school principal.

8. I understand that I can withdraw my child from the study at any time without prejudice to my or my child’s relationship with the researcher/s or the University of Sydney or [NAME OF SCHOOL] now or in the future.

9. I understand that, if my child is interviewed, they can stop the interview at any time if they do not wish to continue. The audio recording will be erased and the information provided will not be included in the study.
10. I understand that my child can stop my participation in the group discussion at any time if they do not wish to continue; however as it is a group discussion it will not be possible to exclude individual data to that point.

11. I understand that the information that my child provides will be stored securely during the study on a password-protected electronic device, and physical copies of anything that they create will be stored in a locked filing cabinet in the office of Eve Mayes at the University of Sydney. I understand that, after the study is completed, all audio/visual/text/physical data will be stored in a locked filing cabinet in the Chief Investigator’s office. It will be stored for 7 years and then shredded/erased.

12. I understand that my child will not receive any compensation for being involved in the project, apart from further opportunities to develop his/her skills and understanding of research processes. I understand that the research is intended to inform [NAME OF SCHOOL’S] student consultation and participation processes and improve communication between teachers and students, benefitting the student body and staff.

13. I understand that my child also has to consent to take part in the research study.

14. I consent to:

- Audio-recording  YES ☐ NO ☐
- Video-recording  YES ☐ NO ☐
- Recording/photocopying of visuals/texts produced during the interview/focus group  YES ☐ NO ☐
- Publishing of visuals/photos/texts produced by my child (The photographs will only be of your child’s work, not of your child)  YES ☐ NO ☐
- Receiving Feedback  YES ☐ NO ☐

If you answered YES to the “Receiving Feedback” question, please provide your details i.e. mailing address, email address.

Feedback Option

Address: __________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________

Email: __________________________________________________________
Signature of Parent/Caregiver

Please PRINT name

Date
١٣. والدرباء الطلاب للمشاركة الطلابية

١٣.1. والدرباء الطلاب في دراسة "مشاركة الطلاب" (مصطلح يصف مشاركة الطلاب في محاولة التفاوض على مشاركتهم في دراسة)[NAME OF SCHOOL] .

(1) ما الذي يقوم بإجراء الدراسة؟

يتولي طالب consolidate Cooperate في هذه الدراسة أن يaklıب في مدرسة [NAME OF SCHOOL] مهتمًا بالمشاركة الطلابية. هذه الدراسة تبحث أثراتها في المشاركة في إتخاذ القرار الدراسي والبحث.

(2) من الذي يقوم بإجراء الدراسة؟

يتم إجراء هذه الدراسة من قبل ايف ماس. وهي جزء من درجة دكتوراه الفلسفة الخاصة بها بجامعة سيدي نكاح إثر الفاصل الدراسي بديل هنري. يتم مشاركة التحليل من هذه الدراسة في رسالة دكتوراه الفلسفة الخاصة بـ[NAME OF SCHOOL] بالإضافة إلى أنه سيتي مشاركتها في تقرير قصير لوزارة التعليم والمجتمع والمدرسة.

(3) ما الذي ينتظر عليه هذه الدراسة؟

تجزء من هذه الدراسة البحثية، تقوم ايف ماس بتحديد الفرص المتاحة لمجموعة الطلاب والطرق التي يفكّر فيها الطلاب والمشرفون والآباء والقطاعان بالنظرية تحا صوت الطلاب في المجتمع المدرسي الأدنى. كجزء من تلك الملاحظات للمجمع المدرسي، قد تم دفع الأطفال للمشاركة في عدد من الأنشطة البينية المختلفة. يمكن طلاباً اختيار ماراذا كان يرغبون في المشاركة أو تركز الدراسة عند أي مرحلة. قد يتم تسجيل كل الأنشطة على هيئة ملفات صوتية أو ملفات ورقية. حسب ماذا ما كن يوافق أن وطفل على أن يتم تسجيلهم أم لا. يتم تسجيل الأنشطة البحثية لمجموعة الورك والمجموعة الأخبار فقط في حالة موافقة كل الطلاب المشاركون وايهم. القائمين بعملهم. يتم إقامة جميع الأنشطة البحثية في المكتبة. قد يتم إجراء المقابلات أو مجموعات الورك أثناء وقت الصف الدراسي أو أثناء السفر المدرسي. بالتعاون مع المشاركين. المشاركون الذين لا يرغون في المشاركة سيقومون في صفوفهم الدراسة المجدولة أو سيستلموا

في أنشطتهم المعتادة.

41. المقابلة المقامة في الجامعة أو الجماعة - قد يُطلب من طالب أن تتم مقابلته وسكته ماذا كان يفعل المقابلة بشكل فردي أو مع صديق أو في مجموعة من 3 طالب. قد تتضمن مجموعات الشباب تصورهم حول معابضة صوت الطلاب وتجارب صوت الطلاب والمدرسة. وفقًا للمبادرة المدرسية، قد يطلب منهم إخبار تسجيل (مكرون من قبل الباحث) عن صوت الطلاب. يتم قراءته/الاستماع إليه/السماح. قد يقومون بتقديم المقابلة. مع مجموعة ماذا كان يوافق على أن يتم تسجيله (على ملف صوتやすい أو ملف ورق). يتم السجّل في مقابلة مشرف واحد. يستغرق تلك المقابلات حوالي 45 دقيقة.

42. إنشاء تسجيل في المجموعة - قد يُطلب من طالب - حضور في المجموعة - إنشاء السيناريو الخاص به. سأنبأ على خبراتهم بصوت الطلاب. بعد قام مجموعة طالب بإنشاء السيناريو الخاص به، قد يطرح عليهم الباحث بعض الأسئلة عن السيناريو الذي قاموا بإنشائه. سيسكر المشاركون في مجموعة تركز إنشاء السيناريو هذه مرة واحدة. تستغرق مجموعة الورك هذه حوالي 45 دقيقة.

43. كيف يمكن البدء في الدراسة؟

سيقوم الباحث مع طالب حول الأسئلة التي سجّرها فيها الأنشطة البحثية حيث يتم تقليل تعلم اليوس الدراسي لطلاب إلى أقل حد ممكن. يتم إجراء المقابلات أو مجموعة التركيز أثناء وقت الصف الدراسي أو أثناء الفج.
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هل يستطيع طلاب الإسهام من الدورة؟

إن المشاركة في هذه الدورة تماماً إنك تستأجر يا حالي الأحوال للاستماع إلى مشاركة ملتك.

إذا ما كانت ملتك الإسهام في أي وقت قبل الدورة البدنية أو خاللها.

إن قرار ملتك بالمشاركة أو الرفض - لن يؤثر على تنازل ملتك المدرسي أو نحو ما يعلق في ملتك من مشاركة بالمشاركة، فإن تلك الحيرة في مسح مواقفك ورفوع مشاركة ملتك في أي وقت دون أن يؤثر ذلك على مشاركة ملتك بالمشاركة أو مدرسة ملتك، هناك موظف إصال للمشاركون في المدرسة يمكن أيضاً التحدث إليه إذا ما كان ملتك من مدرستهم.

هل سيعود ملتك بالمشاركة أثناء الأنشطة الباحثة؟

سيسمح ملتك بإشار الباحث ما إذا كان هناك أي شيء يتحدث عنه ملتك أثناء البحث يضعه على الملتقى وسنتقبل إفاع الباحث rectified

ما يكون بشكل أكبر.

هل سيسمح أي شخص مايلقى ملتك للباحث؟

لا، لن يعرف أي شخص معلومات التي ي okreبي ملتك للباحث. جميع المعلومات سرية للغاية.

إذا تعرض طلبي لأي من الأسباب أو محدوداً ضرر فيسبو الباحث بدء المدرسة.

ما الذي سيحدث المعلومات التي يقدمها طلبي؟

سيتم استخدام المعلومات التي يكرها ملتك للباحثين من قبلهم فقط للاستعمال عن دراستهم لمشاركاء الطلب. جميع جوانب الدورة، بما في ذلك الطلب، ستكون سرية تماماً وسمنيب بمكنك الفتيان، فقط الوصول إلى معلومات عن المشاركين. سيتم إفشاء هوية البيانات (ما في ذلك أي نصوص تم إنتاجها من قبل الطلاب أو أي نتائج صوتية أو تسجيلات فيديو) لمشتركة من المنتجات الصادرة عن الدورة. إن يعرف أي شخص معلومات التي أعطاه ملتك للباحثين، لسنسيك لا يأسف أية تلبس أو فهم المعلومات.

هل سيعرف أي شخص آخر النتائج؟

جميع جوانب الدورة، بما في ذلك النتائج، ستكون سرية تماماً وسمنيب بمكنك الباحثين فقط الوصول إلى معلومات عن المشاركين.

قد يتم تقديم تقرير عن الدورة من أجل النشر لكن لا يكون بالإمكان التعرف على المشاركين الأفراد في مثل هذا التقرير.

هل تستطيع هذه الدورة؟

لا تستطيع أن تضمن ولا تسمح أو لن أن تجعل أثنا أو طلتك على أي مشاركة في الدورة. ومع ذلك، قد يكون طلتك أن تتحدد عن صور الطلبات مع الطلاب الآخرين، الباحث مساعدتهم على إنجازهم السابقة مع الصور الطلاب بالإضافة إلى تنمية مهاراتهم في فهم المعلومات المتدنية. إن التعرض أيضاً من هذا التحدي هو الأسم عن العملية الاستشراقية وعمليات المشاركة الطلابية بدرسة [NAME OF SCHOOL] وتحسين التواصل بين المدرس وطلابه وفادة الطلبات والموظفين.

هل يمكنني إشاع الأشياء عن الدورة؟
(12) لماذا لو كنت أود الحصول على المزيد من المعلومات عن الدراسة أو مشاركة طفلك؟

عند قراءتك لهذه المعلومات، ستكون إيف مايس متاحة لمناقشاتها معك بشكل أكبر والإجابة عن أي أسئلة قد تكون لديك. يمكن أيضاً الاتصال بهغ ماس عبر البريد الإلكتروني:
إذا كان لديك أي سؤال عن مشروع البحث أو إذا كنت تريد التحدث عنه، فيمكنك أيضاً الاتصال بالأسئلة المشارك ديب هايز، 89351 9351 (02) 661389 (02) بريد الكتروني:
evde8182@uni.sydney.edu.au

deb.hayes@sydney.edu.au

(13) لماذا لو كان لديك أي شكاوى أو مخاوف؟

لا يستطيع أي شخص لديه مخاوف أو شكاوى بشأن إجراء الدراسة البحثية أن يتصل بالمدير، إدارة الأخلاقيات البشرية، جامعة سيدني على هاتف 768177 17786272 612612 612612 بريد الكتروني:
ro.humanethics@sydney.edu.au

ورقة المعلومات هذه مخصصة لاك تحفظ بها.
14. مسؤولون عن الطلاب المشاركين (غير الطلاب الذين توجد في لجنة الإشراف) –
الموافقة على المشاركة في المشروع (الترجمة العربية)

أوافق أنا ………………………….. (أكتب اسم)， على السماح لـ ………………………….. (أكتب اسم الطفل)، والبالغ من
العمر …….. سنة، بالمشاركة في مشروع البحث

العنوان: طلاب مبادئ الطلاب في مشروع البحث:

تتضمّن هذه الموافقة، أعني بما يلي:

1. أنه قد تُبرّر في الإجراءات المطلوبة للمشروع والفرصة الزمنية لمشاركة طفلي في المشروع وأنه قد تم الإجابة على أي
أسئلة قد تكون لدى المشروع بشكل واضح ووضيع.

2. أنني قمت بقراءة بيان المعلومات وتم إعطائي الفرصة لمناقشة المعلومات ومشاركة طفلي في المشروع مع
الباحثين/الباحثات.

3. أنني أتفهم أن المشاركة في هذه الدراسة اختيارية تمامًا - إنني ليست تحت أي إجبار للموافقة على مشاركة طفلي.

4. أنني أتفهم أن البحث سيتم على صورة مقابلات غير رسمية/و/أولاقطات تفاعلية تقوم بالتعاون مع سياوروات أو تشكيلة.

5. أنني أتفهم أن كل هذه الأنشطة المتعلقة بمشاركة الطالب في إتخاذ القرار المدرسي وأن جميع هذه الأنشطة متعلقة بمشاركة
الطالي في إتخاذ القرار المدرسي.

6. أنني أتفهم أن أي الأنشطة سريّة تمامًا. أنني أتفهم أن المعلومات التي يتم جمعها من نتائج الدراسة قد يتم نشرها إلا أنني لن
يستخدم المعلومات عن طفلي أو على أي طريقة يمكن التعرف عليها.

7. أنني أتفهم أنني إذا شعر طفلي بعدم الرضا أثناء البحث، فسأتمكن إيقاف المشاركة و_ssh:pen:01

8. أنني أتفهم أنني إذا شعر طفلي بعدم الرضا أثناء البحث، فسأتمكن إيقاف المشاركة و

9. أنني أتفهم أنني إذا شعر طفلي بعدم الرضا أثناء البحث، فسأتمكن إيقاف المشاركة و

10. أنني أتفهم أنني إذا شعر طفلي بعدم الرضا أثناء البحث، فسأتمكن إيقاف المشاركة و

11. أنني أتفهم أنني إذا شعر طفلي بعدم الرضا أثناء البحث، فسأتمكن إيقاف المشاركة و

جامعة سيدني أو مدرسة [NAME OF SCHOOL]
سيدي. أنفق أنه بعد إتمام الدراسة، سيتم تخزين كل البيانات المادية السمعية/البصرية/النصية في خزانة إبداع مغلقة في
مكتب كبير الباحثين. سيتم تخزينها لمدة سبع سنوات ثم سيتم ترميمها أو طمسها.

أتفهم أن طفلي لن يحصل على أي تعويض مقابل مشاركته في المشروع عدا عن المزيد من الفرص لتنمية مهاراته وفهم
العمليات البحثية. أتفهم أن هذا الغرض من هذا البحث هو الإعلان عن العمليات الاستشارية وعمليات المشاركة للطلاب
بمدرسة [NAME OF SCHOOL]

أتفهم أن طفلي أيضاً أن يوافق على المشاركة في الدراسة البحثية.

أوافق على:

☐ نعم ☐ لا

- التسجيل الصوتي
- تسجيل الفيديو
- التسجيل/التصوير الصوتي للمواد البصرية/النصوص المنتجة أثناء المقابلة/مجموعة التركيز

☐ نعم ☐ لا

- تلقى تغذية استرجاعية

إذا كان ردك هو نعم على سؤال "تلقي تغذية استرجاعية"، فضلاً قم بتزويد بياناتك مثل عنوان المراسلات وعنوان
البريد الإلكتروني.

خيار التغذية الاسترجاعية

العنوان: ______________________________

____________________________

البريد الإلكتروني: ______________________________

________________________________

توقيع الأب/القائم بالرعاية

فضلاً قم بكتابة الإسم بحروف واضحة

التاريخ
15. Teacher participants – PIS

Students’ constructions of student participation
PARTICIPANT INFORMATION STATEMENT (TEACHERS)

(1) **What is the study about?**

You are invited to participate in a study of ‘student participation’ (a term that describes the involvement of students in school decision-making).

You were selected as a possible participant in this study because of your experience of [NAME OF SCHOOL’S] use of student participation as a reform strategy. Students in this student participation group were trained and involved in research investigating teaching and learning reforms at the school. The study is investigating the experiences of participation in school decision-making of the students in this group, as well as experiences of participation in the wider school community, including students, teachers and parents/caregivers.

(2) **Who is carrying out the study?**

The study is being conducted by Eve Mayes and will form the basis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy at The University of Sydney under the supervision of Associate Professor Deb Hayes.

(3) **What does the study involve?**

The study involves participatory research with students, teachers and parents/caregivers, responding to scenarios based on the issues surrounding student participation. This participatory research will be further contextualised by observations of the school community throughout 2013. Research activities with teachers will occur during non-teaching periods, or before or after school, at times negotiated with teachers. Teachers who do not wish to participate will continue their usual working activities.

Teachers are invited to participate in semi-structured interviews, and will choose whether they would prefer to be interviewed individually, with another teacher, or in a group. Topics for discussion will include definitions of student participation, opinions of participation, the school’s context and participation, participation at this school, and school reform. Participants will then choose two scenarios based on the student participation literature to respond to (written by the researcher based on the issues raised in the academic literature). Participants will discuss the issues raised in these scenarios, and how the scenarios relate to their own experiences of student participation. This conversation will be recorded as an audio-file or video-file, depending on the participants’ preferences. Each participating teacher will be interviewed once. Interviews will take approximately 45 minutes.

After all participating teachers have been interviewed (individually or in groups), they will also engage in a group joint data analysis, discussing the key ‘themes’ that they felt emerged in their experiences of student participation and the scenarios that they responded to. This activity will be video recorded (with participant consent) and will be held at a time and location on school grounds chosen by participants. If any participant in the group does not consent to the video-recording of the joint data analysis session, it will not be recorded. There will only be one joint data analysis session with all participating teachers. This session will take approximately 1 hour.

The researcher will be a participant observer in the school community in 2013, exploring the ways in which student participation is conceptualised, enacted and
interpreted in the wider school community. As part of these observations of the school community, teachers are also invited to consent to the researcher visiting their classrooms, at times negotiated with the researcher. These observations will not be recorded in audio- or visual form, but the researcher may take field notes. Any classroom observations will take place during the school day, and so will not take any additional time.

Throughout 2013, teachers may also be invited to be involved in informal interviews or group discussions about student participation. These interviews would be negotiated to be at a time and location convenient for the participants. Each participating teacher will be interviewed once. Interviews will take approximately 45 minutes.

Teachers may choose to be involved or to leave the study at any stage.

(4) How much time will the study take?

The times when the interviews and analysis activity will be held will be negotiated with participants to minimise disruption to the school day. The interviews will take approximately 45 minutes. The larger group analysis of scenarios will take approximately 1 hour. Any classroom observations will take place during the school day, and so will not take any additional time.

(5) Can I withdraw from the study?

Being in this study is completely voluntary. You are not under any obligation to consent. You can withdraw any time prior to or during the research study.

Your decision whether or not to participate will not prejudice your future relations with The University of Sydney. If you decide to participate, you are free to withdraw your consent and to discontinue participation at any time without affecting your relationship with the researchers, the University of Sydney or with [NAME OF SCHOOL].

If you consent to be interviewed, you may stop the interview at any time if you do not wish to continue. The audio recording will be erased and the information provided will not be included in the study.

If you take part in the group analysis activity and wish to withdraw, as this is a group discussion it will not be possible to exclude individual data once the session has commenced.

If you permit the researcher to visit your classroom, you may also ask the researcher to leave at any stage.

(6) Will anyone else know the results?

All aspects of the study, including results, will be strictly confidential and only the researchers will have access to information on participants.

A report of the study may be submitted for publication, but individual participants will not be identifiable in such a report.

(7) What will happen to the information that I tell you?

The information that you give will only be used by the researchers in this project to inform their study of student participation. All aspects of the study, including results, will be strictly confidential and only the researchers will have access to information on participants. No one will know what information you gave the
researchers and no one else apart from the researchers will be allowed to use the information.

During the study, the information you give will be stored securely on a password-protected electronic device, and any physical data will be stored in a locked filing cabinet in the office of Eve Mayes at the University of Sydney. After the study is completed, all data will be stored in a locked filing cabinet in the Chief Investigator's office. It will be stored for 7 years and then shredded/erased.

(8) Will the study benefit me?

We cannot and do not guarantee or promise that you will receive any direct benefits from the study. The research is intended to inform [NAME OF SCHOOL'S] student consultation and participation processes and improve communication between teachers and students, benefitting the student body and staff.

(9) Can I tell other people about the study?

Yes.

(10) What if I require further information about the study or my involvement in it?

When you have read this information, Eve Mayes is available to discuss it with you further and answer any questions you may have. Eve Mayes can also be contacted via email: evde8182@uni.sydney.edu.au. If you would like to know more at any stage, please feel free to contact Associate Professor Deb Hayes, (02) 9351 6389, email: deb.hayes@sydney.edu.au.

(11) What if I have a complaint or any concerns?

Any person with concerns or complaints about the conduct of a research study can contact The Manager, Human Ethics Administration, University of Sydney on +61 2 8627 8176 (Telephone); +61 2 8627 8177 (Facsimile) or ro.humanethics@sydney.edu.au (Email).

This information sheet is for you to keep
16. Teacher participants – Consent form

TEACHER PARTICIPANT CONSENT FORM

I, ....................................................................................................................[PRINT NAME], give consent to my participation in the research project

TITLE: Students’ constructions of student participation

In giving my consent I acknowledge that:

1. The procedures required for the project and the time involved have been explained to me, and any questions I have about the project have been answered to my satisfaction.

2. I have read the Participant Information Statement and have been given the opportunity to discuss the information and my involvement in the project with the researcher/s.

3. I understand that being in this study is completely voluntary – I am not under any obligation to consent.

4. I understand that my involvement is strictly confidential. I understand that any research data gathered from the results of the study may be published however no information about me will be used in any way that is identifiable.

5. I understand that I can withdraw from the study at any time, without affecting my relationship with the researcher(s) or the University of Sydney or [NAME OF SCHOOL] now or in the future.

6. I understand that I can stop the interview at any time if I do not wish to continue, the audio recording will be erased and the information provided will not be included in the study.

7. I understand that I can stop my participation in the focus group at any time if I do not wish to continue; however as it is a group discussion it will not be possible to exclude individual data to that point.

8. I understand that, if the researcher visits my classroom, field notes may be taken. I understand that I can ask the researcher to leave at any time.

9. I consent to:

   • Audio-recording YES ☐ NO ☐
   • Video-recording YES ☐ NO ☐
   • Recording/ photocopying of visuals/ texts produced in group joint data analysis YES ☐ NO ☐
• The researcher visiting my classroom (at times negotiated with me)
   YES ☐   NO ☐

• Receiving Feedback   YES ☐   NO ☐

If you answered YES to the “Receiving Feedback” question, please provide your details i.e. mailing address, email address.

Feedback Option

Address: _______________________________________________________
________________________

Email: _________________________________

...................................................
Signature

...........................................................
Please PRINT name

...........................................................
Date
17. Parent/ caregiver participation – PIS

Students’ constructions of student participation
PARTICIPANT INFORMATION STATEMENT (PARENT/ CAREGIVER INVOLVEMENT)

(1) What is the study about?

You are invited to participate in a study of ‘student participation’ (a term that describes the involvement of students in school decision-making).

You have been invited to participate because you are a parent/ caregiver of a student at [NAME OF SCHOOL]. The study is investigating students’ experiences of participation in school decision-making, as well as understandings of ‘student participation’ in the wider school community, including students, teachers and parents/ caregivers.

(2) Who is carrying out the study?

The study is being conducted by Eve Mayes and will form the basis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy at The University of Sydney under the supervision of Associate Professor Deb Hayes.

(3) What does the study involve?

The study involves participatory research with students, teachers and parents/ caregivers, responding to scenarios based on the issues surrounding student participation. This participatory research will be further contextualised by observations of the school community throughout 2013.

Parents/ caregivers are invited to participate in semi-structured interviews, and will choose whether they would prefer to be interviewed individually, with another parent/ caregiver, or in a group. Topics for discussion will include your experiences of the school, your child’s experiences of school, participation at this school, and school reform. Parent/ caregiver participants will then choose two scenarios based on the student participation literature to respond to (written by the researcher based on the issues raised in the academic literature). Participants will discuss the issues raised in these scenarios, and how the scenarios relate to their own ideas about student participation. This conversation will be recorded as an audio-file or video-file, depending on participants’ preferences. Interviews will be held at a time and location on school grounds chosen by participants. Each participating parent/ caregiver will be interviewed once. Interviews will take approximately 45 minutes and will be held on school grounds.

After all participating parents/ caregivers have been interviewed, they will also engage in one group joint data analysis, discussing the key ‘themes’ that they felt emerged from their discussions of the scenarios. This activity will be video recorded (with participant consent) and will be held at a time and location on school grounds chosen by participants. If any participant in the group does not consent to the video-recording of the joint data analysis session, it will not be recorded. This session will take approximately 1 hour and will be held on school grounds.

Parents/ caregivers may choose to be involved or to leave the study at any stage.

(4) How much time will the study take?
The times when the interviews and analysis activity will be held will be negotiated with parents/ caregivers. The interviews will take approximately 45 minutes. The larger group analysis of scenarios will take approximately 1 hour.

(5) **Can I withdraw from the study?**

Being in this study is completely voluntary. You are not under any obligation to consent to participate. You can withdraw any time prior to or during the research study.

Your decision whether or not to participate will not prejudice you or your child's future relations with The University of Sydney. If you decide to consent to participate, you are free to withdraw your consent at any time without affecting your relationship with the University of Sydney or with [NAME OF SCHOOL].

If you consent to be interviewed, you may stop the interview at any time if you do not wish to continue. The audio recording will be erased and the information provided will not be included in the study.

(6) **Will anyone hear about what I say to the researchers?**

No, no one will know what information you give the researcher. All information is strictly confidential.

(7) **What will happen to the information that I give?**

The information that you give will only be used by the researchers in this project to inform their study of student participation. All aspects of the study, including results, will be strictly confidential and only the researchers will have access to information on participants. No one will know what information you gave the researchers and no one else apart from the researchers will be allowed to use the information.

During the study, the information you give will be stored securely on a password-protected electronic device, and physical copies of anything that you create will be stored in a locked filing cabinet in the office of Eve Mayes at the University of Sydney. After the study is completed, all audio/visual/ text/ physical data will be stored in a locked filing cabinet in the Chief Investigator’s office. It will be stored for 7 years and then shredded/ erased.

(8) **Will anyone else know the results?**

All aspects of the study, including results, will be strictly confidential and only the researchers will have access to information on participants.

A report of the study may be submitted for publication, but individual participants will not be identifiable in such a report.

(9) **Will the study benefit me or my child?**

We cannot and do not guarantee or promise that you or your child will receive any direct benefit from the study. The research is intended to inform [NAME OF SCHOOL’S] student consultation and participation processes and improve communication between teachers and students, benefitting the student body and staff.

(10) **Can I tell other people about the study?**
Yes.

(11) What if I require further information about the study?

When you have read this information, Eve Mayes is available to discuss it with you further and answer any questions you may have. Eve Mayes can also be contacted via email: evde8182@uni.sydney.edu.au. If you would like to know more at any stage, please feel free to contact Associate Professor Deb Hayes, (02) 9351 6389, email: deb.hayes@sydney.edu.au.

(12) What if I have a complaint or any concerns?

Any person with concerns or complaints about the conduct of a research study can contact The Manager, Human Ethics Administration, University of Sydney on +61 2 8627 8176 (Telephone); +61 2 8627 8177 (Facsimile) or ro.humanethics@sydney.edu.au (Email).

This information sheet is for you to keep
PARTICIPANT CONSENT FORM (PARENT/ CAREGIVER INVOLVEMENT)

I, ...........................................................................................[PRINT NAME], give consent to my participation in the research project

TITLE: Students’ constructions of student participation

In giving my consent I acknowledge that:

1. The procedures required for the project and the time involved for my participation in the project have been explained to me, and any questions I have about the project have been answered to my satisfaction.

2. I have read the Information Statement and have been given the opportunity to discuss the information and my involvement in the project with the researcher/s.

3. I understand that being in this study is completely voluntary – I am not under any obligation to consent to participate.

4. I understand that my involvement is strictly confidential. I understand that research data gathered from the results of the study may be published however no information about me or my child nor I will be used in any way that is identifiable.

5. I understand that I can withdraw from the study at any time without prejudice to my or my child's relationship with the researcher/s or the University of Sydney or [NAME OF SCHOOL] now or in the future.

6. I understand that I can stop the interview at any time if I do not wish the interview to continue. The audio/video recording will be erased and the information provided will not be included in the study.

7. I understand that I can stop my participation in the focus group at any time if I do not wish to continue; however as it is a group discussion it will not be possible to exclude individual data to that point.

8. I understand that the information that I provide will be stored securely during the study on a password-protected electronic device, and physical copies of anything that I write for the purposes of the research will be stored in a locked filing cabinet in the office of Eve Mayes at the University of Sydney. I understand that, after the study is completed, all audio/visual/text/physical data will be stored in a locked filing cabinet in the Chief Investigator’s office. It will be stored for 7 years and then shredded/erased.

9. I understand that I will not receive any compensation for being involved in the project. I understand that the research is intended to inform [NAME OF SCHOOL’S] student consultation and participation processes and improve communication between teachers and students, benefitting the student body and staff.
10. I consent to:

- Audio-recording  YES ☐ NO ☐
- Video-recording  YES ☐ NO ☐
- Recording/photocopying of visuals/texts produced in group joint data analysis  YES ☐ NO ☐
- Receiving Feedback  YES ☐ NO ☐

If you answered YES to the “Receiving Feedback” question, please provide your details i.e. mailing address, email address.

**Feedback Option**

**Address:**

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

**Email:**

____________________________________________________________________

......................................................
Signature

......................................................
Please PRINT name

......................................................
Date
19. Parent/ Caregiver Participation – PIS (Arabic Translation)

**Main Topic:**

طريقة المشاركة الطلابية

بيان مسند المشاركة (مشاركة الأباء/الأمهات بالرعاية)

(1) **Purpose of the Study?**

Did you participate in this study?

The school participates in this study.

(2) **Who conducts the study?**

This study is conducted by the study.

(3) **What is the study about?**

This study is about the teaching and learning process in the school.

(4) **When was the study conducted?**

This study was conducted during the school year.

(5) **What were the main findings of the study?**

The main findings of the study were that...
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إن قرارك المتعلق بالمشاركة من عدماً لن يضر بعلاقتك أو علاقاتك المستقبلية بجامعة سيديني. إذا قرت الموافقة على المشاركة، فإن تلك الحجزية في سبب موافتك في أي وقت دون أن يثير ذلك على علاقتك بجامعة [NAME OF SCHOOL] سيديني أو بمدرسة.

إذا اقتدف على الإجراء مقابل، فيمكنك إيقاف المشاركة في أي وقت في حالة عدم رغبتك في الاستمرار. سيتم محو التسجيلات الصوتية ولن يتم إدراج المعلومات المقدمة في الدراسة.

هل سيجسأ أي شخص م罚款ة للباحثين؟

لا، لن يعرف أي شخص معلومات تتصل بالبحث. جميع المعلومات سرية للغاية.

ما الذي سيحدث المعلومات التي أقدمها؟

سيتم استخدام المعلومات التي تقدمها فقط من قبل الباحثين في هذا المشروع من أجل الإعلام عن قيمتهم دراسة مشاركة الطلاب. جميع جوانب الدراسة، بما في ذلك النتائج، ستكون سرية تماماً وسيكون بإمكان الباحثين فقط الوصول إلى معلومات المشاركون. لن يعرف أي شخص معلومات التي أعطيتها للباحثين، ولا سيما أي شخص آخر. إذا كنت ترغب في تخزين المعلومات في جهاز إلكتروني محمي بكلمة مرور وسيتم تخزين المعلومات التي تقدمها بشكل آمن على جهاز إلكتروني محمي بكلمة مرور وسيتم تخزين النسخ المادية لأي شيء تقوم بإنشائه في خزانة إيداع مغلقة في مكتب إيف ماسنج بجامعة سيديني بعد إتمام الدراسة. سيتم تخزين كل البيانات المادية السمعية/البصرية/مرئية في خزانة إيداع مغلقة في مكتب إيف ماسنج في مكتب كبير الباحثين. سيتم تخزينها لمدة سبع سنوات ثم سيتم تدميرها أو ترميمها.

هل اسمع أي شخص آخر النتائج؟

جميع جوانب الدراسة، بما في ذلك النتائج، ستكون سرية تماماً وسيكون بإمكان الباحثين فقط الوصول إلى معلومات المشاركون.

قد يتم تقديم تقرير عن الدراسة من أجل النشر لكن لن يكون بالإمكان التعرف على المشاركون الأفراد في مثل هذا التقرير.

هل ستقوم الدراسة بإلغاءي أو إفادة طالب؟

لا يستطيع أن تضمن والدك أو ناعدة أن تحصل أنت أو طفلك على فائدة مباشرة من الدراسة. إن الغرض من هذا البحث هو الإعلام عن العمليات الاستشارة وعمليات المشاركة للطلاب وتحسين التواصل بين المدرسين والطلاب وإفادة الطلاب والموظفين.

هل يمكنني إخبار الآخرين عن الدراسة؟

نعم.

ماذا لو كنت أريد الحصول على المزيد من المعلومات من الدراسة؟

عند قراءتك لهذه المعلومات، ستكون إيف ماسنج مهلة لمناقشة معك بشكل أكبر والإجابة عن أي أسئلة قد تكون لديك. يمكن أيضاً الإتصال بـإيف ماسنج عبر البريد الإلكتروني في الاتصال بالتواصل ودبي هایس على هاتف رقم: (02) 9351 6389.

ماذا لو كان لدى أي شخص مخاوف أو مخاوف؟

يمستطيع أي شخص لديه مخاوف أو مخاوف بشأن إجراء الدراسة البحثية أن يتصل بالمدير، إدارة الأخلاقيات.
20. Parent/ caregiver participation – Consent form (Arabic translation)

استمارة موافقة المشاركة (مشاركة الأب/القائم بالرعاية)

أوافق أنا اَن [اكتب الأسم]، على مشاركتي في مشروع البحث لتقديم الموافقة، أقر بما يلي:

العنوان: مبادئ الطلاب للمشاركة الطلابية

1. أنى قد شرح لي الإجراءات المطلوبة للمشروع والفترة الزمنية لمشاركتي في المشروع وأنى تم الإجابة على أي أسئلة قد تكون لدى عن المشروع بشكل واضح ومرضى.

2. أنى قد قمت بقراءة بيان المعلومات وتم إعطائي الفرصة لمناقشة المعلومات ومشاركتي في المشروع مع الباحث/الباحثين.

3. أنى أتفهم أن المشاركة في هذه الدراسة اختيارية تماماً - إنى ليست تحت أي إجبار على المشاركة.

4. أنى أتفهم أن معلوماتي سرية تماماً. أنى أتفهم أن معلومات البحث التي يتم جمعها من نتائج الدراسة قد يتم نشرها إلا أنه لن يتم استخدام المعلومات عن طفلي أو عن أي طريقة يمكن التعرف عليها.

5. أنى أتفهم أن بإمكانى الانسحاب من الدراسة في أي وقت دون حدوث ضرر على علاقتي أو علاقة طفلي بالباحث/الباحثين أو [NAME OF SCHOOL] جامعة سيدني أو مدرسة سواء في الوقت الراهن أو في المستقبل.

6. أنى أتفهم أن بإمكانى إيقاف المقابلة في أي وقت في حالة عدم رغبتي في استمرار المقابلة. سيتم محو التسجيلات الصوتية/المردية ولن يتم إدراج المعلومات المقدمة في الدراسة.

7. أنى أتفهم أن بإمكانى التوقف عن المشاركة في مجموعة التركيز في أي وقت إذا لم أرغب في الاستمرار؛ لأنه وحيث إن هذه مناقصة جماعية فإن يكون من الممكن استبعاد البيانات الفردية عند هذه المرحلة.

8. أنى أتفهم أن المعلومات التي أقوم بتقديمها سيتم تخزينها بشكل آمن أثناء الدراسة على جهاز الكمبيوتر محتي بكلمة مرور وأنه سيتم تخزين النسخ المائية لأي شيء يقومون بإنشائه في حزاء إستدامة معلقة في مكتب إيف ماس بجامعة سيدني. أنى أتفهم أنه بعد إتمام الدراسة، سيتم تخزين كل البيانات المسموعة/البصري/النصية في حزاء إستدامة معلقة في مكتب كبير للباحثين. سيتم تخزينها لمدة سبع سنوات ثم سيتم تمزقيها أو تسجيلها.

9. أنى أتفهم أن أحصل على أي تعويض مقابل مشاركتي في هذا المشروع. أنى أتفهم أن هذا الرسوم هو الإعلام عن العمليات الاستشارية وعمليات المشاركة الطلابية بمدرسة [NAME OF SCHOOL] المدرسية والطلاب وإفادة الطلاب الموظفين.

10. أوافق على:

   - التسجيل الصوتي
   - تسجيل الفيديو
   - التسجيل/التصوير الصوتي/البصري/النصي/الوجوهية في تحليل البيانات المشتركة للمجموعة

[أكتب الأسم]

[Date]

[Signature]

[Name of School]

[Signature of School Official]
إذا كان لديك أي أسئلة حول "النظام الغذائي الاسترخائي"، فضلاً قم بتزويد بياناتك مثل عنوان المراسلات وعنوان البريد الإلكتروني.

خيار النظام الغذائي الاسترخائي

العنوان: ________________________________

البريد الإلكتروني: ________________________________

التوقيع: ________________________________

فضلاً قم بكتابة اسمك بحروف واضحة.

الناري: ________________________________
Appendix C: Interview and focus group procedures

Student focus group procedures

Summary

1. Students will discuss what they remember about their time in the Steering Committee (see below for prompt questions).

2. Students will then be invited to:

   a) Choose a scenario written by Eve Mayes, adapted from the student voice literature presented in a variety of formats (e.g. as a transcript, cartoon, poster, puppet show video, audio recording etc.), from a table list that summarises the scenarios.

   NOTE:
   These sample scenarios were shown and discussed as examples of the form and content of scenarios that students might later choose to create. Due to time constraints, not all focus groups included discussion of the prompt scenarios.

   In my discussion of the focus groups in this thesis, I focus on the scenarios that students created (rather than their responses to the scenarios that I created).

   b) After reading/ listening to/ viewing the scenario, the group will discuss the issues raised in their scenario (see below for detailed outline of discussion probes). The intention is for these discussions to be as open-ended as possible.

   c) At the end of their conversation, participants will be invited to write a brief written comment on their response to the scenario (see below for prompt questions).

3. Students will then be given the option to compose their own scenarios as a group based on their group’s experiences of student participation. Students will have a number of choices to make about their participation:
a) They will be told that the scenarios that they create may based on their personal experiences, a fictionalised ‘story’ of something that could happen, or an issue that they feel is important in thinking about student participation.

b) They may choose to compose their scenario in written, visual or audio-visual form (e.g. write a script, draw a picture, video a puppet show, record a radio interview).

c) Student groups can decide whether they are happy to have the researcher stay in the room while they create their scenario, or having an audio- or video-recording of their process of creating the scenario (which can be turned on and off as they choose), or having complete privacy as they compose their scenario.

d) Student groups will be asked both before and after they create their scenario to consider whether they consent to the scenario that they compose to be read/listened to/viewed by/responded to by another student focus group.

e) After each group has composed their scenario, they will discuss their scenario with the researcher (see below for probes for discussion).

f) At the end of this conversation, students will be invited individually to write a brief written comment on the main points that they think their scenario raises, and any thoughts about the process of creating a scenario as a group (see below for prompt questions).

**Detailed outline of student focus group:**

**Introduction**

Good morning/afternoon and welcome to our session. Thanks for taking the time to join us to talk about student voice/participation in school decision-making. My name is Eve Mayes and, as you know, I’m doing research at the University of Sydney about what students think about student voice at school. I’m interested in finding out about the experiences of students who have been involved in school decision-making and research.

You were invited because you used to be in [NAME OMITTED] High School’s ‘Steering Committee’ (when you were in Year 9). As you probably remember, you learned about and were involved in research thinking about teaching and learning reforms at [NAME OMITTED] High School.

There are no wrong answers but just different points of view. Please feel free to share your point of view even if it is different from what others have said. Keep in mind that I’m just as interested in negative comments as positive comments, and at times the negative comments are the most helpful.

You’ve probably noticed that I had a recording device and a video camera. It’s up to you whether you are happy to have our conversation recorded, and whether you prefer audio recording or video recording, or neither. I’m hoping to record the session because I don’t want to miss any of your comments. People often say very helpful things in these discussions and I can’t write fast enough to get them all down. We’ll say each other’s names during the conversation, but your names won’t be used in
any reports I write about the conversation. You can be assured of complete confidentiality. This conversation will help me write my PhD about student participation, and I’ll also write a summary version from everything I learn for the DEC. Finding out what students really think about participating in school decision-making will help adults in schools, researchers and other young people think more about how to work together in school decision-making and research.

Are you okay with the focus group being recorded? [Participants respond.]

Do you have a preference for audio or video recording? [Participants respond.]

Well, let’s begin. I have some name cards here to help us remember each other’s names [if needed]. We’re going to start with some questions about how your involvement in the Steering Committee. After that, you guys will choose a scenario that you want to respond to. Does that sound okay?

**Introductory question**

Let’s go around the circle and tell us a bit about yourself. [Or other ‘ice-breakers’ – for example, choosing a visual postcard to describe how you remember the Steering Committee.]

**Transition topics**

- **Definitions of ‘student voice’/ ‘student participation’/ ‘students having a say’**
  
  Example probes: *What does ‘student voice’/ ‘student participation’/ ‘having a say’ mean to you?*

- **Experiences of student voice/ participation/ having a say**
  
  Example probes: *How did you come to be involved in the Steering Committee? What do you remember about the Steering Committee? How did you feel about the Steering Committee before you were in it? How did you feel about the Steering Committee while you were in it? How did you feel about the Steering Committee once you were not in the group anymore? How do you feel about the Steering Committee now? How do you feel about school now? Is there a relationship between how you feel about school now and your involvement in the Steering Committee?*

- **Ways that students have a voice in the school**

  Example probes: *How can students get involved in school decision making at this school? Are there other ways that students express their opinions at this school?*

- **Experiences of school**

  Example probes: *What are some of your best memories of school?*
What are some of your most difficult memories of school?

- Experiences of change in the school
  
  Example probes: *Describe any changes (positive or negative) that you think have happened at the school in the last few years.*

  *What has helped or prevented change at school?*

**Scenario introduction**

Now you all can choose a scenario – like a short little story or response – that you can talk about as a group. Here’s the summary of all the scenarios (see Table 3: Summary of prompt scenarios). Some of the scenarios are in the form of a script, pictures, audio, videos or a blog. All the scenarios are about student voice. I wrote the scenarios, but they are based on what other adults (working at or researching at other schools) have written about student voice. I’m giving you a scenario to talk about so you can talk about what you think about it, and how it relates to your experience. Take a couple of minutes to read through the summaries (ask me any questions if you like) and choose one amongst yourselves. [Students choose scenario, read/ listen to/ view it.]

**Table 3. Summary of prompt scenarios**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Summary of scenario (<em>Title italicised</em>)</th>
<th>Format</th>
<th>Central issue</th>
<th>Reference(s) the scenario is based on/ adapted from</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>What is student voice?</strong> At the beginning of a new student voice group, a facilitating teacher tells a group of students about student voice. He tells them that student voice is about human rights, learning to be a good citizen, learning to express yourself and empowerment. He talks about their opportunity to change things in their school.</td>
<td>Audio-recording, transcript &amp; cartoon with student thought bubbles</td>
<td>Change, power, co-opion.</td>
<td>(Bahou, 2011, pp. 2-3; Fielding, 2011; Fielding &amp; Bragg, 2003, 2005; Holdsworth, 2000; Rudduck &amp; Flutter, 2004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td><strong>Students’ participation in a student voice group meeting:</strong> Drawing/ cartoon of students talking in groups in a student voice group meeting. While some students have speech bubbles describing their positive experiences/ skills/ relationships and expressing their ideas, there are four silent students. Thought bubbles from their heads: “Only the good ones talk- they leave us out and take over all the good jobs”; “I’m too dumb to say anything interesting here”; “I don’t know what I think about this topic... I don’t know what to say” and “As if you’d care - I don’t want to be like any of</td>
<td>Drawing/ cartoon of a student voice group meeting</td>
<td>Benefits, dominance of articulate students, power, creation of self-governing subjects</td>
<td>(Crane, 2001, p. 54; Harding, 2001, pp. 56-57; McIntyre, Pedder, &amp; Rudduck, 2005, pp. 153-155; Mitra, 2001, p. 93; Oldfather, 1995, p. 134; Roberts &amp; Nash, 2009, pp. 182-183; Ruddock, 2007, p. 605; Silva, 2001, pp. 97-98)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>One student in a student voice group tells a researcher about why he left the group. Another student talks about how he decided to “start again” and rebuild her reputation after her involvement in research. After they talk, researchers discuss other reasons why students have left student voice groups/ research projects in the past.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>A facilitating teacher’s perspective: A facilitating teacher blogs about good things about the student voice group. She writes about the difficulties of making students feel that they run the student voice group and not impose her own views on the students, and how she feels that she has to defend the students to other teachers. She worries how the group will continue if funding ends.</td>
<td>Blog written by facilitating teacher</td>
<td>Teacher perceptions, power</td>
<td>(Bland &amp; Atweh, 2007, p.345; Mitra, 2005, p.533)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Students talk about co-researching with adult teachers/ researchers: Some students role play positive relationships that they developed with teachers/ researchers in a student voice group. Another group of students role play how their work was changed/ edited by adults for the formal report about their research.</td>
<td>Students role play what happened using puppets (video) with transcript</td>
<td>Cooption, power</td>
<td>(Atweh &amp; Bland, 2004, p.10; Crane, 2001, p.55; Mitra, 2001, p.184)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Two staff presentations: During one student presentation to teachers about their research with other students, the students suggest that shouting is not helpful for teaching and learning. A teacher gets angry with the students in response. In the second presentation, a student describes how teachers reacted positively to the students’ research about bullying.</td>
<td>Transcript of staff presentation (participants in focus group to read aloud)</td>
<td>Power, change</td>
<td>(Bahou, 2012, p.244; Thomson &amp; Gunter, 2007, 2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Students’ feelings about teachers’ reactions to their work: Students from one student voice group describe how they felt about teachers’ negative reactions. A video of a dam overflowing plays as they speak about their experiences. Other students then describe how they felt good after presenting to staff.</td>
<td>Video of dam overflowing and voiceovers of student talking (and transcript of their words)</td>
<td>Power</td>
<td>(Crane, 2001, p.55; Mitra, 2001, pp.92-93)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Students talk to a researcher about the benefits of student voice: Students say all the good things that they have experienced/learned from the student voice group. Other adults/students question (with thought bubbles) what the students are saying in their heads.

Cartoon with speech/thought bubbles


Students show through photos how they feel about their experiences of student voice: Four photos with captions describe how students feel about student voice. Photos include a closed flower bud in a field of open flowers, a dawn of a new day a plastic ear and flowers in a glass jar.

Photos with captions


Teachers talk about student voice: Some teachers give feedback about the benefits of student voice as a form of professional learning and the positive impact that student voice has had on their teaching, students’ learning and on the feeling of the school. Other teachers say that they feel like students have more of a voice than teachers now.

Pictures of adults cut out of magazines/from Google images with speech bubbles and text

Teacher perspective, power, governmentality (Bahou, 2011, p. 5; Bragg, 2007a, pp. 512-513; Demetriou & Wilson, 2010, pp. 56-57; McIntyre et al, 2005, p. 163; Morgan, 2011; Raymond, 2001, p. 61; Rudduck, 2007, p. 66)

Three stories of teachers, student voice and change: One teacher ‘changes’ at first, but then returns to her previous teaching style due to the pressure of national tests and not having enough time to do ‘fun’ things in class. Two other teachers struggle at first to apply student feedback, but then make changes to their teaching practices.

Picture book with story (fairy tale form)

Change, power. Student/teacher perceptions (McIntyre et al., 2005, pp. 160-163, 166; Morgan, 2011, pp. 451-457; Raymond, 2001, p. 61)

Who makes the changes actually happen? A mind-map written by students, teachers and a researcher about who is responsible for making change in a school actually happen.

Mind map (visual)


The relationship between student voice groups and the whole school: A student blog: one school where there was a student voice group but

Blog post

Change, power (Morgan, 2011, pp. 458-459; Rudduck, 2007, pp. 601-602)
negative messages at a whole-school level, and another school where the principal and executive had strong support for student voice, but where classrooms did not emphasise student voice.

**Scenario prompts**

Probes for group discussion could include:

- *How did you come to choose this scenario?*
- *What are your impressions of what happens in this scenario?*
- *What issues does this scenario raise?*
- *Did this scenario remind you of your experience of the Steering Committee, or was it different to your experience? How?*
- *Was this scenario realistic? Fake?*
- *What do you think the different people in this scenario are thinking? What are their intentions?*
- *What are the consequences of the words and actions of different people in this scenario?*
- *Could this scenario end differently? How?*

**Student written comment (after scenario response) prompt questions**

After the focus group discussion, students will be asked to write a written reflection on their experience of responding to a scenario in a focus group. Prompts for the written reflection could include:

- *What do you think were the main points that were raised in your focus group discussion about the scenario?*
- *Describe your experience of being in a focus group discussion on student participation. How did you feel participating in this method of research?*

**Focus group discussion about the scenario created by the group**

Students will be given time to formulate their own scenarios. After composition, the focus group will then discuss their scenario, and the research process. Below are possible prompts for this discussion.

Questions about the scenario:

- *What is your scenario about?*
- *How did you come to choose this particular event/ issue to discuss?*
- *What is the main point that you are highlighting in your scenario? Why do you think this point is important?*
- *How did you come to choose the format that you chose?*

Questions about the research process:
• What were the advantages and disadvantages of responding to a scenario before you created your own scenario?
• How did you feel about the process of creating your scenario? How did you feel about the researcher being present/ your conversations being recorded/ privacy during composition?
• Do you consider what you have created to be a form of ‘data’ for research? What do you think I can learn from your scenario?

Student written comment (after group creation of scenario) prompt questions

After the focus group discussion about the scenario that they have composed, students will be asked to write a written reflection on their experience. Prompts for the written reflection could include:

• What do you think were the main points that were raised in your focus group discussion about your scenario?
• Describe your experience of creating a scenario in a group and being in a focus group. How did you feel participating in this method of research?

Teacher interview procedures

Summary of teacher interview

a) Participating teachers will choose whether they prefer to be interviewed individually, with another person or in a group, and will elect a convenient time for the interview in negotiation with the researcher.
b) Interviews with teachers/ school executive will be semi-structured, with open-ended topics (see below for detailed outline of interview introduction, interview topics and probes).
c) Participant(s) will choose two scenarios written by the researcher to respond to from a summarised list of scenarios (see Table 3 above). See below for detailed outline of how the researcher will introduce the interview. Probes for discussion will be the same as for the students (see below for probes).

NOTE: Due to time restraints in interviews with teachers, most of the interviews did not include discussion of these scenarios. Instead, teachers spoke about their own experiences/ memories/ opinions.
d) At the end of the interview, teachers will be invited individually to write a brief written comment on the research experience (see below for prompt questions).

**Detailed outline of teacher interview**

**Introduction**

Good morning/ afternoon and welcome. Thanks for taking the time to join us to talk about student voice/ participation in school decision making. As you know, I’m doing research at the University of Sydney about what students think about student voice at school. I’m also interested in finding out about the viewpoints of teachers who have experienced the use of student participation as a strategy for school reform.

You were invited because you have been a teacher/ member of the executive at [NAME OMITTED] High School during the period when student voice has been used as a school reform strategy.

There are no wrong answers but just different points of view. Please feel free to share your point of view even if you think that it might be different from other people’s at the school. Keep in mind that I’m just as interested in negative comments as positive comments, and at times the negative comments are the most helpful.

You’ve probably noticed that I had a recording device and a video camera. It’s up to you whether you are happy to have our conversation recorded, and whether you prefer audio recording or video recording, or neither. I’m hoping to record the session because I don’t want to miss any of your comments. People often say very helpful things in these discussions and I can’t write fast enough to get them all down. While I might use your name during the conversation, your name(s) won’t be used in any reports I write about the conversation. You can be assured of complete confidentiality. This conversation will help me write my PhD about student participation, and I’ll also write a summary version from everything I learn for the DEC. Finding out what members of the school community think about participating in school decision-making will help teachers, researchers and other young people think more about how to work together in school decision-making and research.

Are you okay with this interview being recorded? [Participants respond.]

Do you have a preference for audio or video recording? [Participants respond.]

Well, let’s begin. We’re going to start with some general questions. After that, you will choose two scenarios that you want to respond to. Does that sound okay?
Teacher semi-structured interview topics

Introductory question
• Teaching experiences
  Example probes: Tell me about yourself and your teaching career.
  How did you come to be at [NAME OMITTED] High School?

Transition topics
• Student voice/ participation – definition
  Example probe: How would you define ‘student voice/ participation’?

• Your opinion of student voice/ participation
  Example probe: What are your views on student participation (its benefits/ challenges)?

• This school’s context and student participation
  Example probe: What does ‘student participation’ look like at this school?
  Are there any particular aspects of the school’s context that (positively or negatively) impact on ‘student participation’?

• Student voice/ participation at this school - progress, benefits, challenges
  Example probe: Have there been positive consequences of student participation at this school?
  Have there been negative consequences of student participation at this school?

• National Partnerships for Low Socio-Economic Schools initiative and this school
  Example probe: Describe your experience of the National Partnerships for Low Socio-Economic Schools initiative at this school.

Teacher prompts for responding to scenarios

NOTE: Most interviews did not involve responding to scenarios.

Prompts for discussion could include:

• How did you come to choose this scenario?
• What are your impressions of what happens in this scenario?
• What issues does this scenario raise?
• Did this scenario reflect your understanding of the Steering Committee at this school, or was it different? How?
• Was this scenario realistic? Fake?
• What do your think the different people in this scenario are thinking? What are their intentions?
• What are the consequences of the words and actions of different people in this scenario?
• Could this scenario end differently? How?

**Parent and caregiver interview and focus group procedures**

**Summary of parent interviews and focus groups**

a) Parents will choose whether they prefer to be interviewed individually, with another person or in a group, and will elect a convenient time for the interview.

b) Interviews with parents will be semi-structured (see below for detailed outline of interview introduction, interview topics and probes).

c) Parent(s) will choose two scenarios written by the researcher to respond to from a summarised list of scenarios (see Table 3 above). See below for detailed outline of how the researcher will introduce the interviews. Probes for discussion will be the same as for the students and teachers (see below for probes).

**NOTE:** Due to time constraints, scenarios were not discussed during any of the parent interviews or focus groups.

d) At the end of the interview, parents will be invited individually to write a brief written comment on the research experience (see below for prompt questions).

**Detailed outline of parent interview**

**Introduction**

Good morning/ afternoon and welcome. Thanks for taking the time to join us to talk about student voice/ participation in school decision-making. As you know, I’m doing research at the University of Sydney about what students think about being involved in school decision-making. I’m interested in finding out about the viewpoints of parents/ caregivers on students’ involvement in school decision-making and changing the school.

You were invited because you have been a parent/ caregiver of a student at [NAME OMITTED] High School during the period when student voice has been used as a strategy for making changes at the school.

There are no wrong answers but just different points of view. Please feel free to share your point of view even if it is different from what others have said. Keep in mind that I’m just as interested in negative comments as positive comments, and at times the negative comments are the most helpful.
You’ve probably noticed that I had a recording device and a video camera. It’s up to you whether you are happy to have our conversation recorded, and whether you prefer audio recording or video recording, or neither. I’m hoping to record the session because I don’t want to miss any of your comments. People often say very helpful things in these discussions and I can’t write fast enough to get them all down. While I might use your name during the conversation, your name(s) won’t be used in any reports I write about the conversation. You can be assured of complete confidentiality. This conversation will help me write my PhD about student participation, and I’ll also write a summary version from everything I learn for the DEC. Finding out what members of the school community think about participating in school decision-making will help teachers, researchers and other young people think more about how to work together in school decision-making and research.

Are you okay with this interview being recorded? [Participants respond.]

Do you have a preference for audio or video recording? [Participants respond.]

Well, let’s begin. We’re going to start with some general questions. After that, you will choose two scenarios that you want to respond to. Does that sound okay?

**Parent semi-structured interview topics**

- The school

  Example probe: Describe this school.

- Your child’s experience of school

  Example probes: Describe your child.
  Describe your child’s experience of school before this year.
  Describe your child’s experience of school this year.
  What has your child shared with you about their experience of school this year?
  How have you felt about your child’s experience of school this year?
  What do you think are your child’s priorities this year?
  What are your priorities for your child?

- Students ‘having a say’ in school

  Example probes: What do you know about the change process at [NAME OMITTED] High School?
  What do you think about students participating in thinking about changing the school?
  What do you think about young people being involved in research?
• The process of getting a school to change

Example probes: Do you believe that there have been changes at this school this year? If so, what changes have occurred? If not, what changes do you think need to occur? Do you think students, teachers, parents and the community have been involved thinking about changing the school? Do you think that they should be involved? Is there anything else that you would like to say about your child’s experience of school, participation in changing the school or participation in research?

**Parent prompts for responding to scenarios**

• How did you come to choose this scenario?
• What are your impressions of what happens in this scenario?
• What issues does this scenario raise?
• Did this scenario remind you of any of your child’s experiences?
• Do you think this scenario could happen at this school?
• What do you think the different people in this scenario are thinking? What are their intentions?
• What are the consequences of the words and actions of different people in this scenario?
• Could this scenario end differently? How?

**Parent written comment (after scenario response) prompt questions**

After they respond to the scenarios, parents will be asked to write a written reflection on their experience of responding to a scenario. Prompts for the written reflection could include:

• What do you think were the main points that were raised in your response to the scenarios?
• Describe your feelings in responding to these scenarios.
Appendix D: A summary of scenarios generated in student focus groups

Scenarios are listed in chronological order when generated in focus groups. Scenarios that are not included in the body of this thesis are described in greater detail than scenarios that are discussed in the thesis. For focus groups where a scenario was not created, I summarise what was discussed during this focus group.

Table 4. A summary of scenarios generated in student focus groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Creators</th>
<th>Yr gp</th>
<th>Year of Steering Committee involvement</th>
<th>Scenario mode (e.g. puppet production, drawing, embodied drama)</th>
<th>Summary of scenario (for groups that did not create scenarios, I summarise the main points discussed in the focus group)</th>
<th>Location in thesis (if discussed, or other publications or presentations where discussed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Madhuri</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Sketch drawing</td>
<td>Note: In this first focus group, these students chose to each create their own scenarios. Manduri created a drawing (see Figure 1 in Chapter 1). Jim Stiman wrote a script for a puppet production, and B.J. wrote a script for a puppet production. They then each helped each other to perform these two puppet productions, each performing particular roles. This mode of scenario production was time consuming. After this focus group, I encouraged students to create one scenario as a group. See Chapter 1 and Figure 1 for the sketch drawing and Madhuri’s explanation of it.</td>
<td>A photograph of this sketch drawing is in Chapter 1 and 10 (Figures 1 and 34). Madhuri’s transcribed account of the sketch drawing is in Chapter 1.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A summary of scenarios generated in student focus groups.
**Jim Stiman**  
**Written script and puppet production**  
Two scenes in two classrooms at their school: in the first classroom, the teacher-puppet says, “Guys, I’m really proud of you” and another where the teacher-puppet says, “Excuse me? […] That’s your first warning, your name’s going on the board. […] I told you already. […] Go to the classroom next door. […] I’ve got permission to yell at you all I want.” In the second classroom, another teacher-puppet says, “I’m so proud of you guys. […] You’re working so well.”

This puppet production is not explicitly quoted in this thesis. I presented its transcript (and visuals) and discussed it in the conference paper presented at the 2013 Cambridge student voice seminar (see Appendix F for Abstract). This puppet production informed my explanation of “concept creation” in Chapter 5.

**B.J.**  
**Written script and puppet production**  
Two scenes: one at their school, and the other at a coeducational public high school in an outer suburb of their city that they visited as part of their research in 2012. In the first scene, a student-puppet at their school who is hugging a friend is told, “You know it’s a hands off policy. I’m ringing your parents right now. You’re not coming to school tomorrow – you’re getting stood down” by a Senior Executive teacher-puppet because of the “hands off” policy. In the second scene, a student-puppet at the other school (that they visited) who is hugging a friend is greeted by a Senior Executive teacher-puppet, “Hi Stephanie, how are you? How’s your mum?”

This puppet production is not explicitly quoted in this thesis. I presented its transcript (and visuals) and discussed it in the conference paper presented at the 2013 Cambridge student voice seminar (see Appendix F for Abstract). This puppet production informed my explanation of “concept creation” in Chapter 5.

| John Citizen Smith, Savannah Smith, Ayman, Hagrid | 11 | John, Savannah, Ayman = 2011 group. | Puppet production (improvised, rehearsed and then recorded) | See Chapter 8 for full transcript.  
*Note:* Hagrid was not in the Steering Committee. | Puppet production transcript is in Chapter 8, where this puppet production and focus group conversation are discussed. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Onetwo-three, Sarah</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Puppet production (improvised, rehearsed and</td>
<td>A teacher-puppet comes to the staffroom after a difficult lesson. She says the two other teacher-puppets, “I hate my class. They are so rude. Why are they always so rude to me? Do youse have any tips how to be a better teacher?” One teacher-puppet gives this teacher advice about how to enter the room: “when you walk</td>
<td>This puppet production is not explicitly quoted in this thesis. I presented its transcript (and visuals) and discussed it in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Relevant Text</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monique, Ike and Bob</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Puppet production</td>
<td>A teacher-puppet is introducing the lesson. Student-puppets are talking over her. She shouts, “Guys! I told you to stop speaking over me!” The student-puppets tell her that her lessons are, “so boring! I’m sorry” and “the same routine.” The teacher-puppet asks, “Look, what is it that I can do to make my lessons more effective and for you to participate more?” They suggest more “class discussions” a movie “reward.” The teacher-puppet agrees, “on one condition. You guys must, st- like (.) prove to me that if like I make my lessons more (.) entertaining by saying, by doing with what you suggested me to do, that you will prove to me that it was effective.” The students agree, and she says, “class dismissed.” They farewell each other cheerfully, “Bye miss”, “Have a nice day!” “You too!”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leila, Rebecca, Faisal, Abdul</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>No scenario created</td>
<td>In this focus group, we discussed their memories of the Steering Committee, and the staff presentation event from 2010 in particular. We discussed why there had been some negative responses to the video they had produced. Rebecca said about the video: “Part of the reason why it didn’t completely get across the message we wanted was because it [the video] was so dramatised. Because the disrespect we wanted to convey was subtle and stuff, but we couldn’t make it in a subtle way because then people wouldn’t see it – so we had to dramatisate it and that’s why people thought it was a bit of a joke.” They also spoke about some of the challenges of their discussions with teachers at the end of the staff presentations in discussion groups. This led into a discussion of the Steering Committee and the PBIS RESP process (quoted and discussed in Chapter 9).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This puppet production is not explicitly quoted in this thesis. However, quotations from these students from this particular focus group are included in Chapter 6, in a discussion of the order word of age. Quotations from these three students are also included and discussed in Chapter 6 in the context of a
They also spoke about some reactions to the work of the Steering Committee back in the classroom (with interactions similar to the conversation dramatised by a Year 11 focus group in Chapter 8). They also spoke about how student/teacher relationships change as the student grows older, and how teachers come to form expectations for how students in particular year groups will behave, and consequently treat them differently. They also spoke about how the Steering Committee “actually helped me put my voice out there. And now if something is bothering me, I’m going to go to the teacher and go – talk to someone about it and get it fixed something. Back then I would have been like, ‘you know maybe I shouldn’t – it’s just the way things are.’ Better now, if something is bothering me I’ll go” (Leila) and gave examples of approaching the Senior Executive. Rebecca and Faisal also spoke about how the experience “gave us a new perspective. So not only were we seeing it from our viewpoint on how the school was, but we also were looking at the teacher’s side as well – seeing how they for and how they reacted to certain situations and that helped us understand why they were reacting the way they were.” “I got their perspective and now I understand” (Faisal). Abdul crafted an analogy from the game League of Legends where the student and teacher work together like the “support” and “carry” in the game – symbiotically, responsively.

| Chapter 9. They also spoke about some reactions to the work of the Steering Committee back in the classroom (with interactions similar to the conversation dramatised by a Year 11 focus group in Chapter 8). They also spoke about how student/teacher relationships change as the student grows older, and how teachers come to form expectations for how students in particular year groups will behave, and consequently treat them differently. They also spoke about how the Steering Committee “actually helped me put my voice out there. And now if something is bothering me, I’m going to go to the teacher and go – talk to someone about it and get it fixed something. Back then I would have been like, ‘you know maybe I shouldn’t – it’s just the way things are.’ Better now, if something is bothering me I’ll go” (Leila) and gave examples of approaching the Senior Executive. Rebecca and Faisal also spoke about how the experience “gave us a new perspective. So not only were we seeing it from our viewpoint on how the school was, but we also were looking at the teacher’s side as well – seeing how they for and how they reacted to certain situations and that helped us understand why they were reacting the way they were.” “I got their perspective and now I understand” (Faisal). Abdul crafted an analogy from the game League of Legends where the student and teacher work together like the “support” and “carry” in the game – symbiotically, responsively. | This embodied performance is not quoted in this thesis. However, this dramatisation thoroughly influenced my conceptualisation of affect and desiring-assemblages in classrooms that pervades this thesis. Quotations from these students are included in Chapters 2 (Abu George), Chapter 5 (Doshua Doshua and Jarryd Hayne), 7 and 8 (Onetwothree), 9 (Abu George and Onetwothree) and 10 (Abu George). |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Doshua Doshua, Jarryd Hayne, Bing Latin, Onetwothree, Abu George, Hares | 11 | The first five students listed were in the 2011 group. | Embodied performance (improvised, rehearsed and then recorded) | Note: Onetwothree and Abu George were part of two focus groups. |
| 11 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 10 |
| Hares | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
was not in the Steering Committee.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Puppet Production</th>
<th>Discussion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Samantha, Pythagoras, Johnathan Rudd</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Puppet production (improvised, rehearsed and then recorded)</td>
<td>See Chapter 6 for full transcript. The Deputy says, “Nah nah nah you’re getting stood down. Get outside.” They dispute whether or not Onetwothree can use his TAFE account to access YouTube. The Deputy says, “Nah nah nah you’re getting stood down. Get outside.” See Chapter 6 for full transcript. Puppet production transcript is in Chapter 6, where this puppet production, focus group conversation and collaborative analysis of it are discussed. Quotations from this focus group are also included in Chapter 9’s discussion of the RESP initiative. See also Appendix F for an Abstract for a peer reviewed journal article (in Childhood) that includes discussion of this puppet production.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michele Johnson and Zein</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Puppet production (improvised, rehearsed and then recorded)</td>
<td>This puppet production contrasts two responses to a student-puppet not completing homework. In the first classroom, when the teacher-puppet asks, “Did you do your assignment?” the student-puppet responds, “No.” The teacher-puppet becomes increasingly angry, saying, “Why not? This is unacceptable!” When the student puppet tries to explain, “I’m sorry, I’m really stressed!” and “But but but”, the teacher-puppet speaks over the student-puppet, “Sorry is not [...] I don’t care if you’re stressed. Your assignment – [...] = No, no, no, no! Your job is to do – “. At this stage, the student-puppet says, “Miss, why don’t you listen to me? Why?” The teacher puppet says “Because you (...) Goodbye” and exits. In the second scene, the teacher-puppet also asks, “Did you do your assignment?” The student-puppet says, “No I didn’t.” The teacher-puppet says, “Why didn’t you do your assignment?” The student-puppet explains, “Because I’m very stressed.” The teacher-puppet asks, “Because I’m very stressed.” The student-puppet says, “Why are you so stressed?” They then discuss the assignments that the student-puppet has and when they are each due. The teacher-puppet then says, “Would you like an extension?” The student-puppet Puppet production is not discussed in thesis, but this puppet production and the focus group conversation about it informed my discussion of affect, stress and voice/silence discussed in Chapter 7, where quotations from Michael Johnson and Zein are included.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
then asks, “Can you please give me a three day extension?” The teacher-puppet agrees and they thank each other and say goodbye.

| Shaniqua, Batata, Jeff Seid, Soraya | 10 2012 | Puppet production (improvised, rehearsed and then recorded) | This puppet production is set at a comprehensive coeducational public school that they visited as part of their research in 2012 about The Learner I’d like to Be. The teacher-puppet starts the lesson: “Alright guys. Doesn’t look like any of your books are out so can you guys please take your books out? Ladies please stop talking.” Student-puppets sigh, and the teacher-puppet says, “I’m trying to like teach a lesson here. Alright, and please get off your phone. It’s not very good.” A student-puppet responds, “No!” The teacher-puppet asks about an assignment that had been due two months ago: “and none of youse have handed it in yet. I’m just going to like go round and collect them.” The teacher-puppet moves to each student-puppet one at a time, asking them individually, “Have you started your assignment? It was due to months ago.” Each student says, “No.” Student-puppets are talking as the teacher-puppet tries to start the lesson on “Cells” and one student-puppet eats food. The teacher-puppet says, “No food in class please – Cause I’m the one who has to clean it up at the end of the day. And I’m very tired. So please clean it up after yourself and not have anything to eat. All right. Copy what’s off the board. [...] Please no mobile phones in class. I told you observe what’s on the board.” When she directs a student-puppet to give her his mobile phone, he refuses “No [...] It’s my phone – you can’t make me give me it.” The teacher-puppet says, “Do you want me to send you to the principal’s office?” The student-puppet says, “No.” The teacher –puppet says, “Alright. You just stand there. You’re not going to get a future when you grow up. You’re not going to learn anything.” | Puppet production is not discussed in thesis. Quotations from these students are included in Chapters 5 (Batata and Jeff Seid), 6 (Shaniqua), and 8 (Batata and Jeff Seid). |

| Maria, Natalia, Hamad | 12 2010 | No scenario created (time restraints – focus group only 40 minutes). Informal focus group (not recorded) | My fieldnotes from this discussion read: I ask what they remember about the Steering Committee. Maria says we used to do lots of “conference groups – what do you call it? Focus groups.” She says we were looking for strategies “to make the school better” and we got “free food.” Hamad says we were trying to “make a change to the school” – and we worked with other students from the year. He says that the Steering Committee made up the RESP rules. Magi says, “We involved the parents too. I had to talk to my friend’s parents. I remember getting into a fight with my friend’s parent.” I say was that weird talking to a parent at school when you usually might go to their house? She hears my questions as asking about where the talking was held, and says no, the parent | This conversation about the staff research presentation event and their conversations with teachers back in classrooms informed my discussion of the affective complexities of student/teacher relationships in Chapter 8. A quotation from Hamad is included in Chapter 2. |
discussion happened in the common room at school. Hamad says, “the main thing was to make this school a better school.”

Natalia leans forward and says, “most of the teachers disagreed with it.” I ask what she’s referring to. She says there was a staff meeting where the students presented – though she wasn’t there. Maria says that the “older teachers” disagreed with the Steering Committee’s findings at the staff presentation – they were “more comfortable with their own way.” I ask Maria and Hamad if they were at the staff meeting. They say no, they weren’t. Hamad says it was Rebecca, [a student who didn’t participate in this PhD research], Leila, Abdul, the others. They can’t remember why they weren’t there. They say they saw video from it though and pictures of it. I ask if they remember reactions of teachers back in their classrooms. Maria says, “I would remind one of my teachers” about the staff presentation,” saying, “‘Miss, this is what we agreed on, what do you think?’” But she would respond, “‘I don’t want to change my ways.’”

I ask the students why they joined the group. Hamad says, “mainly, most of the people wanted to make a change in the school.” Maria and Natalia nod.

One of them [Hamad or Maria?] remembers that they were given a little survey to start with when the idea of a Steering Committee was introduced to the whole of Year 9 in 2010. I ask what they thought then. Maria says it was “the start of something.” I ask if it lived up to their expectations. She says, “we didn’t know how far it was supposed to go.” She adds, “how far we’d take it.”

I ask if they thought things changed as a result of their work. Hamad says a “big change was rewarding kids with RESP awards.” I clarify that he is linking the work of the Steering Committee with the RESP initiative – he says yes. He says we were “making a change” with this. He says RESP meant that students “wouldn’t be good because they have to be good, but be good for a reward.”

I ask Maria and Natalia if they think things changed in the school as a result. Maria says, “it’s improved a little bit” – “if you think back to Year 7 compared to now.” Hamad says, “Teachers teach year 12s different to junior students.” He says that younger students might see him in [the Deputy Principal’s] office “having a joke, having a laugh,” which they might think is unimaginable. He says that when students are seniors, teachers “actually treat students more like adults.” He says in Year 9, “teachers literally hated us, but now they’re our friends.” I ask if they think their perception of changes would have happened anyway because of growing older and maturity, or if it was the work of the Steering Committee. Maria says, “I didn’t know it
was going to go this far.” Natalia says, “I was surprised” that it kept going; she expected “that it was going to stop.” I ask why. Maria says because, since there were teachers that disagreed with what students said, she expected it to stop. She says, “some teachers weren’t on that wagon.” Natalia says, “it didn’t work out” initially, straight after the presentation. Maria adds, “we didn’t see a change straight away – but now we do.”

Maria says, “I thought it would just tank”. I ask why. She says, “because they [teachers] have the final say – if they’re not on board” then it wouldn’t be allowed to continue. Maria says, “We saw other years follow on and we thought, ‘that’s good’.” Hamad says, “I think what kept the Steering Committee going was that they had more practical work to do” – students in it “got to speak their mind” when they “usually get shut down.” He says that’s the reason “why it kept going over the years.” He says there was a “back and forth” where normally “you can’t speak your mind.” Hamad says, “here you get to speak your mind” – “she doesn’t shut you down”, you “actually have a conversation like adults.” One of the students says, “slowly” – “it did transfer.”

I ask whether Steering Committee was different to normal classes or similar. Hamad nods emphatically and Maria and Natalia say yeah. Maria says that in the Steering Committee it wasn’t like other settings, “we have to speak” “in a civilized way”. I ask how this was different to normal classes. She says, in normal classes, “it was chaotic, but no one was diplomatic, but the Steering Committee prompted everyone to be civilized.” She says that some teachers, “When they saw the kids [in the Steering Committee presenting] they thought, ‘if they’re being nice, I should be as well.’” Hamad says, “it affected both groups” – “teachers treat them better and students started behaving better in class – the teacher would respect them more.”

Maria says, “they [teachers] chose a different route – screaming is not going to stop anything.” The bell goes for the end of the school period.
most amazing class. They’re always committed, they always do their work, and there’s no noise coming out of them at all. Ms M says, “Well with me, they’re so disrespectful and they never do their work.” Ms H is disbeliefing, and asks Ms M what she does with the class. Ms M says, “Well, I give them worksheet after worksheet, and just expect them to do their work.” Ms H says, “No no no no no no [moving right puppet arm back and forth as if shaking finger]. What you’re supposed to do is to get involved with the class discussions – make them involved – not worksheet after worksheet. That will make them so bored [nods head backwards]. So would you try that next time with them?” Ms M says, “I’ll consider it.” Ms H says, “Yeah? And you’ll see massive change [opens mouth wide, jumps up and around in a circle].” The narrator (sheep puppet) says, “They have come to a conclusion where Ms M – Ms H will come to Ms M’s class and see how she teaches. Yeah!” The teacher-puppets confirm this arrangement.

This interview was specifically about an online Facebook Meme page that Faisal had administered after his time in the Steering Committee, particularly in Year 10 and 11. I had heard about this from the Deputy Principal and had briefly spoken to Faisal and another student about it, but wanted to speak further about what had happened. Below, I bring together key quotations from this interview:

**Faisal:** Can you tell me first about how that Facebook page came about?

**Eve:** Uh, well, memes were on the rise for like two years now, and then schools started making them. And at a lot of schools actually got - a lot of kids actually got in a lot of trouble for making them – at the respective schools. But I came up with a pretty good one, ‘[Senior Executive teacher name] – I don’t always give lectures but when I do, they go for six hours’ – that was on my Facebook page – so I made a alias – uh John Smith.

**Eve:** John Smith? [Faisal clears throat] Uh huh.

**Faisal:** And I made a whole new Facebook uh – I hid my IP address [laughs].

[Faisal then tells me about how to hide one’s IP address through a proxy. Faisal then explains how he was a bit nervous about the possibility of negative consequences.] […]

This interview not explicitly quoted in this thesis. However, this conversation informed my thinking about the affirmative, joyful affects at work in the school that I discuss in Chapter 9.
**Faisal:** I put a lot of notices on, I was very scared and I was like, ‘I don’t want to get in trouble with this. I just want it to be nice fun.’ So I wrote a lot of things like, you know like, ‘if teachers have an issue with anything’ [...] Then I’ll take it down. I’ll take it down. And that’s how it was. Even with students, ‘if anyone has an issue with it, I’ll take it down.’ I ended up taking down for of them, because teachers asked me to. I took it down straight away. I cooperated. And so yeah, I would make most of them. But a lot of them, students would submit them to me as well and I put them up, and there’d be a tag like, ‘anonymous’ would mean some other person unless cause they didn’t want to give their name. or if they did, I’d write their name. And if it was me, I’d write, ‘John.’

**Eve:** And did you keep the - your pseudonym as John? Your alias, sorry?

**Faisal:** Yeah, I kept it for – until the school – everyone in the school started talking about it [laughs].

**Eve:** And then it was okay to use -

**Faisal:** No, what happened was I just kept – I’m like, cause a lot of people knew it was me because I’ve been doing the initial meme on Facebook, and then I told everyone just to keep it private. Maybe Year 12 knew. First thing they did, when I got to school [mock shouting], ‘hey John Smith!’ I’m like [groaning], ‘oh my God. You guys are joking right?’ [Eve laughs]

**Eve:** In front of teachers?

**Faisal:** Yeah, just walking around, in front of students, everyone. Nearly the whole school has liked that page.

[Faisal then describes specific Memes that he created in detail, before explaining how his identity became known by the school] […]

**Faisal:** The language was never an issue. The school didn’t care about the language. It was a private Facebook page and the kids wanted fun. Yeah, [a Senior Executive teacher] called me in to a meeting. She said, ‘I know.’ I said, ‘okay.’

**Eve:** And when was that?

**Faisal:** A week after, two weeks after. Very soon, very soon.

**Eve:** So she found out -

**Faisal:** She stayed in contact with me from the day I made it = on Facebook.

**Eve:** And = how did she know about it?
Faisal: She guessed. A lot, a lot of people guessed. Like, the only person bothered enough to do something like that on a computer is [Faisal].
Eve: Right, right.
Faisal: So, they had suspicions, but they asked me. I’m like, ‘yeah, it was me. Are you going to make me take it down?’ They said, ‘no, we like it.’ […]
Eve: So what, were you surprised that they thought it = was okay?
Faisal: = I was extremely surprised.
Eve: Why?
Faisal: I don’t know. I just [laughs] because most schools – and their schools are less strict than ours. […] And this is a public page. Like it’s not private or anything. The world can see. Anyone can type in [school name] and it will pop up. […]
Eve: Why do you think they did say it was okay?
Faisal: Maybe because I was cooperative at the start. I had left a message saying, ‘if you have a problem with any of them, contact me and I will take it down. And I did take a lot of things down. I deleted some comments some students were making regarding [a Senior Executive teacher] and some other teachers. […] Comments on the pictures. Or just comments on the page. Ex-students as well. A lot of them were ex-students like, you know like, just insults to the teachers. […]
Eve: Mmm. Do you think if it was a different student it would have been different?
Faisal: I don’t know. I don’t know because I had to get um [two friends’ names] to moderate with me after awhile […] It was too much to delete comments every five seconds. […] I later ask and he explains to me how to create a meme. I ask how the memes relate to his school experiences and the appeal of the meme page […]
Faisal: Nearly every person that goes to [school name], even kids that have left, cause they came back and go, ‘oh I remember this!’ You know? All of them. It’s just an experience that’s unique to our school. You know? And some of them that are unique are just an average experience that any school kid would have. Like, the schoolbooks one, that kind of stuff. But some of them are unique to our school, like the canteen, [a phrase a Senior executive teacher says] - they’re unique and the thing is, our school gets it. All the kids understand it. The teachers get it, they laugh at it, they go, ‘is this how our kids see us?’”
I then ask:

**Eve:** Is there any relationship between – and there doesn’t have to be again - your involvement – the steering committee stuff and doing this page?

**Faisal:** It has – yeah, a little bit. I would never have been able to uh commentate on anything in the school without that. […] It’s just um the mindset of a student is, ‘they’re the authority. You don’t –’. **Eve:** The teachers?

**Faisal:** Yeah, um. ‘the school is the institution. They are the authority. Uh, they tell you what to do. You don’t question it. That’s how it is. You question it, you get stood down. You get suspended and that’s, you know.’ So it’s not really a democratic system. Yeah, so with the steering committee, we were given a chance to actually have a say and that allowed our minds to open and be like, ‘maybe it is okay to have a little bit of a joke and have a laugh and make some jokes about it, commentate you know?’ […] I know the boundaries. Yeah of course – there is a limit to everything, I can’t just to go off and you know. It’s all, it’s all in good fun, so the people that are being made fun of are going to laugh as well. […] I knew which ones would be upset about some things um and you know some of them asked me to take some things down. I politely did it. Apologized for it. That was it. […] I am – one of those people that would - who doesn’t really like the rules and boundaries – I want to always cross them. But the thing is that I’m at this school, I’m a student, they have the power to kick me out if they want to. So I know for my own safety [laughs] in this school, and so it can continue – I can continue to make people laugh without, you know, having it end. […] The whole point is to not let it end. You know, just to keep going. […] I ask if he was disappointed when it ended.

**Faisal:** I was kind of disappointed though that other kid didn’t do anything with it. Um but you know, maybe in a few years something else will happen and we’ll get a school where a kid will think, ‘I’ve always wanted to do that.’ But I got too old for it. Year 11 and 12. But that’s something I always wanted to do – I always wanted to have a newsletter where students write editorials and stuff. It just depends on the students and stuff I guess.”

| Holly | 12 | 2010 | No scenario (10 minute) | I ask Holly what she remembers about the Steering Committee. She says, “I remember year nine, you don’t really have much of a [laugh] – you don’t really have that much of a say but, it was good because you got, This interview not explicitly quoted in this thesis. However, Holly’s comments |
interview – right before the end of Year 12 school year). Informal interview.

She says, “I think it’s more of getting together and working together as a team with people that you don’t really usually speak to all coming together and putting in your opinions and your ideas about things that should go on in the school [...] We used to do research tasks. And we would do surveys – I remember we did a survey once – I remember quite a lot. And I remember once we – how we would, we would sit in groups and we would have discussion times about what we think our main values were.” She says being interviewed by people “that came from overseas” [these were university researchers from Utrecht University who came with the academic partner and informally spoke to students]. Holly spoke about the difference between the Steering Committee and the SRC (School Representative Council): “with the SRC it’s kind of different. The SRC organizes events that are going to happen – this is more of a – we get to put in things that we want to learn. It’s for our education.” Holly also spoke about the social aspects of the Steering Committee: “I never spoke to many people in the year till then. And it’s good, to be involved people in your year that you don’t really hang out with” – how she “found peace” with a particular student who she used to have conflict with through the Steering Committee. When I asked her if she remembered presenting to staff, she said she “wasn’t one of the people that spoke” [she was not there]. She said, “I think, telling the teachers what we think and how we think learning should be done and how we yeah how we want it – it was kind of a good twist. It made, it made – I don’t know, I think it just made us feel um like, what we thought actually mattered, like our opinion is actually relevant. Um, when otherwise, we didn’t – we were just what told to do all the time and to follow whatever we were told to do.” When I asked what she remembered about teachers’ responses, she said, “I remember after that some of the teachers started, at the beginning of the lesson, they started being like, ‘this is what we are going to be doing this lesson.’ And at the end of the lesson they would begin to do a little bit of something fun. And I think it was due to um yeah the steering committee yeah. I think that they - they responded well to it. And it made us feel good, like we knew that we were responsible for it. So it was good.” She added towards the end, “I think communicating with people that you usually wouldn’t have spoken to, getting to know people on a different kind of level. I think only in that way because I know that I spoke to a lot of people that – far away from my friend group and that way I got to know some people that go to my school and we got to work together to, yep, which was good.” She also spoke about “growing up”: “I think some students forget that teachers are human beings as well. No, even when I was in Year 7 – I’m 18 now. Year 7 to 12, there’s a bit of an age
difference there. I remember being in Year 7; of course you think you’re getting picked on if you get told to move. You don’t, you don’t understand – yeah, you don’t really understand why teachers do what they do yeah and the consequences behind doing something wrong.”

I asked Holly about the process of “redesigning the values” [see Chapters 8 and 9: RESP]. She said, “I know many students now that would behave just so they can get a RESP award. Maybe they are behaving for the wrong reasons […] But they are still doing it, right? And maybe it will turn into some kind of habit […] I’m not sure but I think respect, equity, safety, positivity – it’s very it’s positive itself it’s very I don’t know – it reminds me a little bit of primary school – it’s a bit kiddy. […] Maybe for the Year 7, 8s and 9s, they find it normal. But um but yeah – I think that they’re just common sense. Obviously you’re supposed to be safe, and positive, and respectful. […] Why should you be rewarded for being respectful? You should always be respectful regardless of whether you get this little token or not [Eve laughs]. And safe: you should be safe all the time, not just at school so you can get a token. And I find that a bit silly but at least than doing it.”

---

| Adnan and Hamad | 12 | 2010 | No scenario (10 minute interview – right before the end of Year 12 school year) Informal interview – no consent form and not recorded. | This was a short conversation with a student (Adnan) who was not part of the formal part of this research project but was happy to have a casual conversation where I took notes. Adnan had been in the Steering Committee in 2010 for a few months, and then had left the group (see below for discussion). He also wanted Hamad to be part of the conversation. I asked him about his memories of the Steering Committee, and he responded, “I remembered we did an interview or something.” He then adds, “we had interviews to get into the Steering Committee, and you’d ask us, and I think you asked us questions why we’d be good leaders.” He goes on to discuss the research they did with the Year 9s “as group work with the other younger students to ask them their opinions about the school and how they think it’s running. Basically having the students’ voice.” He said, at the beginning of the Steering Committee, “I’m not going to lie to you, I joined that because mainly manouche” [Lebanese pizza that I bought for students for group meetings]. He then says, “but later on I found it was alright.”

I say that he left the group after awhile though [this student left the group in Term 2]. He says, “I found – it got boring. The sessions were too long.” Hamad adds, “I think when we started doing prac, we started to enjoy it more.” Adnan says he doesn’t remember much. I ask, to clarify, if he left because it was “boring.” He says, “No, it wasn’t boring, it was interesting. The sessions were too long” [they were 2 school periods]. This conversation is not explicitly quoted in this thesis. However, this conversation informed my discussion of age in Chapter 6 and RESP in Chapter 9. |
When I asked what was “interesting”, he said, “the group work.” Hamad says, “the prac work – because we usually don’t in class.” I ask, “not just the teacher talking?” Adnan finishes Hamad’s sentence:

Hamad: Yeah. The students actually get -
Adnan: - they got a say.
Hamad: Yeah. Exactly.

We talk about what they like to do in class – “practical work,” “group work”, “play games on the board”, “class discussions.” But Adnan said teachers only do that “when the teachers are bored” or when they have “nothing to do” and “haven’t prepared work.” They say they’d like to have that as part of their actual learning, not bludging. Hamad says, “Face it. We are kids Miss. We’re not going to like sitting down listening to the teacher the whole time.”

They then talk about how teachers treat them differently from Year 9 to Year 12: “teachers are more relaxed on you. They’ll treat you better, they’ll treat you like you’re older” (Adnan), while in Year 9 “they’d send us out of the class” (Hamad). Hamad says, now, “they know we understand them better” and they can “actually cooperate” together. I ask if the difference is because “they treat you differently or you treat them differently?” Adnan says, “It goes both ways. [...] You treat them better, they’ll treat you better. Yeah. Because you’re older, you’re more mature.” Hamad says a younger student who is “good” will be treated “good” and “proper” and repeats “it works both ways.” He adds, “If you’ll be good, they’ll be good to you.” I ask them when they realised these things. Hamad says how he used to get suspended a lot around Year 9 and Year 10, and then includes Adnan, “we used to get suspended a lot” for “everything we done”. He says “teachers, once you do something big, they start to look out for the little stuff”, but when a student starts to “behave, they don’t look at you, they don’t focus on you.” Adnan adds, “they go on to the next person.” We then talk about finishing Year 12 and why they stayed on (when some of their friends left school). Hamad says, “most of us want the experience of Year 12.” He says “some people leave school because they just don’t like the school.” Hamad says some stay, “because they like the way the teachers treat them and stuff”. Adnan says he stayed because “I know nothing’s going to work out if you don’t have [an HSC certificate].”

Adema 11 2011 Word Note: Adema did not want to participate in a focus group, but said she would contribute through answering written questions (adapted from the focus group questions – see Appendix C). This written response is not explicitly
FULL TEXT RESPONSE RECEIVED:

How did you feel about the Steering Committee before you were in it?
I felt the steering committee was an opportunity to express my opinions and views of what could be improved at the school. I have many ideas and therefore when I had the chance to be in the steering committee I initially thought that “Ok, wow! I can be heard and express my opinions in a way that would be heard and respected.”

How did you feel about the Steering Committee while you were in it?
I honestly felt neglected and unable to express my feelings and opinions, I had lots of support from my teachers but my peers, however, weren’t very empathetic to my opinions. As an example we were asked what a researcher looked like, I had left my sheet blank, whereas my peers all drew their “idealistic researcher” when I was asked why, I had replied that researchers do not go by their aesthetics but rather their state of mind and the intention of actually coming to a conclusion in their research. Charles Darwin was a researcher and so are we as we “search” for what students want and need. This was followed by nasty comments and disapproval from my peers, which brought me down and so the rest of my limited time in the steering committee was unenjoyable and unproductive.

How did you feel about the Steering Committee once you were not in the group anymore?
I felt like I should’ve stayed as opposed to leaving because I do have provocative opinions, which despite being described as “annoying” when put into perspective, could’ve made a change and I feel like had I put my opinions forth, I could’ve made a difference, even if a minor one.

How do you feel about the Steering Committee now?
I feel that the steering committee should be limited to a certain group of students from each year that genuinely want to make a difference because many students only join and attend meetings to “get out of class”, so even though it may sound harsh, perhaps a questionnaire should be put into place in order to discover who really wants to take part. I feel as though teachers are too generous in the steering committee and listen to many opinions which may not be actual opinions but rather answers which were moulded in order to please the teachers, making the steering committee ineffective.

How do you feel about school now? Is there a relationship between how you feel about school now and

quoted in this thesis, although I include a footnote in Chapter 5 referring the reader to Adema’s response in this Appendix. Adema’s response informed my inclusion of Figure 19 in Chapter 5 (where another student spoke about feeling “silenced”), my discussion of silence in Chapter 7, and my discussion of internal power relations between students in a journal article published in Childhood (see Appendix F).
your involvement in the Steering Committee?

Honestly no, because my time in the steering committee was not much I did not have all my ideas of the time heard. The opinions that were heard were often dismissed which led to me leaving.

Dale, Brooke Davis, The professor, Cristiano Suarez Ronaldo, John Dixon

This puppet production enacts a students-as-researchers situation where student-puppets are interviewing a teacher-puppet. The marionette puppet is the 'camera-puppet', ‘holding’ a video camera. The yellow haired student-puppet is perched in front of the laptop computer. The orange haired teacher-puppet, the sheep puppet, and the brown haired student-puppet are engaged in a research interview. The student-puppets are interviewing the teacher-puppet, with a ‘camera person’ (the marionette) and a ‘scribe’ (the puppet in front of the laptop puppet).

The student-puppet interviewer asks the teacher puppet, “What emotions do you feel in teaching a class first period on a Monday?” The teacher-puppet says, “Well, I feel very good feeling - teaching first period on a Monday, cause I like seeing all the students – their dreadful faces, which is what I love seeing. And um, I find that first period they usually learn more because their brains haven’t really been functioning over the weekend, cause they haven’t been doing anything serious.” The student-puppet interviewer asks, “Do you ever get emotional towards your students when they use excuses about why they forgot their homework?” The teacher-puppet answers with a story about a time when students did their homework: “Well, I get emotional because it’s like– some students always bring in their homework, which makes me very sad, because I love keeping students in for detention, and if they give me excuses, I usually let them go, because that’s what I want them to do. But I still keep them in, because I hate students.” The student-puppet-interviewer asks, “Do you have any kids of your own who you hate?” The teacher-puppet answers, “No, I’m a single mother of 37 and I don’t– I don’t like kids for some reason, because they’re just trouble. They’re all trouble.” The student-puppet-interviewer asks, “What’s the worst class you’ve ever taught?” The teacher-puppet says, “Oah. Please don’t ask. [Puppet-body shudders violently] […] It was back in 1937. I taught a class of 50 students. (.) They were so quiet, they did all their work. (.) I was so sad. (.) Why did God have to do that to me on that day? […] It was so s-dreadful. (.) I’m going to start crying just from thinking of it. (.) That’s it – I don’t want to continue this interview anymore.” The student-puppet-interviewer says, “Calm down.” The teacher-puppet says, “Nup. No more interview. Thank you very much, I’m going home.”

This puppet production is not explicitly quoted in this thesis. The puppet production’s use of humour and irony informed my discussion of affirmative affects in Chapter 9. The students’ interests in teachers’ feelings informed my discussion about dialogue in Chapter 7. Quotations from all students in this group are included in Chapter 7. Chapter 7 includes a drawing sketched by The professor. Chapter 5 includes quotations from Dale, Cristiano Suarez Ronaldo and John Dixon.
The camera-puppet says, “Come on, I’ll turn off the camera.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name(s)</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Puppet Production Details</th>
<th>See Chapter</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Isaac, xPeke, Shaza, Umprik ash</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Puppet production (improvised, rehearsed and then recorded)</td>
<td>7 for full transcript.</td>
<td>Puppet production transcript is in Chapter 7, where this puppet production, focus group conversation and collaborative analysis of it are discussed. A sketch drawn by xPeke is also included in Chapter 7. All of these students are quoted in Chapters. A photograph of a work of art that Shaza participated in creating is in Chapter 5 (Figure 7). See also Appendix F for a discussion of collaborative writing and presenting experiments where Shaza and Isaac were co-authors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hussein Rodger Alisha James</td>
<td>9 9 8</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Puppet production (improvised, rehearsed and then recorded)</td>
<td>See Chapters 3 for the first half of the puppet production transcript, and Chapter 6 for the second half of the puppet production transcript.</td>
<td>First half of transcript of this puppet production is in Chapter 3, as an entry point to a discussion of order words in schools. Second half of transcript of this puppet production transcript is in Chapter 6, as part of a discussion of the potential for the transformation of order words. These four students are all quoted in Chapter 6. Additionally, Rodger is quoted in Chapter 2, and James is quoted in Chapters 7 and 10. A photograph of a post-it note written on by James is included in Chapter 5 (Figure 19).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note: Hussein was overseas during when the collaborative analysis days were held.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This puppet production contrasts a student/teacher conversations about rubbish inside and outside the territory of the school. In the first half of the puppet production, the student-marionette is asked by a teacher-puppet, “Hey you, can you pick up the rubbish please? Can we keep the environment tidy?” The student-marionette follows instructions and picks up the rubbish.

In the second scene, the same student-puppet and teacher puppet are outside of the territory of the school (in a local park). The teacher puppet asks the student-marionette to pick up a piece of rubbish, “Hey you, can you please pick up this rubbish?” The student-marionette says, “I’m not at school Miss” and walks away.

The third scene is located back in the territory of the school, in the Principal’s office. The student-marionette sits on another puppet (the ‘chair’). The Principal-puppet questions the student-marionette about why the student-marionette did not follow the teacher-puppet’s instructions outside of the territory of the school. The Principal-puppet says that it was “unacceptable” that the student-marionette did not follow the teacher-puppet’s instructions. When the student-marionette tries to explain, the Principal-puppet says, “Do not speak.” The Principal-puppet says that the student-marionette is going to be “stood down from class.”

Not discussed in thesis. However, I make brief reference to our discussion of the concept of interpellation in Chapter 5. A photograph from this puppet production is included in Figures 10 and 12 in Chapter 5. Chapters 5 includes quotations from Johnathan Stewart and Christian Stewart, and Chapter 7 also quotes Christian Stewart. See Appendix F for a discussion of collaborative writing and presenting experiments where Mia Rose and Christian Stewart were co-authors and co-presenters.

Fieldnotes (Not recorded because one student did not consent – see below):

We all go to the library. I have put out on the table a post it note, a consent form, and an electronic clicker [for a SMART board survey – constructed with visuals: students are to press particular buttons and there results will come up on screen]. Roselina says, “What’s this?” about the clickers. I say they’re special, we’ll talk about them later. I introduce the plan on the board (dot points). They say sounds good. We go through the consent form – I get them to tick if they agree with each statement. Writing their email addresses at the end is a bit of a struggle – we need to assist with these.

I check through the consent forms before recording. Adrian says no to audio or video – I say we won’t be recording it then because not everyone agreed. I introducing making up fake names. There is some discussion about this, and then they write down names. We talk about the SMART clickers.

[Below are the questions and the students’ responses [what I was able to write down in time]: My questions are in bolded italics. Quotations from students are italicised, but without quotation marks]

Do you like school? Yes. [All 5]

We talk through the following questions slowly, with students answering via the clickers and discussing their answers: Why do you like school? Who do you ask if the work is hard? Who do you speak to if you’re sad...
or angry?

We then talk through particular school routines, activities and rules. I invite them to choose particular photos that showed what they liked about the Moon Jellies experience (Art Magic project – see Chapters 5 and 9). They look through the photos and choose some. At this stage, Harry asks if he can go out to the bathroom, and leaves for a bit. They choose particular photos each [that I will later give to them to keep.] They say about the photos and the project (summary of quotations:

Spiderman: I liked the moon jellies – the sun and the moon in 2 dimensions [looking at the two photographs he has chosen…]. Adrian: I like this one [of him creating his moon jelly]. […] It gives you more experience in the future if you want to create something – if you get a job one day – knitting – if you want to knit something – create a pillow [he mimes having a pillow and putting his head on it]. Roselina: I chose this one [her working in class on a basket]. Spiderman: [Another student sitting on a stool at the excursion] – because he was being silly. Yuma: [Chose one with his 4 friends] All 4 of us are in it – best friends.

Did you get to choose what you wanted to do in moon jellies? They say yes, they got to choose –

I got the help I needed? False: Adrian, Spiderman

It was okay to make mistakes? True: Spiderman, true

The excursion was boring: Rosalina: Maybe; Spiderman: Fun.

I liked making it into something big. Yes, they agree with this statement.

We then discuss the Talk Time project: My fieldnotes from what they said:

Adrian: Fun […] [but] sometimes you don’t have enough social skills, running out of things to talk about. Everyday it gets more difficult to talk about different things – what do you have next? What did you do on the weekend? What do you have second period?

Is talk time hard? Spiderman: No. Yuma: Somewhere in between – because, you run out of things to talk about. If you have really exciting news, then it can be fun. [But not if you don’t have any news.]

I get to talk to who I want to talk to: Spiderman and Adrian: True. Yuma: I guess so. Harry: You’re with the same people. I would like you get to talk to different people. I always talk to the same people. Adrian: [changes his answer] False. [I ask if they would like to talk to one week one person, and another week, another person]. Yuma: I normally talk to [two particular students].

I am friends with my talk time buddy:
Yuma: I feel like we’re getting there. Adrian: [In the] middle.

Note: Adrian and Roselina participated in two focus groups (their request).

Summary of key fieldnote quotations and student quotations:

[Not recorded – Adrian has put “no” on the student consent form for audio or video recording] I go through the consent form again for Circuit blade, telling him that Yuma, Adrian and Roselina have already been through it. I tell them that I don’t have the clickers, and this time we’re going to use cards instead. I say it’s a bit like a game of cards – holding the yes and no card up to your chest, and then putting down yes or no. Someone says, “oh cool.” They seem to warm into this more quickly than the clickers – it seems to be much more accessible, and more fun.

Below are my questions and a summary of our discussion of being upset, and of students making suggestions to help teaching and learning.

If you are finding something hard in class, who do you ask for help? (Friend, teacher, SLSO, Head Teacher)?

During this conversation, we start speaking about going for a walk when upset [I have seen this happen, and I ask them what happens – do people go for a walk when they are upset?]

Circuit blade: Usually when people are upset or angry. Not all the kids. There are some kids who kick over bins. The last time I had a big melt down – I like to create stuff and be proud of myself – I actually stacked the bins on top of each other and sat down rather than kick – also I think I’ve matured quite a bit. I don’t know if I’m sounding like a bit of a windbag, but I love all the teachers here. The teachers are all friendly, they’re all nice and if they can’t help, they’ll say so. They’re all really helpful and very nice. I’m glad I’m in the Support Unit – it’s the best school I’ve ever been to. At school in the past, I would try to get to be sick. If I’m sick now I still want to come to school. Adrian: I speak with [Head Teacher] – tell him how I feel. I rarely get upset. In the Support Unit I rarely get upset because people are really friendly. Year 7s [in mainstream] bother me sometimes – really immature. Circuit blade: Year 7s have been introduced to the support playground – if I saw a mainstream person making fun of a support person, I’d be there. If they’re making fun of a Support Unit person, they might as well be making fun of me.

See Chapter 5 – Art Magic project discussion. My engagements with the Support Unit also troubled my easy sense of student voice and its inclusivity. See also Chapter 9 for discussion of RESP tokens and these students’ and teachers’ joyful appropriation of them.

**Does anyone notice if you go quiet that you’re upset?** Circuit blade: If we’re in class and he [Yuma] goes quiet we won’t notice. Once we get to him, if he [is upset] we either let him be or I try to cheer him up.

**Should students be allowed to make suggestions about how to improve teaching and learning?** Circuit blade: Yes and No. Roselina and Adrian: Yes. Adrian: So there won’t be any difficulties. Circuit blade: Yes – except for exceptions – really big things. […] [In the Support Unit we have] no selections whatsoever – I very dislike [not having subject selections in the senior years]. Yuma: Like for yes, if it’s something like from science what Circuit blade said, we can do like a chemistry science. Circuit blade: Practical things, science-y stuff. Yuma: And I actually would like to do more hands on stuff in science. Circuit blade: Most hands-on things in science – cutting out things. Yuma: In Year 7 we did go to the science labs and played with Bunsen burners. Circuit blade: Make that suggestion too, that would be awesome.

If I want to change something in class, I am allowed to make a suggestion. Adrian: Both [Yes and No]; Yuma: No. Circuit blade: No. Roselina: Maybe. Circuit blade: It’s not really hard but I feel like we can’t really make a suggestion what we could actually do because there’s nothing they really can do on a set thing they have to do. There has to be someone higher that can listen to us and take something in at least.

**Talking about teachers, schools and what happens in a classroom help me to be a better student and learner.** 2 Trues, 2 Maybe. Circuit blade: If I talk about something and something actually happens, then I’d say Yes.

**If you wanted to change something in class, who would you talk to?** Friend, teacher, SLSO, [Head Teacher], [Principal], parent, someone else (Why would you talk to that person?) Adrian: [Principal] - we should talk to her because she’s in power. You’d have to make an appointment to see her. [Talks about a mistake in the diary about the bell times for assembly on Tues in Term 1 and 2 that was confusing. Eve: Who would you talk to if you wanted to change the bell times? Adrian: It should be [Principal].

**How would you talk to a teacher/SLSO if you wanted to change something?** [We role play a response to this question with puppets – one person is the teacher, one person is the student asking to change something – students brainstorm what they would like to change. We talk about the time table change – asking the timetables. They are initially hesitant to use the puppets but Yuma eventually says he will (maybe just to please me, or because it’s too hard to tell me they don’t want to do that). Yuma plays the student, I play the
principal. Yuma tells me, as principal, that the timetables are confusing, we should have printed the times for assemblies, and the changes each term.]

Individual interview, in the library using a teacher’s computer with the SMARTboard presentation with questions (used with the other focus groups) open. We talk about the same questions as in the other groups. I quote two particular sections below, about becoming a Prefect, and about the Art Magic Project:

_Eve:_ And being a prefect now, how does that feel?

_Juliet Roberts:_ Amazing (laughs). There’s no other words. I was speechless on the day I got the badge. I was just like, ’oh my God. What do I do?’ [...] I was in trouble a lot for the first 3 terms – I nearly got [...] I nearly got expelled and this term I’ve just become (1) more of a grown up student, acting like a prefect. I’m like, ’I’ve gone from being a naughty person (.) to a prefect. How did that work?"

_Eve:_ Yeah. How did that happen?

_Juliet Roberts:_ (laughs) I don’t know. I was just like, ’oh my God.’ Mum opened the letter because a letter went home. Mum didn’t believe me at first. (.) she opened it up and went, ’ooah. Oh my god. Are you kidding me?’ And she sent a picture to my Dad, and my Dad went, ’oh my god.’

Art magic project - conversation with photographs from the project:

_Juliet Roberts:_ I like this one. [...] It’s pretty. [...] And plus I remember taking that photo.

_Eve:_ So what do you remember about the whole process of making them?

_Juliet Roberts:_ It was just the enjoyment of having to teach people about wool and having the most fun ever in the world. (Looking through photographs) Look! I’m wearing pom poms [in the photograph]. I learned how to make pom poms with it. That was fun. [...] I found out something new. It’s interesting. [About the excursion to the gallery to see the assembled Art Magic] It was fun. [...] Just to see everything put together and the hard work that we did really paid off. (Looks through the photos) Oh look. [...] (Laughs) Ha, [Name of a friend]. (1) Oh my god. [...] [Roselina] and you. (.) Oh my god. (Laughs) Bagsing that one (laughs). Oh my god, (laughs) I looked ridiculous [in thr photograph, she has a hula hoop around her neck] – I want a copy of that. [...] Yessss. (1) I love that photo. (.) it’s just a big reminder of my friends.

_Eve:_ Yeah. So which ones have you (.) oh yeah.
Juliet Roberts: I loved the moon jellies. I wish we could do it again.
Eve: What did you like about it so much?
Juliet Roberts: Just the enjoyment. [...] My name’s there [on the list of all the contributors to the exhibition] (Silly voice) Pom poms. (.) you should see my bedroom – it’s covered in pom-poms. [...] I really just wanted to keep going with the pom-poms but they made me do other things.
[Go through True/False statements about the Moon Jelly Project]
Eve: Cool. I would like other subjects to be like the moon jellies project?
Juliet Roberts: No. (Laughs)
Eve: Oh really?
Juliet Roberts: I want to keep it – keep it some strict, some fun.
Eve: That’s a good point. You can’t have fun all the time.
Juliet Roberts: No. (Laughs) No you can’t.

### Fieldnotes from this individual interview. His parent had already completed a formal consent form:

I say hi to Brian. He nods. I say “you know how we talked about having a talk? Did you want to do that now?” He sits down. I sit down at the table next to him.

I say, “these are yes and no cards. If you would like to talk to me now, you can touch the Yes card. If you don’t want to talk to me now, you can touch the No card.” He puts his hand on the yes card and picks it up. A SLSO asks another student to play the piano while I am talking to Brian. He moves to the back corner and starts playing (what is the song? It’s a famous one…) on the piano softly while I am talking to Brian. The students are still, listening. The student playing the piano is wearing a pink paper tie.

I say to Brian I have a few questions. I put down the first one (printed from the support unit Notebook IWB survey), “‘do you like school?’” He puts his right hand on the Yes card and looks at me. I say okay, you like school? He nods.

I put down the next card and say verbally, “‘Do you like maths?’” He puts his hand on Yes and picks it up. He makes a noise, “hmmm” emphatically. I say okay, “you like maths?” He makes an emphatic sound with his mouth closed.

See Chapter 5 – Art Magic project discussion. My engagements with the Support Unit also troubled my easy sense of student voice and its inclusivity. See also Chapter 9 for discussion of RESP tokens and these students’ and teachers’ joyful appropriation of them.

| Brian | 7 | Not in Steering Committee | YES and NO cards used, along with photographs from the Art Magic Project, taken by students. | Note: Brian did not verbally communicate very frequently, but communicated by other means. | See Chapter 5 – Art Magic project discussion. My engagements with the Support Unit also troubled my easy sense of student voice and its inclusivity. See also Chapter 9 for discussion of RESP tokens and these students’ and teachers’ joyful appropriation of them. |
I say I want to ask about the moon jellies [Art Magic] project now. I take out some of the photos of the process of making the moon jellies, and put them in front of him on the desk. I say pick the photos that you like. He leafs through the photos, and comes to the photo [a photo that another student took of Brian’s art basket] of his basket. He picks it up. I say, “that’s your basket isn’t it?” He makes a sound with the back of his throat, and then says verbally, “yes.” [I am elated.] He chooses two other photos – one is also of his particular work, and I am not sure about the other photograph. He also takes the photograph of one of the green pom with someone cutting the pom pom. I say, “I’ll take the other photos away?” I start picking them up.

I put down the next question, “did you like the moon jellies [Art magic] project?” He looks at me, picks up the Yes card, and verbally speaks: “yes.” I say, “yes, okay.” [I feel elated inside – he has spoken!].

I put down the next question, “If you wanted to change something, are you allowed to make a suggestion?” He does not touch either of the cards – no response, and he looks away. I leave him with some time to think about this. I say it another way, then say, shall we go to the next question? I am not sure if he doesn’t understand the question or if he doesn’t want to answer.

I put down the next question, thinking that he probably won’t respond to this one either: “teachers notice if I am sad or unhappy.” He does not respond – he does not touch Yes or No.

I say we might finish up there. I ask, “did you like using these yes and no cards?” He says, “Yes” audibly, looking at me. I say, “that’s great! Thank you so much for your time.”

The student playing the piano has just finished playing. The students clap and I realise that they have all been quiet – it is like they have provided a space for Brian and I to talk. The Art teacher says, “they like the music, it’s calming.” I ask the group, “do you like the music?” A few students say yes.
Appendix E: PowerPoint slides used to structure the collaborative analysis days

These PowerPoint slides are close to what was used on these collaborative analysis days. These slides were used as backdrops to structure each day. The first collaborative analysis day was held with students previously in the Steering Committee in 2010, 2011 and 2012. The second collaborative analysis day was held with students currently in the Steering Committee (who ranged in year groups from Years 7-11). There are similarities and differences in the analysis activities done on each day. On the second collaborative analysis day, I also followed up particular issues that had been previously debated in Steering Committee meetings and the focus groups.

NOTE: The quotations used on these PowerPoint slides are anonymised with the generic pseudonym Student. Where multiple students are quoted, I use the generic pseudonyms: Student 1, Student 2, Student 3 and so on. I did not want to make students’ quotations identifiable because I did not sense that all students would feel comfortable with their words, uttered in a smaller group in another situation, to be identifiable to a broader range of students. Students chose their pseudonyms and wrote their self-descriptions at the end of these collaborative analysis days.
Previous Steering Committee Group analysis/ theorising day

What’s today all about?

- To ANALYZE the data group presented (A)
- To JOT DOWN their impressions (what they think, feel, discuss, and wonder about)
- FORGET to be involved: Four stages of learning how to use of connecting hypotheses, reflecting, discussing, and planning...
- FOUR (FOUR) steps to writing up your observations: (1) data collection, (2) data analysis, (3) data interpretation, (4) data discussion

What ‘ethical guidelines’ should we have?

- Ethics (the moral principles that keep us from hurting others emotionally and physically)
- VEN?
- ‘A note about the camera and others...’

Period 1: Scenario analysis in groups

What was it like to make a puppet show in the focus group?
What some of you said about the puppets:

- Student 3: Because it could be from 1950's and 1960's.
- Student 4: What you learn is how to handle people because like people work and play together.
- Student 5: It seems like there are lot of choices.

Period 1: Beginning of 2.
Analysing other groups' scenarios

- 3 groups:
  - 1st scenario: 10:00-10:30
  - 2nd scenario: 9:20-9:50
  - 3rd scenario: 19:00-10:30

Period 2: Reporting back (10:00-10:30)

- Group 1 reports back - 10:00-10:10
- Group 2 reports back - 10:10-10:20
- Group 3 reports back - 10:20-10:30

Group scenario comparison 10:30-10:45

- Post-it notes on board.
- Group together, draw summary relationships.
- What word & title go with each other group's scenarios?
- What do you think the overall group that came first (the group), the purpose?
- What's the meaning of the scenarios and the 3 groups, one of them? Do you think it is different? (Please see list above)

End of Period 3: Reflection

- 00:40:11 - Pick a postcard and describe how it reflects your impressions of taking part it a group analysis.
- 10:11:41 - Outline plan for next period.
- Discuss present themes.
- Quick information sheet (and why).
- Pizza.

Period 4: Questions that you came up with during the focus groups

- Did you become involved in the thinking about all of the aspects of a single theme or a single theme or one other space?
- Did you discuss thinking about the other aspects of the theme?
- Were the people using the same term in different situations?
- Should you think about or a single theme or one other space?
- What kind of issues are you? Obviously you understand it later.
Period 4: Postcards

- Choosing a photo to represent power in Australia
- Come up silently and pick one, tell partner, draw a chart for each option
- Who picked ‘em? Why? (etc.)
- Focus on identity/self-realisation/identity

Period 5: Group theorising

- Choose one of the following to theorise: Power, emotion, motivation/identity
- In groups, look at what students have said and army about this concept (question)
- Using these ideas (not), draw a diagram of flow chart pattern

Focus group quotations from you about POWER (see handout slips of paper)

Student 1: They’re [teachers] just run all over you. So if you don’t have your head up, they don’t stand up for themselves. They can just use it for your advantage.

Student 2: And then there’s that girl, they’re not going to say, “I’m not doing that.” They’re not going to say that. And if you don’t do what they will.

Student 3: What are you doing? (I don’t think there’s much pressure among the students. Like, I’m pretty sure if someone did something wrong, they’d just say, “I’m sorry, I made a mistake.”)
Focus group quotations from you about EMOTION (see handout slips of paper)

Student 1: They might be angry from the other kids in the class.
Student 2: They might be angry.
Student 3: Because they might not like what the teacher is saying.
Student 4: They might be angry because they’re getting一等奖.
Student 5: They might be angry because they’re getting a good grade.
Student 6: They might be angry because they’re getting a bad grade.
Student 7: They might be angry because they’re getting a good grade.
Student 8: They might be angry because they’re getting a bad grade.
Student 9: They might be angry because they’re getting a good grade.

Focus group quotations from you about EMOTION (see handout slips of paper)

Student 1: They might be angry from the other kids in the class.
Student 2: They might be angry.
Student 3: Because they might not like what the teacher is saying.
Student 4: They might be angry because they’re getting一等奖.
Student 5: They might be angry because they’re getting a good grade.
Student 6: They might be angry because they’re getting a bad grade.
Student 7: They might be angry because they’re getting a good grade.
Student 8: They might be angry because they’re getting a bad grade.
Student 9: They might be angry because they’re getting a good grade.

Focus group quotations from you about EMOTION (see handout slips of paper)

Student 1: They might be angry from the other kids in the class.
Student 2: They might be angry.
Student 3: Because they might not like what the teacher is saying.
Student 4: They might be angry because they’re getting一等奖.
Student 5: They might be angry because they’re getting a good grade.
Student 6: They might be angry because they’re getting a bad grade.
Student 7: They might be angry because they’re getting a good grade.
Student 8: They might be angry because they’re getting a bad grade.
Student 9: They might be angry because they’re getting a good grade.

Focus group quotations from you about EMOTION (see handout slips of paper)

Student 1: They might be angry from the other kids in the class.
Student 2: They might be angry.
Student 3: Because they might not like what the teacher is saying.
Student 4: They might be angry because they’re getting一等奖.
Student 5: They might be angry because they’re getting a good grade.
Student 6: They might be angry because they’re getting a bad grade.
Student 7: They might be angry because they’re getting a good grade.
Student 8: They might be angry because they’re getting a bad grade.
Student 9: They might be angry because they’re getting a good grade.
Focus group quotations from you about MOTIVATION (see handout slips of paper)

Student 1: [A student notes an issue that you were doing the work when you are.]
Student 2: [The student adds that it's a fun situation.]
Student 4: [A student mentions doing your work in the time you have.]

Student 1: [A student adds that they were doing your work.]
Student 2: [The student adds that they were doing your work.]
Student 4: [A student mentions doing your work in the time you have.]

Focus group quotations from you about IDENTITY/AGE/MATURITY/CHANGE (see handout slips of paper)

Student 1: [A student notes an issue that they were doing the work when you are.]
Student 2: [The student adds that it's a fun situation.]
Student 4: [A student mentions doing your work in the time you have.]

Student 1: [A student adds that they were doing your work.]
Student 2: [The student adds that they were doing your work.]
Student 4: [A student mentions doing your work in the time you have.]

Focus group quotations from you about IDENTITY/AGE/MATURITY/CHANGE (see handout slips of paper)

Student 1: [A student notes an issue that they were doing the work when you are.]
Student 2: [The student adds that it's a fun situation.]
Student 4: [A student mentions doing your work in the time you have.]

Student 1: [A student adds that they were doing your work.]
Student 2: [The student adds that they were doing your work.]
Student 4: [A student mentions doing your work in the time you have.]

Group theorising: Motivation

- [A group discussion on motivation is occurring.]
- [Participants are discussing the benefits of motivation and how it affects their work.]

Group theorising: Identity

- [A group discussion on identity is occurring.]
- [Participants are discussing how their identity affects their work and how it changes over time.]

Exhibit the examples: [A chart showing examples of identities is displayed.]

A note on the examples: [A note is added to the chart explaining the examples shown.]

A question on the examples: [A question is posed about the examples shown.]

A discussion on the examples: [A discussion is held about the examples shown.]

A conclusion on the examples: [A conclusion is drawn about the examples shown.]
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Group theorising

- ISLO:1.2 - Share back as a whole group. What did you notice?
- Overlap these drawings on each other - power, emotion, identity - group discussion.

Period 6: Theorising about student voice

- How do you want to name what you did in the Sharing Committee and how to theorise it? What "voice" time would you visualise represent it?
- What do you like about the following diagrams of student voice? Why?


**Student voice?**

![Diagram](https://example.com/student_voice_diagram.png)

- What is student voice?
- What is a rhizome?
- Issues with the name 'student voice'

- Singular
- Speaking only
- Doesn't allow for differences?
- Is there an alternative way of diagramming student voice? Is a diagram even appropriate?

**Final silent conversation**

- What is student voice?
- What is a rhizome?
- What are the most important parts of education today?
Current Steering Committee
Group analysis/ the rising day
27/3/17 (final collaborative analysis day)

What’s today all about?

- ToDivider you group
- 8:00-10:30: Group work on the puppet show
- 10:30-10:45: Coffee break
- 10:45-11:00: Group presentation on the puppet show
- 11:00-11:30: Group discussion on the puppet show
- 11:30-13:00: Lunch
- 13:00-13:30: Group presentation on the puppet show
- 13:30-14:00: Group discussion on the puppet show
- 14:00-14:30: Group presentation on the puppet show
- 14:30-15:00: Group discussion on the puppet show
- 15:00-15:30: Group presentation on the puppet show
- 15:30-16:00: Group discussion on the puppet show
- 16:00-16:30: Group presentation on the puppet show
- 16:30-17:00: Group discussion on the puppet show

What ‘ethical guidelines’ should we have?

- Ethics - the moral principle that governs how we treat others (physically and verbally)
- Idea?
- A note about the current situation - making decisions before calling anyone

Period 1: Scenario analysis in groups

- What’s it like to make a puppet show in the focus group?

What previous Steering Committee students said about the puppets:

- Student 1: The puppet was a great idea, but it took a lot of time to build.
- Student 2: It made our story more engaging when we used the puppet.
- Student 3: The puppet added a sense of humor to the story.
- Student 4: The puppet was a good idea, but we should have done more research at the beginning.
**Periods 1-3: Analysing other groups’ scenarios**

- Group 1: Discussion
- Group 2: Discussion
- Group 3: Discussion
- Group 4: Discussion
- Group 5: Discussion

**Group scenario comparison 11:05-11:14**

- Writing up key ideas
- Drawing on the board
- Grouping, drawing arrows, etc.

**Period 4: Quick reflection**

- What are the key themes/narratives in the group scenarios?
- What do you think were the main points that came up in the group scenarios?
- What’s missing from the scenarios that you think is important?
- What is difficult to talk about when you’re not part of a group?

**Period 4: Questions that you came up with during the focus groups**

- What do you feel about school?
- What are your favorite parts of school?
- What are the differences for respondents?
- How do you feel about your group?
- What were your thoughts on the focus groups?

**Period 4: Interviewing and its purposes**

- 1/31/21 – Discuss what the purpose of an interview is.
- YOU as interviewers: capturing problems, being interviewee.
- Draw picture of you and your interlocutor.

**Period 5: Interviewing**

- YOU as interviewee: experience/country
- Draw picture of you being interviewed with speech bubbles.

**415**
Interview ‘reality’ and classroom ‘reality’

- 2.19 – L1: Think it is classroom? Do you? Is she in the ‘reality’? Are you?
- 10.38 – Think your classroom with speech/ thought bubbles (include emotions – show in face/body/spread)

What might be produced in ‘unnormal’ interview/observation situations?

- For those brief moments, increased their connection between themselves and student – you are still aware of them – awareness of their thoughts – add that, an awareness of their interactions and your actions and how you think it normal to do that. In saying the program – 1 I felt that connection was really positive.
- You can’t really absolutely ignore that they’re there, and you’re really want to – ‘communicate’ to them. How do you become not really aware of them, but also aware of the things? [A teacher]
- = What did your presence make the teacher think about? What did it produce in her?

You as interviewee/observer: Quotes from your focus groups and Steering Committee meetings

- [A focus group question] teeth and other issues
- H1 – Being a teacher

You as interviewee/observer: Quotes from your focus groups and Steering Committee meetings

- To take a further development

You as interviewee/observer: Quotes from your focus groups and Steering Committee meetings

- Conversations

You as interviewee/observer: Quotes from your focus groups and Steering Committee meetings

- Emotional conversations in the interview
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Period 6: Theorising about student voice

- What is student voice?
- What do you like about the following aspects of student voice? Why? Why not?
- Change one that resonates with you...
Student voice as music?

The phrase, "the student voice is music," is a metaphor that highlights the value of students' perspectives and contributions in the learning process. It suggests that the unique experiences and ideas of students are as valuable as the music in an orchestra. This perspective encourages educators to listen to students and incorporate their voices into the curriculum, much like musicians listen to each other and the music they are creating. It also implies that each student's voice is unique and should be respected and celebrated.
Final silent conversation

- What is student voice?
- What is school reform?
- What was the most important point discussed today?
Appendix F: A summary of collaborative writing and presenting experiments with students and teachers

As discussed in Chapter 5, this study involved collaborative writing experiments. In addition, I was enfolded in the production of other presentations and texts that students created about their research work in the Steering Committee.

Table 5 summarises the process of organising these collaborative creations, who was involved, and if and where they are published. These collaborative writing/presenting experiments are listed in chronological order, depending on when the process of writing or preparing the work for the presentation began.
Table 5. A summary of collaborative writing and presenting experiments with students and teachers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The process of organising the collaborative writing/presenting experiments and summary of content (if unpublished)</th>
<th>Who was involved (student pseudonyms, teachers, others)</th>
<th>If and where published</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>[STUDENT FOCUS GROUP IN APRIL, TEACHER INTERVIEW AND COLLABORATIVE WRITING SESSION IN MAY]</strong> In a focus group (also with Abu George), two Year 11 students (Onetwothree and Sarah) spoke about a past research event – where they observed a teacher’s lesson as part of their research about <em>The Teachers I’d Like</em> – as a powerful learning experience for understanding the complexities of teaching and learning (see, for example, a quotation from <em>Onetwothree</em> in Chapter 7). I asked them whether they would permit me to share these positive quotations about the experience of lesson observation with the teacher whom they had observed. They agreed and were excited to hear what the teacher (Miss Wood) would say in response. I then printed off and shared quotations from these students with this teacher in an interview, and she also spoke about how powerful the experience of being observed by student researchers had been for her professional reflection. I then asked the two students and the teacher if we might meet together to construct a collective account of this past lesson observation experience. The four of us met to write together about this 2011 lesson observation event. We spoke and I collectively pooled our memories of the 2011 research event on a Word document viewed by all, negotiating the wording of the account. As part of preparing this paper after this collaborative writing, I hoped to share some of my early research thinking with Senior Executive teachers at the school (in May 2013), to facilitate a conversation about some of the challenging issues raised by students, articulate some of my anxieties surrounding representation, and to provide them with opportunities to provide other interpretations of the data, as well as to share these positive comments from students and teachers. I discussed the content and quotations from this paper, as well as other anonymised puppet production data. St Pierre (1997) has called...</td>
<td>Onetwothree, Sarah, Miss Wood (teacher pseudonym), and Eve Mayes</td>
<td>Conference paper presented at Australian Association for Research in Education conference in Adelaide. The peer reviewed version of the paper is published online (see Mayes, 2013c in Reference List).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
such conversations “response data” – engagements with participants where data and interpretations are shared, critical response is invited, and the researcher accounts for how these engagements have shifted their own interpretations (p. 184). I met with both Senior Executive teachers separately in July 2013. When I shared these anonymised quotations and summarised the content of the paper, both articulated their support, and said that they were not surprised, nor concerned, about some of the more challenging data. I invited them to read a full version of the paper, but they declined.

The collective account constructed between Onetwothree, Sarah, Miss Wood and I became part of a conference paper (Peer Reviewed and available online). I theorised our discussions of this past event as a “re-eventalisation” of this past lesson observation event (Fraser, 2006, p. 130; see Chapter 5).

Abstract

Observers of teachers’ practice in their classrooms have typically been adults: academic researchers analysing professional practice, school executive members assessing teacher quality and colleagues engaged in professional development and school reform initiatives. This paper discusses observations of teachers’ practice from a different vantage point: students. In 2011, two Year 9 students observed a teacher in her classroom. This student research event was part of a broader four-year Students-as-Co-Researchers initiative investigating teaching and learning in a low socio-economic high school receiving targeted funding. In 2013, these students were invited to remember and re-construct the 2011 research event in various configurations. This paper examines the affective flows at work in re-positioning students and teachers using the concepts of the “assemblage”, subjectivity as “lines” and “rhizoanalysis” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1980/1987). It is argued that lines of flight - ruptures in thought and experimentation in practice - escaped in and through the 2011 research event and the 2013 research assemblages for both the students, the teacher and the researcher. Alternative ways of speaking, relating, teaching, learning and becoming prompted by these encounters in the classroom, the staffroom and the school are considered for their potential to convert the “education assemblage” (Youdell, 2011, p. 137).

[PAPER PREPARED IN APRIL/MAY AND PRESENTED IN JUNE] I wrote a conference paper for the Cambridge Student Voice seminar in June 2013 (in the middle of the process of fieldwork). This conference paper included discussion of two puppet productions generated in a Year 10 and a Year 11 focus group (see Appendix D for a summary of these puppet productions).
I shared earlier drafts of this paper with the facilitating teacher of the Steering Committee and the academic partner, and they gave helpful feedback about its content. While I presented the conference paper in June 2013 by myself, I acknowledged the contributions of the facilitating teacher and the academic partner, and included them as co-authors.

**Abstract**

Evaluations of schools’ performance have increasingly moved into the public domain. Both policy formation and critiques of the evaluation of schools on the basis of statistical data from standardised tests have predominantly been generated by politicians, academics, the teaching profession and parent groups, all of whom are adults. This paper explores critical evaluations of schools and the state of education from a different vantage point: students’ perspectives about their cross-school research experiences within a broader four-year *Students as Co-researchers* initiative at a low socio-economic school in Sydney, Australia. Two focus group discussions that are part of a participatory ethnography of students’ experiences of participation in school reform are analysed. We explore how students made meaning of their observations of other schools in their *Students as Co-researchers* project, and how their discussions might contribute to wider debates about the evaluation of schools. Deleuze and Parnet’s discussion of subjectivity as lines (Deleuze & Parnet, 2007/1997) is drawn upon to analyse how the visits prompted not only responses that aligned with the school’s purposes, but also lines of critique of the surveillance of bodies, interactive habits, and socialisation practices at work in the school visits and their own school. In the final section of the paper, we examine students’ imaginings of how these patterns of speaking, listening, teaching and learning might be constituted otherwise. It is argued that the experience of participation, connection and rupture across school settings might result in uncomfortable critique, but also to new imaginings of alternative constructions of teacher/ student relationships and education itself.

**[ORGANISED/ WRITTEN AND PRESENTED IN AUGUST 2013]** A Senior Executive teacher at the school asked me if I would give a presentation at the NSW Secondary Deputy Principals Annual Conference about student voice. I agreed, on the condition that students present and discuss their own work. I invited four students (two from the 2012 Steering Committee – Chatterbox and Jeff Seid, and two from the 2013 Steering Committee – Christian Stewart and Mia Rose) to be involved in this Deputy Principals’ conference presentation. The students and I met over three-week period to plan their speeches and a PowerPoint about their work in the Steering Committee and the concept of *student voice*. As part of their preparation, they filmed Vox Pops of students from the school (beyond the Steering Committee) talking about what the phrase “student voice” meant to them. These four students organised to borrow a faculty video camera, recorded the video, and edited and assembled the final video of Vox Pops.
On the day of the presentation, I sat amongst the audience (of Deputy Principals) and introduced them. The Deputy Principal from this school was also present at the presentation as an audience member, and encouraged the students throughout their presentation and afterwards.

During the presentation, the students described the purpose of their presentation as:

- To inform you of some ways that students, as researchers, might be involved in assessing or changing the teaching and learning at a school;
- To inspire you, as future principals, to take into consideration students’ opinions;
- To broadcast student voice and to have you leaving this conference with the mind-set of empowering students.

These four students gave each Deputy Principal three post it notes to write on during the presentation: one for their “Emotions” felt in response to the presentation; another for “Ideas” generated during the presentation; and another for “Questions” to ask at the end of the presentation.

The four students then introduced the school’s context and student voice, and then played the student Vox Pop video. I briefly introduced rationales from student voice from the research literature. After this introduction, the four students took turns to describe what happened each year of the students’ research – The School I’d Like (2010), The Teachers I’d Like (2011), The Learner I’d Like to be (2012) and What I’d Like to Learn (2013): each year’s research process and each Steering Committee’s research findings. The presentation was broken up with a video produced by the Steering Committee in 2011 about the complexities of being an “effective” learner according to students (with complexities including family circumstances, tiredness, peer pressure, but also having a “choice” to focus and engage at school. The theme of the video was Choice or Chance?”).

The students concluded their presentation by speaking about, “What is the Steering Committee to us?” The students had pre-written these responses that they spoke to the Deputy Principal audience. Christian Stewart and Mia Rose said:

To us the steering is a group open for all students, enabling them to be involved in research programs that are aimed at creating a better learning environment for both teachers and students. Just being involved and able to having the opportunity to give our opinions is an amazing feeling. We were able to talk to the teachers while discussing issues that affected us just as well as them.
Jeff Seid and Chatterbox said:

> To us the Steering Committee is a massive opportunity for us as students to express our opinion about what goes in the school. The Steering Committee is beneficial towards students as it makes students feel engaged in their learning environment as they speak for whatever they want to make their learning more precious and valuable. The Steering Committee to us has created stronger relationships with teachers and students as we were researching for one year about student voice and how to make students’ learning environment more positive. Overall, the Steering Committee to us has consolidated our self-confidence as we feel we can speak about anything that can help us make changes as learners and towards our education for the better.

At the end of the presentation, the Deputy Principals took some time to write their post it note responses: their “Emotions,” “Ideas,” and “Questions.” The Deputy Principals then made comments and asked questions of the students. At the end of the presentation, the Deputy Principals handed in their post it notes to the students (optional). The four students and I read and discussed the post it notes on the train home (see below for next collaborative writing experiment).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[WRITTEN IN AUGUST 2013, PUBLISHED IN DECEMBER 2013] On the train ride home after presenting at the NSW Deputy Principals’ Annual Conference, we discussed the presentation and the Deputy Principals’ responses on their post it notes and in question time. As we discussed these responses, I asked if they would like to jointly construct an article for the school’s newsletter about the experience. We then passed my laptop around, and each student wrote a section each about the presentation, and added to each other’s sentences. This account was published in the December school newsletter, as below:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year 10s present at the Deputy Principals’ Conference!</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>On Thursday 29 August, [Mia Rose] went with three other students in my year: [Chatterbox], [Christian Stewart], [Jeff Seid], and Mrs Mayes. We gave a presentation to about 15 Deputy Principals at the Deputy Principals’ conference at [name of hotel] in the city. There were about 300 deputies from all over [NSW] at the conference. Our presentation was about student voice: students and teachers talking and researching together about how to work together for improved learning. We hoped to raise their awareness on how student voice can make a major contribution to education and learning in schools.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>At first I was a bit nervous - I didn’t know what was going to happen - but it turned out to be one of the most amazing experiences I’ve ever had. We were able to understand attitudes and perspectives from a principal’s eyes, deputy principal’s</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
eyes and even the teachers’. It was a great experience and we hope to contribute in other presentations like this, gaining more knowledge and understanding.

The conference built our confidence in presenting in front of many executive staff about our research and our recommendations for them in the future. The conference was an experience that will remain with us in the present and for the future. Seeing deputies interested in our research and co-operating with their questions and opinions was satisfying as we got to see that they all have different opinions and views. We asked the deputies to share their emotions, ideas and questions on post it notes at the end of the presentation. [*See below.] They asked us many questions about the Steering Committee. Their questions included how to spread these ideas across a school and how our involvement had impacted on us personally. They seemed actually interested in what we had to say and the ideas we gave them for their possible future projects as deputies.

Thanks [Deputy Principal’s name] for organising the conference and inviting us to present at it.

[REAL NAMES USED IN SCHOOL NEWSLETTER ARTICLE]

* Note: The following section was in the students’ draft of this place of the article, but was not included in the newsletter publication:

Some of the emotions they [the Deputy Principals] wrote down included “happy,” “curious,” “interested”, “excited”, “thought-provoking and valuable,” “very authentic.” We were quite interested in one response: “this is a wonderful idea but confronting” and had a long discussion together about this point later. One of the deputies wrote, “student passion is obvious – high levels of passion/engagement. Wow! Very impressive. Great role models.”

| [ANALYTICAL MEETING IN SEPTEMBER] Invited to contribute an article to a Special Issue of *English in Australia* on Garth Boomer and negotiating the curriculum, I issued an open invitation at a 2013 Steering Committee meeting to be involved in a small group discussion of the “hidden curriculum” of the Steering Committee, reading and talking about my fieldnotes from a meeting where the group explored the concept of the “hidden curriculum.” I explicitly told the Steering Committee that this group discussion would later become part of a journal article for teachers and researchers. Three Year 10 and one Year 9 student volunteered to be part of this discussion meeting for the journal article. During this meeting, | Bella, Mia Rose, Christian Stewart, Isaac and Eve Mayes | Journal article published in *English in Australia* (See Mayes, 2013a in Reference List). |
I asked students what they remembered from the past Steering Committee meeting where the concept of the “hidden curriculum” was introduced. After discussing their memories, students individually read my fieldnote account of this past Steering Committee meeting. My instructions to them were:

• Highlight sentences or interactions in this account that you find interesting. Why did you highlight these sentences?
• What questions do you have about the hidden curriculum/this meeting/the interactions in this meeting?

We then read the fieldnotes together as a group and discussed what they found interesting and their questions. Later, I transcribed this conversation and highlighted passages where these students explicitly discussed power, emotion/affect, as well as passages that resonated or jarred with what I had read in Boomer’s Negotiating the Curriculum. Students’ quotations and questions were prominent in this journal article. I shared the journal article with the students when it was closed to complete, and sent a PDF of the published article to these students.

Abstract

Garth Boomer’s ideas in Negotiating the Curriculum (1992a) resonate with discussions of shifting teacher and student roles and relationships in the ‘student voice’ movement (Bragg & Fielding, 2005; Cook-Sather, 2002; Groundwater-Smith, 2007; Mitra, 2003). Boomer (1988) critiqued his earlier conception of power in Negotiating the Curriculum, asserting that he would ‘now like to write a book on Negotiating the Hidden Curriculum’, in which he would conduct an ethnographic ‘micro-analysis’ of the ‘moment-by-moment dance’ between teachers and students and the fluctuations in the ‘flows and ebbs of affect and primal resistance in teachers and taught’ (p.171). This article takes up this provocation, considering a 2013 meeting of a cross-age student voice group where students, teachers and researchers collectively discussed the meanings and manifestations of the hidden curriculum through analysing Pink Floyd’s Another Brick in the Wall (Waters, 1979), other film representations of school, and their own school. In an attempt to negotiate an account of this meeting, I analysed a transcript of the interactions between students and between students and the adult teachers/researchers with four students who participated in this meeting. Students discussed these transcripts and posed their own questions about the interactions in this meeting. I integrate my questions arising from this meeting and its joint analysis with their questions, adding to questions about shifting power and affect in classrooms previously raised by practitioners/scholars in relation to negotiating the curriculum and student voice work.

[VIDEOS PREPARED IN OCTOBER] I assisted four students from the 2013 Steering Committee (Shaza, Isaac, Christian Stewart and Mia Rose) in preparing two videos for a philanthropic organisation. This was in response to a call

| Shaza | Not published. |
from the organisation called “Student ShoutOut” for video submission of what students would tell their Prime Minister if they could. This “Student ShoutOut” “learner initiative” was described in the organisation’s Annual Report as about “empowering young Australians to have a voice in their education, as primary stakeholders” (Organisation Annual Report, 2013, p. 11). I helped the students to prepare their presentation and video, and filmed it for them. Two videos were made: one with Shaza, Christian and Mia Rose about the Steering Committee, and one by Isaac about governments listening to students’ perspectives when making decisions about school funding. The students edited their videos themselves.

All four students were selected by the philanthropic organisation to attend a State conference after they prepared their videos. Because teacher relief to accompany them to the conference for the day was not possible, and the students’ parents could not accompany them to the conference, the students did not attend. An offer was then made by the philanthropic organisation to pay for the students to fly to a neighbouring city and accommodate students to be able to attend and contribute to a national student participation conference. Ms Frazzle offered to pay for her own ticket and accommodation to chaperone the students. This excursion was not approved, and the students did not attend these conferences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[CONSTRUCTED/ WRITTEN IN NOVEMBER] Invited by Roger Holdsworth to contribute an article about the 2013 Steering Committee to the student voice journal Connect, I issued an open invitation at a meeting of the 2013 Steering Committee to be involved in composing this article together. In the article, we wrote the following account of how it was constructed:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In November 2013, I [Eve] asked students in the Steering Committee if anyone would like to work on an article for Connect together. Isaac and Brooke volunteered, and we met to discuss how to write it, and how to structure it. Isaac suggested that it would be good to have quotations from other students in the group, as well as the teachers, and other members of the community who had heard about the work of the students, so that they were not speaking in the place of their peers. In this article, quotations are assembled from what students, teachers and others have said in a range of settings: during group meetings/research activities and at formal presentations. Christian [Stewart] and Mia [Rose] summarise the work of the group. Their words come from a presentation that they made at the NSW Deputy Principals’ Conference in August 2013 with [Chatterbox] and [Jeff Seid] [see above]. Isaac, Brooke and Eve worked together to bring the text of the article together [from quotations from my fieldnotes from Steering Committee and student focus groups]. A draft of this article was shown to the Brooke Davis, Isaac and Eve Mayes constructed this article. The final version (before submission) shared with the 2013 Steering Committee.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
whole [2013] Steering Committee group before publication” (p. 14).

[FILMED IN DECEMBER AND VIEWED/ UPLOADED TO WEBSITE IN FEBRUARY 2014] The philanthropic organisation that supported the students in October (see above) offered the school to be part of a particular initiative, funded by a corporate partner, providing micro-grants to honour “youth-led initiatives from Australia.” In the organisation’s Annual Report, this initiative was described as follows:

[Initiative name] is a joint initiative of [philanthropic organisation name] and [corporate partner] that provides support and micro-grants to young people who want to make a difference. [Philanthropic organisation name] selects inspiring youth-led initiatives from across Australia that can be easily replicated, showcasing them online via video at [website], and then encourages other young people to take up the challenge and re-create these ideas in their own communities (Philanthropic organization Annual Report, 2013, p. 17).

The organisation provided a professional film crew to come to the school over two days to plan with the students and Ms Frazzle how they would like to be filmed and what they would like to say and present. The organisation had its own consent process, and the school also ensured that students had signed NSW Department of Education consent forms for photo/video production. I was away at two conferences at the time of filming.

The video included students speaking about the Steering Committee, their research about the curriculum, their interviews and focus groups with teachers, and why they think student voice is important. Ms Frazzle was released from class to assist with the filming, but was not part of the video.

The organisation professionally edited and produced the video. In February 2014, a final draft version of the video was sent to the school to approve before it would be uploaded to the website. The Steering Committee students, the Principal, the Deputy Principal, a Head teacher, Ms Frazzle and I watched the final draft version of the video together twice. Students and the teachers wrote written responses to the video and shared them after the first viewing of the video. These responses

Video uploaded to organization website. I do not put the weblink here because the school name and the students are identifiable in the video.
were to be sent to the philanthropic organisation to give them feedback for the final editing process. Students and teachers wrote responses to questions including: “How do we feel: about seeing the Steering Committee program on the screen; about seeing our school on the screen?” and “What is the message: for other students to learn; about the type of school [school name] is?” These written responses from the students, Deputy Principal Head teacher were mostly positive, including the following statements:

“SO PROUD OF [the school], THE STEERING COMMITTEE. I LOVED IT. SO IMPRESSED – IT WAS BOTH GENUINE AND POSITIVE. […] In the few minutes it certainly did operate as a call to action. [The message about the school was that it is] INCLUSIVE! PROVIDES OPPORTUNITIES” [Deputy Principal].
Really good. Everyone seems relaxed. It’s really honest and genuine (the portrayal of the students). It’s quite complementary to the program and students. It exceeded my expectations – the school, the students and program are presented in a positive light that is complimentary. […] [The message about the school in the video is that it is a] [o]pen and friendly school where students’ voices are valued and where teachers care about students [Head Teacher].
We have shown that [school name] is a great school that listens to its students [Rima].
It makes me feel like Steering Committee is growing larger and larger. It makes me feel like the school has finally shown its good side [xPeke].
It feels good to know that the world can see what we do. The school might get a better reputation [Dale].
The feeling about seeing ourselves on screen is really overwhelming and mad to see [Cristiano Suarez Ronaldo].
Proud, happy [Shaza].
Really happy, seeing people appreciate the work we do [Mia Rose].
I am actually excited because it shows the Steering Committee is starting to get noticed and published. It was amazing because it shows the hard work was paying off. It makes me proud to say I am a member of [school name]. This video broadcast the message that [school name] is a school looking to improve continuously [No name written on paper]”.
I feel happy because some parents might watch it and say what a good school we have and they might also enroll there kids [The Professor].
I expected for the video to contain more people in it, for the video to be longer, to discuss other questions and answer segments. […] [T]he video consisted of people who contribute a lot to the Committee rather than younger people, who were asked questions from the director and that is such a shame and it truly summarised the Steering Committee [James].
Very good publicity. […] The video was very powerful. […] [School name] is a beautiful school that actually cares about what the students think or like and need for them [Ike].
It felt like a sense of accomplishment, finally we can make a difference. It felt a little weird but it was very exciting. […] I am very proud to have been apart of it. […] It shows that we listen support each other because in the movie we were finishing each others sentences, we all felt the same. […] We have evolved so much as a group and as a team over the past year. I am very happy with the amount of work we got done and our results throughout the year [Brooke Davis].
At the same time, one Senior Executive teacher was concerned that not enough detail about the students’ research methods had been included in the final video, and that not all students had been equally represented in the video’s editing process. This collective feedback was sent to the organisation before it was uploaded to the organisation’s website.

**[WRITTEN FROM OCTOBER 2013 AND PRESENTED DEC 2013]** This conference paper was formed in and through my perturbations felt throughout this research. In particular, a particular ethnographic event from the first collaborative analysis day is discussed. This event was not discussed in this thesis.

**Abstract**

Scholars and practitioners who align themselves with the ‘student voice’ movement call for the participation of young people in the reform of and research about their schools (Cook-Sather, 2006; Fielding, 2009). Research on students in schools has been eschewed in favour of research with or by students (Kellet, 2011). In this paper, I attempt to give an account of how I have come ‘undone’ (Jackson & Mazzei, 2012) as a researcher and a teacher in the process of research ‘in the fold’ (Deleuze, 1988/1993) of a school where I previously taught and facilitated a student participation initiative. Over a year of ethnographic fieldwork, students and teachers were invited to discuss their experiences of students’ involvement in the National Partnerships for Low Socio-Economic Schools reform process. I examine my initial desire to ask those ‘directly concerned to speak on their own behalf’ (Deleuze, in Deleuze & Foucault, 1977, p. 209). I then discuss my anxieties surrounding speaking for the students (cf. Alcoff, 1991; Spivak, 1987), and what Deleuze and Guattari’s preposition before (Deleuze & Foucault, 1977; Deleuze & Guattari, 1994/2009) has produced in these methodological experiments. The affective intensities at work in a particular vocal and non-vocal pedagogical encounter provoke the questions: What does student participation do? What does it produce? And: What does research about student participation do? What does it produce?

In the paper itself, I described the event:

On the same day, a survey for a university study was being conducted in the hall, supervised by casual teachers and overseen by university staff. I had been told my the Head Teacher who was the liaison for the survey that certain Year 10 students’ parents’ had signed consent forms a few years ago agreeing to their child’s participation in the survey once a year. We agreed that these certain students would leave the participatory analysis that I was facilitating for one period to go to the hall to complete the survey.

Telling the students this arrangement in the morning, the students who had previously participated in this survey study began complaining about it. They complained that teachers stood over them and made them do the survey. They complained that the survey was 20 pages long and took 50 minutes; that the language was hard; that the survey asked “very personal” questions about their families and that they had to write their names on the front of the survey. We discussed the principle of informed and ongoing consent, and how filling in the survey is a form of consent. We discussed ethical principles and I repeated a few times that they did not have to do the survey if they did not want to, even if their parents had signed a

| Students from collaborative analysis days | Not published (See Mayes, 2013b in Reference List). |
consent form on their behalf.

One of the students, who later chose the pseudonym ‘Steve’, and described himself as “black and funny, love[s] to meet new people, confident”, was one of the students who went out to do the survey. Steve returned 5 or 10 minutes later from the hall. He sauntered in with a broad smile and said to me, “I was kicked out.” […]

Since we were in the middle of analysis, I did not get to speak to Steve about his experience of being “kicked out” further. A few weeks later in the playground at lunch, I asked him what had happened. Below is an extract from my fieldnotes:

I see Steve (who is standing with another boy) and I ask him if I can ask him something. He stands tall and looks down at me and says sure. I say that I wanted to ask him about the big analysis day we had, when they also had to do that survey in the hall, and how he came back from the survey early. I ask what happened.

Steve claps his hands three times, grinning broadly.
I ask again, “what happened?”
He says, “just that.”
I am confused. I ask him to explain.
He says he clapped his hands three times in the line of students assembled to go into the hall to do the survey, and then he was told “get out.” I ask by whom – a uni person or a teacher? He says the name of a teacher.
I ask if he had wanted to do the survey.
He says, “yeah”, his voice rising in intonation. He pauses, and then continues, “I wanted to give back to the school.”
I say I’m not asking as a teacher – I’m not trying to get him in trouble, but I’m interested in what happened. I ask if he remembers the conversation that we’d had earlier on that day about not having to do the survey if they didn’t want to – if he had been thinking about that when he clapped. He says, “yeah, there’s no point because it [the survey] doesn’t do anything to change the school.” He repeats this sentence: “there’s no point.”
I thank him for talking to me about this. He says, “no worries miss. Take care.”

When I asked about the incident, his response was movement, embodied re-enactment of what had happened, accompanied by a cheeky grin. Steve’s description and explanation of his action of clapping three times is still quite ambivalent, but the action of clapping and the response of the teacher were clearly imprinted in his mind. He did not talk back to the teacher; he did not ‘speak up’ and say that he didn’t want to do the survey (indeed, it is ambiguous whether he did want to do the survey and “give back to the school”, or whether he was saying that for my benefit, or whether he did not want to do the survey).

This event was later discussed in relation to Deleuze and Guattari’s discussion of the question What can a body do? and their discussion of minor literature.
[WRITTEN FROM SEPTEMBER 2013 AND PRESENTED IN FEBRUARY 2014]
This paper emerged from an interpretosis (see Chapter 4) event: where I over-coded a drawing and words written by a student from the school’s Support Unit for students diagnosed with autism. This event happened on the day of an excursion to the regional gallery to see the finalised exhibition. The paper presentation included a number of the photographs of the students’ works of art that are included in this thesis text.

Abstract

In this paper I describe how an art project in a school’s autism unit ruptured my ethnography of ‘student voice’ in school reform and my understanding of myself as a researcher. Concerns about linguisticism in the ‘student voice’ literature are intersected with similar concerns in the disability studies literature, before I describe a series of relational encounters that are beyond the verbal or written word and the human subject in isolation. The art project explored in this paper involved students and teachers winding, knitting, folding and knotting wool, fabric, thread and paper, constructing works that became part of a larger public art exhibition. I argue that these works of art are visual statements of a different mode of being, speaking and relating in schools: a ‘becoming’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 1980/1987) ontology of individuals, education, and ethnography. Yet a particular research encounter also reminded me of the dangers of pinning down an uncrirical celebratory account of a student’s communication, a student voice project or a collaborative art project.

I gave an account and analysis of my interpretosis event in the conference paper.

[WRITTEN BETWEEN AUGUST AND NOVEMBER 2014]
The academic partner was invited to contribute an article about metaphors for educational research. She invited Ms Frazzle and I to be part of this process. This article, led by the academic partner, was a retrospective consideration of the accountability pressures felt as part of the reform process and the challenges of sustainability. The academic partner and I wrote this piece of writing collaboratively, meeting and passing drafts back and forth. This work was informed by our entanglements with Ms Frazzle’s work, and shared with her in its preparation.

Abstract

Students as co-researchers is a mode of engagement between students and teachers in school systems that has been likened to a
bridge. This article explores the bridge metaphor with reference to one school’s experience of students as co-researchers project involving students and teachers in the school and a university partner. We use the bridge metaphor, inspired by the imagist poet Ezra Pound, to explore particular challenges faced in this project, and to envision new modes of teacher/student relationships in education. We argue that the purpose of building such a bridge between students and teachers is not an instrumental one (to reach the other side), but rather that the bridge offers up zones of affective relational encounters between students and teachers.

[WRITTEN FROM AUGUST 2013 AND PUBLISHED MARCH 2016] This journal article (see abstract below) was formed through my engagement with students about age, and particularly focuses on the puppet production created by Samantha, Pythagoras and Johnathan Stewart and discussed in Chapter 6. The article also discusses my engagements with students on the collaborative analysis days about why they gravitated towards the puppets (discussed also in Chapter 5 of this thesis) and includes discussion of the post-it note written on by James (see Figure 19).

Abstract

The conception of the child that a researcher holds has implications for research methods. This article adds to work that mobilises Deleuze and Guattari’s becoming-child in Childhood Studies, exploring what their conceptual tools do to research methods and analysis. I map how puppet production emerged as a research method during an ethnography at a high school and how the students and I co-theorised the methodological value of puppet production. Exploring one particular puppet production, it is argued that puppet productions, analysed with young people, may open up conceptual possibilities, but must be examined alongside the dynamic conditions of their creation and analysis.

Samantha, Pythagoras, Johnathan Stewart, students from first and second collaborative analysis days, and James
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